



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. 93 - 1:30 p.m., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1992



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
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
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, Clif	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
MANNESSE, 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

Wednesday, June 24, 1992

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

Speaker's Statement

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Routine Proceedings, I have a statement for the House.

I must inform the House that Edward James Connery, the honourable member for Portage la Prairie, has resigned his seat in the House, effective June 23, 1992. I am therefore tabling his resignation and my letter to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council advising of the vacancy thus created in the membership of the House.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): I beg to present the petition of Violet Thurston, Eleanor Heminger, Elio Mancinelli and others requesting the government consider restoring the former full funding of \$700,000 to fight Dutch elm disease.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Carol Kendrick, Angele Kernel, Ted Zarn and 1,100 others requesting the government consider reviewing the funding of the Brandon General Hospital to avoid layoffs and cutbacks to vital services. That is the latest batch.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): I beg to present the petition of Kim Lalonde, Brenda Osborne, Kathy Clark and others urging the government consider establishing an office of the Children's Advocate, independent of cabinet and reporting directly to this Assembly.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply sat yesterday afternoon and last evening and has considered the concurrence motion, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister responsible for Seniors): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement.

It gives me great pleasure to invite the members of this House to join me in celebrating tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, as Seniors Day in Winnipeg. This celebration is one of the many related activities held in communities throughout our province in the past several weeks to mark June as Seniors Month in Manitoba.

Seniors Month gives us a special opportunity to thank our seniors for their role in making Manitoba what it is today, a strong, economically vibrant partner in a nation that has earned international acclaim for the highest standard of living in the world today. This unsurpassed quality of life has grown out of the efforts of our seniors, the men and women who tilled the soil, raised families, fought for our freedom, built our communities and took bold risks.

Seniors' contributions have had an enormous impact on our lives and continue to enrich our communities. Their knowledge and experience guides our youth in their quest for a better tomorrow. Their energy is an inspiration and motivation to all of us.

As we gather tomorrow, we will recognize Seniors Day. It is fitting that we consider and acknowledge how much our seniors have shaped the quality of our existence in the past, present and the many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition that senior citizens' achievements have improved our lives and continue to give us great hope for the future, I ask the members of this House to join me in extending sincere thanks and best wishes to all Manitoba seniors.

* (1335)

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, we are happy that at least this government has continued this tradition of recognizing Seniors Day, which was started by the NDP.

While we are happy about this continuation of this tradition on behalf of our citizens who have contributed their lives and their talents for the improvement of this province, we are very unhappy and disappointed on behalf of seniors on the failure of this government to again correct the deindexing of 55 Plus for our unfortunate senior citizens.

We are unhappy on behalf of seniors, for they are again imposing a new tax on the Blue Cross, which will have its detrimental effect on the bulk of our senior citizens, but Seniors Day should be continued, and all good practices should have their day in this Legislature. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be Seniors Day at the Legislature, and along with the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party, we welcome the seniors here.

However, we wonder about the amount of money that will be spent on that particular enjoyment of that day here at the Legislature when money has been denied those very same seniors in programs such as 55 Plus which is no longer indexed, and never was indexed under the NDP, and the Shelter Allowance—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1340)

Point of Order

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is in order for any member of this Legislature to mislead this House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order. It is clearly a dispute over the facts.

Mrs. Carstairs: The seniors know how much money they got under the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, the other issue, of course, is that the shelter allowance has also been frozen. So there is a lack of funding to make those very seniors, the so-called economically vibrant partners whom the minister makes reference to in his notes today.

So while they are wandering around the Legislature tomorrow, I only hope that some of those who are able to come will be those individuals who would be able to come more easily if they had enough money on a day-to-day basis for their food and their shelter and, tragically enough, do not have enough money on a day-to-day basis because of the unwillingness of this government to meet their needs.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Economic Growth Summit Formation

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier.

In December, six months ago, the Premier made four economic boasts in this House, in Hansard, about the Manitoba economy. He boasted that the Conference Board had predicted Manitoba would have a 4 percent growth in 1992. He boasted that his policies in government had resulted in an 8.7 percent unemployment rate. He boasted that manufacturing employment was up over the previous year. He also boasted that investment in manufacturing in 1991 would be some 7.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, six months later, we have the reality of those boasts, the reality that the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery)—the former member for Portage la Prairie—was commenting on yesterday in terms of the lack of economic performance by this Premier and his office. We see that now the Conference Board is predicting 1.1 percent growth. We now see that Manitoba's unemployment rate is 5,000 people per month higher than December 1991, when the Premier made those predictions. We see that the manufacturing sector has declined from 55,000 to 51,000 in May 1992, and we see that investment in manufacturing declined 38 percent.

Will the Premier now, instead of boasting about the future, take really strong action as chair of the Economic Committee of Cabinet, and will he call together the various groups in Manitoba, business, labour and government, to work together and call together an economic summit to get our province moving again?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we see the prince of darkness again quoting statistics that he likes to quote about 1991, always looking

through the rearview mirror and gloating about the difficulties of the Manitoba economy.

Manitobans are not looking for that kind of leadership. Manitobans are looking forward positively. They know the statistics that we quoted in December for 1992, for 1993 and for 1994 are still valid. We are going to be, according to all of the recent economic forecasts, in the top three or four in the country, above the national average in growth for '92, '93 and '94.

In fact, the most recent survey that was just out yesterday from CIBC says: The recovery in 1992 is expected to be somewhat stronger than the national average in Manitoba. Manufacturing, Manitoba's largest goods producing sector, is expected to reap some of the fruits of diversification away from Agri-Food and also to benefit from the pickup in North American economies.

They go on to talk about agriculture having a better year. They go on to say that overall, in '92, '93, '94, we will continue to outperform the national average. That is the forecast, and it remains valid, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Doer: I would refer the Premier back to his own boasts in December, in Hansard, when this session first started, Mr. Speaker. They are all his words in this Chamber. These were his so-called forward-looking views six months ago, and he is wrong, wrong, wrong all the way through his predictions.

One of the things that is becoming abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, is that this Premier and his office do not listen to Manitobans. Whether it is legislation on social assistance, they were not listening to Manitobans. Whether it is legislation on child advocates, they were not listening to Manitobans. Whether it is legislation dealing with police, they were not listening to Manitobans until they were forced to do otherwise.

On and on and on—with the economy, they are not listening to Manitobans. In fact, this Premier is not even listening to members of his own caucus, Mr. Speaker. He is not even listening to members of his own caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask this Premier to change his style and change the style of his government and call together an economic summit so that all Manitobans would have access to the Premier in terms of the province, so that we can work together in a consensus with all Manitobans rather than a few

select members of the economy whom the Premier chooses. Will he call an economic summit and involve all Manitobans in that?

* (1345)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, you know, again, the Leader of the Opposition is wrong, wrong, wrong. Number one, he is basing all of his information on last year's statistics. He is not looking at all of the forecasts—'92, '93 and '94—which are saying that we will outperform the national average in '92, '93 and '94.

Secondly, he says that this government has not listened. On the bill, with respect to—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Doer: Again, Mr. Speaker, all the predictions the Premier made in Hansard in December are wrong. All the predictions of the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) last year at this time are all wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we need an economic approach that involves all Manitobans, not just a select few. Why will the Premier not call an economic summit, an economic summit that was just called with business, labour and government in British Columbia—a province, by the way, that is predicted by all the forecasters to lead all other provinces in Canada? They are working with a consensus approach to their challenges, to their problems.

