



Second Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

LAW AMENDMENTS

40 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. Jack Reimer
Constituency of Niakwa



VOL. XL No. 6 - 3 p.m., TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

LIB - Liberal; ND - New Democrat; PC - Progressive Conservative

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIB
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	ND
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	ND
CARR, James	Crescentwood	LIB
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIB
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	ND
CHEEMA, Guizar	The Maples	LIB
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	ND
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	ND
DOER, Gary	Concordia	ND
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIB
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Cliff	Interlake	ND
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	ND
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	ND
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIB
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	ND
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	ND
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	LIB
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	ND
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	ND
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	ND
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	ND
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	ND
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	ND
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	ND
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	ND
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	ND

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW AMENDMENTS

Tuesday, July 23, 1991

TIME — 3 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa)

ATTENDANCE - 10 — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Downey, McCrae, Hon. Mrs. Mitchelson

Messrs. Evans (Brandon East), Hicke, Lamoureux, McAlpine, Reimer, Sveinson, Mrs. Vodrey

APPEARING:

Steve Ashton, MLA for Thompson

Glen Findlay, MLA for Springfield

John Plohman, MLA for Dauphin

Judy Wasylycia-Leis, MLA for St. Johns

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill 65—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1991

* * *

Clerk of Committees (Ms. Bonnie Greschuk): Will the committee please come to order. We must proceed to elect a Chairperson for the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. Are there any nominations?

Mr. Ben Sveinson (La Verendrye): I nominate Mr. Reimer for Chairperson.

Madam Clerk: Mr. Reimer has been nominated as Chairperson. Are there any further nominations? Since there are no further nominations, will Mr. Reimer please take the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Will the committee on Law Amendments please come to order. Bill 65, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1991, will be considered today. Does the minister responsible have an opening statement?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Yes, Mr. Chairperson, before clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 65, I would like to indicate that the Minister of Labour (Mr.

Praznik) has requested that the proposed changes to The Amusements Act that appear in Section 1 of the bill be deleted.

In view of the fact that a member of the public has expressed an interest in speaking to the substance of the changes, the minister is prepared to bring this matter back to the House in the form of a separate bill at a later session, should that be necessary, following his review of the matter.

We are advised by staff that a motion to delete a clause is not in order and that the appropriate approach is to vote against the clause. Accordingly, I would invite honourable members to vote against Clause 1 of Bill 65.

Mr. Chairman: Does the critic for the official opposition have an opening statement?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Just on that, we indicate that is quite satisfactory in terms of that particular provision. We have a number of questions about other provisions. There has been some discussion with the minister on the possibility of further amendments on the section on The Pas health complex, and he is undertaking to look at that for potential amendment at report stage. There are also some ongoing discussions on the section on the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women which may or may not affect that particular section.

We would be pleased to proceed through the bill clause by clause and can raise some questions on some of the items that are in there and deal with those other matters, as I indicated.

* (1510)

Mr. Chairman: Does the critic for the second opposition have an opening statement? No. Mr. Plohman.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just serve notice that it asks some questions of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) regarding The Crop Insurance Act, repealing of subsection 24(2). The reason I raise that now is because I do not have the information back from the minister's office. Looking at the act, I see that it is a

substantial change in terms of the notice that the federal government has to give to the province with regard to an agreement five years previously. I do have some questions about that. I thought it might be appropriate to raise it now, and the minister could be notified if he is available.

Mr. Chairman: The bill will be considered clause by clause. During the consideration of the bill, the Title and the Preamble are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order by the committee. I will just start with Clause 1. Shall Clause 1 pass?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour, please signify by saying yea. Those opposed, say nay. In my opinion, the clause is defeated. The Nays have it.

