



Third Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

---

39-40 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**VOL. XLI No. 92B - 7 p.m., TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 1992**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, June 23, 1992

The House met at 7 p.m.

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, what I intend to do is call report stage of those bills, with leave of the House—all of this will require leave, I imagine—that were reported this afternoon. Having passed clause by clause, there are several of them over the last sitting day of the committees, and I will ask you to call the bills then in the following order: 9, 61, 62, 71, 73, 75, 84, 92, 94, 95. These are report stage.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Acting Opposition House Leader):** For clarification, those bills, the numbers of which the government House leader just read, are those that had received passage earlier in the day, and he now wants permission of the House to proceed to report stage on these bills that he has enumerated. Is that correct?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is correct.

**Mr. Manness:** In fairness to the opposition acting House leader, I know he would like to have a schedule of the names of those bills, of the titles of those bills, and I only have it because I have the motions in front of me. I am wondering if we could ask the Clerk to provide some piece of paper that would give the member opposite and indeed the Liberal House leader also the titles of the bills in question.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Speaker, this is my question. Is it the government's wish to proceed through all the bills in the report stage, and then from that point, go on to the third readings? Is that correct?

**Mr. Speaker:** Third readings, that is correct.

### REPORT STAGE

#### Bill 9—The Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** I move, (by leave) seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 9, The Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act

(Loi sur le Conseil de l'innovation économique et de la technologie), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (1905)

#### Bill 61—The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4)

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 61, The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4)? Is there leave? Yes, there is leave.

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** I move, (by leave) seconded by the honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 61, The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4); Loi no 4 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur, reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### Bill 62—The Business Practices Amendment Act (2)

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 62, The Business Practices Amendment Act (2)? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed.

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I move, (by leave) seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 62, The Business Practices Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les pratiques commerciales, reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### Bill 71—The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 71? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** On behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr.

McCrae), with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 71, The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act (Loi sur les bénéficiaires des régimes de retraite), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 73—The Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 73, The Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act? Leave. It is agreed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** With leave of the House, I move, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 73, The Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les directives en matière de soins de santé et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (1910)

### **Bill 75—The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 75, The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** With the leave of the House, I move, on behalf of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 75, The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 84—The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 84, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I move, (by leave), seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 84, The Residential Tenancies Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation, reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 92—The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 92, The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 92, The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le vérificateur provincial), reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 94—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 94, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992? There is leave? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), with leave of the House, that Bill 94, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992 (Loi de 1992 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité), as amended and reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### Bill 95—The Tax Appeals Commission Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 95, The Tax Appeals Commission Act? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 95, The Tax Appeals Commission Act (Loi sur la Commission d'appel des impôts et des taxes), reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (1915)

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, what I propose to do now is call third readings of the very same bills that we have just finished report stage and, of course, I will require leave.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the House whether or not they want to give individual leave to these bills or indeed whether they want to give it as a package. The bills, therefore, are 9—[interjection] You have the listing? Thank you.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Just in response to the government House leader, we are prepared to give leave for all those bills that were just given report stage.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** I do not think there would be any problem, but I think the Speaker should call them one at a time and ask for leave each time.

**Mr. Speaker:** We will call them one at a time.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill 9—The Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 9, The Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 9, The

Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act, (Loi sur le Conseil de l'innovation économique et de la technologie), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** I will just take a few minutes to put a few final remarks on the record on this particular bill.

It saddens me, Mr. Speaker, that the government has missed an opportunity to do something really creative in the area of providing greater direction and support for research and development in this province. I was particularly dismayed by the unwillingness of the minister in committee to accept any amendments that I think would remove some of the obvious flaws in this particular bill.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we are not setting up a council that is independent of government. We are not setting up a council that will be allowed to recommend independently new directions in research and development. We are setting up one more little committee that will operate under the direction and at the direction [interjection] I am glad that we have the technical difficulty straightened out, and I will start over again. I know the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is dying to hear because he missed a couple of the very important points I made at the beginning.

When the government proposed this bill, the government will recall that I stood immediately after the minister put a few supportive remarks on the record and asked that it be passed into committee immediately, because I felt it was about time, after four years, that this government got down to doing something serious on economic development. When we received and then when we got into committee and looked at really what the implications of this bill were, I must say that we were extremely disappointed.

We have a need right now to develop an expertise to assist this province, not just this government, but this province, in making some very tough economic decisions, so the concept of establishing a committee, an organization that can stand apart from government, that can make economic decisions that are going to go on beyond the four-year life of any government and can make the tough choices between what they are going to fund and what they are not going to fund, is a good idea.

What we have here is a commission that is appointed entirely by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The chief executive officer and the chairman of the board are appointed directly by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. All of the major decisions of the council are subject to review by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The minister determines most of the activities if the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is not expressly indicated to be doing so.

\* (1920)

There is virtually no independent action that this body can take, and that can only lead one to one conclusion, that this is simply window-dressing. It is not a sincere attempt to step back from politicizing economic policy in this province, and that is very sad, because I think all of us are going to be losers as a result.

What we have here is one more public relations activity on the part of this government. It has no substance; it has no depth; it has no credibility. It will be proved, like similar actions on the part of the former government, to be entirely without merit.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** I just want to put a few brief comments on the record. All the Deputy Premier [interjection] Well, this is a pretty feisty group tonight, and one would question why the feistiness. They just had a member of their own caucus resign over economic development and the lack of economic development for rural Manitoba, and they sit there with smiles on their faces about their economic innovation fund.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the public knows best what is going on in terms of the economy of this province. This is the Premier's bill. The Premier sponsored this bill, the new chair of the new economic committee of cabinet, an \$850,000 body that cannot give us answers on the impact on free trade with Mexico, cannot give us answers on the impact of free trade with the United States, cannot give us answers on various economic questions that we have on a daily basis and cannot give us the answer to why Manitoba was in dead-last place in 1991 of all the provinces in Canada—dead last, No. 10.

The last time this government and this province was in last place, whether it was Ed Schreyer or Sterling Lyon or Howard Pawley or Gary Filmon at the so-called helm, was when Walter Weir was

defeated in 1969 by Ed Schreyer. That was the last time this province was in dead last place.

Mr. Speaker, this government said a year ago that they would just step aside and allow the private sector to develop the economic opportunities in this province. Just step aside, the Premier said, do not worry about us. We will just step aside, and we will let the private sector create the jobs.

Well what do we see? Private sector investment was second last in Canada in 1991; manufacturing investment in Manitoba in 1991 was last; manufacturing shipments were down 13 percent in 1991; residential construction was second last.

Mr. Speaker, we were in last place in private sector investment or second only to Newfoundland. So what did we see? We called on the government to provide an economic summit of business, labour and government to get together to share their challenges, to share their ideas, to share their views, to share their vision and to share the challenge of working together to get Manitobans working again.

Government does not like that. They would rather just have a little session with the Chamber of Commerce, pass a few of their laws and think that that is economic development. Well, it is not.

Mr. Speaker, then they came back, and this is a great government for public relations. The Chamber of Commerce has already commented on the public relations part of the government in dealing with The Environment Act. People are now starting to see through the pool-like strategy of this government. Three or four cabinet ministers, three or four lights, three or four baseball hats yesterday, and no jobs and no content. People are starting to see through it.

Mr. Speaker, this government decided to do something about the economy. I guess they thought their step-aside approach was not working with the public, so they tried a different strategy. They created this gimmick called the Economic Innovation and Technological Council, and they put 30 business people on the council. They put a couple of labour people on, a couple of academics, and they called this an Innovation Council. This is after they got rid of more funding and more development in research and development before they created this Economic Innovation committee at cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, the public spoke out on this bill. There were two representatives of the public who

spoke on this bill and really cited the weaknesses of the Tory economic policy in Manitoba and the economic policy of the Premier (Mr. Filmon). It is too bad the Premier was not at the committee to hear the public presentations on his own bill—too bad, because the silence of others spoke volumes about what is going on in this province.

\* (1925)

Did we see all the representatives of this so-called Economic Innovation Council coming forward and praising this great idea of Tory economic redevelopment? Now we did not. They would be too embarrassed to come forward on what they know to be a public relations exercise and a public relations bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are in last place, dead last. We are talking about it every day in Question Period, and now members of the Conservative caucus are raising it in the public arena. We believe in a consensus of our public and people in this province. We believe that business, labour and government should co-operate and work together, but we do not believe in these public relations gimmicks, as the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has pointed out.

We believe the public of Manitoba will evaluate you on the bottom line, a last-place bottom line. If this Premier was a chief executive officer in a corporation, he would be fired by the shareholders—fired. If we was a head of a nonprofit organization, he would be fired by the nonprofit voters at an annual meeting. If he was the head of almost any other organization in this province, he would be fired for being in last place.

**An Honourable Member:** What is a nonprofit voter?

**Mr. Doer:** The member opposite does not know what a nonprofit voter is. Why do you not attend a United Way meeting in Brandon or Portage or Thompson, or the Cancer Association.

Mr. Speaker, he would have a democratic vote, and if he was in last place, he would be defeated; he or she would be defeated. Instead, we see 28 trained seals going along with a last-place economic performance. We see this Conservative caucus hanging on to power, in spite of the fact that they are in last place, until today, until tonight. Now we are seeing the people inside saying what the people outside are saying. They are now talking about why we are in last place, why this government is "rotten" in terms of economic performance, and those were

not my words, Mr. Speaker. That was what the member for Portage La Prairie told me a couple of weeks ago. "Rotten," that was the word he used to describe the inside of the apple, the inside of this operation.

Mr. Speaker, we will pass this bill—[interjection] Well, we will have speaker for speaker; it is your decision. We will pass this bill, and if the government chooses to speak, we will have other speakers, because you cannot defend dead last. You may talk about your little fantasies in the future. You may talk about all these things. We have 14,000 fewer manufacturing jobs May of 1992 over May of 1988. We have fewer jobs in every major sector in this province than you had when you took office.

We will pass this bill on third reading, but look at the fact that nobody came out to speak in favour of Tory economic policies, because there is no Tory economic policies, and that is why we had the silence of the business community when the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) bill, without the Premier in presence, was presented to the committee before the public of Manitoba Monday—zero economic policy, zero feedback from the business community or the people of Manitoba.

Nobody in the world is saying how well this government is doing. They are all talking about the fact that you are in last place. Shame on the government.

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words about this bill, a very important bill for the future of Manitoba and the creation of an organization that I feel will be in place for many years to come.

I had the good fortune to participate in some of their meetings last week, and the enthusiasm and expertise that these 29 individuals bring to the table is going to do an awful lot of good for the economy of Manitoba. I have a lot of confidence in those 29 individuals who are representing Manitoba on that council. I wish the leader of the opposition would show some of the same confidence for those very talented and committed people.

Several months ago, we had an opportunity in this House, where there was unanimous support of all members to have a MUPI, a matter of urgent public importance on the economy, an opportunity certainly for the opposition parties to come forth with

all of their ideas, their thoughts, what should be done in this province, what kinds of initiatives should be undertaken. What did we hear, Mr. Speaker? Absolutely nothing, not one idea—anybody who wants to go back and read Hansard a second time will find that there is absolutely not a single idea that came forward from the opposition parties, particularly the NDP opposition. Here we support this initiative to have an urgent debate on the issue, and not a single idea comes forth.

\* (1930)

I also hope the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) had an opportunity to read a survey that came out from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business on Friday, and they were talking about businesses within Canada. They surveyed their membership, some 15,000 small businesses primarily across Canada, and they said the second biggest impediment to their operations creating further economic opportunities, creating further jobs, is the policies and programs of provincial governments. The national average was something like 54 percent who said that this was the second biggest impediment, the policies and directions of provincial governments.

If the Leader of the Opposition takes a look at the provincial breakdown, he will find that in the province of Manitoba, it was in the low 20 percent, the best rating of any province in all of Canada, Mr. Speaker. That is the business community themselves, small businesses across Canada, putting forth their thoughts on the jobs that provincial governments are doing.

I encourage the opposition members to take a look at that survey because it is very telling about the attitude of businesses and individuals trying to do business in provinces. If you get out and talk to those individuals, you will find that one of the single most important issues, and one of the single biggest impediments to expansion and development—and we saw it again today in another study from CFIB—is the area of taxation.

What kind of taxation policies did our province have the misfortune of going through from 1982 to 1988? Shame, I say, to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and the policies that they brought to the table from that time frame, Mr. Speaker. Look at the increases in taxes during that time frame, some \$800 million plus. Look at the losses in our Crown corporations, \$400 million to

\$500 million. Think back to MTX. Think back to ManOil. Think back to the continual fiascos and losses of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars that were heaped upon us during the period of 1982-1988.

We will not follow policies like that. We have reduced income taxes. We have frozen provincial sales taxes, and we have not increased personal income tax, corporate income tax, provincial sales tax in the last five budgets. We listen to the citizens of Manitoba, and they say no to more taxes. It is too bad that the Leader of the Opposition and his party did not listen to some of that during their time frame.

I have a lot of confidence in this province, Mr. Speaker. You need look no further than the projections for this province in 1992 and 1993—being in the top three or four provinces in terms of growth rate and gross domestic product, leading the nation in private sector investment in the manufacturing sector, second overall in Canada in terms of private sector investment, the third lowest unemployment rate in all of Canada, among the lowest consumer bankruptcies in all of Canada, among the lowest business bankruptcies in all of Canada. The list goes on and on and on.

We will not fall into the trap that happened so often to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and his party, that they tried to find a quick fix. They think that the quick fix is again to dip into the pocket of the taxpayer and go out and create make-work projects here and make-work projects there, mismanage our hard-earned tax money here, mismanage it there.

In terms of creating the proper economic climate for a province, it requires sound fiscal policies in the areas of taxation and how you manage your economy. We are doing just that, Mr. Speaker, and at the same time, creating pools of capital that allow Manitobans the opportunity to invest in their province.

You need look no further than programs like Vision Capital. Look at Grow Bonds in rural Manitoba. Look at the Crocus Fund in terms of employee ownership, which I am sure the Leader of the Opposition supports. Look at the newly announced manufacturing Industrial Recruitment Initiative, a series of capital pools that create the capital required for Manitobans and individuals to invest right here in our province.

Look at the training being provided in conjunction with the private sector. Look at the Workforce 2000 and the training of some 15,000 employees here in



Manitoba in the fiscal year 1991-92. I could go on and on. I have confidence in this province in terms of building on the strengths that we have, but you have to create the positive economic climate. You have to create the solid foundation that individuals have confidence in.

Individuals lost confidence in Manitoba from 1982 to '88. Individuals not only in this province, but across this nation and around the world lost confidence with the fiscal policies of the government of the day. We do not do that. We are creating a positive economic climate in this province that can be built on for years to come, and we will see the results.

The Economic Innovation Technology Council and the 29 citizens committed to that organization, including two representatives from labour, will be a major part of the development and the future of this province, Mr. Speaker. I have confidence in them. I hope the Liberal Party has confidence in those individuals, and I certainly hope the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and his party start to show some confidence in Manitobans and in their ability to compete, not only here but throughout the world.

### Committee Changes

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. To facilitate the business of the House, the honourable member for Osborne with a committee change.

**Mr. Alcock:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs). [Agreed]

**Mr. Speaker:** In order to facilitate the business of the House, I will ask the honourable member for Burrows to do his committee change at this time.

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen); and Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) for Burrows (Mr. Martindale). [Agreed]

**Mr. Speaker:** To facilitate matters, I will recognize the honourable member for Seine River with committee changes.

**Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River):** I move that the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be changed by replacing the honourable member for

Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine) with the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson). [Agreed]

### Committee Report

**Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees):** The Committee of Supply has adopted a resolution respecting Capital Supply, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* \* \*

### Bill 9—The Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Resuming debate on Bill 9.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in the debate at this point, but having listened to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), I have been inspired to say a few words at this point, near the closing hours, closing days of the session.

There is so much that could be said, and it is indeed a very important topic. In fact, the biggest challenge facing Manitobans today is the challenge of lack of economic growth and exceedingly high unemployment. We have over 50,000 people unemployed in Manitoba now, and from what I can see, we are reaching unfortunately all-time highs in terms of numbers of people who are unemployed.

\* (1940)

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a piece of legislation that really is going to mean very little in terms of addressing the problem of lack of economic growth and, certainly, the problem of excessive unemployment. This bill, I am sorry to say, is more a window dressing than an effective piece of legislation that will have some teeth, some impact on the future of our economy.

If you look at the bill and the authorities given to this council and the intention of the council, you will read that you have an organization that is very, very similar to the Manitoba Research Council which it is replacing. What this body is doing is simply absorbing the MRC. You have another name and maybe one or two other terms of reference, so really

you have a warmed-over Manitoba Research Council.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against the idea of having the council. I am not against the idea, but I am saying that this council, as such, is not going to be effective in turning the tide of economic decline in this province. Our economy, unfortunately, has declined very seriously over the last few years. Traditionally, we have been a slow-growth economy. Traditionally, we have had, relative to the other provinces, lower levels of unemployment. When people say, well, we have the third lowest level of unemployment. So what is new? Traditionally, the three prairie provinces have been among the three lowest.

In years back, we used to be the very lowest and sometimes the second lowest and sometimes the third lowest. Now, we are either third lowest and the odd time, we are the fourth; but to say we are third lowest is not saying anything significant. The reason we are only third lowest with the lack of economic growth is the fact that there are many thousands of people who leave this province to seek employment opportunities elsewhere, particularly, to the west of us. If those people had not left, Mr. Speaker, then our unemployment rate would be much higher, but they go abroad. They leave Manitoba because the job opportunities are not here.

As a matter of fact, there are statistics out again showing that our net interprovincial migration is very serious, and we do indeed continue to lose some of the best people, some of the best trained people in our midst. These are the people who are leaving, the people with skills who are seeking opportunities, not the people usually who have very few skills and maybe very little motivation. It is those who have motivation, those who have training who are leaving to go for jobs elsewhere.

So we have a very serious problem on our hands. Our economy has stagnated in terms of manufacturing. There are all kinds of figures on that whether you look at manufacturing shipments or whether you look at the number of people employed in manufacturing.

As a matter of fact, the number of people employed in manufacturing, I believe in this last month that has been reported by Statistics Canada, is 51,000 people. That is May of 1992; whereas last May, we were at 55,000. Where are we going?

The fact is that our manufacturing industries are declining. Housing starts are at abysmal level. Sure there is some increase now, but we are so low, we are so down in the valley in terms of housing starts that it is almost embarrassing to note the level, the very pitiful level of housing activity in this province. Indeed, it is.

Retail sales, we heard some figures this morning about how poorly we were doing in terms of retail sales. The Leader of our party, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), referred to the investment situation. As I said, there are figures showing that we are losing thousands of people through interprovincial migration. Our population, therefore—some of the best and the brightest are unfortunately leaving us.

So the minister then talks about—well, what about, you know, he blames everything on the situation they inherited, even though this government has been in office now for about four years—still using envelope No. 1, which Mr. Warner Jorgenson first told the story about the advice from the outgoing minister to the incoming minister.

The incoming minister wanted advice. The story has it that all the advice that I have for you is in three envelopes: numbered 1, 2 and 3, but only use those envelopes if you absolutely have to—[interjection] I am telling a story.

The first envelope came along, and he said, only use these envelopes if you are in real trouble. It was Warner Jorgenson who first told this story. So the new minister did not want to but he did get into some trouble. So he opened the first envelope, and it said blame the previous provincial government. [interjection] I am getting so many interruptions here, my flow is being interrupted.

The second envelope had to be opened too because he had difficulty. Subsequently, of course, the second envelope said blame the federal government. Finally, a third time occurred. He did not want to do it, but he just simply had to. He opened the envelope, and the third envelope said, start preparing three envelopes. So you know, three strikes and you are out.

Mr. Speaker, I say they are still on the first envelope, blaming the previous government. The facts are that the last four years, we have not seen economic growth. We have seen a lot of economic stagnation.

The minister says, well, it is all taxation. I want to remind him that of the 14 percent points of sales tax that people are paying today—and are very annoyed about it—12 of those points were put in place by Conservative administrations. We will take credit for two, but the Conservatives, federally and provincially, have to take credit for the other 12 points.

The minister did ask rhetorically, in his speech he rhetorically said, well, what response do we have? What plans do we have? What is our solution and what is our approach? Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that can be done of an affirmative action nature that it would take us hours to debate them. For example, the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) talked about more emphasis on research and development, that is fine, more emphasis on education, that is fine, in particular types of trades, although, unfortunately, some of these areas have been squeezed, have been cut back. Certainly, we should have programs to promote technological innovation, and indeed we did have those under the Manitoba Jobs Fund. We had some specific programs to enhance technology.

But, really, Mr. Speaker, my message to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Stefanson) is, you really do not have any idea of where you are going. You have no economic objectives. You have no economic plan, and I want to say—I know, maybe you do not like the word plan, but I can tell you there are a couple of previous administrations who did have some kind of a plan, the TED report, Targets for Economic Development that came out in the late '60s by a Conservative administration. There was a series of goals and objectives in infinite detail, by industry group. These were objectives that the government had set for itself.