Why will the Premier not call an economic summit with all Manitobans being involved in a consensus way to solve our problems rather than just a select few who have the ear of the Premier?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted, the Leader of the Opposition was wrong when he said that we did not listen to the presentations of the City of Winnipeg Police Association. All of the changes that they had advocated were indeed made. Their president, as well as the commissioner of Parks and Protection, stood up last evening at committee and said they supported the bill.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Child Advocate, that bill was just passed this morning, and nobody voted against it in this House. So if it so wrong, why did the opposition not vote against it? Again, he is wrong—again.

With respect to the issue of a summit or a discussion of all groups in the economy with respect

to the economy, I attended last Thursday and Friday a two-day session of the Economic Innovation and Technology Council, at which point one of the decisions that was made by that council was to hold just such a seminar, just such a conference in Winnipeg or in Manitoba this coming fall. I know that plans are well underway for that to take place.

Rural Economic Development Video Lottery Revenues

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural Development.

Mr. Speaker, this government has failed dismally in its economic development plan for rural Manitoba. The only major effort they had to stimulate the rural economy was the Repap deal, and that was a failure. They broke their promises on Video Lottery Terminals, and they offloaded costs onto municipalities with roads.

Mr. Speaker, video lottery revenue was promised to be spent to stimulate rural economic growth and to create permanent jobs rather than to cover up government cutbacks in Natural Resources and student funding.

Will the minister give his commitment that money from Video Lottery Terminals will be put back into the rural economy to stimulate it, to have economic growth and to have real jobs, not cover-ups?

* (1350)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development): I certainly do not accept any of the preamble that has been put forth by the member for Swan River.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give you an illustration of what has happened in terms of rural economic development issues in this province since this government has been in power.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it was this government that introduced the Grow Bonds program in Manitoba, which allows communities to invest in themselves. It was this government that introduced the Community Choices Program which allows communities to also come together and identify their strengths. It was this government that indicated through the REDI program—they introduced the REDI program, and under the REDI program, \$2.4 million this year is going to rural economic development initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is also this government that has put a substantial amount of money into the rural economy through the GRIP program. I will not accept any of the rhetoric put forth by the member for Swan River.

Ms. Wowchuk: Well, the minister is not listening to rural Manitobans. Millions of dollars have been raised on Video Lottery Terminals; 95 per cent of this money comes from rural Manitoba.

Since all of the revenue comes out of rural Manitoba, why is the Minister of Rural Development allowing the money to go back into general revenue rather than to economic growth, as he promised?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, it is only a mere four or five days ago that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) stood in his place, as the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) did, and criticized this government for not putting forward employment programs for the youth in Manitoba.

We have done just that. We have put forward a program for rural Manitoba, for rural students to get involved in programs that will assist those students in terms of employment, but secondly, will assist in terms of developing our infrastructure in the rural part of our province. That is also a part of rural economic development in this province.

Minister's Commitment

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): \$3.5 million—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Swan River, with her question.

Ms. Wowchuk: Since this government has broken its promises on decentralization, and mayors and reeves across the province are upset with this government on this decision to take Video Lottery Terminal funds out of economic development, when is this minister going to show some leadership, stand up for rural people and urge this government to have some commitment to economic growth, real economic growth in rural Manitoba?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy that the member raised the question of decentralization, because 720 jobs will be decentralized to rural Manitoba as a result of the decentralization initiative.

Mr. Speaker, \$25-million worth of payroll will be going into rural Manitoba as a result of

decentralization. Another \$750,000 will be going into rural Manitoba as a result of a youth employment program for our parks through the Green Team project.

This is a sincere and a serious commitment to the economic development policies for rural Manitoba.

Constitutional Proposal Public Hearings

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the ongoing constitutional negotiations cause us grave concerns. It would appear that the Premier is going to be meeting with other Premiers if he accepts the invitation for lunch with the Prime Minister next Monday, and we are concerned as to what his position will be at those discussions. We asked a week ago, I specifically asked him, if, when the tentative agreement among First Ministers was reached, the public would be given the opportunity through public hearing process to give their opinions as to whether they accepted that tentative deal.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears that we have come a long way from the original position of the people of this province, as reported in the Meech Lake task force report, because in that task force report, I can find the following quotation: The task force recommends that public hearings be held at the federal and provincial levels of government after the First Ministers develop a proposal for constitutional change and prior to the signing of the proposed constitutional change.

Mr. Speaker, my question is: How does the Premier reconcile his answer to my request last week and this recommendation in the task force report?

* (1355)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Very simply, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have the proposals go before a public committee of this Legislature to be reviewed and commented on by the public before any resolution will be voted upon in this Legislature. So the public will have full input and full opportunity to do that.

I have said before that I would not presume to sign away the rights of the people of Manitoba. Their rights are guaranteed in the rules of this Legislature, rules that were changed by both parties in this Legislature who existed in 1984 and who were committed to that change in rules. We will abide by

that change in rules, which means that the people will have the opportunity to review any proposal prior to any vote taking place in this Legislature.

Spending Powers

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the spirit of the task force report on Meech Lake was that they would be given the chance to comment before the negotiation of the final proposal, and they are not being given that opportunity.

We have other areas in which this government is separating itself from the task force reports that have been done. The Meech Lake Accord proposed that individual provinces receive compensation for opting out of national programs without any requirement for national standards—that was the Accord—but merely compatibility with national objectives.

The first Manitoba task force said this proposal should simply be scrapped. The second Manitoba task force said that spending power should only be included in a review of the division of empowerment that included, and I quote: the possibility of increased federal government involvement in policy fields, increased involvement in policy fields which might benefit from national policy making and/or co-ordination.

Now we have come full circle, and the rolling draft contains a spending power clause that is virtually identical to the one in the Meech Lake Accord.

My question for the Premier is simple: How does he justify this vast distance which has been apparently travelled by his government?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Wrong again, Mr. Speaker. The consistent position of the Minister responsible for Constitutional Affairs (Mr. McCrae) has been that we prefer the Dobbie-Beaudoin wording, and we have stayed by that position at the table all the way through.

Multiculturalism

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the second Manitoba task force recommended, quote: that the unique place and role of Quebec be recognized in a Canada clause along with the equality of the provinces, recognition of aboriginal peoples, duality, multiculturalism and an affirmation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

That is not what is in the rolling draft texts. The rolling draft texts make no reference whatsoever to multiculturalism, and they extend further derogation of the Charter to aboriginal peoples and to the people of Quebec.

Can the Premier tell us today exactly what his position is and what position he will be taking to the Premiers' and Prime Minister's table on Monday at lunch?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the purpose of the meeting is to review the considerable areas of disagreement that are contained within the current rolling draft text, areas of disagreement that the Leader of the Liberal Party's questions bring out.

We will be attempting to achieve, as much as possible, the positions that were put forward by the Manitoba All-Party Task Force.

Economic Growth Government Policy Performance

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

There are many statistics that reveal the serious economic stagnation that is occurring in this province. My Leader referred to some of them—declining manufacturing, lagging investment, heavy unemployment—but probably one of the key indications of Manitoba's decline is the loss of our people to other provinces. Some of the best and brightest are leaving.