Clause 2—pass; Clause 3—pass; Clause 4—pass; Clause 5—pass; Clause 6—pass; Clause 7—pass; Clause 8—pass; Clause 9—

Mr. McCrae: I wonder if the members of the committee would agree to stand Section 9 down for the moment. We are, at present, attempting to find the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) so that he might attempt to answer the honourable member's questions and we could come back to Section 9, if that would be agreeable to members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman: Is there leave to come back to this clause later, Clause 9? Agreed.

Clause 10—pass; Clause 11—pass; Clause 12—pass; Clause 13—pass; Clause 14—pass; Clause 15—pass; Clause 16—pass; Clause 17—pass; Clause 18—pass; Clause 19—pass; Clause 20—pass; Clause 21—pass; Clause 22—pass; Clause 23—pass; Clause 24—pass; Clause 25—pass; Clause 26—pass; Clause 27—pass; Clause 28—pass; Clause 29—pass; Clause 30—

Mr. McCrae: This is the clause referred to a moment ago by the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). Perhaps we could give that similar treatment to Section 9 which we stood down until we can get some clarification of the position of the member for Thompson on this matter. So, if we could come back to this one, I think that would be the best way to handle it.

Mr. Chairman: We are referring to Clause 30. Is there agreement to come back to Clause 30?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed. Clause 31—pass; Clause 32—pass; Clause 33—pass; Clause 34—pass; Clause 35—pass; Clause 36—pass; Clause 37—pass; Clause 38—pass; Clause 39—pass; Clause 40—pass; Clause 41—pass; Clause 42—

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Chairperson, I do not think there is any question that Clause 42, as we see it, will find favour with the members of the committee, although I understand there is talk of a further amendment brought in by members of the New Democratic Party. On that one I am awaiting some clarification before I can agree to pass that particular amendment. I believe the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) referred possibly to an amendment at report stage on this one. So, if we can agree to that, that this one can pass as it is and to entertain the motion brought in by the NDP respecting another matter with regard to The Pas health complex, that might be a way to handle this one. So I suggest we could pass Section 42.

Mr. Chairman: Is there agreement?

* (1515)

Mr. Plohan: I am not certain right at this point. If we could just hold this a few moments. The minister's recollection or understanding of it may be correct. However, I am not certain whether the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) wanted to move an amendment at committee stage as opposed to report stage. We are just attempting to locate him right at this moment.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Chairman, if it gives members a better level of comfort, we could stand this section down as well and come back to it.

Mr. Chairman: Is it agreed to leave 42 and address it later? Agreed.

Clause 43—pass; Clause 44—pass.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Chairperson, on the understanding that Clause 44 has passed, I would move

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this Committee.

If it is necessary, I move this motion in both French and English languages.

(French version)

Il est proposé que le conseiller législatif soit autorisé à changer tous les numéros d'articles ainsi que les

renvois nécessaires à l'adoption des amendements faits par le présent comité.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a willingness to recess the committee for a few moments until the other clauses are addressed? Agreed? Agreed.

* * *

The committee took recess at 3:18 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 3:19 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Consideration of Clause 9.

Mr. Plohman: I believe Legislative Counsel has gone to get a copy of the act, The Crop Insurance Act. In any event, I wanted in reviewing this section to ask the minister, and I have attempted to contact him, but he has been busy today in meetings. His assistant did relate some information but not complete on this.

My understanding of this renumbering and deletion or repealing of subsection (2) is that the federal government would no longer have to give five years' notice for changes to an agreement under the act. That is, therefore, a significant change. If it was something that the federal government has unilaterally declared, or is something that has been negotiated and agreed to as part of GRIP or whatever, I just do not know, so I wanted to ask the minister for some clarification on how that change came about. Is it in fact true that the federal government would no longer be required to give five years' notice for changes?

* (1520)

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Back in the spring of 1990 the federal government introduced Bill C-48, the Crop Insurance Act, amendments to the Crop Insurance Act, and at that time we introduced the change of five years to two years. So what we are doing in this legislation is making our Crop Insurance Act consistent with the federal act as it has been changed.