Prior to that, there was a committee on Manitoba's economic future, and under the Schreyer government there was Guidelines for the '70s. At least we had some idea of where we were going. We had some goals; we had some objectives. I say it is time to do some real solid economic research.

There is no economic research going on now of any consequence to know where are our strengths, where are our weaknesses, what do we want to achieve, what should we back off of? It is easy for me to say this, but there is room and there is certainly a critical need for in-depth economic research, and that is simply not going on because this government believes, we will just leave

everything to the market and take a very laissez-faire approach, and all things will be resolved.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour this. We could talk about this for some many hours, for many days. I simply say we will not oppose the legislation, but really, it is a very, very pitiful attempt at trying to address economic problems. It really is not going to amount to anything of any great substance, unfortunately. We are still going to continue to have this slow economic growth, and until we get some positive programs, action programs, this is going to continue to be the case. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

\* (1950)

#### **Bill 61—The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4)**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 61, the Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4)? Is there leave? There is leave.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 61, The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4) (Loi no 4 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### **Bill 62—The Business Practices Amendment Act (2)**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 62, The Business Practices Amendment Act (2)? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 62, The Business Practices Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les pratiques commerciales), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 71—The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 71, The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** With leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 71, The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act (Loi sur les bénéficiaires des régimes de retraite), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 73—The Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 73, The Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 73, The Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les directives en matière de soins de santé et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** It is a pleasure for me to rise and speak on this bill, Bill 73, The Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act, the reason being that I believe it is very seldom that in this Chamber we get to debate issues that are almost purely ethical in nature or theological in nature. I have thought about this. I have talked to people on the phone about it, and I appreciate having the opportunity to speak on third reading.

I believe the theological problem that it addresses is our attitude towards dying and our attitude toward death. In fact, many people here, I hope, will have read the book *On Death and Dying* by Dr. Kubler-Ross in which she describes the stages people go through when they are dying from some disease such as cancer, when they know they are going to die, and they go through different mental states as death approaches. This book, I believe, helps people to understand those stages, and I think it is helpful to all of us to think about this. I think that

the reason why people do not like talking about this topic is that most people have an inherent fear of death, and that is why it is considered difficult to talk about this topic.

Different religions have different views of death. For example, our brothers and sisters of the Jewish faith do not believe in life after death. I think there is something healthy about that view that says that you only have one life to live, and therefore, you should live life to its fullest and make every day count, because there is going to be no pie in the sky by and by, as the fundamentalists used to be parodied as saying.

Christians, on the other hand, do believe in life after death and, therefore, should have no fear of death. I believe, if people accepted the inevitability of death, that they and their families would not prolong death with heroic measures or even life-support systems which prolong life.

In committee stage of this bill, we heard a doctor say that there are approximately 100 patients in Manitoba who are being kept on life-support systems, all of whom—and this is a paraphrase of what he said—are hopeless cases, people who are being kept alive for whom the quality of life is very, very poor and there is no hope of recovery. I believe that this bill makes it easier for individuals and families to face and accept death and allow people to carry out their wishes in dying.

It is not that long ago that our practices and attitudes in society were quite different, I would say, as recently as a couple of generations ago. I can remember that my grandfather, for example, died at home on the farm, and there was no attempt to prolong his life. I remember a friend telling me, when I was a child, that she was in the presence of her grandfather, who spoke to her and then died in his own home. I am sure it was a sad occasion, but I do not remember that as being particularly traumatic. It was very touching to hear my friend talk about that, though.

However, nowadays, the vast majority of people die in hospitals. As a clergy person, I have had occasion to visit many people in the hospital as they are dying. I did so recently, visited one of my constituents who died a couple of weeks later. When I was interning as a student chaplain, I was at a bedside when a patient died, and that was a very interesting experience for me to reflect on with my fellow students and my supervising chaplain.

So this bill which we support, I believe, helps to address this problem of helping people to die with dignity and to die with their own wishes being carried out, either by themselves or by their family members by way of a health care directive.

I have actually had some experience, not that long ago, in making a decision about someone's condition. I had power of attorney for a senior citizen who was 88 years old, and we took her to the hospital on December 24, 1990. The next day, December 25, a doctor at Misericordia phoned and said the patient was in a comatose state, I guess, and should they prolong the life, or should they disconnect the life-support systems?

I asked some questions about the possibility of recovery. I consulted this person's two closest friends, and the three of us agreed that we would give the doctor permission to disconnect the life-support systems. Within about three hours, the patient died, and I conducted the funeral about three days later.

The person whom I talked to on the phone about this bill has already made a living will, which she received from a lawyer to make out. This individual did not believe that she wanted to be a "vegetable"—to use a common phrase—in her dying days and knew that it was a hard decision for others to make. It is a very difficult decision for others to make, even if they know what your wishes are. So there is wisdom in putting one's wishes in writing and letting other people know what your intentions are and having those intentions followed in one's final days.

So we commend the government for this initiative. We support this bill, and we hope that it will be publicized so that members of the public will be encouraged to sign a Health Care Directive. It is something that all of us here in this Chamber should think about as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (2000)

### **Bill 75—The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House for third reading of Bill 75, The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 75, The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie et apportent des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 84—The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House for third reading of Bill 84, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 84, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 92—The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House for third reading of Bill 92, The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act? Is there leave? Leave? It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 92, The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le vérificateur provincial), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 94—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 94, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992? Is there leave? Leave? It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr.

Downey), that Bill 94, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992 (Loi de 1992 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, we had some considerable debate on this legislation last night, but I just want to take a couple of minutes to put on the record a concern that I do not believe was expressed last evening when we discussed this particular bill, and that is the fact that according to one section of this taxation bill 94, parents of infants and toddlers will be hit with a 7 percent increase in cost, payable of course to the provincial government. This is in addition to the 7 percent GST. In other words, the exemption on disposable diapers is being removed.

Our concern is one that we share with the Manitoba Child Care Association which I know has written to the minister and to several members of the Legislature pointing out that many parents who use disposable diapers are families from lower income groups. This is a fact. The fact is, many parents cannot even afford to use diaper services, nor do they have washing machines in many cases, so as a result, they tend to do their laundry at public laundromats. It is very difficult, as I understand, to use the public laundry for the purpose of cleaning diapers.

This is a fact, and therefore, the parents of babies, young children and so on, the low-income groups, are being penalized by this particular measure, including not only parents of babies and toddlers, but also those who may have children who have certain physical or mental handicaps.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that this particular section in the act is going to penalize, in particular, this low-income group. Now, this is according to the reasoning of the Manitoba Child Care Association because the low-income groups—[interjection] Yes, exemption on disposable diapers.

The other point that is made is that there are environmental concerns, as well, in terms of using the reuseable diapers, because the Manitoba Child Care Association points out that there is strong concern about the effects on the environment due to the increased use of detergents, bleaches, disinfectants and water usage in regard to the cleaning of the reusable diapers. Of course, they

remind us the City of Winnipeg is advising citizens to reduce the use of water, and yet the use of cloth diapers could quadruple the water usage of homes where children are in diapers.

At any rate, the association has made some good points here. I do not want to belabour it, because I know they have written to the minister. I do not know whether the minister is prepared to reconsider this particular item. Maybe he would like to comment on it because I am not intending to make a speech covering all the many other items. Perhaps he would like to comment on it, but there is a plea on behalf of the lower-income families in Manitoba who are going to be hurt, apparently very badly by this particular measure.

I would ask the minister to reconsider, and perhaps he would like to respond. I am not sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** It is a very interesting issue on the statute law taxation issue. I have been one who produced a paper a couple of years ago about recycled diapers and the ability of keeping disposables out of the landfill site. I do not know whether the evidence produced to us in the last 24 hours, which I am sure the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has seen, is accurate or not accurate. I read pediatric reports from the United States, et cetera, and I do not know what the energy component is and what the landfill problem is.

What I am a little concerned about—and it is a point to the minister—here we have one policy on recycling beverages, and we have a permissive policy for the soft drink industry, and yet another policy on diapers which one in 10 families may have to purchase, with children. We have a different policy on the basis of taxation policy and environment. So it seems to me that some of the biggies in environmental recycling in terms of taxation policy and deposit legislation we do not have, and on this one there is a differential.

I do not have any evidence either way. I was always under the bias of cloth diapers and recycling. In fact, with my own child, we went through the recycling. I have received this information, and I have received some of the information the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) has received, and if we have collectively made a wrong decision, I would ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to look at it. Nothing is placed in stone so long as it cannot be changed a year later by whoever is in government.

\* (2010)

Mr. Speaker, I have not had a chance to look at this evidence, and I would like to talk to members of the outside community who are involved in conservation policy. Certainly I acknowledge that the people in child care centres, low-income families, et cetera, seem to me to be one down by this government initiative, even though I recognize the government is doing it with laudable goals in mind. Maybe we should look at some of the empirical evidence in the interim just so that we are sure that what we are doing is correct and also fair.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

### Committee Changes

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) at 6 p.m.; Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) at 6 p.m. [Agreed]

I move, seconded by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: The member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) for the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) at 6:50 p.m. [Agreed]

**Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River):** I move, seconded by the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: The honourable member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) for the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay). [Agreed]

\* \* \*

### Bill 95—The Tax Appeals Commission Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House for third reading of Bill 95, The Tax Appeals Commission Act? Leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave. It is agreed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 95, The Tax Appeals Commission Act (Loi sur la Commission d'appel des impôts des taxes), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* \* \*

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** I am going to ask the member of the Committee on Law Amendments if we could recess for a minute, Mr. Speaker. The member is bringing in a report of referral from the committee back to the House dealing with Bills 78 and 97.

**Mr. Speaker:** We will take a three-minute recess starting right now.

\* \* \*

The House took recess at 8:11 p.m.

### After Recess

The House resumed at 8:14 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House is ready to go.

**Mr. Manness:** While we are waiting for that report, would you call debate on third readings, Bill 5.

### DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS

#### Bill 5—The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Amendment Act

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 5, The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil consultatif manitobain de la situation de la femme, standing in the name of honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would yield the floor to our critic.

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting almost four months to be able to speak on third reading of Bill 5.

I will not be as extensive in my comments as I would have been had the minister chosen to report this bill back for third reading earlier in the session. I find it very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) was very quick to bring in this legislation

twice and felt that it was vital that it be passed as quickly as possible and then held this legislation until the penultimate days of the House sitting.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to report briefly on what some of the presentations were in committee hearings which we held on March 5, as I said, almost four months ago.

We held these committee hearings on March 5 because the Minister responsible for the Status of Women attempted to bring in this name change under The Statute Law Amendment Act of last July. Luckily, the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) caught the attempted move and change in this name, went to the committee hearings and was able to convince the minister to further consult and to come back with her report.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to say very briefly that in July of 1991, the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, when questioned on the need for this name change said, it is just a housekeeping change to avoid confusion with the acronym, the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women. I wish that I could say that this was actually the reason for and only the reason for the name change.

We found when we canvassed women's groups in this province, when we canvassed individual women in this province, when we canvassed men in this province, and when we held the hearings on March 5 of this year that the concerns are far deeper and more important than simply attempting to make a change in name that would avoid confusion and acronyms.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the issue of confusion in the acronyms could have easily been dealt with by adopting any one of a number of names that other status of women's or women's issues advisory councils have adopted throughout the country. As a matter of fact, virtually all provinces and territories and the federal government have advisory councils on the status of women with either advisory council or women's issues in their title. Manitoba will be again, if this legislation passes, in the rear guard, not the forefront of progressive change. We will be virtually the only province which does not have advisory council on the status of women or advisory council on women's issues in their title.

The one interesting thing, and quite a disturbing thing, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I would like to relate to the House is that when the minister went back and, quote, consulted with members of the community, she also was able to bring forward a large number of letters, identical letters—which is a perfectly legitimate proceeding—to the committee hearings. But what was interesting and disturbing for us in these letters was that the issues that were raised in these letters were not the true issues dealing with the change of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

\* (2020)

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to read into the record that letter that was signed by a number of private citizens: I support the change of name of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women to the name proposed on the above bill, Manitoba Women's Advisory Council. The alternative proposed—and I underline that—Status of Women Advisory Council of Manitoba, is not appropriate because the acronym reads SWACM. When we strive to eliminate violence from society, such an abbreviation would be unacceptable.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in this House, in debate on Bill 5, that name, proposed alternative, Status of Women Advisory Council of Manitoba, was one of nine proposed name changes that were read into the record on that day in this House. The Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) chose to have people respond—chose to tell people that was the only proposed name change. I find that is not being clear or concise or legitimate with the people of Manitoba. I think it speaks ill of the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, that she felt that she had to stoop to the depths of misrepresenting what had been stated in this House on that occasion.

When we spoke, and when women making presentations to the bill on March 5 spoke, not a single one spoke in opposition to a name change. They understood the need to change the acronym so that there would no longer be confusion between the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women and the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women. However, Madam Deputy Speaker, a large number of the presenters who spoke and sent in written presentations to that committee said very clearly and very eloquently in many ways that while the name change was



important, it was also basically and ultimately important that Status of Women remain in the title.

Language is very important, and we had a good debate on that in the House—and I will not go into that—early last spring about the importance of the name and language. The final major thing that was brought up by the presenters at the hearings in March was, as I have stated before, the names and language are important and the name of this advisory council is critical, because if in fact, as one presenter stated, the focus of this committee is on the status of women, then that is what should be reflected in the title, so people know what the committee is about and that it remains focused on that. If systems were working equitably and fairly, one would not need a Status of Women department, but the truth is, women are continuing to be treated differently. Therefore, you need to have an advisory committee that has that in their name change.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that sentiment was expressed time and time again by women reporting to the committee. Again, the reason the Manitoba Advisory Council exists at all is that there is a recognition on the part of government that women are not yet equally represented in many important places in society, not in politics, not in senior levels of government, nor in trades and technology. An advisory council is an interim measure to work towards increasing women's representation and their overall status in society and workplace. The hope is that one day women will be equally represented at all levels and the need for the advisory council will no longer exist.

There were also representations made, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the proposed name change put forward by the government, quote, the Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba, Manitoba Women's Advisory Council, does not truly reflect or accurately reflect the past work of this advisory committee, a past that is full of proposals, of recommendations, of briefs, of reports, since its inception in 1987. There was concern raised on the part of many presenters that it was a deliberate choice on the part of the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) to downgrade the importance and the influence of that advisory council.

As one woman stated, the suggested name falls short of describing any mandate, nor does it really impart any power to the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women which is, according to its

mandate, to advise the Minister responsible for the Status of Women on issues that reflect on the status of women in Manitoba. The new name, Madam Deputy Speaker, as spoken by very many people who presented that evening, does not do that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, one woman in particular made a strong impression on me and on many other people at the committee hearings. She was actually a member of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women. She stated: For me, having status of women in the title would help ensure that status of women is always an issue. That means for me that the poor, the women right at the bottom of the ladder, would never be forgotten. She stated that the present name, the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, expresses a desire or mandate to raise or elevate the status of women, all women, but including the poor and other disadvantaged minorities. The new name, in omitting status of women, erodes this. Soon this council could be addressing only those issues related to women in power.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I could speak at much greater length reporting on what the women of Manitoba have stated and did state at the hearings on March 5. I would just like to close with one final quote, and that is from the executive director of women in second-stage housing when she said: Manitoba women have fought for decades to be recognized as having status. I would object to any attempt to deteriorate this position, even figuratively speaking.

The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, since its inception in 1987, has had a long and illustrious career. We are afraid, Madam Deputy Speaker, that with a name change, it is a first step on the slippery slope that this government is following in many of its actions, with a very negative impact on the future status of women in the province of Manitoba. We would strongly urge that this government rescind its ill-conceived and ill-thought-out Bill 5 and bring back, for this Legislature, another name for the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women that incorporates status of women in its title. This is too important an issue to be lost by the women of Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is

third reading of Bill 5? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

**An Honourable Member:** On division.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On division.

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**Mr. Jack Relmer (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments):** Madam Deputy Speaker, by leave, I beg to present the Sixth Report on the Committee on Law Amendments.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as its Sixth Report.

Your committee met on Monday, June 22, 1992, at 2:30 p.m. and 7 p.m.; and Tuesday, June 23, at 10 a.m. in Room 255 and Tuesday, June 23, at 5:23 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

**Bill 78—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3);**  
**Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg**

Trevor Thomas - City of Winnipeg Legal Department

Donovan Timmers - Westminster Ward (City of Winnipeg)

Larry Lehotsky - Private Citizen

Sylvia DiCosimo - Private Citizen

Fred Curry - Private Citizen

Patricia Thomson - Armstrong Point Association Inc.

Morley Jacobs - Private Citizen

Bev Jacobs - Private Citizen

Guy Jourdain - Société franco-manitobaine

Lorna Cramer - Residents Committee of Garden City

David Cramer - Private Citizen

Max Saper - Private Citizen

**Written submission:**

Cathy Collins - McDermot-Sherbrook Residents Association

Your committee has considered:

**Bill 97—The Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary"**

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee recommends that the fees paid with respect to Bill 97 - be refunded less the cost of printing.

Your committee has also considered **Bill 78—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg**, and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

#### **MOTION:**

**THAT** the proposed clause 33(4)(c), as set out in section 3 of the Bill, be amended in the English version by striking out "major" and substituting "mayor".

#### **MOTION:**

**THAT** the proposed subsection 87.3(2), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

#### **Notice**

**87.3(2)**A notice referred to in subsection (1) shall be in writing, shall specify the matter and the proceeding and shall be given to the city clerk

(a) in the case of a regular meeting of council, not less than two working days before the proceeding; and

(b) in the case of a special or emergency meeting of council, within a reasonable time having regard to the period of notice that is given for the special or emergency meeting.

#### **MOTION:**

**THAT** the proposed subsection 87.3(3), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "in proceedings of or before the community

committee in the designated area and those proceedings" and substituting "in a proceeding of or before the community committee in the designated area with respect to a matter and the proceeding with respect to that matter".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 87.3(4), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be struck out.

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsections 87.4(1), (2) and (3), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be amended in the French version by adding "oralement" after "servir".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 87.4(6), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "the St. Boniface Ward" and substituting "historic St. Boniface".

**MOTION:**

THAT section 5 of the Bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed subsection 87.4(6):

**Definition**

**87.4(7)**In subsection (6), "**historic St. Boniface**" means the area bounded on the east by the centre line of Panet Road, extending north from the Canadian National Railway Right of Way to the centre line of Mission Street, thence north along the centre line of Panet Road to the northern limit of River Lot 72 in the Parish of St. Boniface; on the west by the eastern bank of the Red River; on the north by the northern limit of River Lot 72 in the Parish of St. Boniface and on the south by a line drawn southeasterly from the eastern bank of the Red River along the northern limit of Lots 37, 36, 33 and 32, Plan Number 4709 to the centre line of St. Mary's Road and thence southeast along the centre line of St. Mary's Road to the centre line of Enfield Crescent and its straight projection east to the centre line of Kenny Street and its straight projection north to the back land between Berry Street and Goulet Street and its straight projection east to the eastern limit of Plan No. 692, thence northerly to the centre line of Bertand Street and its straight projection east to the centre line of the Seine River, thence north along this line to the northern limit of Plan No. 1507 extending to the eastern limit of the land taken for the Right of Way of the Canadian Pacific Railway (Emerson Branch) thence northerly along the eastern limit of the land taken for the said

Right of Way to the northeastern limit of the land taken for the Right of Way of the Canadian National Railway according to registered Plan No. 6705; thence southeasterly along the same northeastern limit to the northern limit of Parcel 4 in Plan Number 6737 and its straight northeasterly projection along the Canadian National Railway spurline known as the MacArthur cut-off; thence easterly to the centre line of Panet Road.

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed section 87.5, as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

**MUNICIPAL SERVICES**

**Application**

**87.5(1)**This section applies in respect of municipal services other than those available at an office

**Receipt of municipal services in St. Boniface Ward**

**87.5(2)**Every person resident in St. Boniface Ward is entitled to receive in the official language of his or her choice at a facility of the city within the Ward or at his or her place of residence all municipal services that are ordinarily provided at that facility or place of residence.

**Municipal services for designated area**

**87.5(3)**Every person who is resident in the designated area and who goes to a facility of the city where a municipal service is ordinarily provided is entitled to have that municipal service provided in either official language within the designated area or at any location designated by council by by-law under subsection 87.11(1) for the purposes of this subsection.

**Subsequent communications**

**87.5(4)**A person who is entitled to a municipal service in the official language of his or her choice under this section and who initiates communication respecting that service in the official language of his or her choice is entitled to use or to require the use of that official language in all subsequent communications, whether spoken or written, with respect to that service.

**MOTION:**

THAT section 87.8, as set out in section 5 of the Bill be amended

(a) in the heading preceding subsection (1), by striking out "**Information signs**" and

substituting "**Signs respecting municipal services**"; and

(b) by adding the following after subsection (1):

**General Information signs**

**87.8(1.1)**In addition to the signs referred to in subsection (1), all signs that are inside or outside each location where municipal services are available in both official languages and that provide information to the public shall be erected and maintained in both official languages.