Figures that we now have, Mr. Speaker, show that in the first quarter of this year, we lost more people than in the first quarter of last year. In fact, since this government assumed office in the spring of 1988, we have lost over 36,500 people to other provinces. That is almost as large as the city of Brandon.

My question, therefore, to the Minister of Finance is: Will he and his government now admit that its economic policies are totally failing?

* (1400)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I categorically reject the assertion of the member for Brandon East. I watched and waited very carefully for census statistics to come out, and it showed that the growth of the province

continues at a rate which although not incredibly fast, still is growing in a positive sense.

Again, I have to chastise the member for trying always to dwell on the negative. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say for the record—and this is basis of the middle of June—this is the area in which we are performing above the national average. Of course, you will never get this from members opposite.

In business bankruptcies, we are far above the Canadian average as far as a diminution of that indicator. The CPI in this province is far below that in Canada; housing starts, urban areas, 75 percent in Manitoba as compared to 42 percent in Canada; manufacturing shipments in the province of Manitoba far above the Canadian average; personal bankruptcies, again, far below the national average; private nonresidential investment intentions, again—and the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Stefanson) has talked about this often—retail trade, well above the national average; and the unemployment rate far below the national average. You never hear these types of statistics from the member opposite.

Population Statistics

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Well, if it is so great, why is everybody leaving Manitoba, Mr. Speaker?—36,000 since this government took office.

My supplementary question to the minister is: Can the minister explain why Manitoba is steadily shrinking within the Canadian nation, because when this government assumed office, Manitoba equalled 4.2 percent of the national population total and today, I regret to say, we have shrunk to only 4.0 percent? Why are we becoming less significant in the Canadian nation?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Well, that is the mind-set of the member opposite. He measures significance in the terms of numbers, Mr. Speaker. That is his ultimate determinant factor. I would say to him, if he believes that Manitoba is not significant in the context of Canada, then I am saying he is doing a tremendous disservice, not only to all the people, but specifically to his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know for sure why it is that the census and the number of people in the province of Ontario have grown beyond 10 million. I think it has something to do with the institutional make-up

of this nation. It is one of the reasons why this government is pressing so hard for Triple-E Senate reform. Where are the members opposite? Where does the member for Brandon East stand on an issue like that?

So, Mr. Speaker, obviously, within the Canadian context, if Ontario and British Columbia have numbers that are going at a much higher rate than those in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, obviously, our share is not going to grow, but I would say to him, Manitoba is not any less significant because of that factor.

Mr. Leonard Evans: The honourable minister knows that I am not reflecting on the quality of our people. We have the greatest people in the world. I am talking about the magnitude, and you know that very well.

My question to the minister is: When will this government change its economic policies so that we are going to have more job opportunities for our people in this province and help to slow down, if not entirely eliminate, this brain drain that is occurring?

I note, Mr. Speaker, that our rate of population loss on an annualized basis is the second worst in Canada. We are nine out of 10.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, when are the members opposite going to stop voting against budgets which provide for tax decreases? When are the members opposite going to stop voting against budgets that provide increases in a number of social areas, going to stop chastising the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), who is trying to take some money and put it into employment opportunities? When are the members opposite going to live up to what they did when they were government and saddled this province with the highest taxation load in the country?

So, Mr. Speaker, I can point fingers, too, but the reality is we have a course; we are following it; we are staying out of debt. We are managing well, and we are giving those credits within the Canadian context.

Post-Secondary Education Accessibility

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Students at St. Boniface College and Brandon University are facing fee increases in the region of 15 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these students live in small communities, where there are almost no jobs

available and fewer jobs since this government cut the support for student employment by more than 50 percent. These students already have high debts. They are not eligible for UIC-based training. Our community colleges have long waiting lists; in some cases, more than a year.

I want to ask the Minister of Education: Does she have a plan? Does she have any emergency response to these Manitoba families who in 1992 are seeing further education slipping out of their grasp?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): We certainly support the students in Manitoba and are interested in people studying, both those young people who are studying sequentially and also those Manitobans who are returning to school and have other responsibilities.

We have maintained that commitment through our support for the Student Aid program in Manitoba, which I will remind the member is a bursary program.

Universities Review Timetable

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Will the minister tell us when, in the fullness of geological time, she is going to introduce that university review, and will she tell us how students will be represented on that review?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, she will not have to wait quite that long, and it will be very soon.

Post-Secondary Education Accessibility

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, will the minister ensure that the university review, when it does emerge from the myths of history, will examine the crucial issues facing Manitobans, and that is, accessibility to university education?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, we have taken the issue of the university review extremely seriously. We have developed a mandate which is very wide in scope and which, I believe, will certainly address the issues that the member opposite has raised today.

Dutch Elm Disease Research and Development Funding

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the pioneers who established the city of Winnipeg had some vision. They had some vision to make this a beautiful place to live by planting thousands and thousands of trees. Unfortunately, many of those are elm trees and subject to Dutch elm disease.

Can the Minister of Natural Resources tell this House whether he met, or any of his department met, this week with Dr. Carl Hubbes, who has been working at the University of Toronto on a vaccine which will prevent Dutch elm disease but has indicated that he might be forced to stop that research because of insufficient funds? Did the minister have officials meet with him, and what did they learn from that meeting?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dubis's [phonetic] research with respect to potentially finding a cure for Dutch elm disease first came to the attention of myself and my department three years ago, when I was increasing the level of the Dutch elm disease program to the City of Winnipeg. It was then the considered opinion of both the professional staff of my department and of the city forestry people that monies the city and the province had could best and should best be applied to the managing of the disease as in fact we are doing, as in fact I have been encouraged to do virtually every day by members opposite, in doing precisely the program that we are.

With all the respect that I have for Dr. Dubis's [phonetic] research, it simply has not been supported, nor is it hopeful enough that a cure in fact can be found. He himself suggests that it may be found in five years or in 10 years. There is no guarantee to that.

I have suggested to him at that time—and I say this very publicly—we, as taxpayers, support a major research institute called the National Research Council operating out of Ottawa. Surely, if this Dutch elm disease is not a problem unique to Winnipeg or to Manitoba, if among his peers it can be construed as a worthwhile research project, then quite frankly the National Research Council bears some responsibility in providing support to Dr. Dubis [phonetic].

* (1410)

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, the name is Hubbes, and I can only assume that he has not read the research project work since he obviously has not clearly understood the spelling of the man's name.

The government has indicated that they thought it was better to spend money on managing the disease, but in fact they have decreased the money they are spending managing the disease. They have also made the decision they are not going to fund R & D in this area even though they have strongly advocated funding for R & D in a number of presentations and election campaigns.

Can the Minister of Natural Resources tell the House why this government has chosen to put no money into research to find a cure for this particular disease?

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, quite simply because the best professional advice provided to this government and indeed to former governments was that the monies currently being spent in controlling Dutch elm disease are being spent in the most prudent manner. There has never been a professional case put forward, obviously, for the good doctor to attract the kind of research dollars—even the potential for a cure. My foresters quite frankly tell me that it is blowing money into the wind, and if we have any monies available, I am being advised to help in the maintaining of control of dead and diseased trees in precisely the manner we are.