In terms of whether there was negotiation, or whether it was acceptance of a change from five years to two years, I guess we could argue from a province point of view and the things that have happened with GRIP and changes to crop insurance, we as a province like to see more flexibility in terms of The Crop Insurance Act and

being able to do things as a response to what the farm community wants. The change from five years to two years was done before GRIP; it was done prior to GRIP coming into being. But, from the crop insurance people and the Province of Manitoba's point of view, it does give greater flexibility, which is desirable in terms of any further changes or negotiations that we and our Crop Insurance Corporation want to do with the federal partners in crop insurance, whether we are talking pure crop insurance, as we knew it in the past, or crop insurance plus revenue insurance, which is GRIP today.

So it was done on the Crop Insurance Act and we are just making our act consistent with that principle in theirs.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Chairman, the minister did not say whether there was an agreement by the province to do this in the spring of 1990 when Bill C-48 was brought in, or was this done by the federal government without consultation?

Mr. Findlay: It was done at the federal government's choice, but, as we look at things, as they have unfolded since, we like the fact that it does give greater sense of flexibility to allow provinces to negotiate changes with the federal government.

Mr. Plohman: The minister would agree that this is a significant change. I have not got the other act in front of me, but is there a provision in Section 24 now for two-year notice, or is it silent on that now because the subsection (2) was the one that dealt with the five-year notice? If it is being deleted, not being replaced with two years, where is the provision for two years?

Mr. Findlay: The two years is in the federal act, so five years in the provincial act is inconsistent.

Mr. Plohman: I wonder, federal legislation does not govern provincial jurisdiction. I mean, we have a provision here that says five years; the minister, understandably, wants to make it consistent with the federal legislation. This is not making it consistent; this just removes an anomaly but does not make it consistent because it is silent on the length of time required by the federal government to give notice for changes to this agreement. Is that correct? He now has an act that is completely silent on any requirement by the federal government to give notice. They could, in other words, change it to no notice whatsoever and that would not be in violation of our legislation.

Mr. Findlay: What the federal government will do is governed by their act, which says two years, and legal counsel has interpreted what is written there in terms of how they have acted here. They have written it in here to be silent on the years by taking out the five because the two years is in the federal act, and putting two years in here would just be duplicating what is already in the federal act.

Mr. Plozman: Yes, did the previous federal act have five years in it when they reduced it to two?

Mr. Findlay: That is right.

Mr. Plozman: Does the minister know the history of this as to why the province had a five-year provision then if it was simply duplication of the federal act and no other function?

Mr. Findlay: At the time when it was put in the provincial act it was deemed to be the appropriate thing to do, and I would have to gather that legal counsel has decided there is no need for the two years being stipulated in the provincial act now with it in the federal act, because that is the overriding governing act in crop insurance in the country of Canada.

* (1525)

Mr. Plozman: Can the minister indicate how long the five-year provision existed in the act?

Mr. Findlay: I am just almost speculating, but as far as I know it is from the beginning, which was about 1960 or '61.

Mr. Plozman: I know that we are moving toward the end of the session, but I do want to register concern that something that is a major change in terms of the act is put into the Statute of Law Amendments. It is not just housekeeping. It does, in fact, change an agreement with the federal government, albeit, as the minister says, makes it consistent with the federal legislation which was not changed by consultation; it was changed unilaterally.

The minister says, well, he does not have any problems with that change. Perhaps he wants it less than two years, I do not know; but he has not stated that here. He does say he wants flexibility, and yet we are bringing in a change, which I have no reason to believe was ever consulted with the farmers of Manitoba, with the Crop Insurance officials or anything. I think on those grounds it should not be slipped into an omnibus act such as this; it should actually be a change in The Crop

Insurance Act. That would be my only protest to this that I would like to register is that I do not think it is appropriate to be slipped in here.