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 87.11(1), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be amended

(a) in that portion of the subsection preceding clause (a) by adding ", not later than September 1, 1992," after "The City of Winnipeg shall";

(b) in clause (b), by striking out "87.5(4), 87.5(5)" and substituting "87.5(2), 87.5(3)", and

(c) in clause (c), by striking out "87.5(5)" and substituting "87.5(3)".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed section 87.14, as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be renumbered as subsection 87.14(1) and the following added after it:

**Consultations**

**7.14(2)**In the course of the review referred to in subsection (1), the minister may consult with the public with respect to such matters as the minister considers advisable.

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 608(4), as set out in subsection 12(2) of the Bill, be amended by adding "made after July 26, 1991" before ", does not exceed five years".

**MOTION:**

THAT the Bill be amended by adding the following after section 12:

12.1(1) Section 617, as enacted by The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, S.M. 1991-92, c. 15, s. 18 and proclaimed in force on May 27, 1992, is repealed and is deemed never to have been in force.

12.1(2) The following is added after section 616:

**SUBDIVISION STANDARDS**

**Subdivision standards by-laws**

**617(1)**Council shall pass by-laws establishing standards, criteria or requirements respecting the subdivision of land in the city.

**Content of standards by-laws**

**617(2)**A by-law passed under subsection (1) shall conform with this Act, Plan Winnipeg, secondary plans and development by-laws, and may establish standards, criteria or requirements respecting any of the following:

(a) the layout of, and access to, dedicated land, lots, blocks, and other units of land;

(b) the construction, reconstruction and alteration of highways;

(c) the width, grade and election of highways, by reference to minimum or maximum standards, criteria or requirements, or to any other standard council considers appropriate;

(d) the provision and location of strips of land to act as buffers;

(e) the efficient use of energy, including the orientation of lots and parcels so as to obtain maximum benefit from solar energy;

(f) transportation systems, including their operation in a matter that is efficient and convenient for citizens;

(g) the determination of whether land is suitable for subdivisions;

(h) the provision of utilities and municipal services;

(i) sites for schools, parks and recreation areas;

(j) the protection of sensitive lands;

(k) flood control;

(l) the conveyance or dedication of land for public purposes other than highways;

(m) such other matters as council considers advisable.

**Referral of proposed by-law for report**

**617(3)**Notwithstanding subsection 628(2), council shall, before giving second reading to a by-law proposed under subsection (2), refer the proposed by-law to a committee of council which shall give notice of, and conduct, a public hearing and submit a report to council in accordance with a by-law passed under subsection 628(1).

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed clause 641(3)(b), as set out in section 13 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "clause (1)(b)" and substituting "clause (2)(b)".

**MOTION:**

THAT the Bill be amended by adding the following after section 17:

17.1(1) Subsection 668(1) is amended

(a) in the definition "purchase price", by adding "by a seller" after "electricity or gas is sold"; and

(b) by repealing the definition "seller" and substituting the following:

"seller" means

(a) in the case of electricity, a person, including Manitoba Hydro, who has agreed to sell to a consumer electricity that the person supplies directly to that consumer, or

(b) in the case of gas, a person

(i) who has agreed to sell to a consumer gas that the person supplies directly to that consumer, or

(ii) who supplies gas to a consumer on behalf of a broker who has entered into an agreement to sell that gas to the consumer; ("vendeur")

17.1(2) The following is added after subsection 668(6):

**Refund of money paid as tax on gas**

668(6.1) A by-law passed under this section may, where a consumer has entered into an agreement with a broker for the purchase of gas at a price (referred to in this subsection as the "broker's price") that is less than the purchase price of the seller who supplies the gas,

(a) provide for a refund to the consumer of the difference between the amount of tax that

(i) The consumer paid to the seller on the purchase price of the gas, and

(ii) the consumer would have paid if the tax had been paid only on the broker's price of the gas;

(b) prescribe the amount below which no refund is required to be made; and

(c) require any application for a refund to be made before the expiration of such period as is prescribed.

**MOTION:**

THAT section 18 of the Bill be amended

(a) in subsection (1), by striking out "3, 5, 9, 11 and 12" and substituting "3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12 and subsection 12.1(2)"; and

(b) by repealing subsections (3) and (4) and substituting the following:

Coming into force: s. 4, 5, 9 and 12.1(2)

18.(3) The following provisions come into force on a day fixed by proclamation:

(a) section 4;

(b) section 5;

(c) section 9; and

(d) subsection 12.1(2).

**MOTION:**

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

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**Mr. Reimer:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

\*\*\*

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** Madam Deputy Speaker, we would ask that you call Bill 53 for third reading.

**DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS**

**Bill 53—The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Amendment Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 53, The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la manutention et le transport des marchandises dangereuses), standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I held the bill on behalf of our critic, who is prepared to speak on the bill on third reading at this point.

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to add my comments on a piece of legislation that I am happy to support, environment legislation that the government is bringing in that is actually going to be a positive step.

It is going to be a positive step because it is going to enable the government to issue remedial work

orders to deal with contaminated sites, hazardous waste or other contamination that has been, up to this point, outside the realm of work orders issued by the department, because these are sites that are no longer owned by the polluter or oftentimes no longer owned at all.

\* (2030)

The legislation, as I said, is a positive step. I just want to put some emphasis, though, on what it took to get this government to bring in this legislation. It is somewhat satisfying to have the government's own notes on the bill indicate that this has been brought in to deal with the Domtar site, which is a hazardous waste site in my own constituency, and I am pleased to see that this issue has forced the proclamation and the development of this legislation. There are other sections of The Dangerous Goods Act that also are being proclaimed and should also be proclaimed that will only go to having this government keep its commitment.

It is interesting what it took for this government to actually bring in this bill. They have had an opportunity because they have been dealing with the Domtar contaminated site in Transcona for a number of years, but it was only after there was a group organized in Transcona, it was only after the Premier (Mr. Filmon), himself, was personally implicated as being responsible for allowing resident housing to go into the area that caused the controversy and caused the outcry that required some action and some clear and determined action. It will be from this act that work orders can be issued so that this site will in fact be put on a clean-up time line and will be dealt with in a way that is going to make the area safe for residents.

Through the committee hearings though, it became apparent that this is not the solution to all the problems. It is a sad comment on the state of the environment that we are dealing with a number of different problems with contaminated sites that are no longer owned by the polluter. We saw a case with PCBs in Stonewall where even though there was some indication made by the government to the residents who have in their back yard PCB contamination from oil used on a golf course that took in the area of their back yard, this legislation may not include that.

The legislation is quite broad in trying to catch any individual who had prior ownership who was in

charge of the dangerous goods that were put onto the site, but it does not deal with the fact that if the owner was not the person responsible for the dangerous goods or the hazardous waste finding its way onto a site, then we are not sure this legislation is going to be adequate in issuing work orders to see that there is a responsible party going to be forced to see that it is cleaned up.

The legislation is strong in the sense that it is specific to indicate that there be orders to pay for the cleanup, and it is going to allow the minister to authorize a work order that will determine who that party should be and that there will be specific time lines. I guess the big concern is that we will have to see if the government will actually use it.

There is lots of other legislation, environment legislation, that is on the books that the government of the day currently has a hard time enforcing and using. I would hate to see that this becomes one of them. As the minister has said throughout the discussion of this bill, there are a lot of areas that this kind of legislation is going to be moving toward.

We may be moving toward the legislated need for certification, some kind of certification system for land to ensure that sites are tested and certified as being safe before they are sold. I was saying earlier, it is a sad comment on the state of our environment when we have to resort to that, but the land leasing and banks are leery of this kind of case, the kind of case that is provoking the need for this legislation.

I would recommend to the government that they must keep up the pace and that they must stay on top, and be at the forefront even, of developing legislation that will deal with hazardous waste and deal with areas contaminated with various kinds of hazardous waste.

With that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will conclude my remarks and I look forward to the speedy implication, and the proclamation, and the use of this bill. Thank you.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is third reading of Bill 53 (The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la manutention et le transport des marchandises dangereuses). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

\* \* \*

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I would ask if you could please call Bill 74 for debate on third reading.

### **Bill 74—The Law Society Amendment Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Third reading of Bill 74, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), The Law Society Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau), standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Yes, the member for Concordia has indicated we are prepared to pass this bill.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 74. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**An Honourable Member:** Agreed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

\* \* \*

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** I would ask if you could please call for debate on third reading, Bill 88.

### **Bill 88—The Homesteads, Marital Property Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Third reading of Bill 88, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), The Homesteads, Marital Property Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur la propriété familiale, modifiant la Loi sur les biens matrimoniaux et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** The member for Concordia stood this bill in a previous session so that I could speak on it and pass it through this evening.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer)?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** No. Leave has been denied.

**Ms. Barrett:** I want to put just a few brief words on the record in support of Bill 88. It makes some changes to The Marital Property Act and puts in place a new homesteads act in replacement of The Dower Act.

Basically, it makes these changes in the understanding that—and following through the philosophy that marriage is an equal partnership. It deals with various dispositions of property before and after death.

As I stated, Madam Deputy Speaker, we are prepared to support this legislation and only wish that there was more legislation on the Order Paper from the government in this session that was as progressive and understanding of the needs of women in this province. Thank you.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 88. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

\* \* \*

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** Madam Deputy Speaker, if you could please call for debate on third reading, Bill 89.

### **Bill 89—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 89, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire), standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** No. Leave has been denied.

\* (2040)

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Madam Deputy Speaker, Bill 89, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act, we spoke briefly in support of this before it went to committee hearings and has now

been reported back. While we are prepared to support this bill in passage tonight at third reading, I would like to put on record some concerns that were raised about this bill on the part of rural women in particular.

On Wednesday, June 10 of this year, the *Stonewall Argus* and *Teulon Times* had a signed editorial dealing with the implications of this bill on rural women. I thought it was important to put this on the record, and I would hope that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) and the rest of the government pay attention to the concerns that are raised by this woman, because I believe very strongly they reflect not only her concerns, but the concerns on the part of many women in this province as it deals with issues of domestic and other kinds of violence.

This woman is talking about the increase of penalties for noncompliance of a restraining order with fines up to \$1,000 and one year in prison. While she states that is a positive move and that it makes a little more clear to everyone in this province that abuse is something that will not be tolerated, she does say, and I would like to quote, Madam Deputy Speaker: While such a change may deter men who are close to crossing the line into violence, it is unlikely to have much effect on those who already have. If a man is so irrational that he will not be deterred by the penalties for assault or murder, violating a nonmolestation order is not going to mean much.

Madam Deputy Speaker, anyone who has worked with abused women will know that is true. It is also in the papers regularly that women say they are afraid for their lives, and when they are told by the justice system, do not worry you have a restraining order, they laugh, ruefully I might add, and say that is not worth the paper it is printed on. So we do have many long-standing, long-term solutions that need to be found for the issues of domestic violence and other violence perpetrated on, particularly, women and children in our province.

Another specific thing that this woman recommended or a problem that she brought up that I think is of great importance, particularly to those who live outside the urban centres in our province, is that women in the country do not have access to 911 or any other emergency phone number. They are often at the mercy of a party line. It is very difficult for them to, perhaps in the fear of the moment, remember the seven- or eight-digit RCMP line.

So the concern is there, too, that issues that relate to women and children who live outside the large urban communities in small-town and rural and northern Manitoba are issues that need to be addressed specifically and particularly by all governments. While Bill 89 goes a step towards addressing these issues, these important issues of domestic violence, there is still much more work that needs to be done. I would recommend to the Minister of Justice that he work with the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) and bring forward some legislation in the next session of the Legislature that reflects the needs of all Manitobans no matter where they reside. With that caveat, Madam Deputy Speaker, we are prepared to pass this legislation.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

## REPORT STAGE

### Bill 78—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)

**Hon. Darren Praznlk (Deputy Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 78, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable minister have leave for Bill 78, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave. It is agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### Bill 97—The Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act

**Hon. Darren Praznlk (Deputy Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would move, with



leave of the House, seconded by the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) that Bill 97, The Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary," reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable deputy government House leader have leave for Bill 97, The Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act? Is there leave?

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave. It is agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill 78—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 78, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable deputy government House leader have leave for third reading of Bill 78, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)? Is there leave? Leave? It is agreed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** I move, seconded by the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that debate on Bill 78 be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### Bill 97—The Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 97, The Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le

"Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary," be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable deputy government House leader (Mr. Praznik) have leave for third reading of Bill 97, The Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act? Is there leave? Leave? It is agreed to.

**Motion agreed to.**

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**Mrs. Shirley Render (Chairperson of Standing Committee on Industrial Relations):** Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Industrial Relations.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable member for St. Vital have leave to report? Leave? That is agreed.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Your Standing Committee on Industrial Relations presents the following as its First Report.

Your committee met on Friday, June 19 at 1 p.m., Monday, June 22 at 2:30 p.m. and 7 p.m. and Tuesday, June 23, 1992, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building, to consider bills referred. At the June 19, 1992, meeting, your committee elected Mrs. Dacquay as Chairperson. At the June 22, 1992, meeting, your committee elected Mrs. Render as Chairperson.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 64—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille

Rob Grant - Manitoba Coalition on Children's Rights

Jean Altemeyer - Choices

Mike Bills - Knowles Centre Inc.

Written Submissions:

Dennis Schellenberg - Child and Family Services of Central Manitoba

Jerry Ross - Private Citizen

Gillian Colton - Private Citizen

Gale Pearase - Director, The Street Kids and Youth Project

Bill 70—The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la

**Loi sur l'aide sociale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois**

Genny Funk-Unrau - Private Citizen

Pal Wooley - St. Matthew's Maryland Community Ministry

Diane Sobie - Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization

Erika Wiebe - Winnipeg Child and Family Services (Central)

Shirley Lord - Choices

Renate Bublick - Social Planning Council of Winnipeg

Greg Selinger - City Councillor, Tache Ward

**Bill 76—The Pension Benefits Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension**

Susan Cormack - Private Citizen

Bev Hindle and Al Rieger - Private Citizens

Susan Hart-Kulbaba - Manitoba Federation of Labour

Irene Giesbrecht - Manitoba Nurses' Union

Marilyn Gault - Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women

Jean Minish - Private Citizen

Jeri Bjornson - Charter of Rights Coalition

Cynthia Devine - Manitoba Association of Women and the Law

Terry Clifford - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Ron Youngston - Turnbull and Turnbull

Stan Hutton - Private Citizen

**Written Submissions:**

Christine Merritt - Private Citizen

Gisele Rouillard - Private Citizen

Arlene Wilson - Private Citizen

Doris Alarie - Private Citizen

Lynn Chwartacki - Private Citizen

Ed Legary - Private Citizen

Andrew Dawson and Wayne Byron - Manitoba Health Organization

**Bill 85—The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail**

Susan Hart-Kulbaba - Manitoba Federation of Labour

John Doyle - Private Citizen

Irene Giesbrecht - Manitoba Nurses' Union

Sid Green - Leader of the Progressive Party of Manitoba

Susan Spratt - Canadian Autoworkers Union

Peter Olfert - Manitoba Government Employees' Association

Howard Raper - Communications & Electrical Workers of Canada

Bill Sumerlus and Paul Moist - CUPE, National/CUPE - Local 500

Terry Clifford - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Richard Orlandini - Choices

Bernard Christophe - United Food and Commercial Workers

Roland Doucet - Private Citizen

**Written Submissions:**

Ross Martin - Brandon and District Labour Council, CLC

James Cowan - Graphic Communications International Union

Neil Harden - The Professional Institute of the Public Services of Canada

Sandy Hopkins - Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce

Grant Mitchell - Private Citizen

**Bill 100—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992; Loi de 1992 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives**

Terry Clifford - Manitoba Teachers' Society

**Your committee has considered:**

**Bill 42—The Amusements Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les divertissements**

**Bill 70—The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois**

**Bill 100—The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act; Loi modifiant les lois sur les régimes de retrait**

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

**Your committee has considered**

**Bill 64—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille**

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendment:

**MOTION:**

THAT section 4 of the Bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed section 8.12:

**Review by committee**

8.13 Within three years of the coming into force of this section, a committee of the Legislative Assembly, designed or established by the Legislative Assembly for the purpose, shall undertake a comprehensive review of the operation of this Part and shall, within one year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the Legislative Assembly may allow, submit to the Legislative Assembly a report on the operation of this Part, including any amendments to the Act which the committee recommends.

Your committee has considered:

Bill 76—The Pension Benefits Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension, and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

**MOTION:**

THAT section 5 of the English version of the Bill be amended by striking out clause (b) and substituting the following:

(b) by adding "the payment of pension benefits any other matters respecting pension plans" at the end of clause (a); and

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 11(2), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "subsection (1)" and substituting "clause (1)(a)".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 11(3), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be struck out and the following be substituted:

**Law governing agreement with Canada**

11(3) An agreement under clause (1)(a) between Manitoba and the authorized representative of the Government of Canada shall indicate whether the provisions respecting the payment of pension benefits and the other matters contained in the agreement are to be governed by the laws of Manitoba or the laws of Canada or a specified combination of both, and the provisions shall be governed by the laws so indicated or the combination so specified.

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 18(2.1), as set out in section 6 of the Bill, be amended

(a) by striking out "registered" and substituting "submitted for registration"; and

(b) in clause (c), by striking out "mechanism" and substituting "mechanism satisfactory to the superintendent".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed clause 21(4)(c), as set out in subsection 7(5) of the Bill, be amended

(a) in subclauses (i) and (ii), by striking out "member retired" and substituting "member died, retired"; and

(b) in the English version of subclause (ii), by striking out "that" and substituting "than".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 25(1), as set out in section 10 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "or on behalf of".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 26.1(8), as set out in section 12 of the Bill, be struck out and the following be substituted:

**Refund of contributions**

26.1(8) Contributions made to a multi-unit pension plan by a member that are not vested or locked in pursuant to subsection (7) shall be refunded to the member in the manner provided in section 22.

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 31(6), as set out in subsection 13(3) of the Bill, be amended by adding "and the agreement shall otherwise be in form and content as the minister may by regulation prescribe." at the end.

**MOTION:**

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

Your committee has considered Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail,

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 7(1) of the Bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed subsection 45(3.1):

**Proof of information provided**

**45(3.2)** Proof of compliance with subsection (3.1) may consist of the signature of the employee on a statement that the employee has been provided with information respecting:

(a) any initiation fees and regular membership dues of the union; or

(b) where any such initiation fees and regular membership dues are not determined, the manner in which the initiation fees and membership dues are determined;

and that the employee understands the information.

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed subsection 45(4), as set out in subsection (2) of the Bill, be amended by striking out everything after clause (b) and substituting the following:

the board

(c) may, in a case under clause (a), dismiss the application or order a vote to determine the wishes of the employees in the unit; and

(d) shall not, in a case under clause (b), accept the membership of an employee in the union as evidence of the wish of the employee to have the union represent the employee as bargaining again, where the employee did not receive information in accordance with subsection (3.1).

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed clause 48.1(b), as set out in section 8 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "or other activity".

**MOTION:**

THAT the proposed section 48.1, as set out in section 8 of the Bill, be amended by renumbering it as subsection 48.1(1) and adding the following as subsection 48.1(2):

**Electioneering by other persons**

**48.1(2)** Any person, other than a person referred to in subsection (1), who does anything that would be an unfair labor practice under subsection (1) if done by an employer or union is guilty of an offence.

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 68(3.1), as set out in section 9 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "shall" and substituting "may, after the expiry of 90 days and before the expiry of 120 days from the day of the appointment."

**MOTION:**

THAT clause 87(1)(b), as set out in subsection 11(1) of the Bill, be amended by adding ", or 120 days have expired since the appointment", after "subsection 68(3.1)".

**MOTION:**

THAT the bill be amended by striking out section 12 and substituting the following:

12 Subsection 130(6) is amended by striking out "The board may appoint a" and substituting "Where the board has added the name of a part-time vice-chairperson to the list of arbitrators under subsection 117(2), the board may appoint the".

**MOTION:**

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

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**Mrs. Render:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* \* \*

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, now that those bills have been reported to the House, I propose that we would do report stage on Bills 42, 64, 70, 76, 85 and 100, all requiring leave of the House.

\* (2050)

## REPORT STAGE

### Bill 42—The Amusements Amendment Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable government House leader have leave to report Bill 42, The Amusements Amendment Act? Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would move,

seconded by the honourable Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), that Bill 42, The Amusements Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les divertissements, reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### **Bill 64—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 64, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act? Leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed to.

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services):** I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 64, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille) as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### **Bill 70—The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 70, The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act? Leave? It is agreed to.

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services):** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 70, The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 70, The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in. Agreed?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** On division.

**Mr. Speaker:** On division.

#### **Bill 76—The Pension Benefits Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 76, The Pension Benefits Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension? Leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 76, The Pension Benefits Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 76, The Pension Benefits Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be concurred in. Agreed?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** On division, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** On division.

### Bill 85—The Labour Relations Amendment Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act?

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in. Agreed?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** On division, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** On division.