Mrs. Carstairs: But that is in fact exactly what the government has done. They have cut the program. They have cut the program they already were funding. Can the minister explain to this House why there is now less money available for the prudent program he is now advocating?

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, let me state it very clearly. Never before in the history of this province—never before since the onslaught of Dutch elm disease has a provincial government provided the level of funding that this government, my government, is providing for Dutch elm disease.

That is a categorical statement. We are providing \$1.5 million for the fighting of Dutch elm disease, more by several hundreds of thousands than any previous government in the province's history.

Pharmacare Calcium Supplements

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): To the honourable Minister of Health, I recall the Biblical story of an old woman who was sick for 12 years, and being unable to get the attention of the Lord Jesus Christ, she approached the back and touched the hem of the garment, moved by the faith that by doing so she would get well.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, ignoring the recommendation of the Centre for Health Policy studies, delisted a dozen forms of calcium from the eligible list in the Pharmacare program.

My question is on behalf of sick seniors, particularly women: Will the honourable Minister of Health explain to this Assembly why his department ignored the recommendation that they first conduct a utilization study before doing the delisting?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would be totally pleased if someone would find a cure for the common cold as well.

Mr. Speaker, I take my honourable friend's question quite seriously, but I want my honourable friend to understand that in the establishment of the included products that are reimbursed under the Pharmacare program, we engage the professional minds of pharmacists in the province of Manitoba, who recommend to us those products, pharmaceuticals and even some over-the-counter products which, in their professional opinions, are effective and ought to be made available through the prescribing mechanism of pharmacists, hence reimbursable under the Pharmacare program, Sir.

Now that professional advice has said to us that there are many over-the-counter calcium replacements, including TUMS, by which individuals can access calcium needs. They have recommended to government that we examine that list and have made recommendations to government that some of the products be not reimbursed under the Pharmacare program because they are available either as over-the-counter or in other equally effective nonprescription sources, Sir.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the suffering women, senior citizens, may I approach the minister and touch the hem of his garment and ask him to list again at least one form of calcium supplementation so that these women may be safe from

osteoporosis, which is a crippling disease and not like a common cold?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I will even shake hands with my honourable friend if you get rid of this cold.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is attempting to paint a picture where there are no available calcium products to women and others who may well wish, under a doctor's advice, to supplement their calcium. That is not the case. There have been a number of over-the-counter products that individuals have bought.

The recommendation from the professional pharmacy group, pharmacists, professionals—and I realize my honourable friend is advocating on behalf of possibly a constituent, but professionals have recommended that we do not have the need to make recommendations and reimbursement under Pharmacare for calcium products available as over-the-counter products.

Northern Manitoba Employment Creation Strategy

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

The resignation yesterday of one of the Premier's own caucus colleagues demonstrated what we have been saying for years, that this government is not listening and is particularly not listening to rural and northern Manitoba.

Northern Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, has the highest rate of unemployment of any region in the country, and yet this government has cut back in terms of job creation programs affecting remote northern communities.

My question is simple, to the First Minister: When will he listen to northern Manitobans and reinstate the kind of funding cutbacks we have seen to CareerStart and the Northern Youth Corps program, which is leaving a devastating situation in terms of unemployment in those communities? When will he start listening?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the figures that I saw not too long ago indicated that the highest per capita income in the province today is in the city of Thompson, represented by that member for Thompson, of any city or town or village in this province.

This administration has spent four years trying to work at problems that were created and unsolved

by the former administration. We have, for instance, entered into a trilateral agreement to build the northeast hydro line to serve seven native communities in northern Manitoba, to invest some \$80 million in infrastructure to lower substantially their costs of hydroelectricity.

Today, right at this very minute, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), the Deputy Premier, is signing with Split Lake an agreement that will provide over \$45 million of funding to the Split Lake Cree Band, the largest input of financial contribution that community has ever seen in its history, as a result of the efforts of this government.

I can say, despite the fact that the northern flooding that affected that band occurred under the Schreyer government in the mid-'70s, it took this government's commitment, this government's integrity to work with the Split Lake Cree so they could get that kind of agreement. No other administration has been able to do it. No other administration has put that kind of money into the North that this administration has, Mr. Speaker.

* (1420)

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, the Premier does not understand. Thompson, for example, has had 6,800 applications for welfare, thanks to the failure of this government in terms of economic policy.

I want to go further and ask as my final supplementary: When will this Premier stop designing programs on job creation for Tuxedo and recognize, in remote northern communities that have no jobs, have no tax base and have no funds, that they get no job creation under the kind of programs this government has brought in? When will he listen to the people of the remote communities of northern Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, that kind of irrational ranting and raving is what produced the kind of irrational policy that the New Democrats applied to northern Manitoba, where, in the words of his Leader, they devised a plan that paid people to plant flowers along the roadways of the North, that paid people to put up signs, those green and white Jobs Fund signs, paid them a fortune, and all they ever saw by way of economic development and long-term infrastructure were those signs.

What we see today, of course, is the hundreds of millions of dollars of debt that was created by that kind of irrational spending that occurred under the NDP. Of course, the member for Thompson was

there every step of the way, counselling that kind of irrational throwing away of money and building up of debt for this province.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to recognizing the honourable member for The Maples for a nonpolitical statement, I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the loge to my right, where we have with us this afternoon Mr. Sid Green, the former member for Inkster.

On behalf of all honourable members, I would like to welcome you here this afternoon.

Nonpolitical Statement

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for The Maples have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [Agreed]

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, the Winnipeg Hawks Triple "A" Bantam Red hockey team captured the Western Canadian Bantam Championship in Red Deer, Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the members of the team and the coaching staff. Congratulations to: Dorian Anneck, Chris Brett, Jeff Chatyrbok, Mark Dawybida, Tony Ducharme, Billy Ewanchuk, Kyle Janssen, Chris Kavanagh, Clayton Lyons, Craig Malaschuk, Ryden Marko, Kevin Medwick, Jullien Phillips, Edmond Turcotte, Jason Klos, Vince Kluz, Curtis Menzul, Craig Siasor, Justin Kurtz, head coach Wayne Chernecki, assistant coaches Glen Harrison and Brian Kizuik, parent representative Bill Kitchen, team manager Donna Medwick. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I would like to seek permission to have the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections sit at 2:30 p.m. to consider the report on Judicial Compensation.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave for the Committee on Privileges and Elections to—

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, there is no leave from our side for sitting this afternoon. Discussions may continue, I

believe, between the individuals involved. Our critic has to be in the House to deal with a number of bills.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is denied.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, would you call bills? We will continue from where we left off earlier on this afternoon.

I would ask you to call Bills 34, 49, 79, 82, 93, 96 and 98 in that order. Of course, all of those bills will require the leave of the House.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 34—The Surveys Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to have third reading of Bill 34, The Surveys Amendment Act? Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 34, The Surveys Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'arpentage), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 49—The Environment Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 49, The Environment Amendment Act? Leave? Leave. It is agreed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 49, The Environment Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 79—The Highways Protection and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 79, The Highways Protection and Consequential Amendments Act? Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that by leave Bill 79, The Highways Protection and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur la protection des voies

publiques et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 82—The Farm Practices Protection and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 82, The Farm Practices Protection and Consequential Amendments Act? Leave?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), that, by leave, Bill 82, The Farm Practices Protection and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur la protection des pratiques agricoles et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I just want to say in response to the committee hearings that we had on this bill that I believe they reflected the concerns that we stated in this House during second reading debate dealing with the need to deal with companion issues, dealing with the environment and zoning and guidelines. I believe that point has been made very clear to the government during those hearings, as well as by the opposition in this House, and we will be following that closely with this minister, following the passage of this bill. We will be supporting the third reading of this bill as we did during second reading with those concerns being registered and will ask the minister to move quickly on those other related issues.