Mr. Findlay: In terms of consultation with the farm community, we have been in months and months of consultation on a large number of issues related to crop insurance and revenue insurance, an incredible number of issues, and those consultations and discussions with the producers and the other provincial governments and the federal government are a steady ongoing process as we evolve the kind of risk protection that farmers are going to need in today's environment, and that environment is a moving target.

This may seem like a big issue to the member because it has been in there for a long time, but the federal government has made a change and every province has to coincide with that change in terms of their provincial legislation, and that is what is being done in this particular instance. There is no doubt that in the future delivery of the risk protection programming, crop insurance or revenue insurance, flexibility will be needed; flexibility and understanding will be needed by producers and other levels of government. So we are in a difficult process to be sure that the risk protection mechanisms do meet the farmers' need, and this flexibility in an ongoing process is going to be needed.

Mr. Plozman: The section now that I have in front of me that we are deleting says that the Government of Canada will not terminate the agreement, except on five years' notice in writing given to the minister. That seems to be a pretty good protection for the farmers of Manitoba and for the province to have that kind of protection on termination. We are not talking about changes here; we are talking about terminating the agreement.

The minister was talking in his explanation that he wants flexibility in terms of changes. We are talking termination here. Why is the minister so willing to eliminate a five-year provision for termination of a crop insurance agreement with the federal government? Is he just prepared to operate on blind faith?

Mr. Findlay: The federal act now has that in it, two years, and that is the overriding act. We could put ten years there; it would not mean anything because the federal act now says two years.

Mr. Plohman: Yes, and the minister is not even prepared to put the two years in in this one, nor was he consulted when the five-year change was removed by the federal government, as has been stated by the minister. Is that correct?

Mr. Findlay: The federal government made their changes, and they made them as they saw fit. There was not any meaningful consultation on whether we accept it or not. They decided to do it; they did it.

Mr. Plohman: I made my point and I will state it again. Why did the minister not bring in an amendment to the act in the normal course of changes to the act, as is normally done, rather than having a change that changes the requirement of notice for a major agreement, such a major change from five years to nothing—in fact, to their act to two years—without bringing it in through the proper channels, rather than through the Statute of Law Amendments?

Mr. Findlay: As I have said several times already, the change happened in March of 1990 and the federal act, Bill C-48, the change was made to two years, so this is a routine adjustment so that we are consistent.

Mr. Chalman: Clause 9—pass.

Clause 30.

* (1530)

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Chairperson, I would just like to indicate that the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women wrote to me back in early March of this year. I do want to read into the record the letter that they wrote to me requesting a name change for the advisory council.

I quote: The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women has since its inception had ongoing difficulties with confusion between ourselves and the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women. The confusion exists in the minds of the media as well as in the general public. As a result, we get their mail and vice versa. The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women is quoted in the media as having said something that was actually stated by the action committee or statements by council's chair are attributed to the action committee. Even some MLAs are not sure of the difference between the two organizations. After some deliberations and consultation with the council members, we would like to suggest that the name

of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women be changed by act of the Legislature to Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba. We hope this proposal meets with your approval, et cetera.

As a result of the request from the advisory council, I felt there was really no problem in making a name change and therefore came forward in this bill with a name change to the Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba. That was the name that they recommended to us.

Back in May of this year during my Estimates as Minister responsible for the Status of Women, I indicated clearly in my opening statement that in fact this name change would be coming forward in legislation this session. It was subsequently introduced through this bill to the House several weeks ago, I believe. I had heard nothing until a few short moments ago that possibly the NDP caucus had some problems with the name change. I would like to support the Advisory Council on the Status of Women in this change. I believe that maybe the NDP party would like to put something on the record.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Chairperson, I would like to express some serious concerns on behalf of the New Democratic Party caucus with respect to the proposed name change. I want to begin though by apologizing for the lateness of raising this request. It has only recently come to our attention in terms of dealing with all the bills before us. So I apologize for that. However, I believe our concerns are very serious ones and I believe would be reflected by women in the community.