### Bill 100—The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to report Bill 100, The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 100, The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act; Loi modifiant les lois sur les régimes de retraite, reported from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* \* \*

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I propose to call third readings of the same bills.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We will ascertain if there is leave.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill 42—The Amusements Amendment Act

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** With leave of the House, would you call Bill 42.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House for third reading of Bill 42, The Amusements Amendment Act?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 42 (The Amusements Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les divertissements), be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable government House leader, seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 42, The Amusements Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les divertissements, be now read a third time and passed. Agreed?

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** I move, seconded by the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that debate be adjourned.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), seconded by the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), that debate be adjourned. Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

#### Bill 64—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 64, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act? Leave?

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave. It is agreed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 64, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** I move, seconded by the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that debate on Bill 64 be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 70—The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 70, The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois)? Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** With the leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 70, The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** I move, seconded by the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), that debate on Bill 70 be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 76—The Pension Benefits Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 76, The Pension Benefits Amendment Act? Leave?

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave. It is agreed to.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 76, The Pension Benefits

Amendment Act, be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** I move, seconded by the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that debate be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (2100)

### **Bill 85—The Labour Relations Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act? Leave? It is agreed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that debate be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 100—The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 100, The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act? Leave? It is agreed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, with leave, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 100, The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act (Loi modifiant les lois sur les régimes de retraite), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Committee Changes**

**Mr. Speaker:** In order to facilitate the House, the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) with committee changes.

**Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law

Amendments be amended as follows: the honourable member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) for the honourable member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer). [Agreed]

**Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas):** I move, seconded by the member for Interlake (Mr. Cliff Evans), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen); Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

I move, seconded by the member for Interlake, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be amended as follows: Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman). [Agreed]

### House Business

**Mr. Manness:** I am proposing that we go into Committee of Supply, but before we do I would like the unanimous consent of the House to move certain bills that have been referred to Law Amendments back to Municipal Affairs.

Now, I do so only because I understand the bills that are presently before Municipal Affairs seem to be progressing quite rapidly, and as we have a backlog in Law Amendments, I would ask unanimous consent to move certain bills back into Municipal Affairs to be dealt with possibly later tonight.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable government House leader have [interjection] Oh, here they come. Okay.

**Mr. Manness:** Those bills would be 98 and Bill 96, and is 93 still there? We are done with that, are we not?

Mr. Speaker, Bills 93, 96 and 98.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable government House leader have leave to bring Bill 93, Bill 96 and Bill 98 into Municipal Affairs? Agreed. That is agreed and so ordered.

\*\*\*

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable government House leader (Mr. Manness),

seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee—order, please.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, I think there is a motion on the record saying that we adjourn at eleven o'clock. I would like to have the unanimous consent of the House to waive that and to sit for a later period of time, with unanimous consent of the members here.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent of the House? We had previously agreed to sit until 11 p.m.; now we are asking to sit later than 11 p.m. Is there unanimous consent of the House to sit beyond 11 p.m.?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is agreed.

**Motion agreed to,** and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair.

### SUPPLY—CAPITAL SUPPLY COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

**Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. The committee is considering all the supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993, which have been adopted at this session by the two sections of the Committee of Supply sitting separately and by the full committee. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples):** Madam Chairperson, I just wanted to ask some more questions of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and some clarification in terms of the capital project the minister tabled this afternoon. I was asking in terms of the long-term plan and whether it meets the needs of the health care reform package, and certainly I had a few comments from outside individuals who have gone through this report very quickly and most of them agree that this is in line actually with the health action plan.

\* (2110)

I just want to have assurance from the minister that there will not be any policy that will say that we cannot change anything out of this package,



because we may require some changes to fit the actual implementation of the health action plan, and that may be required from time to time. I just want the minister to know we cannot have a rigid rule with the capital funding any more if you are going to have your health action plan, and I just want to know whether the minister does agree with that kind of statement.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Yes, I do agree with that, and that is really the essence of the discussion I had with my honourable friend the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), because since approximately '86 or '87 there has been a substantial amount of work coming around the role/function of Brandon General Hospital. There have been changes as recently as the last year and a half where we have made the decision that we would incorporate acute psychiatric beds. It has been talked about, but it is part of our planning process now, given decisions that we are making around Brandon Mental Health Centre. So, yes, I say to my honourable friend that there is commitment to change.

Let me give my honourable friend another example. In the Misericordia Hospital plans that have been developed, architecturally even, there was accommodation for some 40 psychiatric beds in the Misericordia redevelopment. As my honourable friend knows, we are about to accept the recommendation on the acute psychiatric unit at Misericordia to replace it with community-based services, so that has led us to a redevelopment of the scope of the Misericordia redevelopment. So they are fluid plans.

But what I would like to say is that the projects that we have, particularly in architectural planning and particularly the ones that are in the construction phase, are ones that we believe fit the long-term goals as established over the next two years in the action plan for reform and the longer term out to meet the needs as we see it at the turn of the century and on.

That does not mean that, for instance, there are not going to be changes in the scope of the Brandon General Hospital as we approach the redevelopment. That is just a given. I do not even think my honourable friend from Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) finds that to be an objectionable statement. I mean, that has been reality since he has been involved in developing plans around the Brandon General Hospital.

I would venture to say that the concept of just five years or seven years ago is now somewhat different than what it is today, because there have been decisions in '87 to close beds there and further decisions just in January of this year to close beds as services have moved to the community through outpatient surgery and other community-based provision of services.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I think it is very essential that any long-term planning, specifically with the capital projects—because when you are building beds, whether they are acute care beds or chronic care beds or some other form of health care facility, it is very easy to build in a way that it will give you some extra mileage for the short term, but you may be doing something wrong for the long run.

It has happened in the past, so I just want the minister to be very cautious and not really get into that kind of planning where I have seen failures in the past. Exactly what is required is a sound knowledge and a long-term vision, because if we do not have both, you cannot have a capital project, because it is not good to build places when you cannot fund them to operate. Because once you have a bed somewhere, it is very difficult to take that bed out. That is what the health care providers and patients are saying too, that maybe we did not need so many places first-hand. That actually has happened.

Because once you have an extra bed there, it is going to be occupied, and that is well known. I think that is why it is so essential, and we want to emphasize again that any long-term health care planning should be based on the true need of a community and not on the short-term things, because once you are gone after four years, you are going to leave something which is going to be very difficult to get rid of. Then blaming and counterblaming starts, then, I think, it is just a waste of time.

So we want to, again, emphasize that anything which will be done, the minister should make sure that the health action plan's basic intent is not being violated by anyone, and to put a system like that that does not matter what happens in 1994. Anybody who would like to change this basic plan should face a lot of tough opposition from the health care providers and patients.

That is why I think it is very crucial to have everything put in place, all the basic things, all the

primary work must be done in terms of analysis, in terms of the basic planning. That is why the health policy centre is so essential to the whole plan. I mean, when we came to know the health centre was being set up, we knew what was going to happen. It was something that any government can say, well, it is not my political ideology, I am basing it on the data which is available and it is Manitoba data.

You cannot go wrong with that. That is why if you have all the things put in place, then it will very difficult, whether this government or next government or any Minister of Health cannot even touch those things. But to build something today and not to use it for the long run, I think that causes many problems. That is the issue not only with the capital funding but with the other health care associated in terms of the health care providers, in terms of the school of nursing or school of LPN or the medical school.

Everything when it was started in 1967 and '68 was based on 36 million population in this country, and not only for the physician manpower but everything else. So what has happened when you put something in place—once you have a whole structure put in place, it is very difficult to touch anyone. A basic fight for survival comes there, and then people create needs, whether they are real or not. I think that is a point, but within the short life of any given minister it is very, very difficult to really come to any conclusion with that. There are a lot of barriers. One can set up committees, but then there will be countercommittees and counterstudies to back up what is required. So my basic point here is that the long-term planning, whether it is capital funding or the health care provider funding or the health care resources, if you want to call that, it has to be based on the true need in five or ten years' time.

I mean, you can have any other minister, whether it is the Minister of Industry, Trade, other ministers, and it could be changed; but it is very important to have the same Health minister at least for four or five years because it takes a minimum of that amount of time to understand the whole thing and put the whole process. That is why right now many in government would wish they had a minister who has been there for a long time. They are having a difficult time. If you are not knowledgeable, if you do not have understanding of the whole system, then you are being run by somebody who does not have interest, probably because they are not

accountable. Only the elected officials are accountable.

This is so important, very crucial that anything which is put in place now—I want to emphasize again, because, who knows, I may not be able to get this opportunity to say those things—but it is so essential that those things are put on the record, that whatever we do here has to be on that basis of true need and not on the basis of a short-term political gain or mileage or whatever you want to call it. That is why when I went through this report, this very short period of time, I was satisfied that this planning is based on the need assessment and not on which riding is represented by which party and which riding is not represented by the opposition or the other groups. That is why we can see some investment done in Thompson; some is going to be in Brandon; some in Swan River and Dauphin. I mean, those are the places, and some other places, which are going to get beds. I think that will really send a very strong message.

\* (2120)

That is another thing that I want to say, that the health care issue has—I think it is the first time probably since the minister took over in 1988—it has truly become a very, very rational issue. It is not anymore an emotional issue, which was very tough to get rid of.

Secondly, it is not a political issue anymore in the broader term. It may be that something is attached because certainly the minister is in power to implement those things, and they are going to get credit and that is fair. I think that is the way that life is, but certainly it is not likely that you are going to announce 10 beds here and tomorrow they are going to have a demonstration. We have not seen any single demonstration yet against the health action plan.

That says a lot, because people want to know how you are going to deliver, if you are going to oppose it, who is going to pay the bills, and what is the reality of life? I think if we do not address those issues we are running away from the responsibility. I would like to contribute anything—[interjection] That probably took us four years. [interjection] Well, it is not a question of what I am going to do, time will tell.

It is very important to put those things—and I mean somebody else will take the time, and I do not want to pass my time like this. I want to put something on the record. It is four or five years of a lot of hard

work, many hours of research based on the scientific analysis, and I think it is—

**An Honourable Member:** Harry is getting tired.

**Mr. Cheema:** If the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) is not very pleased to listen to what the government is going to do, I think that is his problem, not mine. I am not going to stop because it is very essential for me to put those remarks on the record because, as I said, it is very difficult to be rational in politics, and once you do it, then you want to make sure your message is conveyed.

To convey that message, for us, as I said again today, that even if we take four or five front or second pages, put it . . . the health action plan, and I think our role is to make sure. The member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) should know that. Our role here is to make sure this plan is being implemented, because it is not going to be difficult for various interest groups to derail this plan. It would have been a wonderful day for them when the plan was being put forward that the political parties were having a . . . . We could have torn this report upside-down and it would have been a disaster, but the tone was set in a way, I think, that is very positive, and we are very happy with that kind of an approach.

Certainly I will not take more time, but I want to emphasize again, please do not get yourself away from the normal path, which is not easy, but once people would remember it—because as I said, I think it was six months ago, that a person can remember only a few things in life for something that you do, and any minister of life, there are a couple of things one can remember. If we can have mental health reform and the major health action plan at least, I think that is a major statement.

Whether that is true today, in my view it is true, but I think eventually people will judge on the record of the health care reform, and there could be some problems, but ultimately I think people will be benefitted. Because something so dear to them—and as I said, if any one of us is telling any person outside this House that either the NDP or the Tories or us, any one of us is going to kill medicare, we are simply lying through our teeth. Absolutely, it is all nonsense. Those things do not work. Everyone knows that each and every party is very serious about the health care reform. They want to preserve better health care because we all use it;

our families, we, and generations are going to use it. It is so important.

What has happened out of the health action plan was education. The education component is coming. I mean, people have not really taken it in a negative way. They want to see how it is going to work. They want to make sure how it is going to be implemented because—there was a meeting at St. Boniface Hospital about the ward displacement. There were a couple of wards, and people were concerned how we are going to have community services put into place. So I think if we can address all those issues, then certainly we can achieve a lot of things.

Madam Chairperson, the other issue which has to be addressed in the long run is the question of funding. Everyone talks about funding, but it does not matter, in my view, where the funding is going to come from. As local politicians, as local policy makers, we still have to deliver the same services. So it would be very easy for anyone to say, well, the federal government is not doing this or that.

That actually happened at last week's conference. I mean, basically, the intention was to get hold of the basic financial problem in the health care system, but it was very unfortunate that they did not address some of the real issues, like how they are going to change the whole thing, because they are running away from responsibility. It would have been much better to see a health action plan which would go from St. John's to Victoria, something which crosses all boundaries. If the government is very serious, then it has no choice.

That is why I am very pleased that, at least, we are going to have a resolution in this House, voted on by all the three parties, I presume. We should make every effort, the effort which was put forward by all the Premiers of all political stripes to make sure we have a health care policy which is consistent with the real law. We may not be delivering the right things, but at least we can sensitize ourselves, all of us, that we have the courage of our convictions and we are going to do the right things. Thank you.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairperson, I just want to say to my honourable friend that he would be very comfortable at Minister of Health meetings, because my honourable friend has risen above the partisanship that from time to time comes to the House and has approached it as I know his Liberal

colleagues across Canada are approaching issues facing them in their respective governments, whether it be New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, the Province of Quebec, Newfoundland.

I have to say that just last week, Thursday, Wednesday, there were four New Democratic Ministers of Health at the conference. They are approaching in the same kind of challenges a different approach. I am not faulting them for the approach they are taking because their circumstances are different from Manitoba's.

Saskatchewan's circumstances are different; so is Ontario's; so is British Columbia's. But they are all coming to grips with the management issues in the health care system. They are all working on very aggressive reform packages. They are all trying their very, very best to preserve medicare and accessibility to quality health care, and there is a great deal of unanimous consent around the issue of what we do.

That is why the system is going to survive. That is why the system is going to be refreshed with new thinking, innovative ideas on how we can make responsible change, and it is ours to keep and it is ours to preserve.

If we get our minds around it, there is no one can tell me that we are not going to be able to maintain a very, very excellent and world-leading health care system. But it is not going to be without its challenges. I mean, all of us understand that, and all of us understand, I think, to a greater degree today the financial challenges facing governments in the nation of Canada.

I just want to say to my honourable friend that he would be comfortable at a Health ministers' meeting because some of the contributions he makes are good ones.

Now, you know, I am not going to take too long, but there are a couple of points that my honourable friend is fully aware of. Even in the commitment of the personal care home beds, there is argument around whether we should be committing that much capital resource to personal care home beds in the province of Manitoba.

(Mrs. Shirley Render, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

There is a strong school of thought that says, no, we should invest in the community and in alternate methods of care in the community, and we will be

as we approach the reform of the system and challenge new ideas and bring them forward.

There is significant movement right across Canada. New Brunswick has set a goal to reduce their acute care bed ratio, I think, by about a half a bed per thousand population over the next several years. We are doing the same thing. British Columbia has accepted the royal commission recommendations to reduce acute care bed ratios.

I mean, this whole system across Canada is moving away from our overdependence on institutions to genuinely enhance service provision in the community and on the prevention education side. These capital plans, as best I and the ministry can reflect today, try to point us at what we see to be the appropriate capital investment today that is going to last us 10, 20, 30 years.

\* (2130)

But, as my honourable friend has cautioned, this is not written in stone. You will see changes two years from now in some of the capital projects. You will see community clinics come to be more and more a part of service delivery outside the city of Winnipeg as well as inside the city of Winnipeg.

So we are into a fluid process, but I have reasonable confidence around the proposals that are made here and the contingency plans that we have got in place to reform agenda both in acute care and mental health.

I think that we have tried to develop something that is reflective of new thinking around Capital Program, because my honourable friend is absolutely right. I have often said it as I stepped outside that door after tabling Capital Estimates in past years, particularly the first couple.

(Madam Chairperson in the Chair)

I mean, I was lined up and besieged by reporters wanting to know why this project was not advanced or that project was not advanced, and I had to explain that, you know, at any given time a Minister of Health is faced with \$1 billion worth of capital construction requests.

You would be an absolute hero if you said, yes, they are all going to go, we are going to build them all. The construction industry would love you, every community, every sponsor would love you; but woe beget you if you are still around when the costs of operating those \$1 billion worth of new facilities come in if they have not met care needs that are

affordable and sustainable within today's financial and health care environment.

I would suggest to you that no government is able to do that. So the capital document, more and more, will become very much a strategic document which is underpinned as much as possible by some of the scientific analysis my honourable friend makes mention of, so that we invest in appropriate care in appropriate areas of the health care system.

**Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake):** Madam Chairperson, as indicated last week, we had wanted to continue with some questioning with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) on some uncompleted questions that I have, and my colleagues from Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) and Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) have also indicated that they have some questions for the Minister of Natural Resources.

I would like to begin by sort of continuing from I believe it was the afternoon session that we had in Estimates when we had discussed the misunderstanding, the issue to date with Commercial Concessions. I know the minister had indicated in some of his answers that he believed, not that we believed, the fact that it was within the court process. Of course, it is not. The process right now, I believe, is that it is being discussed between the lawyers of the Department of Natural Resources and the representative for Commercial Concessions.

After Estimates, I had taken the time to go through Hansard and my files that I have on this particular issue and still find some discrepancies as to what the minister's department had indicated and what Commercial Concessions had also indicated to me in writing and in personal meetings over the last year. I would like to ask the minister to clarify a few things, but I would also like to reiterate one very important aspect of this issue that I feel—and I had mentioned it in Estimates and I am going to mention it again.

The dispute that is now before the minister's department and Commercial Concessions is not that they did not receive the tender. The dispute—and in my questioning during Question Period last July—was the fact that Commercial Concessions believes very strongly that they are entitled to leasehold improvement payments.

The minister indicated in Hansard, in Estimates, that on one side the dispute was a legal action because of not receiving the tender, and further

down he indicates that the dispute, in fact, is over leasehold improvements and payments.

I would like to just, again, be strong with this by indicating to the minister, as I did during Estimates, Commercial Concessions would be and are extremely willing and very wanting to sit down and meet with this minister on a one-to-one basis and discuss this issue with him on a one-to-one basis, so that this matter does not go to court.

There is no need for this matter to go to court. It is being discussed with lawyers, but it does not have to go to court. This matter could, and I feel—and I would certainly offer any assistance that I am able to provide—but Commercial Concessions would like to, have requested, have through their representatives, through myself, have requested to sit down and meet with the minister, the minister give them some time on this issue. Let them explain their situation. Let them explain the facts as they have them. Let the minister in turn explain his facts that he feels he has, that he feels his department being strong on and conclude this matter from there, not letting it go to court.

I think it is extremely important. I am going to ask a few questions, and I ask because of the discrepancies of what I have on file and what the minister has indicated. I do not question the department, the people within his department, as to how things are done or operated, no specific person within his department.

I feel that there has been some misconception as far as how the whole process was done. There was perhaps a misunderstanding, but I feel, and Commercial Concessions feels, that they have unjustly been treated by the minister's department when it comes to the leasehold improvements and when it comes to the whole process.

I think the indication, when I first had the opportunity to meet with the people from Commercial Concessions, was the fact that all they wanted to do was settle this in a manner that was beneficial to both parties. That resolution would only come if the minister would find the time for Commercial Concessions and not let legal departments and legal representation continue to banter back and forth while people are out a substantial amount of funds.

The minister had indicated that, as he was led to believe perhaps, or as his department had indicated to him, that Commercial Concessions was in fact the

instigator of the lease being terminated. Looking in my files I find that it was an indication from the minister's department that they had approached Commercial Concessions and had indicated to Commercial Concessions that in fact the lease should be or had to be terminated before the expiry date of the full five-year term that Commercial Concessions had.

I want to ask the minister why. Why did his department come to Commercial Concessions indicating that the lease had to be terminated before the five-year term of the lease was up?

\* (2140)

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Madam Chairperson, I am pleased to clarify one or two matters on this issue that is obviously of interest and of concern to the honourable member for the Interlake. Number one, I certainly agree with the honourable member that the matter need not go to the courts, and I hope it does not go to the courts. To whatever extent my office can facilitate that from happening, I am certainly prepared to discuss with my Parks officials ways that we can bring that about. Number two, I do want to clear up, although I acknowledge that I had indicated in earlier discussion during the Estimates that I believe that maybe some of the bad feelings arose because Commercial Concessions did not get chosen for the proposal. That, I agree also with my friend in the Interlake, is not the issue before us.

My department acknowledges that there are leasehold improvements that Commercial Concessions are entitled to be reimbursed. In fact, I understand that there is an offer before Commercial Concessions at this very time of X number of thousands of dollars to do just that. Now, I understand that is the point of dispute. Commercial Concessions obviously feel that the amount being offered by the department is not sufficient to cover what they believe to be the actual improvements that they made. That is where the matter stands

For the member to be absolutely clear, I do not dispute the facts that the member is putting before the House. The issue is leasehold improvements made by Commercial Concessions during the time that they occupied the premises and that is what is before the department right now. I hope that can be resolved without having redress, without having to

go through the expense where the legal community gets most of the monies involved, and that we can come to an understanding of the matter that the member now has raised on several occasions.