We did have an opportunity to improve the bill as well last night with some removal of a clause that was somewhat confusing and ambiguous insofar as its meaning.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 82, The Farm Practices Protection and Consequential Amendments Act. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

* (1430)

Bill 93—The Mental Health Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 93, The Mental Health Amendment Act? Leave. It is agreed. Third reading, Bill 93, The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 93, The Mental Health Amendment Act, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 96—The Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 96, The Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act? Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed. Third reading, Bill 96, The Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act; Loi sur l'Office de financement des organismes de service spécial.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 96, The Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, very, very briefly, we are not happy with this bill whatsoever. I think information to that extent was provided to the committee last night. We see that as a proliferation of agencies. We are not convinced that there will be any value to the government, to the taxpayers of Manitoba through these agencies.

It seems to be a proliferation of bodies that are really unnecessary. We are always in favour of ways and means to improve efficiency in government spending, but we do not think that this is a way to do it. We are not convinced. The whole area seems to be very fuzzy, Mr. Speaker,

It is not clear to us that anything positive will be accomplished by this. So on this account we on this side cannot support this legislation.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I want to be quite brief. I was at committee last night when this view went before the standing committee, and we heard from representatives of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association and, quite frankly, we are quite surprised when they contradicted the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) with respect to the consultation that supposedly went on before this bill was introduced.

The fact of the matter is that there was no substantive consultation. There was, as is traditional with this government, a declaration that this was going to be done and that is the way it was. But I want to put on record, I guess, two overriding concerns that were already mentioned by my colleague from Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) and mentioned by others that the government on this occasion is speaking out of both sides of its mouth.

It says that these kinds of arrangements are going to create for a more businesslike atmosphere in parts of the department, and they say that it is going to expedite, I guess, the work of administrators and managers in those areas, when it is argued against such efficiencies in agencies like the Manitoba Energy Authority and Manitoba Data Services and others.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other significant problems with this legislation. Number one, let it be very clear that these new financial authority agencies are going to have the authority to hire consultants and hire people who are noncivil servants. They are going to become the new gateway for political patronage appointments. They are going to be the new avenue for agencies within various departments, separate entities to hire political operatives in one form or another.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) said in his remarks that was not going to happen, but notwithstanding the good intentions, the fact is that there is no rational reason at this point for the introduction of these small minicorporations within the department. They serve no useful purpose that could not be served by the efficient running of government departments at the present time, that the current system of charge-backs, if the government wished to refine it, could offer the same kinds of advantages that these new SOAs, special operating agencies as they are called, Mr. Speaker, the same kind of efficiencies could be achieved with good management within the department. In fact,

the former Minister of Government Services said they had already been achieved in the Fleet Vehicles branch of the Department of Government Services.

Mr. Speaker, the government is going to get its way, assuming it comes to a vote, but we want on record that this is no panacea for some of the problems that are plaguing this government in particular.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 96, The Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

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.

Some Honourable Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, my apology. I am wondering if we can delay the third reading call of Bill 98, and go to Bills 86, 87 and 101.

Bill 86—The Provincial Police Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 86, The Provincial Police Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act?

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): I just wanted to speak on the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, just hold, we are ascertaining leave. There is leave for third reading of Bill 86?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, with leave, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 86, The Provincial Police

Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Sûreté du Manitoba et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I want to put some closing comments on the record with respect to both Bills 86 and 87. My comments will relate to both.

We heard last night from a very large group, and a very persuasive group, of police officers in this city, as well as representatives from the City of Winnipeg—I am sorry, I might add, as well, there was a representative from the City of Brandon police—who came to our committee last night to put on the record their concerns about the proposed amendments of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae).

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, after an arduous process, quite a lengthy hearing of the committee, a resolution was reached which accommodated the legitimate desires of the police constables involved and the police forces of this province, to be heard on these issues and to have a voice in how they are to be judged in executing their duties.

I, at this point, want to put two things on the record. Firstly, I do acknowledge and I do appreciate, and I think all Manitobans recognize that the minister did the right thing last night by sitting down with the police, albeit far after he should have done that. But he did sit down with them, and they did come to a resolution, and it was acceptable to both sides. The second comment I want to put on the record is that process, which occurred right around midnight last night, after five hours of hearings, should have occurred, it is our view, months before.

Concerns about the Law Enforcement Review Agency, the Manitoba Police Commission and the regulation and enforcement of standards and discipline within the police force have been issues that have been before this minister, debated in this House for years, for at least as long as I have been here, in the last four years. It is, I think, a sign of the arrogance of the minister that he would presume to come forward with legislation without having consulted beforehand. Again, I acknowledge that at the end of the day that occurred, and that is good.

My only statement here today is that should have happened some time ago. I look forward to a new relationship between this government and the police

forces whereby they will get together ahead of time and consult about what is going to be in this bill. Nobody expects them to agree all the time. But the least that can be expected by members of this House, by the police forces themselves, is that the minister would come forward at a date when he is coming up with the solution to the problems, when he is actually formulating his ideas as to what should be in the bill, not after he is committed to the bill, not after he has tabled it in this House, Mr. Speaker.

I leave those comments on the record. I am pleased that we do have a resolution which appears to be workable and acceptable to the police persons of this province. I want to acknowledge and thank the many police officers and their supporters who came forward last night, literally in the hundreds. It was a very clear, very convincing sign that they were concerned and that they had not been listened to up to that point. The minister did, at the end of the day, thankfully, listen to their concerns and make amendments accordingly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 86, The Provincial Police Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: That is agreed and so ordered.

* (1440)

Bill 87—The Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 87, The Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les enquêtes relatives à l'application de la loi?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 87, The Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, like the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), my comments on Bill 87 will also reflect in general my

comments on Bill 86. I am dealing with both issues basically at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we, too, in the New Democratic Party, are very pleased that the matter was resolved late last night. The bill that went to committee yesterday at 10 a.m. and emerged last night at approximately midnight was substantially different—the two were substantially different—and in fact, one could say there was a new bill that was put in effectively last night.

We are pleased with that. I want to say at the onset, we are pleased the government heard the wishes of the public, through the forum of several hundred police officers and their families and others who made representation last night, who made their views known to the government.

The unfortunate aspect of this whole process is that we raised these concerns for weeks in this House. For weeks, at least on four separate occasions, I stood up in this House and I queried the minister on this bill. Right from the start, on principle, I laid out our opposition and our concerns with this bill. Each time the minister was evasive; the minister dismissed our claims, and it was basically a steadfast position, an unbending position, an unyielding position.

The minister never gave our concerns the opportunity to even review or discuss, he simply dismissed them in this Chamber. That spoke to the entire process. Last night at the committee hearings, we heard that the Winnipeg Police Association requested last December from the Department of Justice under Freedom of Information, the recommendations of the ministerial committee dealing with changes to the Law Enforcement Review Agency.