The legislation creating the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women is very new. It is only several years old. At that time, consideration was given to the whole question of the name of the council. It was felt then that the name the Advisory Council on the Status of Women reflected the intentions of the legislation and the role of the committee and indeed its very purpose from the beginning. It is the view of our caucus and I would believe the view of many women's activists in the Manitoba community that this proposed name change is a significant divergence from reflecting the intent and purpose of the actual council.

* (1535)

Clearly the current name, Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, indicates a group, a council of members appointed to work on Status

of Women issues, to enhance equality between women and men in our society. It is a significant change to go from that title to the Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba which, in essence, means a body of women advising the government of Manitoba. The intentions of that council, the real goal and purpose and aims and objectives of the council are not reflected in the title and I believe do not do a service to the origins of this council and to the work that has gone on over the years.

I would simply suggest at this point that perhaps we give some reconsideration of entrenching this name change in legislation at this time and that perhaps there could be some consultation process over the next number of months and this brought back to the Manitoba Legislature in the next session.

I cannot say that we reflect the women's community in its entirety in Manitoba. I cannot say that the final name may not be as recommended, the Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba. I think in the interests of those women who have spoken out on these issues and fought hard for the entrenchment of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women in legislation not so long ago that it is in our best interest to pause, to discuss, to reflect and to bring this matter back.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Clause 30.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Chairperson, I guess my main concern is that there is a body that is working on behalf of women in the province no matter what their name might be. If it is an advisory body that can be an advocacy body for women, I do not think a name really makes a difference.

If I can just relate it to Ontario, Ontario has an advisory council on women's issues and, in fact, I believe they probably work just as hard and are committed just as much to the women in Ontario as the women in Manitoba who are part of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women work.

I do not have a hang-up and I do not have a big problem with names but, in fact, if it is going to cause some problem with the New Democratic caucus and party at this point in time, I will agree at this point to remove it from the legislation and bring in next year a change. It seems absolutely silly to me that two organizations with the same initials and very similar names get their mail mixed up. It causes major inconvenience for, I am sure, both organizations.

I would, at this point in time, indicate that we will, this session, not change the name, but we will, in

fact, be bringing in a change that will distinguish the two groups and will work on behalf of women. I do not think, as I have indicated before, a name makes the difference. It is the commitment of the women who are involved in the Manitoba community and society that will make a difference for women in Manitoba.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Chairperson, before the minister does withdraw it, I would like to ask a question from the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), if the committee will allow.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Lamoureux: Was she in contact with the different organizations? I am asking specifically, where did she get the direction from? Did she contact these organizations? Are they opposing it themselves? Where are you getting that position from?

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Chairperson, I would inform all members that we are in fairly regular contact with active women and women's organizations on a regular basis. This issue is not a new one. It is only as recent as three to four years ago that the legislation to create the advisory council on the status women was initiated, was sponsored by the previous New Democratic Party government. That process went through, that legislative proposal went through a great deal of discussion. There were certainly questions pertaining to the appropriate name for this council raised then. It was certainly agreed, back those several years ago, that the title "Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women" truly reflected the aims and intentions of the council.

We recognize the problem in terms of confusion between the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women and the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women. Some of our own members continue to mix up the two organizations. We are not adverse to dealing with that particular problem. We are very concerned with the proposal before us, the Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba.

There is a significant difference between that title and the suggestion or the example just given to this committee by the Minister responsible for the Status of Women; that being the Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues. Again that is a title that reflects the intent and purpose of the actual body, of the actual organization, to act, speak out on behalf of

women's issues, status of women matters and equality between women and men. That is the kind of idea that needs to be reflected in the title. It is not reflected now in the Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Chairman, I kind of regret the situation that we have here. I would just like to put on the record my reason for agreeing with the minister's recommendation in this case. That is, as the Minister responsible for the annual Statute Law Amendment bill, I like to maintain a tradition that the Statute Law Amendment bill is not one that should be the subject of a whole lot of haggling and difficulty. It ought to deal with issues that are not generally substantive in nature, but where they are substantive they are a question of no controversy.