The member asks, why was it that the department approached the commercial leaseholder prior to the final date of their lease to re-examine the concession that they were operating at Grand Beach? The simple reason is that an additional property, namely the old hotel that is at Grand Beach along with the restaurant and something like that, became available because of another leaseholder walking away from his lease on that property. That caused the department Parks Branch to look at a broader potential concession and to approach Commercial Concessions, as my information has it, whether or not he would be mutually agreeable to giving up the lease in its third year, or whatever year it was prior to the completion of his lease, and to, in fact, involve himself in an active bid, in a proposal bid, for the new configuration of the concession which took into account the additional facilities, the restaurant, the hotel, that is on those premises. Regrettably—and this is a matter of some objectivity, because it is not, as I said during the course of the Estimates, a straight matter of a dollar bid, it is the attractiveness of the proposal that individuals and firms made. I did not choose the successful bidder on the leaseholds. The department had a well-understood point kind of forum where for different considerations a proposal was judged, and Commercial Concessions failed to win that proposal.

But I put on the record what I can, Madam Chairperson. I do want to assure the honourable member that I have no problem having Commercial Concessions continue their discussions with Parks people. Certainly, if court action can be avoided, it ought to be avoided, as the member says, for the mutual benefit of both the Parks Branch and for Commercial Concessions.

Secondly, I acknowledge that the Parks Branch does not admit to a responsibility of some leasehold improvements owing to Commercial Concessions. My understanding is a firm figure has been presented to Commercial Concessions. The precise figure is not available to me at this time. I know it is in the several thousands, \$16,000, \$18,000 or \$20,000 range. I am assuming that Commercial Concessions feels that is not adequate. Well, that is a case for continued discussions.

I suppose if we fail to come to an agreement, and if Commercial Concessions feels strongly enough about it, that could eventually lead to a court case. But I will undertake, and I have certainly asked my Parks officials who were present when the member raised the issue the other day when we were dealing in our regular process of the Estimates, to renew their efforts to bring this matter to a conclusion with Commercial Concessions.

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** I appreciate the minister putting on record that he and his department are willing to settle or to look at the matter and try and settle it so it does not go to court. But there are questions.

The minister indicated that Commercial Concessions had the lease on certain parts of the park, of the property. He indicated that someone else wanted to take the lease on the old hotel and the restaurant as such.

My records and what I have seen indicate to me that Commercial Concessions, in fact, had that, had the old hotel, had the restaurant, made improvements there, made improvements to the concessions on the boardwalk, made improvements throughout the part that they were responsible for, and spent an enormous amount of time and money to make those improvements.

My understanding, according to the lease and according to Commercial Concessions, is that in their lease they had control—or not to say control—but that was their lease. It was not just one specific area. It was everything. The minister is indicating something different. The five-year lease was there with Commercial Concessions for the hotel, for the restaurant, for the motel, for the concessions on the boardwalk, and for other areas, and they took care of this and spent money on this with, if I may add, the approval and the co-operation of the Parks people at that time.

Now we are talking about leasehold improvements that people are putting in. Being within the business community, Madam Chairperson, my understanding is that when you have a leasehold improvement and your lease is terminated, I do not know where there is any kind of contract that says, well, if you make leasehold improvements to the building that you are leasing that is under the agreement, you have to approve, being the lessor has to approve. In fact, the lessor has to reimburse the person leasing the facilities when the lease is terminated, whether it be before

the lease is up or it should be under mutual agreement. This was not done.

I say to the minister that I find it very strange that people who have worked very hard for this minister's department for three full years—if I may stand corrected on that, maybe four, but three that I know of for sure—that they make improvements to that facility when they came upon that facility, and it is on record, they have it on record as what they came to, and what they left with and what they made improvements to, again with the co-operation of this minister's department.

Again the dispute may not be on the fact that they did not receive the tender. They are saying, we have done all this with the co-operation of the minister's department, of the Parks people; we had no dispute with the Parks people in the time that we had our lease. The Parks come to us and say, we have to put this up for bid again. We are terminating the lease, or we are asking you to terminate the lease because something else has come about.

\* (2150)

Commercial Concessions says: That is fine, but we want the improvements that we have put into it. Now, if I may continue on that, the walkabout, as I had mentioned in Estimates, was not performed after Commercial Concessions did not receive the tender. Commercial Concessions was present; Parks people were not.

The indication was to Commercial Concessions that anything that belongs to Commercial Concessions, that they made leasehold improvements to the facility, they take. It belongs to them. The department had no intention of reimbursing Commercial Concessions for those leasehold improvements.

In fact, after that, after Commercial Concessions did take what belonged to them and they made those improvements, and they had requested from the minister's department to be reimbursed for what they felt was due to them, the minister's department sends back, along with copies of bills, saying: Well, here you are. You are asking for this amount of money. That is fine, but here are some bills for you. Here are some bills that we have to—it does not say that we have to pay—but here are some bills, minus these bills and minus this and minus that, this is what you are going to receive.

These bills, why? Who paid for Commercial Concessions' bills when they came in on the lease

and they made all the improvements to the facilities as required to enhance the facility and enhance the promotion of the park and of the concession? Who paid them? They paid it. Now, the indication that I have is that, yes, we will pay you back some leasehold improvements. However, we will deduct some bills here, that there have been improvements made because you left the facility in a state that it had to be re-equipped.

I hope the minister understands where I am coming from. It is a question to the minister, whether he feels himself that this may be the correct way to operate. I do not think so. You are talking some \$8,000 or \$9,000 of bills that the minister's department is putting on Commercial Concessions. Wrong. They did what they were supposed to do. These bills that were received—and I might add, bills that were made out to the Grand Beach Ski Corporation. I ask the minister why is Commercial Concessions being held responsible for bills that were made out to Grand Beach Ski Corporation?

In fact, there was no reasoning for Commercial Concessions to pay this. They did their duty as a leaseholder. They did their job. They tried to co-operate with the Parks people. They had co-operation from the Parks people up until the day that they were asked that they had to review the tender.

I want to ask the minister why this is such? Does he feel that this a correct method of operation for his department?

**Mr. Enns:** I do want to clearly indicate that through the Parks Branch I have the responsibility of several hundred business leases, with the number of people that offer some service throughout our Parks system. It would be, I think, understandable to the honourable member that I certainly do not present myself as being capable of knowing in detail the individual arrangements that were made, and I am not going to attempt to.

I have probably already put some wrong information on the record with respect to this issue, because that is why we have people in the Parks Branch doing these things. All I can do is indicate to the honourable member that I do not dispute the basic facts that the member has put before, that commercial leasehold has a case before the department for reimbursement, for some leasehold that meets the amount. The issue of what constitutes an appropriate bill, what does not

constitute an appropriate bill, I have no way of knowing, particularly not at this moment in dealing with—as we are in the concurrence motion, I do not have the officials of the department with me to provide these kinds of detailed answers, but I ask the honourable member to accept my assurances that as a result of the issue being raised by the honourable member during the course of Estimates, it will be receiving some priority attention in a very short little while.

**Mr. Clif Evans:** I would like to go on to other issues. I think what I have heard from the minister is what Commercial Concessions would like to hear, and on closing on this specific issue that if the minister, as you said, wants to make it a priority, I will in fact, and I put on record, that I would be honoured, if that is the case, to assist the minister in co-ordinating the discussion with Commercial Concessions.

As the minister has indicated, he does not have his staff here. I think where the case perhaps can be concluded is getting the staff involved, that Commercial Concessions is dealt with, and have them both discuss this issue with the minister in place hearing the case, instead of back and forth and through lawyers and through what not.

I appreciate the minister's responsibility. I want that made very clear. I do appreciate his responsibility, and I do appreciate the fact that all ministers cannot keep a tight reign on everything that goes on within their department. You would have to be a superman, and sometimes the minister, I think, feels that he might be close to that. I understand and appreciate it. The minister has put on record that this is what he would like, and I am putting on record that I would really appreciate that this be a priority and, between my office and Commercial Concessions, that we ratify this, satisfy everybody and conclude this.

On another matter, I had questioned the minister, I guess, right at the end of the Estimates last week, in regard to the three and three-quarter mesh on north basin and channel area and the different areas that were—at that time I had indicated to the minister that I had received many calls, and in fact, up until today, before we came into concurrence, was still receiving calls on this matter.

Madam Chairperson, to the minister, there is concern out there that there has been some illegal, perhaps some misinformed fishermen out there who are using three and three-quarter inch mesh in a



nondesignated area by certain fisheries. The minister is well aware and I am sure knows that I have spoken to different people regarding this issue. I know the minister had indicated to me last week that in fact there was no approval to three and three-quarter inch mesh to be used at all, except in Grand Rapids, except in Sturgeon Bay for summer fishing and fall fishing for Grand Rapids. However, I must indicate to the minister that in fact there was three and three-quarter inch mesh used in the north basin just in the past couple of weeks. I want to know from the minister, what does he intend to do about that and why are people so misinformed regarding this whole situation? There is no agreement to anything.

\* (2200)

**Mr. Enns:** A dear old friend of mine, a fisherman of many years experience, an Icelander, I think, by the name of Grantham Skuli Bakerson (phonetic) once told me that the problem with fishermen is that they tend to want to cheat a little bit from time to time. I did not really believe him because I have faith in the 3,500 commercial fishermen that ply the lakes of Manitoba, that they may sometimes be in a position with nets that have shrunk or have gotten oversize and then they run afoul with the enforcement officers of my department.

Leaving that aside, what we have done on Sturgeon Bay and in the area referred to as Area 6, it includes the Grand Rapids corridor, after representations made to us both for and against, and that is always the case in so many of these resource questions—my best biological advice from professional people in the staff who work with the fishermen stationed out of Gimli, we are prepared on an experimental basis to try the smaller three and three-quarter size mesh on Area 6 and Area 6 only, and only for the summer and fall season, which pretty well excludes the whitefish fisheries.

Now, the honourable member suggests to me that there are people that are using that mesh size that ought not to be using it. Let me be very public about it. They run the danger, and they will be caught doing so. The honourable member, certainly if he is in contact with his fishermen, should apprise them that that area will be monitored more closely than normal because of the experimental nature of this summer's fishery, and we want to get some very hard data as to the kind of fish that we are getting, the potential impact on the resource and we will

evaluate that after the fall fisheries to see whether or not that is an acceptable practice in those areas.

We were persuaded to do this by the representation made to us by the elected member of the Lake Winnipeg Advisory Board and Mr. Traverse, by the general manager of the Grand Rapids Fishermen's Co-operative. We were also advised by others who felt that it was a mistake to go to the small fisheries, but that is the kind of challenges that the Minister of Natural Resources quite frequently faces.

I just simply want to reiterate, it is an experiment for the summer and fall fisheries only, and restricted to what is known as Area 6. The commercial fishermen who fish the area know the boundaries much better than I do. I will also indicate to you that I got an invitation from this same Skuli Bakerson to maybe lift a net or two during the course of the summer, which I intend to do, because I like to take time away from the office, particularly during the summer months, not only to have the opportunity of visiting what my staff are about throughout the length and breadth of this province, but to gain some personal experiences about some of the problems that people have with regulations, with rules, with laws that my department imposes on them from time to time. It makes it easier for me to understand precisely what it is that is being faced by people who have to live with these regulations.

**Mr. Clif Evans:** Madam Chairperson, I want to thank the minister for explaining to me what he explained to me last week, what we talked about after those meetings with Mr. Traverse, Mr. Prantreu.

That is not the issue that I have been contacted about. The issue is, in fact, that there was three and three-quarter inch mesh used in north basin by whitefish fisheries. The fact is that the fishermen within these areas, they are concerned. They have a concern to this issue. I think the minister and his department have the same concern. We all do. The system, in fact, now with the marketing and the potential of whitefish being so low, I feel, and so do they, they feel the whole broad scheme of the fishing industry has to be looked at. It has to be decided on with everybody involved, with the whitefish people and with the other regular fishermen.

Perhaps there is a misunderstanding. Perhaps someone was made aware, because of Area 6 and Area 7 getting that, that perhaps we can do it too,

when in fact, questioning the minister, that was not so. So we want to know, where did they get this misinformation, this assumption that they could use them?

The minister is well aware of the different quotas, and 35,000 to 70,000 pounds the amount on a three and three-quarter inch mesh, the amount of sauger that would be taken out of the lake—[interjection] pickerel, too, compared to a five-inch mesh which is allowed, according to the fishermen could be devastating down the road. Not so much just today, but down the road. I have spoken to fishermen and people from the advisory board, and their concern is that there has not been a real indication to everybody just what the specific rules and regulations are, and the changes that the minister has allowed in the past couple of weeks for Area 6 and 7. There is a misunderstanding, I feel, but there is also a tremendous amount of concern that if it is going to be allowed then there has to be proper consultation with all the commercial fishermen through the advisory board, through the minister's department, through the biologists, through regional managers, regional directors, but, more importantly, the fishermen.

Before this happens again or continues, I know speaking to representatives today, they would like to see a meeting, not in November as the advisory board meets, but sooner. I am sure the minister will hear from them on this issue. I would like the minister to indicate that his office will be fully available to attend such a meeting.

This is not just coming from one fisherman. This is coming from a dozen or so fishermen themselves and three representatives of the advisory board. It is coming from some of the staff, too, that this perhaps is the route to go. So what has happened in the last couple of weeks is not going to happen again without the co-operation of everyone.

What can be done now? Probably nothing. What can be done for the future? Probably quite a bit. I guess my real concern is, was there anything from the minister's office to indicate to anybody, or from Fisheries perhaps, to indicate to anybody that north basin was open to three and three-quarter mesh?

**Mr. Enns:** Madam Chairperson, I think it was very, very plain, certainly from the Fisheries department dealing directly with the fishermen involved out of our regional office in Gimli, that this experimental

use of the smaller three and three-quarter inch mesh was restricted to the Sturgeon Bay, Area 6 fisheries area only.

I do not think there was any misunderstanding or any lack of clarity with respect to the issue. I appreciate the points that the honourable member makes; regrettably, the whitefish industry is in serious trouble. I suspect that my Fisheries people and biologists and the fishermen themselves will be severely challenged over this coming season as to the future direction of the Lake Winnipeg fisheries.

I can report to you. I know that Fisheries staff gains valuable data and information from different types of fisheries and experiments with changes of mesh sizes. The fisheries that I am more familiar with is the Lake Manitoba fisheries, which is a winter fisheries only and which had an introduction of small mesh size some years ago, and, quite frankly, that has worked very well, primarily to the satisfaction of all concerned.

\* (2210)

There are still some fishermen on Lake Manitoba who still feel and express the point of view that the use of a smaller mesh size is doing long-term damage to the resource, but data that the department is carefully gathering do not substantiate this.

This decision to experiment on one portion of Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipeg fisheries with a smaller mesh size was not made lightly. I was aware that, if you introduce this measure on one portion of the lake, there will be demands and there might even be a deliberate kind of, well, you know, sense of expanding it without waiting for approval from Fisheries on the basis that, well, if they can use a three and three-quarter on Sturgeon Bay, why can we not use it in other areas of the lake?

On the other hand, I once again tell these fishermen that they stand very real problems with the law enforcement efforts, because the smaller mesh size regulations apply only to Area 6 and enforcement will be rigidly imposed upon—[interjection] Yes, it will be rigidly imposed on anybody outside of that area that is using nonregulatory mesh-size mesh. If the honourable member from Interlake (Mr. Cliff Evans) wants to do his fishermen a favour, he will take that message back to them.

However, I would hope that this experiment in Sturgeon Bay or Area 6, as it is more formally

known, will be helpful to us, will be helpful to the fishermen, that when we do get together and the advisory board gets together in November for the annual meeting, that we will have some direction as to the future. It may well be—I do not wish to speculate—if the state of the whitefish fisheries is still depressed and markets are still as bad, that some hard judgments will be made to accommodate changing fisheries of different species that could involve an examination of existing quotas, what the value of those quotas are when you replace pickerel, well, you know, saugers instead of whitefish.

These could all come up for discussion. But I think it will be helpful, at least people like Kim Campbell and Worth Hayden, the Fisheries people—that is why they recommended it to me. It will be helpful to have had a summer and fall fisheries experience with the small mesh in this restricted area, Area 6 again I repeat so that there is no misunderstanding, that will give us some data that proper biological judgments can be made for future decisions that may affect a greater area of Lake Winnipeg.

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** Just one last comment on that, Madam Chairperson. I appreciate the minister's input and his strong words as to the enforcement. I feel, and what I have heard, that it is too late. [interjection] Well, that is true, but it is in fact in some areas, from what I have heard today, probably too late.

I do hope that, because in some matters it may be too late, that the enforcement people do not hesitate to go out and to check still until the end of season, which is another month or three weeks away. I feel, and the indications from the fishermen and the area representatives is that they do not want to wait for the November 3 advisory meeting, that they would appreciate getting together as a whole after the fishing season is over. It is sometime in October or September or August, as soon as possible, to set the goals that the minister has indicated to prepare for the advisory meetings. That is my point. I am waiting for something to table.

I would just like to table a statement made at the last advisory board meeting, and I would appreciate the minister's involvement, response to this statement, and, perhaps, investigation as to what the specific area representative has indicated in his statement here that he allegedly made to the advisory board in May. I table this for the minister

and I put on record that I would appreciate a response to this as soon as the minister himself is able to go through investigations. One for here and one for the minister.

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** I, earlier this year, had the opportunity to travel with the minister to Swan River to attend a meeting on comanagement of the resources, and there was a lot of concern raised about the depleting wildlife stock in the mountains. The minister had talked about reaching some agreement or working along with the different groups who had concerns in that part of the province, and I wonder what steps have been taken since that meeting? Has any consensus been reached; has any committee been struck; has anything happened to deal with the issue of comanagement of resources in the Duck Mountain and the Swan River area?

**Mr. Enns:** Madam Chairperson, I wish I could report more progress on the matter. I have to indicate to her that the whole question of the department's approach to comanagement is undergoing some review as well, along with some of the major reorganization that has taken place in the department. I wish to bring the whole question of comanagement, the way the department deals with comanagement, into a higher profile focus within our policy direction unit.

(Mr. Edward Helwer, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

We have not in all instances been clear ourselves as to how we want to go out and approach the general public and the specific interest groups on some of these matters. As I said at that meeting and I continue to say it today that some of our successes have tended to be in those areas where we have restricted ourselves to specific species, specific area and with specific numbers of communities of people involved.

The area that the honourable member, of course, refers to, the Duck Mountain-Swan River area, is a complex one in the sense that it brings together all of the problems of aboriginal hunting rights, of prime agricultural land that is subject to severe damage on occasion, depredation from wildlife if not properly managed. Very keenly interested groups of people both within the community, the sportsmen's association and so forth have in the past been extremely concerned as to how the overall natural resources in that area get managed. We are

hoping, and are hopeful to have revitalized or looked at the existing Western Elk management board that has been in place there for some years.

I do not offer that up as being the vehicle through which we will accomplish some degree of comanagement in the area, but it is there and it is in place, and I have asked the department, I have asked Mr. Grant Baker, who has recently been appointed as director of that policy integration unit that I spoke of—I invite the honourable member to feel free to contact him from time to time on this matter. This is a matter that is going to be with us for a long period of time.

\* (2220)

We are going to have some successes; we are going to have some failures in this area. As recently as this week we have relooked at the elk management board to see whether or not, around that framework, there might not be the genesis of adding the necessary components to make a more inclusive vehicle that could result in truly a comanagement of the resources of that beautiful part of the province.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** When we were at that meeting, the minister will remember that there were some pretty heated feelings and a lot of tension in the crowd. It was the feeling that we should try to work towards coming to some compromise and working with the different groups. Has anybody within the department been identified in the Swan River area, for example, besides Mr. Grant Baker who might be working with the individual groups?

Is anybody meeting with the aboriginal groups, with the fishermen's group at this time, to try to get an understanding of what direction the different groups want to go, someone who can still the waters, so to speak, to get things settled down and maybe to a table to start discussing the issue?

Is there anybody identified in the area who is going to be working on that?

**Mr. Enns:** It is my hope that in the first instance this will become a high priority direction of the newly appointed regional director, first of all who will be operating in that region—I suspect he is stationed in The Pas, but that will come directly under the auspices of the regional director as an overall, kind of integrated approach of the department to the problem.

I have another expert in the name of Roberto Sopokolous (phonetic) who has done extensive

academic work, has published books on the question of comanagement, who will be assisting us. He is not a member of the department, although he gets paid by my department on occasion. When he is not otherwise meeting his international obligations in mostly the southern hemisphere, he will assist us in bringing to bear the finest minds on this issue.

I recognize very seriously what the honourable member is saying. Certainly the feelings that she alluded to were not lost on me. Certainly her constituents and the people in that area are looking for leadership, and by the nature of the problem, that has to come from this department.

I appreciate the member's—I appreciate that we are on opposite sides of the House, and I am as much of a partisan politician as she is, but on this issue I know that we can work together to try to at least get it off the ground. I am trying very hard. Part of the problem, I will confess to the honourable member, is that within the department we have had kind of a model for putting together a comanagement unit, that the area that has received most attention are those areas, because it was our priority, particularly directed by my colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) to those communities who were under the Northern Flood Agreement.