Mr. Speaker, the Police Association obtained some documents, but they did not obtain 11 pages which consisted of recommendations to the minister as to how to change LERA. That was in December 1991. At that time, they had approached the minister and said, what are you talking, what are you looking at, what are you thinking about, what direction are you going in, we want to discuss it with you.

The minister failed to respond and provide that information. Subsequently, months later, the minister, with no report, with no background, with no review, introduced in this Chamber a bill to change LERA substantially. The minister then marched out

of this House and at a press conference said the change was being invoked for two reasons: efficiency, it would be more efficient, and it would be speedier. Those were the two reasons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during this session, we, in the New Democratic Party, have supported most of the government's initiatives in terms of the Justice department. We supported most of those initiatives because they were based on a sound process. Generally, in fact, most of the recommendations from the minister were as a result of the Law Reform Commission process.

In most of the cases we supported, we made suggestions and it went back and forth. This LERA initiative came out of nowhere, it had no consultation. The minister marched out of the House and announced that it would be more efficient and more effective. That was shown to be hollow and that was shown to be shallow, and that was shown to be inaccurate. There was no consultation.

It was not an attempt to be more effective, and it was not an attempt to be more efficient. In fact, to this day, we do not know why the government proposed the ill-fated measures that it did. We do not know what the reason and rationale was behind it. Now, I will grant that there are problems with LERA. There were improvements required in LERA, there is no question, but there was no consultation with anyone involved in LERA.

The City of Winnipeg, in the form of the mayor, wrote the minister and said, Mr. Minister, please give us time to review these proposals, so we can know how to deal with our employees. The minister said, no. The minister did not even talk to the Brandon police force. That came out at the hearings last night. The minister had some discussions—yes, there had been some discussions with the Police Association president.

Mr. Speaker, we opposed the bill on principle. We opposed the bill after having talked with the community. We opposed the bill after having talked with the Police Association and others. Where was the government? Why was the minister not listening? If the minister would have paid even a little bit of attention to what was going on, he would have known there were concerns, he would have known there were problems. The matter could have been resolved in an amicable fashion.

As it was, we were forced into a situation where members of the public, who generally do not like to take public stands because of their position, were forced to appear en masse in front of the minister and say, Mr. Minister, stop this process; it is wrong, Mr. Minister, stop this process.

I will grant you, they succeeded. We suspect that in the morning when we had heard that there might be representation that perhaps the government could at last be forced, could at last see the error of its ways, could at last begin to do, at least in 24 hours or in eight hours, what the government had failed to do in three weeks, and that is consult with the affected population.

Mr. Speaker, over and over again, the issue that came out at yesterday's hearings was that this bill was unfair, something that we had said from the very start, this was an unfair bill. It was felt by the rank and file as unfair. I suggest that any fair-minded representative or constituent would say, when looking at this bill, that it was unfair.

Fortunately, by eloquence, by sheer numbers, by some persuasion, the members who attended last night and most of them were police officers and their families, most from Winnipeg, some from Brandon, they were able to persuade the government of something that we were unable to do in this Chamber for many, many weeks. They were able to force the minister to do what he should have done in the first instance—listen, make some changes.

The minister brought forth nine changes last night to the bill. It effectively is a new bill and we welcome that. I am going to indicate that we will be supporting this new bill because that is what it is. We are going to miss the part that is billed, it was first introduced last night at twelve o'clock. That is what we are going to do. The previous bill, we voted against in this Chamber on principle, and we told them this was going to happen. We had told them for three weeks. Fortunately, the government, the minister, saw the error of his ways, introduced a new bill last night, and we will support it.

* (1450)

The bill does not go entirely all of the way to meet all of our concerns, but given what we were faced with yesterday at 10 a.m. and given what came back last night at 12 midnight, we in the New Democratic Party are going to support these changes to LERA, but we want to remind the minister and the government to start listening, because this is not the

only case and the only bill that I have had occasion to participate in this Session where the government has not been listening to the public.

This one served to illustrate, however, that the public can be heard and that if they get out their message, even in this instance, that steadfast minister who refused to listen to any of our concerns for three weeks, in a mere several hours last night, could be persuaded.

So the hope is there. Hope springs eternal. Mr. Speaker, we urge the minister to continue the dialogue that he launched in those few hours last night to move away from the last three or four weeks of steadfast nonlistening and move towards the path of consulting, the path of listening to the public, the path of going forward and listening and incorporating people's concerns before moving. If the minister were to do that, I think that he would have saved himself a good deal of difficulty last night and will save himself a good deal of difficulty in the future.

There are things that still have yet to be done with respect to LERA. I hope it continues to be examined. I hope changes are looked at, and I hope they are looked at in consultation with all of the citizens.

When we talked about this bill in the House, we indicated it just does not deal with the police. The minister is fond of saying that it is a public bill. That is right. This bill affects every man, woman and child in the province of Manitoba. It is a significant bill, because the justice and its perception in society is one of the most fundamental characteristics of our society.

The rule of law indeed is considered the fundamental basis of our society, so this bill touches every man, woman and child. The bill that the minister wrought forth the last month, Mr. Speaker, was found to be unfair. The new bill that emerged last night goes a long way to redressing the inequities and the unfairness.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) indicated that I said it several times. I said it for three weeks, Mr. Speaker, and the minister did not listen. It took 300 police officers to get the minister to listen. I am only sending a message to the minister that I hope he hears.

He mentioned last night in the press conferences and the scrums that this was the dawning of a new age of consultation that was occurring in Manitoba.

I hope that is true, Mr. Speaker. So I can indicate that we will support this new bill because it is fair, it is fairer, it addresses most of the concerns we raised, and with those comments, that concludes my comments. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question for the House, third reading of Bill 87, The Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: That is agreed and so ordered.

Bill 101—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 101, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992? Leave. It is agreed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move (by leave), seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), that Bill 101, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992 (Loi de 1992 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I am going to take this occasion to comment on a practice, with respect to this bill, that has been adopted by this government, that we in principle think is wrong, with respect to The Statute Law Amendment Act and specifically one of the subsections, specifically subsection 27(1) through to 27(7) dealing with The Public Schools Act.

As a preamble, let me make it very clear that in my comments, I am not dealing with a substantive issue which can be debated in another form at another time with what the government is trying to do in those subsections.

The issue that I am rising on today is a question of principle. It is a principle that I think has been overlooked in this particular statute amendment, and that is, the amendment introduced under The Public Schools Act, by the government, changes the law. It introduces expenditure items of many millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker.

The government has chosen to put that change into a statute law amendment. My recommended course would be for the government to introduce a bill amending The Public Schools Act or alternately setting up a private schools act or whatever. The

point is, the government is choosing to do through The Statute Law Amendment Act what they should be doing in a separate bill. The difficulty with that is that it does not allow for meaningful debate of this particular item, Mr. Speaker.

Now Mr. Speaker, we queried the minister at committee stage this morning on this bill, and the minister indicated that initially this amendment was being introduced to "clarify" changes that already had been passed but not proclaimed by the Legislature. That is fine.

We then asked the minister what those changes were, and the changes that were to be clarified in this bill were not clarified. In fact, the changes that are made in this bill are substantively new law that allows for new rights on the expenditure of different funds, and that is a great leap from clarification. The minister admitted that at the committee stage. She admitted it would set up new rules, new regimes and qualify new schools and agencies for funding.