* (1540)

The honourable member for St. Johns has decided to make an issue about this name change, which has been requested by the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women. She has made an issue of this. In the spirit that I like to carry forward with respect to Statute Law Amendment, I think I reluctantly would agree with the minister's recommendation that we pull this particular clause.

It is on that basis and I wanted the record to show it is on that basis that I will be voting against this clause in this bill. I also know, as the minister has said, that the matter will resurface in our Legislature to help the council deal with the problem that it has.

Ms. Wasylcia-Lels: Mr. Chairperson, I just want to indicate to both the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) that we are not making an issue out of this. We are pointing out our legitimate concerns with respect to the proposed name change. I hope that we are free, as legislators and members of this committee to make those suggestions, to point out concerns and to seek change on that basis.

If the government members have problems with our change, then they are free to forge ahead. We are simply suggesting that it may not be fully accepted in the broad women's community. Certainly there is nothing to lose in terms of consultation.

I would suggest to those who indicate there is nothing in a name, in fact there is everything in a name. Often symbols and names and signals are as significant as substantive issues. Members

around this table know that very well. Certainly members of the Conservative Party know that very well when it came to how they displayed the name Progressive Conservative Party in the last election.

There are issues in a name for a council dealing with equality and status of women issues. A name is important. I do not want to belabour this issue. I simply want to raise our concerns, and I appreciate the gesture on the part of the minister to perhaps reconsider this issue and bring it back at a future date.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Chairperson, I do not think I can continue without making a few comments and correcting a few things. I mean, it was the Advisory Council on the Status of Women who came forward to this government and asked for a name change.

I hear the member for St. Johns talking about a symbol. I hope they are not just symbols but in fact they are there as advocates for women in the province of Manitoba. They are the ones who are experiencing the difficulties with the name and with the confusion and being mixed up. There obviously was not a lot of forethought, and obviously the New Democratic caucus is not terribly progressive because women's issue change and women change.

If in fact we have women who have recognized a fault with the name that was given to them by the NDP party or government of the day, because it causes major confusion, then in fact it is inhibiting their ability to do their job in a really effective manner. If in fact mail that is supposed to come to them goes to another organization, there is a delay in women being able to inform the advisory council of concerns and issues that they may have. Then I consider it a major problem, and I think there is a real need to make a change in the name.

I think the NDP caucus is somewhat wrong-headed on this issue, but in fact, we will go back to the women's community, and I will guarantee that we will come forward next year with legislation that will provide less confusion to the women's community and to the women of Manitoba, and get on with the business of dealing with women's issues in a very progressive and responsible way.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Chairperson, this is something that the advisory council itself is recommending to the minister. The Liberal Party supports the recommendation. The New

Democratic Party has said that they do not want to make a large issue out of the wording. I would suggest that in fact we do allow it to come to a vote at this time. We would be supporting it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Clause 30 pass? All in favour, say yea.

An Honourable Member: Yea.

Mr. Chairman: All opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairman: In my opinion, the Nays have it. Clause 30 is accordingly defeated.

We will now move to Clause 42.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Chairperson, on further reflection with respect to The Pas Health Complex Incorporation Act, the amendment you see before you in our Statute Law Amendment bill arises because an error needs to be corrected in the re-enacted private statute here. So I am going to recommend that we go ahead and pass these

changes, and other changes to be recommended by the New Democrats in a private members' bill should be done in the ordinary way, because there are certain requirements for private members' bills for petitioning the House, and so on, which is impossible to be done here.

I should correct my terminology—private bills as opposed to private members' bills. I put that on the record and ask for the honourable members to support these changes.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Clause 42 passing, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairman: All opposed, say nay. In my opinion, it is passed.

Clause 44—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 3:48 p.m.