It is my understanding that perhaps her colleague the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and the Minister of Northern Affairs will be flying to Thompson tomorrow to sign that historic Split Lake agreement that involves Hydro, the Manitoba government, the federal government and the Split Lake people. Included in that agreement will be a major challenge to all of us in terms of the management of the much larger natural resource area which includes a multitude of resources found in that area.

Part of the problem within the department is we have tended to take that model that we have developed to work on that scale, and then when we try to apply it to a place like Swan River, it does not fit. I have come to the conclusion that they have to be individually customized to meet the needs of a particular community, because every community is different. We are talking, in some cases, a different make-up of people. We are talking of some communities that have a greater involvement, for instance where aboriginal hunting is a bigger issue. We are talking different wildlife species, and we are

talking a different degree of involvement from people.

I want to make this very clear to the honourable member, the one decided change of direction that, in my judgment, has to be taken, and was not always taken by the department, and that comes perhaps partly because of our preoccupation in dealing specifically with the Indian bands involved in the Northern Flood Agreement. When we are talking Swan River we cannot just talk government to one or two Indian bands, reserve populations. There are Métis populations that have to be taken into consideration, there are non-native populations that have to be taken into consideration, and they all have to be married together to make a successful comanagement venture in an area like the Duck Mountains and Swan River.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I guess nothing is happening then as far as meeting with the individual groups. I find that a bit disappointing because that was what we had hoped would come out of that meeting when we were in Swan River, that someone would be meeting with the individual groups and trying to pull a key group together that would then work on this comanagement.

But the minister alluded to the Elk Management Board and the activity of this board. I am a little bit surprised because I thought that board had become inactive and was not doing anything. I am wondering, has the minister met with that board, and who are the representatives on that board that are active?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, the member is partly right, and I think I indicated that. That board has had its periods of inactivity and heightened activity. My understanding though is that there are still original members of that board. I cannot recall the names directly to her, but there are people like Mr. Fulford and some others. I think one of our older senior staffers at one point in time was on that board, retired now, Mr. Joe Robertson, from the Dauphin area, but I could be wrong with these names, and it would be inappropriate for me to put names on the record when I am not sure of them.

I accept the member's chastisement, that not a great deal has happened since that public meeting. I can offer the excuse to the honourable member that part of the responsibility is the current chairman of our committee. As Whip of our caucus he tends to keep the flock close together, particularly even

closer now that one of our pigeons has flown, but, nonetheless, that has made it a little difficult for the minister to get directly and personally involved.

I look forward to doing that perhaps within a day or two when this session comes to conclusion, but that does not mean that we have not concerned ourselves about it. We have had to as I have said now, and I will repeat just one more time, we have really had to rethink the department's approach to the comanagement, and there has been some adjustment that had to take place in senior positions within the department. The fact that the department has undergone fairly radical and major reorganization has also added to our problems of getting out in the field and starting to deliver the programs.

\* (2230)

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I look forward to progress on that issue.

I want to move to another area and it is one I raised in the House a few days ago with respect to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and staff in his department telling farmers that there was a real opportunity for them that we were missing here in Manitoba and that was to diversify into elk and game farming.

I want to ask the minister, is it the intention of this government to change the legislation that we have right now? It is my understanding that elk farming is illegal right now, but from what is coming from the Department of Agriculture there appears to be a move from this government to move in that direction, and I want to ask the Minister of Natural Resources if that is something that he is working towards to start elk and deer farming in Manitoba?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, all members know, particularly the member for Swan River, the modest nature of the Minister of Natural Resources, the member for Lakeside, and so I am somewhat troubled in responding to the honourable member to this question.

It was my honour two Saturdays ago to be singled out by the Canadian Wildlife Federation, representing some 650,000 Canadians, for the singular honour of being given the legislator of the year award for a number of issues involving things that I have been able to have a hand in, in some modest way, over the past years of my political career, including such things as passing Manitoba's

first Endangered Species Act, as introducing the Ecological Reserves Act.

But I do not fool myself. I also believe I got the reward because of my reluctance and my firmness in continuing to not allow elk ranching or game farming of that nature in the province of Manitoba. Certainly, in the presentation of the award, that is what received the kind of enthusiastic attention of the members of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, while they were recently gathered in Winnipeg for their annual convention, at which time this happy occasion was presented to me.

Let me further acknowledge and read to her—I am sure the honourable member gets this magazine and I recommend it to members of the House, to my friend, the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) who sometimes needs widening in her reading material. On page 41 of this magazine, not to my surprise, published—well, I should say, first of all, on page 40, there is kind of a nice picture of the minister and the president of the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, Mr. Roger Venton, and we are signing the TIP agreement for 1992, whereby the Manitoba Wildlife Federation will assist the department in our antipoaching program.

Then on the other page, there is this letter that I wrote to one Mr. John Eisner, whom I think the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) is familiar with, which clearly states the direction of this government, the policy of this government, with respect to elk ranching, that for the time being it is simply a dead issue with us.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** The minister says elk ranching is a dead issue. I will accept it on that. He says he is opposed to the farming of elk. A couple of years ago, the elk ranch in Minitonas was shut down and the people who owned the ranch were paid a substantial amount of money to shut down that operation.

I want to ask the minister why those animals are still there. The people got a substantial amount of money for them, but they also still have those elk. If the minister is opposed to elk farming and says it is a dead issue, why is there such a large number of elk being maintained in Minitonas?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I should take that question as notice. I am aware that there are some animals there. I do not know the exact—under what circumstances they are there. I concur with what the honourable member says. I am certainly

aware that a significant public payout was made to the individual involved, that something happened to those animals. I am not quite sure what happened to those animals, but the ranch itself was discontinued. We, in different parts of the province, under permit, allow some wild animals to be kept in captivity. The member is aware that we monitor these situations pretty carefully and if found wanting, indeed, withdraw that permit, as happened in the case of the Dauphin animal farm that recently has been in the news.

I do not know how many animals are involved in this operation, but I will confirm to provide the honourable member with that information as to exactly under what kind of authority, under what kind of a permit those animals are on that property.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I would appreciate that very much and I thank the minister for indicating that he will look into the matter. I want to assure him that what I am raising is fact, that those animals were paid for, I believe somewhere in the amount of \$70,000. But those animals were supposed to be removed off the property. What ended up happening is they were moved from one side of the road to the other, if I understand correctly, and are still in the vicinity. The contract, to my understanding, has not been carried out, so I would appreciate very much if the minister would get to us on that particular matter.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I will stand, actually, I like the traditions—Harry and I. Besides I have been sitting in committees all day, and this is one advantage of the House. [interjection] I remember the table pounding, some of the dying traditions and standing in the Chamber seems to be a dying tradition as well—[interjection]

I think that is maybe one thing I can agree on with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), he says, as long as we do not get rid of heckling. That might be one thing he and I can agree on up to a certain point.

I have a serious concern I want to raise on behalf of an individual. The bottom line is it is a situation where a number of individuals in The Pas have a wild rice permit and operation, they have a temporary cabin that has been established. The department has threatened to burn it down. They had pursued this matter. They had contacted the department. The deputy minister had phoned a departmental official in Cranberry Portage urging that they try and resolve the concerns, because no one wants to see this particular structure burnt

down. I spoke to this individual on Friday, and I could write the name of the individual and some of the details afterwards. The reason I am doing this is I do not want to create any difficulties for staff people. I am not trying to implicate anyone. He said that he was told basically, that the individual had said that they would rip it down themselves, he would rip it down himself if he had to.

\* (2240)

I am wondering if—and I will provide further details on this to the minister—the minister can perhaps intervene here, because I really suspect that what is happening is there are major problems in terms of communication between the deputy minister, who apparently is trying to resolve this matter, and the departmental official, and whether he will undertake to ensure that such a drastic step of burning down or destroying this particular structure does not take place.

It is a legitimate wild rice operation. They do have a permit for it, and they are very careful in terms of any impact they have in terms of environmental area. I am wondering if the minister can undertake to look into this now.

**Mr. Enns:** Also, certainly in appreciation and fairness to the staff that has, in some instances, a difficult job to carry out, obviously, unpermitted proliferation of campsites and cottaging or so forth throughout the North, the honourable member would be the first, as a member for the North, to ask the department to bring some order to this. I must admit that we do have a kind of a search and pursue and destroy unit in the department.

Rumour has it that President Nixon, before he went into that search-and-destroy unit into neighbouring Cambodia and his difficulties in Vietnam, kind of checked with our boys and found out how we did it, because we do kind of zero in on these lonely little cabins or trappers' cabins somewhere. We do pounce on them. We do burn them. We do destroy them, and we eradicate them right off the face of the earth!

The honourable member is quite right to bring this matter to my attention, and I will give the order soon that it should be looked at with some sensitivity and compassion.

**Mr. Ashton:** Well, I opposed the war in Vietnam and Cambodia and Laos and I oppose the same thing happening in Manitoba in 1992. I would ask the minister if he would ask his department to

recognize the war in Vietnam is over. Richard Nixon is no longer president, and they should not be searching and destroying remote cabin sites where people are just trying to raise some wild rice. As I said, I can provide the details on that, and I am hoping the minister will be of assistance to the individuals involved.

**Mr. Enns:** I just want to make sure that the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) does provide me with the details of the matter, so that I can pass that on to staff in the morning.

(Madam Chairperson in the Chair)

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** I never had an opportunity during regular Estimates to raise the question and the issue, and I know the minister is aware. Let us see, in January, we had the pleasure of attending a meeting in the Red Rose-Dallas area in regard to the Jackhead dam.

I know that there has been correspondence with the minister over the years on this issue. A committee had been formed from the people within the area—actually representatives from different associations, at the meeting itself there was representation from the Jackhead Reserve, from council. I would just like to ask the minister, because I have been contacted just lately as to why the minister has not responded to any of the correspondence that the association that has been put in place, on certain requests that they have made of the minister, can he indicate why there has been no response to this association?

**Mr. Enns:** I have had different meetings with different people and different representation with respect to the project that the honourable member refers to. I share the member's concern and desire that if in fact the quality of the water on Lake St. George, I believe it is, can be enhanced with the reconstruction of the dam that was once in place but over the years for whatever reasons has deteriorated or has been mostly removed.

But I must report to the honourable member that there are complicating factors involved that involve land exchange, involve current rights that other interested parties have, such as Abitibi-Price, in terms of their logging operations operating out of a particular wharf or landing there. I think that is critical to their continued supply of wood from that part of the region for that part of the province.

So the matter is not just a matter of addressing the question of whether or not there is a willingness

to proceed with the construction of a dam. I, quite frankly, am supportive of it. I have so indicated it to interested parties in the area, and I indicate it to the honourable member right now. But there are some complicating land transfer issues involved that are yet to be resolved.

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** Madam Chairperson, I appreciate the minister's indication that there are some problems as far as land exchange. In meeting with the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs some two months ago, he had indicated to me that Northern Affairs had also gotten involved with this negotiation and with the rebuilding of the dam. Can the minister indicate what his department or Northern Affairs, where have they gotten with the co-operation of the different groups, that there seems to be the conflict, if you want to use that term? I do not think it is a conflict, I think it is just that matter of exchanging and negotiations. The indication that I got from Jackhead Council was that they were in full, full support of the project. True, as long as the land exchange was suitable to all, but my understanding from the leaders of the association from Northern Affairs, from the council, is that there does not seem to be a tremendous problem with this negotiation. Where has it stalled and why has it stalled there?

**Mr. Enns:** The honourable member is pretty well putting his finger on it. I am supportive of rebuilding the structure. Certainly the users of Lake St. George are hopeful that would happen, and I share with the honourable member's belief that the Jackhead Reserve is for the dam. However, they put a condition upon that which is causing some of the problem. That is the land transfer, and part of that land transfer is the current use of the land in question becomes a little sensitive.

There is a fish-packing facility that is involved that the freshwater fish marketing corporation uses. It is a major wharf landing for shipping timber logs for the Abitibi operation from that landing, and I certainly do not wish to impede these operations or have them traded away on a land transfer without guaranteeing or without some certainty being placed that these operations can continue. That is specifically where the issue is at rest. The member asked who else is involved. Well, people like Abitibi are involved.

Honourable members are aware that the overall situation that Abitibi and their 500-plus employees face themselves are in a sensitive mode to begin with. I do not wish to add to their troubles by in any way jeopardizing a flow of wood product to them. I

am not suggesting that this necessarily may happen, but I do know that it is an important landing or unloading facility for that purpose, and it happens to be in the middle of the land in question that Jackhead Indian Reserve is being asked to transfer them under their jurisdiction before they will give their approval to the construction of the dam.

So I think the honourable member sees my dilemma. The matter is not stalled. I am dealing with Abitibi people. I agree with the member. Like so many other things, it is a question of getting the time and putting the people around the table and saying, look, do we want to do the project? It is not a major project. We agree that environmentally it is sound. The dam was in place before. It is being requested by virtually everybody in the area for enhancing the water levels of Lake St. George. I would like very much—and quite frankly, we have the funds for it under several of our different programs. We would proceed with it.

\* (2250)

Now my understanding is the federal member has expressed considerable support for the project as well. Indeed, there could also be some federal assistance for the project, so there is a genuine willingness to do it. There are some specific problems attached to it which have to do with the land.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** I wanted to ask the minister, as we indicated during Estimates, about his involvement with the closure of the Wild Kingdom game farm zoo in Dauphin, or just outside, situated near Ashville. The whole situation has been a terrible tragedy for Larry Williamson. In a lot of cases, I think, if we look at the specifics of the situation it has been somewhat precipitated by action by both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Natural Resources. I am talking about this tragedy. I understand that the minister has seized a number of animals under the guise that Mr. Williamson did not have a proper authority or permit contrary to Section 45 of The Wildlife Act.

Can the minister indicate to the House—I have a number of questions of him on this—why this permit was not renewed for the last four or five years by the minister's department? I believe the last one was renewed in 1987 and since that time he has not had a permit, certainly not under this government. Can the minister indicate why this permit was never renewed over the period that he has been minister



and his government has been in office? Certainly if he did not provide a permit, Mr. Williamson could not be in full compliance with all the requirements because he did not have a permit. Why did the minister not issue him one?

**Mr. Enns:** Madam Chairperson, I know that the honourable member, former minister of the department, will appreciate that without the availability of staff, there is a limitation to the detail that I can provide in responding to very specific questions like this. The question that he raises, No. 1, quite frankly catches me somewhat unaware, because it was my understanding that it was the specific action, and I might say, we were by very much the lead department in this, in withdrawing the permit from that operation that closed down his operation back in January, or whenever it was earlier on in the year.

So I am a little surprised by the suggestion—I do not wish to get in a dispute with the honourable member—that Mr. Williamson or the Wild Animal Kingdom at Dauphin was not operating under some kind of permit. It may have been a temporary permit. It may not have been a regular permit, but I will undertake to find out that information.

I can tell the honourable member why. The honourable member should know and does know, I believe, as do many Manitobans, particularly in the Dauphin area as well, that Mr. Williamson had trouble from the beginning in being in compliance with the regulations and conditions attached to the permits that he had. He was repeatedly warned. He was repeatedly asked to clean up his act, if you like, because reports were continually coming to the department from the public and from other interested parties that animals were being kept under conditions that were not acceptable, and that animals in fact were under some abuse. The department acted, you know, with some reluctance in finally acting on these allegations, and indeed, upon inspection, found them to be true; furthermore, found that the improvements that Mr. Williamson was asked to have put in place on numerous occasions had not in fact been carried out, and so it ought not to have come as a surprise certainly to Mr. Williamson.

He may have been surprised at the fact that in this minister he found a minister prepared to act, and, quite frankly, I do not apologize for any action that the department took. In fact, I congratulate my officers, my staff people, in acting with dispatch. In

fact, there are those, certainly within the animal rights group, for instance, who say we acted too late or we were slow in responding, but then we did not have—as the member knows there was some shared responsibility with the Department of Agriculture. We acted, first of all, specifically with those animals under our more direct mandate, namely the native wild animals, native that is to Manitoba, that we released from those conditions at the Dauphin zoo.

**Mr. Plohman:** Madam Chairperson, there was a search warrant issued by a judge on February 6, '92, and Mr. Williamson was charged with having possession of live wild animals without authority of a permit, contrary to section 45 of The Wildlife Act. Mr. Williamson has shown me the last permit that he had, 1987. I have a copy of it. March 31, '87 is when it expired, and his solicitor has also indicated to the department that his last permit expired March 31, 1987. So that would indicate, for the past five years Mr. Williamson has been operating without a permit and with the full knowledge of the minister's department.

That leads one to ask, why was he not issued a permit or even told why he was not being issued a permit all of those years? Yet the animals were being kept with full knowledge of the minister's staff all that time. It was no secret. They knew he was keeping those animals. So that is why I ask that question, and I think it is a serious issue.

You know, I am not going to deal with the hippopotamus death tonight. It is a very serious issue, and I know people when they hear the word hippo or something they start to make jokes about it, but I can tell you it is a very serious matter. It was a very valuable animal that was lost as a result of incompetence in transferring these animals. I have to blame the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Findlay) staff for that. I am not dealing with those exotic animals though tonight. I am asking the Minister of Natural Resources about the native animals because they fall under his jurisdiction. They were seized by his department, and I would ask the minister to determine from his staff why a permit was not issued.

Now, secondly, the minister was speaking just now about how pleased he was with the decisive action taken by his department after five years without a permit—decisive action. It is a little bit of a contradiction there, but I am not going to argue that there was some decisive action. As a matter of fact, I think the action was taken ultimately was so

decisive that there may be a legitimate wrong here for a party, Mr. Williamson, who had kept those animals for many years.

The minister talked about abuse. He talked about him not meeting requirements. I want to ask the minister whether he still has in his employ a Mr. Bob Carmichael. Is he still working with the department as director? The minister can clarify what his position is.

On August 6, 1986, I have a letter that was written from Mr. Carmichael, at that time the acting director of the Wildlife Branch, to Mr. Williamson. He said, and I am going to quote this, Madam Chairperson, because I think this is important: Pursuant to a commitment to you to review conditions under which animals are kept at your Wild Kingdom game farm and zoo, we have received a report from Wildlife director, Garth Ball in Dauphin. Mr. Ball, accompanied by NRO, John Shelton, viewed your premises on July 10, 1986. I am satisfied that indigenous animals covered by Manitoba's Wildlife Act being held on your premises are well housed and cared for.

The following comments pertain: Generally, your pens meet or exceed our requirements as set out in guidelines for keeping wildlife in captivity. Wildlife Branch M.S. Report, '84-85. There could be some improvement, i.e., coyote pens, but plans discussed with Mr. Ball and Mr. Shelton indicate that these improvements are now being effected. Number two, your waterfowl facility is more than adequate. It is on a spring-fed beaver pond and as such the water quality and conditions are excellent. Number three, your facilities are not suited to the treatment or harbouring of sick or injured animals. I trust that this will serve to clear up issues we have reviewed. Thanks for discussing them with us. Yours truly, R. Carmichael.

\* (2300)

You see, that report that happened in 1986 by the acting director would seem to be somewhat contrary to what the minister made, in terms of the statements he made in this House today about this terrible care that was provided. I do not know if the minister is aware that his staff seized two bull elk; one was 14 years old. Fourteen years on that game farm, does that seem to indicate such terrible abuse that that poor elk would have lived 14 years under those conditions? Many people remarked at the excellent condition of that elk when they visited that.

So, I think, just to make those general statements, that we are using a broad-brush approach to paint Mr. Williamson—I do not say the minister is doing that deliberately; he is going by what he has been told by his staff—paint Mr. Williamson as an inhumane operator who did not care about animals. I have testimonials from many people who have known him to nurse back animals to health and to restore them to health when they have been injured, so I believe that the minister has not received the whole story. I ask the minister, in light of the fact that there is a report of a Mr. Carmichael saying that he met all the specifications, whether he will undertake a review of the concerns being raised by Mr. Williamson that these animals were, in fact, stolen from him.

They were taken without providing him any compensation. The minister knows that a bull elk is worth maybe \$6,000, \$7,000, two of them, and five cougars, two raccoons, one river otter, one golden eagle. All taken, no compensation, not to say anything about the hippo and all the exotic animals that this man lost under the guise that he was being inhumane—blanket statement. So the minister could undertake to indicate whether he will investigate, first of all, why there was no permit issued all of those years. Secondly, whether he is prepared to provide some compensation for the animals that were removed from Mr. Williamson by force by his staff.

**Mr. Enns:** Madam Chairperson, I am somewhat surprised that the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) chooses this occasion now, a full year and a half I suppose—is it a year, year and a half?

**An Honourable Member:** Everything happened in '92, December, January of '92.

**Mr. Enns:** —January of '92, actually to raise the issue, I will tell you that among the considerations that I certainly had to take in place upon the advice that I was receiving from my department about the necessity to take some action, the necessity to close down the Dauphin animal zoo, you know, would certainly not be taken lightly by me.