That, to our mind, should be the subject of a separate bill, or separate legislation, not included at the end of a session in a bill which is specifically designed to deal with administrative and with legal clarifications and changes. We are finding no fault with all of the other changes, Mr. Speaker. What we are having difficulty dealing with is a substantive change in the law that is done to the Statute Law Amendment. We do not think this is correct. We think this should be a subject of a separate piece of legislation. If one examines Hansard, one will clearly see that the minister admitted that a new regime was being established by virtue of this particular amendment.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are basically my comments with respect to this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 101, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? 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.

An Honourable Member: On division.

Mr. Speaker: On division. Done.

* * *

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call third readings on private members' Bills 52 and 90, and I guess that ought to be preceded by Report Stage.

THIRD READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

Bill 52—The Pas Health Complex Incorporation Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Bill 52, The Pas Health Complex Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Pas Health Complex," standing in the name of the honourable member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin). Is there leave? No?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is denied.

* (1500)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I just want to put a few comments on the record on behalf of the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) and thank the government for moving this bill along.

The member for The Pas, as the House knows, is attending on government business with the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) at Split Lake today, and he would have liked to have had an opportunity to speak at third reading.

The volunteers at The Pas Health Complex and the community of the Pas very much support this bill and very much want to see the amendments to the incorporation act passed by this Legislature.

We were sorry that we could not get this bill passed last year, but we thank the co-operation of the members opposite this year. I think this bill being passed by the Legislature is in the best interests of The Pas community and the many volunteers and staff who work diligently on behalf of patients and the community of The Pas and its related areas.

So, I would like to thank the House, and on behalf of the member for The Pas, we will be voting for this bill on third reading. Thank you.

I move, seconded by the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that Bill 52, The Pas Health Complex Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Pas Health Complex," be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE—PRIVATE BILLS

Bill 90—The Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would ask if there is leave of the House to allow me to both report on behalf of the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) and give third reading to the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will do one at a time. We will do the report stage.

Mr. Lamoureux: Is there leave?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for the honourable member for Inkster to do it on behalf of the honourable member for The Maples. Leave?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: That is agreed.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), that Bill 90, The Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Seven Oaks General Hospital"), reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

Bill 90—The Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Again, Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House I would ask if I could read the member for The Maples' (Mr. Cheema) bill for third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 90, The Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Seven Oaks General Hospital")?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. That is agreed.

Is there leave for the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to bring forward the bill on behalf of the honourable member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema). There is leave? That is agreed.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), that Bill 90, The Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Seven

Oaks General Hospital") be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put a very few words on the record and acknowledge the willingness of the government, in particular the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) with the co-operation of all members of this Chamber, that we were able to bring in this bill which is a bill that is very necessary and thank them for allowing us to have it read a third time and passed for Royal Assent, possibly later today.

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

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call adjourned debate, third readings, in this order, Bills 42, 76, 78, 98, 70 and 85.

(Madam Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS

Bill 42—The Amusements Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave for third reading, Bill 42, The Amusements Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les divertissements, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton)? Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am prepared to speak on this particular bill. Indeed, as the Leader of the Opposition, our Leader (Mr. Doer) points out, the full weight of the government, this big, brave Conservative government is being brought to bear on a couple of dozen projectionists—a couple of dozen projectionists.

You know, the story of this fight is an interesting one, Madam Deputy Speaker. This goes back to the late 1970s when the then Conservative government attempted at that time to de-license all projectionists, and they trotted out the same arguments then. They said everything is changed, there are no longer the safety problems in terms of projectionists. That, in and of itself, was a reason to de-license the projectionists. Well, indeed, times had changed, but the concerns were still there in

terms of safety. The requirement for trained individuals to operate as projectionists was there. What happened? The projectionists fought the then-Conservative government, and the Conservative government backed down in terms of the major urban centres and continued to require licensing of projectionists.

So that is what happened in the late 1970s. This has been a fight that has taken place in other areas. In Alberta the projectionists have fought successfully against similar attempts. But, you know, one of the first things this government did when they were elected in 1988 was target, guess who?—the projectionists again.

In fact, successive Ministers of Labour in a row tried to sneak it in every year in Statute Law Amendment. I refer to the comments made earlier about the abuse of Statute Law Amendment that our Justice critic referred to in terms of this Bill 101 this year where they are again trying to ram through particular items. But as the former member for Portage tried—I guess we can call him Ed Connery now—Ed Connery tried, Gerrie Hammond tried. [interjection] That is right, we can call him Ed. We are allowed to call him Ed, the former member.

* (1510)

They try to sneak it through on Statute Law Amendment, and along came the current Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) who I cannot refer to by name. But the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), he picked up the torch from the previous Ministers of Labour, and guess what? The projectionists were targeted again.

We tried last year in terms of Statute Law Amendment, but I am sorry, each and every time the Ministers of Labour tried to sneak it through in Statute Law Amendment, some of us on this side were alert enough to the fact and we put a stop to it. So now the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) has gone one step further. He has introduced a bill of the Legislature.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let us look at this. There are 101 bills that have been introduced. Some of them are very formal bills. Many of them are opposition bills that have been introduced in this Legislature. The current number of government bills is not even more than 60. There is a lot of time and effort that goes into preparation of bills, translation of bills, and publication of bills. The time we spend in first reading, second reading,

committee and third reading, out of the 50 or 60 bills that this government thought were important enough to bring before this session of the House, one of them was to de-license projectionists.

Well, indeed, the big, brave Conservative government—[interjection] Well, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) talks about dinosaurs. He need only look into the mirror to see the dinosaurs in this Chamber. They are following the lobbying efforts of the movie theatres who do not want licensed projectionists because they do not want to have fully trained and qualified individuals working there so they can cut the amount they pay the projectionists.

This minister is leading the charge. Well, if anything is a greater example of the pathetic degree to which this government will go to implement the kind of agenda we see from the Chamber of Commerce, it is the projectionists bill, Bill 42, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The minister laughs. He should talk to the projectionists instead of being the "yes" man for those who are lobbying to de-license projectionists. We, only this morning, talked to the projectionists who are quite concerned and upset that they were unable to—they did not get the notice in terms of the bill. They would love to have made a presentation at committee.

But you know, Madam Deputy Speaker, it just goes to show the inability of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to listen—he does not even listen to his own caucus members—is something that is being followed by other ministers, in particular, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik). The Minister of Labour did not want to listen to the projectionists, did not even bother to go and listen to their concerns that is brought in this bill. So one out of—

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Our department met with them. I have spoken with them.

Mr. Ashton: Well, the minister says his department met with them; and he has spoken to them. Probably, some of his best friends are projectionists, Madam Deputy Speaker. The bottom line is he has ignored them, he has not listened to them.

We have a bill before us, Bill 42. Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I could list 100 other bills, 100 other things that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) could be doing in this House besides Bill 42. I could list all sorts of changes that the minister might want

to implement in terms of making greater fairness in our Labour Relations Act, instead of Bill 85 which makes it more and more patently unfair.

I could talk about dozens of suggestions that could be made in terms of employment standards, in terms of employment standards dealing—[interjection] The minister talks about dealing with a changing world. What about dealing with the changes in terms of family, in terms of implications, in terms of leave, parental leave, bereavement leave? What about the many suggestions? I made those in committee in terms of debate on the Labour Estimates. So I ask the question, to look at it. [interjection] If there had been 300 police in committee on Bill 42, maybe they would have backed down on this bill as well.