I was aware that the individual involved had spent a considerable amount of his time and effort and money in the animal farm at Dauphin. I was also aware, although it played a much more minor role to it, that certainly I would expect that the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), in whose back yard this action was taken, would have something to say

about it if he felt at that time—the action was undertaken back in January—that the department was wrong, that this minister was wrong, and that some action should not have been taken.

But let the Hansard show, Madam Chairperson, that the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) was singularly silent when my department took these actions. They were well publicized, certainly members of the media were, both in Dauphin and in Winnipeg, alerted to everything that was going on and well publicized the issues.

So I just put that on the record that the member for Dauphin's (Mr. Plohman) concern for the owner of that operation comes late in the day. Now, I do not say that in any derogatory way, and I want to be very careful about what I say about Mr. Larry Williamson. I have not personally met the gentleman. I have, certainly, no grudge against Mr. Williamson as a person.

I presume that what we are talking to may well lead to a court case, may well lead to some kind of action. So, again, I would be well advised—all my instincts tell me not to say too much more, quite frankly.

I have to say, though, that these same officers of my department, whether it was Mr. Carmichael or others—and I must tell him that they were more senior that were involved in this instance, because it was a very serious decision for the department to take—that certainly I have to rely on their professional judgment as to the conditions that prevailed at the time, in January of 1992.

The conditions that Mr. Carmichael describes in a letter to Mr. Williamson in '86 might have been exactly as he described them in '86. That is four years ago. Deterioration can set in, simple overcrowding, simply not keeping up to the needs of the animals in terms of feed and other things or just deteriorating conditions.

I am a cattleman in my other vocation, and I know what can happen to a corral or to pens or to fences in four or five years if not maintained. So the conditions that Mr. Carmichael described in 1986 and the conditions that my officers found in the fall of '91 and into the winter of '91 then finally drove them to some action in January of '92. You know, I do not think that the honourable member can make a case that because the place obviously passed muster back in '86 that that, indeed, was the case in '92.

I find it very hard to believe that responsible members of my office would precipitate the action they did if that were the case, but I want to assure the honourable member that I will double check with my departmental staff. Certainly, I am sure that files are being developed as to precisely why and what action was taken because of the indication that they, no doubt, have by now that this case, we are not going to hear the end of it. It is going to likely get considerably more serious, particularly if Mr. Williamson wishes to pursue an action for compensation. The department may have to find itself defending in a court the actions that they have undertaken along with the sister department of Agriculture, but I appreciate the member is directing his remarks to my department.

**Mr. Plohman:** Madam Chairperson, I want to keep this in perspective in this discussion, that I am not condemning in a blanket way every single action that was taken. The minister says that I came on this late in the day insofar as this issue. I was aware that there were concerns, of course, but I was not aware of the precise days that animals were seized, and that there was no compensation or anything provided to Mr. Williamson as a result of the seizure of those animals. They were just taken away and he was left with nothing, from a valuable commodity to nothing, I guess, supposedly forfeiting all of his rights on the basis that someone was making a charge that he was being inhumane to one or more of those animals. So all were removed on that basis.

On that basis he lost all title to those animals. Perhaps that is the case. Can the minister maybe shed some light on that? I know this is a very unique case, it probably does not happen that often, this kind of a situation, but is there any provision for any fee to be paid to the owner or is it automatic that if a charge or an allegation of inhumane treatment is made, that there is a forfeiture of all title to any of those animals?

\* (2310)

Is that the minister's understanding? If he does not know that, or is not aware of the details on that, he can perhaps get that information, but I think it is a very important question in terms of the rights of the individual who is impacted on by the action taken by his department. I would appreciate him trying to find some answer to that question.

I was not aware at the time that there was no compensation offered, that these were just being removed, taken away from him. This happened on February 5 and 6, when all these animals were taken, these native animals. So that is only a few months ago, and when Larry Williamson came to me, I responded.

At the time he had a couple of other people looking after them, Raymond and Wallace, a couple of individuals who had come to the location and had offered to purchase it, and were operating on an interim basis. Subsequently the purchase fell through, and Williamson again assumed control, and came to me, probably precipitated by the death of the hippo and the removal of other exotic animals under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

So that is why I was not raising it at the time, realizing there were concerns. I do not like us to take heavy-handed action, and when I say us, I am talking about governments and the minister here and his staff, under the guise that there was something wrong somewhere so that this heavy-handed, sweeping action was taken, and it would seem that no rights at all were left for Mr. Williamson. He was left without anything, as if he was a common criminal or he had been in deliberate violation in such a drastic way that he no longer deserved any rights or any remuneration from the value of those animals that he had in his custody.

So I raise this with the minister in terms of the broad action that was taken, and I am saying that I knew that some action had to be taken, but I am talking about the degree of it and the fairness of what was done. That is why I am raising it with the minister, and I think this is an appropriate forum.

I have not raised it in Question Period in attempts to create a lot of controversy with the minister on this. I did want to raise it in Estimates but we did not have time, so I have the opportunity here. I want also to ask the minister whether he will acknowledge that I did ask him, in writing, on at least one occasion, to please meet with Mr. Williamson and myself to discuss concerns and problems that he had in previous years. Will the minister recall that? Will he acknowledge that?

**Mr. Enns:** Yes, Madam Chairperson, I recall and acknowledge that. My experience has been when the department and the ministry is involved in what, in all likelihood, may end up in court or end up with

some specific legal action being taken, then it is prudent on the part of my part not to shield himself.

I will meet with Mr. Williamson or anybody else if I think it is prudent to do so, but under the current circumstances, I do not believe that is the case. Madam Chairperson, I do not know all the details involved, under what particular sections or regulations of The Wildlife Act that the department acted. I would believe though that if the actions that my department were undertaking were in fact compensable, that is that we would have to buy these animals from him or something like that, that issue would have been raised with me, particularly in my department, where as the honourable member knows, we had just come through a pretty tight budget situation and the department would not have likely discussed an action that may have involved many thousands of dollars without raising it. So on that very general assumption—I mean, the department felt that there were sufficient statutory regulations in place to do what they did.

Madam Chairperson, I do appreciate the honourable member for Dauphin's (Mr. Plohman) very legitimate interest in this matter, his ongoing interest. This discussion that has taken place, which was quite appropriate on the concurrence motions of my Estimates, will be reviewed by staff, and I will undertake to respond in writing to the honourable member, because it likely will be that we will no longer be facing each other in this House on a day-to-day basis, to try to provide him with some of the additional information that he has sought answers to during this evening's questioning.

**Mr. Plohman:** Madam Chairperson, just closing on this. I want to thank the minister for that undertaking, and also to indicate for clarification that the question I asked about the meeting was before all of this action was precipitated. Mr. Williamson was asking for a meeting, and I had put that in writing to the minister. I had not received a written response to that request and no meeting had taken place. That was prior to all of this. You know, it is easy at this point in time—but it may have averted some of this action and the need for it.

Just one other point for clarification: If there is any incumbency on the department and the government to provide some compensation for what was done, I would urge the minister, in his common-sense approach to this issue, to do what is necessary to avoid costly litigation on behalf of Mr. Williamson and on behalf of the taxpayers of the province and

come to some agreement on this if possible, because it would seem from the sense of fairness that there should be something done there. That is my feeling. Whether there is a legal requirement, that is another thing. So there may be a moral requirement, and that is what I want the minister to, if he would, investigate on behalf of my constituent. That is simply what I put forward.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Chairperson, I would just like to ask the minister a couple of more questions. One of the areas I would like to touch on is, the minister has told us how badly he feels about the cuts his department has had to take, particularly in the area of parks and park maintenance and those kinds of things. The Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) has just announced a program that is going to have young people doing the jobs that these Parks people should have been doing. I want to ask the Minister of Natural Resources his position on this. Is he in support of the youth of Manitoba doing the work that should be done by Natural Resources staff?

**Mr. Enns:** Let me, first of all, just for the record indicate that certainly as minister I was not overjoyed with the fact that my department was called upon to make a substantial contribution to the problems of deficit financing in this province. Certainly my department was not overjoyed that to enable us to continue the identified priorities of my government in Health, in Education, in Family Services, so that those departments could, in fact, see substantial increases in their budgets, that my department along with other departments including the Department of Agriculture, including the Department of Rural Development, including a number of other line departments within government saw no increases or some net losses in increase to make that possible with a flat revenue situation that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) was facing. So I want to put that into perspective.

I have been candid, if you like, or forthright in not being afraid to express the fact that I regret that my department has not got more dollars.

The honourable member asks a specific question with respect to the REDI program announced just recently. In the first instance, the Parks Branch has over the many years of its tradition always been an employer of young people throughout the summer season in many different capacities. We have in terms of our own budget controls not been able to

do as much of it in the last few years as we would like to do.

\* (2320)

What this program will assist us in—they will not be doing the things that my staff necessarily does. They will assist us in getting around to doing them faster, building, maintenance, building that may have been scheduled for or should be repainted will get repainted a year earlier. A dock that was damaged with ice flows and something like that will get repaired a little quicker. It enables us to use the maintenance dollars that we have within the Parks Branch, which is sizable, to get on with some of the major repairs to an aging infrastructure.

Our infrastructure throughout our Parks system is getting old and it is showing the signs of it. Never mind the demands of a new facility, such as showers or bathrooms and so forth in various parts of the province. What I see is just a welcome support to making our parks more acceptable, more attractive to the many visitors that come to us throughout a summer season.

By the way, we get many visitors. We log up to 5.5 million to 6 million people who come and visit Manitoba parks. When you consider our own population is just a million, that indicates to you the kind of traffic and kind of wear that our parks system endures. It requires assistance from time to time. I am delighted that 200 rural youngsters are going to help, and particularly we have had to—as a strategy we have tended to use those dollars that we have in our major parks in the Whiteshell, in the Turtle Mountain park, in the urban park here, Birds Hill Park and some of our more major clear water parks. We have many of our smaller parks where there are communities like Rivers, Lundar, and so forth that have over the years, quite frankly, not received some of the kinds of attention that I would like, as minister, to see them get. It is the intention to have these crews move into these areas, St. Ambroise, Lundar, Rivers, throughout the province operating out of bases like Brandon, Portage and Dauphin, and hopefully assist our regular maintenance crew in getting ahead of the maintenance on this parks system.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Chairperson, I guess I will have to disagree with the minister on his answer, because in reality there have been job cuts. As much as I am happy to see young people working in rural Manitoba, I am not happy with the way the

money was allocated or they are doing work that should have been done by Resources staff.

Because of our time limit, I have one other area that I want to touch on, so I am going to change to bear licensing. The bear licences were allocated several years ago. It appears that there are several people who have large numbers of licences. Smaller operators are concerned that they want some of those licences. There is some question that trappers have licences, whether or not they can be reallocated for tourist bear licences.

I want to ask the minister whether any consideration is being given to reviewing the allocation of bear licences? What is happening with that? Are there more bear licences being allocated? Is there any consideration being given to reallocation of those licences that are now for trappers, whether those are being considered? What is the status of the bear allocation and what is being reconsidered at the present time?

**Mr. Enns:** The practice of the allocation and the licensing of bears is relatively new as the member knows. This only happened, I think, in '87 or in the last five or six years. I agree that there are some concerns about how the system is working. There has been a general shrinking of the number of licences available, partly because of a greater control about the numbers of bears that are being harvested, also the number of bears that have been harvested illegally.

The question of bears being harvested through the trapping system is a legitimate one. The trappers, of course, feel strongly about it. They were trapping bears for year and years and years before bears became an attractive animal from an outfitter's point of view, from a tourist's point of view for their purposes, but I am not totally happy. I am aware that the distribution of licences is very uneven. We have one or two very large outfitters. Now, they happen to be aggressive and provide a service to their clientele and that is why they are where they are at, but I think the honourable member is right, that a review is timely, and I will take her good advice and see whether we cannot bring about a review of the whole allocation system. It has problems in an area and I am aware of that fact and I accept the member's good advice in this issue.

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** Madam Chairperson, I would just like to expand a little on my colleague's question

regarding the REDI program and the jobs to the young people in the province that were announced yesterday. I put it on record that we are not certainly opposed to, again, young people working. I have had the opportunity over many years to assist young people in working through summer through different programs that were in place that our government at the time had implemented and that this government had cut back on.

My feeling and the feeling of the small business people within rural Manitoba whom I have spoken to since the VLT operation came into play, again was told to us was initiated for the fact of developing the economic development of rural Manitoba, economic development. I guess it is a flip flop. On one hand I applaud the government for providing jobs; on the other hand I find it very, very strange that we should be using a resource, the minister's department, to enhance jobs created for the young people of Manitoba when in fact there are many people who have lost their permanent jobs because of the cuts in the minister's department.

I feel that there should be some sort of a balance on this whole thing. I do not really feel that the government is really going on what they have said even though they are attempting to provide what we are calling for—some jobs for the young people in this province to at least provide them with some income. But I do not feel that truly this government is really doing what they said they were going to do with these monies.

**Mr. Enns:** I make absolutely no apologies for the program, it is a sound, good program and 200 jobs in rural Manitoba is economic development. Two hundred jobs for youngsters in rural Manitoba is economic development. Looking after our parks infrastructure is sound business for the thousands and thousands of visitors who come and visit out of the communities. A campground that is just a little better looked after, showers and facilities that are bright and clean and well painted attract more visitors to our areas throughout rural Manitoba and that is economic development.

I realize it is not building plants, or it is not creating a great deal of permanent industrial jobs, but it can be considered economic development. Furthermore, what we are dedicating is one week's revenue of the VLT revenues. One week's revenues for this issue and I think the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) and my department, this government, have nothing to

apologize for providing 200 jobs for our youngsters under this program. Thank you.

**An Honourable Member:** Committee rise.

**Madam Chairperson:** Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

\* (2330)

## IN SESSION

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, would you please determine if there is leave to waive subrule 65(11) to permit the introduction of a motion, namely private member's Resolution 77.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House to waive rule 65(11) to introduce the resolution of the honourable member of The Maples? Is there leave?

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

### Res. 77—Five Principles of Medicare

**Mr. Speaker:** I must draw to the attention of the House that when this proposed resolution was placed on a notice paper, a paragraph was inadvertently omitted. The paragraph in question reads as follows:

WHEREAS the First Ministers also directed Health ministers to initiate work to apply the broad principles of the Canadian health care system to the objectives of sustainability, affordability, responsiveness and effectiveness of the system, funded without destabilizing provincial and federal finances.

I am asking for the unanimous consent of the House to insert the paragraph that was inadvertently omitted. Is there unanimous consent. Agreed? That is agreed and so ordered.

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that Resolution 77, Five Principles of Medicare, which reads as follows:

WHEREAS the Canada Health Act mandates the five fundamental principles by which the Canadian health care system is governed; and

WHEREAS the preservation and maintenance of the fundamental principles of the health care system is vital to its survival; and

WHEREAS Manitobans believe that the fundamental principles of the health care system must be protected.

WHEREAS the First Ministers also directed Health ministers to initiate work to apply the broad principles of the Canadian health care system to the objectives of sustainability, affordability, responsiveness and effectiveness of the system, funded without destabilizing provincial and federal finances.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the government of Manitoba uphold the five fundamental principles of the health care system, namely the public administration, comprehensiveness, universality, portability and accessibility, and that the government of Manitoba manage Manitoba's health care system accordingly.

### Motion presented.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am very grateful to the two other parties for allowing this resolution to come forward.

I think, by doing that, the government and the NDP and other parties are sending a very strong message to the people of Manitoba that all three parties are very serious to uphold the five basic principles of the medicare system.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, most people right now are very concerned and very worried, not only in this province, but across this nation that we are in very rough shape. How are we going to uphold the five basic principles of the medicare system? Each and every province has its own ways of delivering a health care system. No one province has ever put the medicare five basic principles into law. That is why we have 10 or 12 different medicare systems in this country.

To address that issue, there was a report out of British Columbia's royal commission. The royal commission's recommendation was to have those five basic principles entrenched in provincial laws. So we drew up our bill, which was Bill 51, based on the work done through various other organizations, to make sure that we have those five basic principles in Manitoba law.

Mr. Speaker, however, there have been difficulties in terms of the interpretation of the whole thing and what is the legal obligation if those five basic principles were held in Manitoba law. So I am still very happy that we, at least, are acknowledging those five basic principles, even in the form of a resolution and sending, as I said, a very strong message to the people of Manitoba that no one is more serious than all of us here collectively to uphold those five principles, which they really deserve and should have.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very important issue for all of us. At times we get very emotional and very angry and very frustrated, and rightly so. We should be, because it is a very important issue. However, the third paragraph in this resolution, which is a very important statement which came out of the First Ministers Conference of this nation was to ask the Ministers of Health to initiate, to work on those five basic principles, but they have asked for a very specific wording here; they are asking for a "responsiveness and effectiveness of the system."

Mr. Speaker, to follow those five or six words by the First Ministers of this country, which is represented by all the political spectrum, and in saying so, it was a basically unanimous consent even at the national level, to make sure that those five basic principles are being upheld—but the wording for "effectiveness of the system" is very crucial for the survival of the system. It is very important that we have a system with the five basic principles, but we have a system which is cost-effective, which is meeting the needs of the day, and we should be basing our expectations and our hopes and aspirations around those lines.

Then we have also looked at, as this resolution said, without destabilizing the provincial and federal finances, and that can only be done if we have a system which can change with the times, can change to meet the needs of the community and individual groups. Above all, this system must be responsible, not only responsible to the patient but also to the taxpayer. In this situation they both are the same. So it is very essential that each one of us pays attention to this system because if we are not smart, if we are not being very careful, we will lose it.

Mr. Speaker, I will give you an example why I think we will lose it. First of all, the federal government has not kept its promise to fund this system effectively. The second thing is the way health care

funding has gone up. For example, in Manitoba the minister has given figures, that was last year, that we had been spending more than—spending on health care has gone up more than 178 percent for the last 10 years, and our population has only grown by 6 percent during that time. So something has gone wrong because we are not more healthy than before. So something is not under control.

\* (2340)

I use the word "open-ended" system, because we have a system that nobody wants to touch. As a taxpayer we have no control because everyone is afraid to say which is right. That is why I think this third paragraph by the First Ministers' conference was very important to give some meaning, real meaning to the health care system in terms of needed reform, how the reform is going to take place, and then nobody should have more control than the collective taxpayers of this nation. That can be only done if there are actual reforms happening.

So, Mr. Speaker, to have this resolution put into place and have approval in this House—but if we can attach to this resolution the reform package which will help us in long run, I think then we are doing a real service, not only just putting words on the paper to mail to our constituents and say we have done a great job, but we have to show that we have really entrusted, and that is why it is very essential that we give a real meaning to the health action plan, and make sure that as the opposition members, we play a very, very constructive and very important role as the government will play for the next two years to uphold those five basic principles.

So all of us have worked very hard. I want to mention the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) who has worked along with the two other caucus House leaders. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has been very receptive and so has the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) to make sure that this kind of resolution is brought forward.

The timing is so important, because with the health care reform package, if we do not have a unanimous approval in the House, then we are sending a wrong message. As I have said many times, if any one of us believes that any of the parties is going to kill medicare, they are fooling, they are lying through their teeth. It is not true. Each one of us has the same basic principle, but we have to see how we are going to deliver it.



Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very important issue for me and my caucus, because we have taken a very different approach for the last almost four years now. The approach we have taken is to preserve medicare, because in our own way we have to do it, we have to show that we are responsible and we have a vision also. The question is whether we can sustain the pressure of the various interest groups to uphold those five basic principles and not to be derailed from that process by short-term political gain. I think we are simply reaffirming those things that we have done for four years. It may sound—at the initial stages probably people would call it political immaturity. Well, Mr. Speaker, I call it responsibility and political smartness in the long run.

Definitely we are concerned for medicare, but that can only be protected if you have something to put forward, something to back up, so we are very happy indeed that we have seen the health care package, we could see a unanimous approval in this House, and then all of us can go and tell people not to be afraid of any of the rumours, any of the fear-mongering, any of the terrible in-fighting among various groups to go for the same tax dollar for health care.

We can tell them that we, as elected officials, are very much interested to preserve what is one of the best systems in the whole world. Why would we give up something which is so essential to our existence? I want to mention here one party in this country, the Reform Party, which is the only one who is not upholding those principles. All other three parties are upholding those principles, because I think it is important even though we are debating provincially, because the Reform Party is a force which is not going to disappear. People have to know what they really actually stand for. People have to realize that voting for a Reform Party is a vote against the medicare system, because that is the outcome. That is the inference I can draw from their stated policies which are very clear that the user has to pay, and if you are rich you will be able to have a system. If you are poor you will be left nowhere.

I wanted to mention that even for one or two minutes, because people of Manitoba must know at the next election, the federal election, because that election is going to be very important for all of us to see which government is going to come, and are they going to honour the commitments to fund the medicare system.

Mr. Speaker, without going into other details, I want to again emphasize and have a word of caution and a word of praise for the present government because they have done something different. They have at least come a long way and taken the image that the Tory party is against health care away. Certainly that has been shown very clearly.

The second word of caution is because we want to make sure that this reform and the trust we have all put in your government, we want you to do it well. We wish you all the best, but we want to make sure that you will do it. That can only be done if each one of us is going to play a very, very vigilant role, very constructive role, and watch every move the government is going to make to reimplement that reform package, because without that package, without a real reform, without the effectiveness of the system, of the responsiveness of the system, which is the fourth paragraph of this resolution, it is very important. It says more than the five basic principles.

It says that the old thinking, old ways of doing the health care system is not going to be workable in this nation. I think we have a chance, in this province, and the government has an opportunity to show their leadership capability to the rest of the country. That has been shown to some extent, but sometimes it probably takes very bold steps. We have used that word many times and I want some bold steps to be taken, but always bold steps forward, not bold steps backward, because somebody could easily derail the system.

That is why I want to emphasize to the minister that to implement your reform package, you must put the right people into the system so those individuals have a real commitment and also a real understanding. Without those two things it will not function.

After two years, whatever will happen still nobody can touch the system because political experience or political manipulation, or whatever you want to call it, people can destroy things for their own motives. That can only be saved if we continue to have reform. Without reform the medicare system will not exist. There is no question about that. I think the role of the Minister of Health is so crucial. It is one of the most important departments in the whole government. We spend 33 percent of our provincial money on this thing, and it is so essential everyone is being a part of the system. Someone in your family or yourself has used the system.

We want to make sure the system is there for those who really need it and to do that there is one component which is not part of the resolution which is a very important one, is public education. People have to be informed. The medicare system is not a free system; it is paid by the taxpayer; it is for the taxpayer. They have to use it very effectively, very carefully and only during the time of very important needs. I think that way people will get more involved and it will be very difficult for any government to attack this system as long as people have a good understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I would end by saying that we are very happy to see this resolution brought forward by the co-operation of the other two parties, and we hope that we can send a strong message to the people of Manitoba that we are committed to the five basic principles of medicare.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity tonight to speak on behalf of government to this resolution by the member for The Maples. I want to say at the outset that my honourable friend proposed the essence of this resolution as an amendment to The Health Services Insurance Act.

\* (2350)

In discussions that I had with my honourable friend, I indicated that the legal advice that we had received from our Justice department cautioned us against incorporation of the principles within the act for the reason that it may well expose the province to litigation for—I do not want to use the words "frivolous challenges," but unnecessary challenges that would simply, in my words—not in legal counsel's words—consume some pretty significant resource from the province paying legal fees and court costs rather than providing health care.

So there was not an aversion to the principles that I expressed to my honourable friend in terms of not being able to support the incorporation in The Health Services Insurance Act as originally proposed, but merely an abundance of caution that we do not set up yet another target for litigation which serves really no useful purpose in terms of the provision of health care services to Manitobans as all of us wish to do.

I want to deal with three issues in my presentation. I want to be brief, Sir. Last fall in Winnipeg I had the pleasure of hosting the federal-provincial-territorial Health ministers' conference. At that conference our communiqué made a commitment, firstly, that

all levels of government supported the five principles of medicare. I think that was a very timely statement by all levels of government, because there were all sorts of speculative conclusions being drawn that this government or that government did not support medicare and the principles that were embodied in the Canada Health Act and having Monsieur Bouchard there on behalf of the federal government, agreeing to that communiqué, committing to the principles as one of our three commitments that we made, was an important signal.

The second area we discussed, of course, was stable and adequate funding in partnership with the federal government, and the third issue was a commitment by provincial ministries to more effectively manage our health care resources. I think my honourable friend from The Maples (Mr. Cheema) and the official opposition critic, I shared that communiqué with them during the course of Health Estimates.

Subsequent to that, Sir, the First Ministers held a meeting on the economy March 24 and 25, 1992. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that I read the conclusion of their communiqué, because I have often said to you and I know, Sir, that you are deeply interested, that I have been around other council of ministers' tables before in my previous experience with the Lyon administration, and there was not a unanimous goal and purpose that was shared by all Ministers of Transportation, for instance, when I was there in '79 and '80 and '81, nor of communications in '80 and '81. Every province seemed to have their own agenda and were coming to a conference of ministers with certain goals and objectives for their province, rightfully so.

But, Sir, I was impressed in 1988 when I went to my first Health ministers' meeting, in that, Ministers of Health from the provinces and territories, regardless of political affiliation, were wrestling with the same kind of problems, same kind of challenges. There was amazing unanimity around the Ministers of Health, provincial and territorial, to seek solutions, because all of us had a commitment and desire to maintain the Canada Health Act and the five principles that are embodied.

George McLeod was Minister of Health in Saskatchewan when I first was elected in 1988. It was George McLeod's leadership at the council of Ministers of Health, then, that put the Health ministers to drive this issue of health care and

medicare to the First Ministers' level. I have to give George McLeod a lot of credit for doing that, because he showed a significant amount of leadership in getting all the Ministers of Health across Canada to agree and then to have his First Minister and the First Minister of this province to raise it again to the level of First Ministers.

That is what I want to read to my honourable friends, is the conclusion on effective and efficient social programs that all First Ministers signed onto or bought into or agreed to in this communiqué, March 25, 1992.

It says, Sir, and I will quote: First Ministers had a good discussion on health and social issues. They directed: (a) a meeting of federal, provincial and territorial Health and Finance ministers be held within two months to deal with issues relating to the cost of the health care system; (b) that the management initiatives being undertaken by Health ministers be accelerated, they directed Health ministers to continue their development of comprehensive, strategic directions and plans to achieve essential health system reforms; and (c) a continuation of the work of Social Services ministers to ensure that the social services system is able to meet the challenges of the years ahead. To this end, they directed Social Services ministers to set priorities for co-ordination and integration of social services programs.

It concluded by saying: First Ministers also directed Health ministers to initiate work to apply the broad principles of the Canadian health care system to the objectives of sustainability, affordability, flexibility, responsiveness and effectiveness of the system, funded without destabilizing provincial and federal finances—which my honourable friend the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) has wisely included as the fourth WHEREAS in this resolution.

Sir, I want to remind all members of the House that this was March 25, 1992, First Ministers' Conference of Canada. At that First Ministers' Conference there were three New Democratic Premiers—four actually, with the Yukon territory. The Northwest Territories were there. Then there was Alberta, Manitoba and Nova Scotia with Progressive Conservative administrations. Then there was Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland with Liberal administrations. All Premiers agreed and directed the Health ministers to undertake this initiative based on assuring that we could deliver the broad

principles of the Canada health care system with the objectives of sustainability, affordability, flexibility, responsiveness and effectiveness of the system. That is a pretty remarkable conclusion for First Ministers of this nation to come to on March 25, 1992.

What it does, Sir, is demonstrate how committed all governments in Canada are to maintaining and preserving medicare, something that the citizens of this country have said we ought to endeavour to do in every means possible. At the same time, Canadians are also saying that there is not a bottomless pool of money to be dedicated towards the preservation of medicare, hence, the reason why in the fall of 1991 in Winnipeg, Health ministers committed to effective management of the system.

I simply want to say that the whole system is moving through remarkable change right now. Whether you are in Newfoundland or British Columbia or the Territories, there is remarkable change ongoing, Sir. The emerging health care system from those remarkable changes and reforms across Canada will be a stronger, better-positioned health care system to assure that we can live by the five principles as laid out in the Canada Health Act, and at the same time deliver a system that is affordable and meets needs, health care needs in the system.

That is not going to happen without some pretty significant challenge. It is only going to happen, Sir, if we have the kind of co-operation that I see emerging in this House tonight with the unanimous passage of this resolution sponsored by the second opposition party and their Health critic. It will only emerge if we carry the unanimous approach that we can take in this House representing three political parties to all of the care providers involved in the health care system.

Gone are the days, Sir, of the them-and-us mentality in health care delivery, of the individual turf protection, of the individual ownership of issue and program and care delivery, of the individual autonomy of an institution. All of those barriers to working together are crashing and crashing very quickly. It is almost as quick a disintegration as I have seen in terms of any barriers to change that I have experienced in the last 15 years that I have been elected, and that, Sir, is good.

\* (0000)

I want to close, Sir, by sharing some information from the Canadian Hospital Association annual meeting which was held approximately 10 days ago in Newfoundland. The overriding message there which was unique this year, unique in probably 20-plus years of holding the Canadian Hospital Association annual meeting, was that the message was that Health ministers across Canada and their deputy ministers and senior staff have essentially decided that there needs to be significant change in the way we deliver health care system if medicare is to survive, and that they have thought through an action plan which all provinces have bought into and are enacting within their own provincial jurisdictions.

The message was to the membership at that Canadian Hospital Association—and bear in mind, those are some of the most powerful institutions in health care delivery, and some of the most powerful people to resist change if they so desire to do. I will tell you, Sir, that a Minister of Health by himself or herself is almost powerless to the issue development that can come out of a major hospital institution in terms of bringing forward individual cases and causing alarm and concern. The message was clear to those people, this is happening and it would be in the best interests of medicare for you to co-operate and get on with the agenda of change. The underlining and the underpinning message that was delivered by this speaker at the Canadian Hospital Association meeting was that if you do not co-operate, there may be more budgetary reactions such as Saskatchewan unfortunately had to do.

I do not use the Saskatchewan example to say that they are not doing things appropriately. I am simply saying that the reality of what they face financially caused them to make much more difficult decisions than we have had to make certainly and that other provinces have had to make.

The Canadian Hospital Association spokesperson said that co-operation is now the environment of change. Get on board with your governments when you go home, make the change happen in the most reasoned form possible, because the alternative is not a reasonable one.

Sir, I close by saying that is going to take co-operation from our institutions, our health care professionals, our unions and the citizens of this province in understanding the need for change, No. 1, and No. 2, the process of change and the end result of change being a health care system which

can uphold and maintain the five principles of the Canada Health Act, as put into this resolution by the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), to assure that our health care system is there when we need it in the future.

I look forward to the unanimous support for this resolution in the House so this Chamber can send that kind of a positive message of reform and change to the citizens of Manitoba, that we can agree on the importance of medicare as three political parties in this Legislature.

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this discussion on the five principles of medicare and to indicate that obviously the New Democratic Party supports any attempt to entrench the five principles of medicare.

The Minister of Health just concluded his remarks by suggesting that we must get on with change and put his focus and his attentions on change in our health care system. It has been our position, from Day One, that any health care reform must begin with an absolute reaffirmation to the five principles of medicare, the Canada Health Act and our most treasured national program.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistaking this evening, the issue of medicare is the heart and soul of this country. Let there be no mistaking that medicare is Canada's flagship social program. As Charlotte Grey said in an article not too long ago, it is an institution more cherished by Canadians than Mounties or CBC Radio's Morningside; it is supported by over 90 percent of Canadians from coast to coast.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that medicare and the principles underlying this national program are the heart and soul of the New Democratic Party. We are pleased to see that there has been some movement on the part of the two old-line parties who have operated so much in concert over the last several months on an agenda which may be more harmful than positive for Manitoba's health care system. We are pleased to see that they have taken a couple of tiny steps forward in terms of recognizing that when we begin with health care reform we begin with medicare and a reaffirmation of the principles underlying that program.

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting this evening is that we have not heard one word from the Liberal Health critic or the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard)

about why we are in this dilemma of having to uphold and reaffirm our support for the five principles of medicare. Let us put some reality on record and recognize the crisis that is looming on the horizon because of the Liberal and Conservative decisions over the last 10 years or so that have steadfastly eroded medicare over a period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I noted the words very carefully of the Liberal Health critic. He said, if we are not careful, we might lose medicare. The situation is a little more urgent than that. It is lost, it is finished, it is dead unless we can get current federal policy reversed. Because let us remind ourselves the money runs out, the money from the federal government for provincial health care systems, as it now stands under current policy, runs out in less than a decade, which is the beginning of the end, because then there is not the means to enforce the principles of medicare, to ensure a national program.

So if we do not start from that premise, what is the basis of this debate? What is the point of the discussion, except to say, we are going to try, province by province, in a patchwork way, on an ad-hoc basis to try to ensure that there are these principles entrenched in different provinces across the country. Well, that is fine, but that assumes we have given up on medicare, we have given up on a national health care program.

I have no trouble supporting any effort to entrench the principles of medicare in any aspect of law or any standards in any form available to us. But if that is where we are going to leave it and that is how we are going to leave the discussion, we have done a great disservice to this province and this country.

Mr. Speaker, all of this fits very much with some of the talk we have heard from Conservatives across this country. Let us go back to Jake Epp who not too long ago said he was not necessarily opposed to user fees. Let us go a little closer in time to Bouchard who said he was not opposed to asymmetrical delivery of health care. That is what we are left with.

That is what we are talking about tonight. We are talking about preserving, entrenching the principles in the province of Manitoba so that in this one province, no matter what other direction the rest of the country goes in, we might have some protection, some guarantees. Sure, that is great, that is fine, but that is narrow-minded. That is selfish. It is not

doing our job in terms of preserving medicare in this country. Where is the fight? Where is the fight to change federal government policy to get EPF funds reinstated, and some force behind the Canada Health Act—some meaning? This does not do it. This might hold our Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) here in Manitoba a little more accountable, but that is all it will do.

\* (0010)

Where were the Liberals over the last two years when the federal government, bit by bit, step by step, ate away at the EPF formula, froze it, year after year after year, to the point where we are now facing the end of those funds in a very short time? Where were the Liberals? Why did they not go to Ottawa and speak up against C-20? Where was the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)? [interjection]

No, you know what the Minister of Finance said when I said why is this government not going to Ottawa and presenting Manitoba's concerns about the erosion of medicare? The Minister of Finance said we have our own ways and they are working.

They really work, yes, C-20 passed. The freeze on the formula is extended for three years, bringing the end all that much closer. Maybe the Minister of Finance does not want to represent the feelings of Manitobans, but at least he should look at the bottom-line figures and see and understand and deal with the terrible dilemma that any provincial government is placed in as a result of Mulroney cutbacks in health care.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health in his comments said he can support a resolution. He could not support legislation because the province might be open to litigation and, goodness knows, we would not want to have people seeking some retribution for denial of access to health care. Goodness knows, I do not understand that logic, I have never heard such a spurious, illogical argument in this Chamber.

That is like saying we should not entrench equality between the sexes in law because then, goodness knows, there will be an avenue to seek justice on the part of women in this province, or we should not entrench antiracism programs and measures in law because, goodness knows, then people who have experienced racism will have an avenue to seek justice. We are dealing with something that

fundamental. This is the right to quality health care, the right to health care—period.

Now if that does not warrant entrenchment in legislation, then I do not know what does. I think the Minister of Health's argument stinks, quite frankly, and it shows his lack of commitment. It makes us understand even better the kind of cutbacks and erosion of health care programs here in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health is right. If this legislation, if these principles had been entrenched in legislation, he and his colleagues in the Manitoba Conservative government would have been in deep trouble. I will refer to the description in the B.C. royal commission that the Liberal Health critic and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) like to refer to, describing what it would mean to entrench those principles in law, and it would mean this government would have to account for the introduction of a \$50-user fee in the northern part of this province. This government would have to account for the delisting of calcium for senior citizens in this province. This government would have to account for the elimination of grants that are vital to our health care system and are important terms of prevention.

The Minister of Health and the member for the Liberal Party say they cannot believe this. They cannot believe it. I cannot either, and I would hope that they would enter the debate and defend prevention programs. Where does this minister get the basis for cutting the entire St. John Ambulance program for rural Manitoba? The member for Portage (Mr. Connery) has something to say about that, and maybe he should have listened.

Where does the minister get the basis for eliminating funding for a prevention program like Childbirth and Family Education? How does it fit in the principles before us in this resolution that the minister cannot commit funding for AIDS education for newcomer population, for a StreetLINKS program that provides for a valuable needle exchange program, for audiology services in our school system, for the erosion of our children's dental health program, for the deinsurance of the removal of varicose veins, and the list goes on and on?

Mr. Speaker, this minister could not support these principles of legislation because it would have been in violation of those principles. Yes, it can support principles in a resolution because it knows that it is

not bound by that resolution, and it can violate the principles without being in trouble with the law and open to litigation.

Mr. Speaker, the future of medicare requires much more than a resolution entrenching the principles of medicare. This is a step and an important step, and I commend the Liberal Health critic for bringing it forward. I am pleased to see that there is all-party support for this small step, but much bigger steps have to be taken, much greater action has to be forthcoming from this government, much more public open debate has to occur in the province of Manitoba and right across this country if we are going to have a medicare program at the turn of the century, and that is how serious it is.

I am not talking about a patchwork of systems across this country where each one is different and varies according to the kind of legislation that they introduce and the principles that they adopt. I am talking about one standard, one right that is the same right across this country from coast to coast to coast and that is the fundamental human right to have access to health care regardless of economic situation or geographical situation.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is up. I want to conclude by saying that we have never hesitated over the last several years when we first learned of the very major blow that has been dealt to our medicare program by the federal Conservative government. We have had emergency debate after emergency debate. We brought forward a resolution to this House that the Liberals did not clearly put on record their support, and the Minister of Health made a mockery out of by his amendment. We will continue to do our job, bring the issues forward and ensure that absolute, unwavering commitment and support for medicare principles are upheld in this province and right across this country.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? It is agreed and so ordered.

## House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that the Law Amendments Committee, I understand, has risen for this evening. That committee will reconvene tomorrow at 10 a.m. to do clause by clause on Bills 86, 87 and 101.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to seek the unanimous consent of the House that we recess this sitting at this time, and that we come back at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent of the House to recess at this hour and reconvene at 10 a.m. this morning? Agreed? That is agreed.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, I should serve notice that the other committee, indeed, if it does not complete its business before tonight will also reconvene at 10 a.m. tomorrow. That is the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

I might also give prior notice to members opposite that there is a good probability that I will probably be calling the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for a short period tomorrow afternoon to deal with the judicial issue that is before it. [interjection] Well, I am giving some notice that that may be called at that time.

\* (0020)

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk advises me that I have to have leave of the House to have standing committees of the House and the House sit at the same time, so I seek that leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable government House leader have leave to have the committees sit at the same time as the House is sitting?

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** There is no problem in the morning with the additional sitting that is taking place in the morning; however, we will discuss further, I am sure, between the House leaders in terms of any possible sittings in the afternoon, so tomorrow morning is no problem.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to allow the committees to sit at the same time as the House, in the morning? That is agreed. Okay, that is it. This House is now recessed until 10 a.m. this morning (Wednesday).

\* \* \*

The House took recess at 12:23 a.m.

# Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Tuesday, June 23, 1992

## CONTENTS

<b>Report Stage</b>		<b>Bill 94, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992</b>	
Bill 9, Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act	5307	L. Evans	5318
		Doer	5318
Bill 61, Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4)	5307	Bill 95, Tax Appeals Commission Act	5319
Bill 62, Business Practices Amendment Act (2)	5307	<b>Debate on Third Readings</b>	
Bill 71, Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act	5307	Bill 5, Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Amendment Act	
Bill 73, Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act	5308	Barrett	5319
Bill 75, Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5308	<b>Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees</b>	
Bill 84, Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)	5308	Law Amendments, 6th Report	
Bill 92, Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act	5308	Reimer	5322
Bill 94, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992	5308	<b>Debate on Third Readings</b>	
Bill 95, Tax Appeals Commission Act	5309	Bill 53, Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Amendment Act	
		Cerilli	5325
<b>Third Readings</b>		Bill 74, Law Society Amendment Act	
Bill 9, Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act		Ashton	5327
Alcock	5309	Bill 88, Homesteads, Marital Property Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
Doer	5310	Barrett	5327
Stefanson	5311	Bill 89, Family Maintenance Amendment Act	
L. Evans	5313	Barrett	5327
Bill 61, Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4)	5315	<b>Report Stage</b>	
Bill 62, Business Practices Amendment Act (2)	5315	Bill 78, City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)	5328
Bill 71, Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act	5316	Bill 97, Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act	5328
Bill 73, Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act			
Martindale	5316	<b>Third Readings</b>	
Bill 75, Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5317	Bill 78, City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)	5329
Bill 84, Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)	5317	Bill 97, Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act	5329
Bill 92, Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act	5317		



**Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees**

Industrial Relations, 1st Report  
Render 5329

**Report Stage**

Bill 42, Amusements Amendment Act 5332

Bill 64, Child and Family Services  
Amendment Act 5333

Bill 70, Social Allowances Amendment  
and Consequential Amendments Act 5333

Bill 76, Pension Benefits Amendment Act 5333

Bill 85, Labour Relations Amendment Act 5334

Bill 100, Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act 5334

**Third Readings**

Bill 42, Amusements Amendment Act 5334

Bill 64, Child and Family Services  
Amendment Act 5334

Bill 70, Social Allowances Amendment  
and Consequential Amendments Act 5335

Bill 76, Pension Benefits Amendment Act 5335

Bill 85, Labour Relations Amendment Act 5335

Bill 100, Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act 5335

**Supply - Capital Supply**

Committee of Supply 5336

**Proposed Resolutions**

Res. 77, Five Principles of Medicare  
Cheema 5359

Orchard 5362

Wasylycia-Leis 5364