We have seen the legislative process grind at one of the lowest levels I have ever seen it. This government is a government that is coming apart at the seams. It has resignations, as we saw yesterday, from the member for Portage. You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, on bills it cannot even get its act together on something as important as matters affecting the police force.

We saw yesterday a committee that was adjourned more than it actually sat, I think, for some parts of the evening, while the minister was doing shuttle diplomacy, trying to bail out in a face-saving way the fact that he had botched the bill. This is an incompetent government. This is a government that has lost sight of all sense of priorities. We have a government, the big, brave government, prioritizing as one of the top 50 or 60 matters that should be dealt with by legislation, the elimination of licensing for projectionists, Madam Deputy Speaker.

An Honourable Member: Some priority.

Mr. Ashton: Some priority, and indeed some government. [interjection] The member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) suggests they make a movie about it. We already know what the title is going to be. It already exists on another one; it has been referenced by members of this House: "Blame It on Rio."

While the First Minister has been in Rio meeting with governors and Prime Ministers, while he has been doing that, while he has been travelling the world, solving the problems of the world, we know how the government has prioritized one of the major problems facing Manitoba in 1992 is the fact that we

have a few dozen projectionists that have to be licensed, as they have been for decades in this province. That is one of the major problems.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this may be seen by some as a small bill, but this bill says volumes about the misplaced priorities of this government. That is why we oppose Bill 42. We will fight for the few dozen projectionists and we will say to this government, it is about time they stop prioritizing the kind of antilabour initiative that this is, that is driven strictly by the lobbying power of corporate and business interests, and start dealing with the real problems of Manitoba, not something like Bill 42.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 42. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

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.

Bill 76—The Pension Benefits Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: Third reading, Bill 76, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), The Pension Benefits Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I also have some comments on 76. I want to indicate, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think the concerns of our caucus were put through very eloquently by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), who spoke both on second and third reading in terms of a number of problems with this particular bill.

I wanted to indicate, Madam Deputy Speaker, we voted against this bill at committee stage, in the committee, because this bill does a number of things that we feel moved this area, in terms of pensions,

into areas that we do not agree with. We feel this is not a positive development for pension legislation in Manitoba.

I mentioned before, Madam Deputy Speaker, we are concerned about the movement increasingly toward self-directed individual retirement plans rather than the traditional group plans which have provided significant financial benefits for those who have been part of those group plans for many years. We feel that is a wrong move on the part of the government. In fact, even investment analysis has indicated that is a risky move.

We are concerned about the government's failure to understand the issue of pension surpluses. This has been a major concern to employees for many years. Many employer- and employee-funded pension plans have developed significant surpluses over the years because of the collective investment of those funds and the return on those investments. Madam Deputy Speaker, this matter was dealt with in committee when the question was asked by a number of people with differing views on this as to who owns the pension surpluses.

I want to indicate very clearly the view of the New Democratic Party is that those pension surpluses are the propriety right of the employees. The employees are the ones who are the beneficiaries of the pensions. Pensions are deferred income. They are very much a part of, if there is a collective agreement, the collective bargaining process, and the discussions and negotiations that go on. They are very much a part of it even as individuals, if they do not have a union, if there is not a collective agreement in place.

The bottom line is this government, instead of allowing the kind of access that employers are going to increasingly have to pension surpluses, should be saying very clearly that is unacceptable. There have been many incidences of that. I point to the situation a number of years ago with Dominion stores in Ontario where they essentially drained the pension fund of its surplus. In fact, there was a sale that took place that was specifically aimed at accessing the pension plan surplus.

* (1520)

We see cases of that today, Madam Deputy Speaker, in a number of jurisdictions, where businesses are treating the pension surpluses out of the employees' pension plans as surpluses which they can tap into for their own business concern.

We are seeing people purchase companies for very little more than access to the pension surpluses.

Let it be very clear that when companies contribute they contribute at a set rate. If there are surpluses that involve the employee pension plan fund having some additional revenue in it, that should be given to either enhance the benefits of the employee or in the form of some sort of rebate in terms of employee contributions. That is only fair, but this government has not recognized that in this bill. That is a negative direction.

I mentioned earlier about the move this government has made to totally open up the issue of pension splitting. I want to say that this is an area where I think the government has moved hastily in response to some legitimate concerns that have been expressed, most notably at committee, not only this time but in terms of pension legislation that was brought to committee last session.

I want to say that I share the concerns expressed by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett). Our entire caucus shares those concerns. We are going to see an imbalance because of this legislation between the holder of the pension plan and the individual who does not hold a pension plan. In most cases, women will be the most vulnerable, but not in all cases.

There are indeed situations where women have the superior pension plan, and it is the husband who is in the more vulnerable position. We feel it would have been far more appropriate in this area if the minister had insisted on moving, that there be far greater regulation and protection of the rights of the more vulnerable person in this case.

I agree 100 percent with the member for Wellington there will be cases of abuse and that people will trade off the house and other assets, or indeed custody of the children, for access to the pension plan. I will go further, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will say there will be a particular problem because most women, in the situation of a marriage breakup, often end up in absolute poverty. The highest percentage of people who end up in poverty are often women who previously in a marriage had some level of security, some level of income, who following the breakup of a marriage are completely vulnerable and end up in poverty.

It has been shown statistically that following the breakup of a marriage often the real disposable income available to the majority of individuals, the

men, the husbands, actually increases while the disposable income of women who are divorced drops dramatically. [interjection]

I appreciate the applause from the member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) on this. I am glad to hear he is concerned about pension splitting. What is going to happen is we are going to end up in a situation where women are going to be even more at risk in their retirement years, because they are going to be pressured into not accessing the pension plans; they are not going to have access to future pensions; they are going to suffer even increasingly in their retirement years.

So this is a matter of principle, Madam Deputy Speaker. Our caucus is opposing several of the directions in this bill, and we feel the government once again, particularly in the area of pension surpluses and group pensions, is following the Chamber of Commerce agenda.

It is about time we saw some balance from this government and that it looked at the real concerns of Manitobans in terms of pensions. This bill does not do that. That is why we are therefore going to be opposing it as we did on second reading at committee stage.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Madam Deputy Speaker, I will only take a few moments to put a few comments on the record in response to the remarks of the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). I would just like to point out to members of this House on the ownership of pension issue in which the member indicates clearly that the NDP position would be, by legislation, to grant ownership of all surpluses to employees.

This legislation deals with that particular issue in two manners. Firstly, for new pensions it requires that issue be settled in the establishing documentation of the pension. So that becomes an issue in new pension plans for negotiations between the employers and employees. With respect to existing pension plans, this legislation simply allows the governing documentation in those plans to be effective.

If one were to take the New Democratic position, which would be to establish in law ownership of those pension plans contrary to the government documents of those plans, it would amount—in some cases, where the plans were negotiated and ownerships were agreed to, it would be on the part of the employer—to expropriation.

So the fact of the matter is this legislation allows the governing documents to be the determining factor on existing plans as to who owns the surplus. With respect to the pension-splitting provisions, and the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) talks about Chamber of Commerce agendas, I would just like to clearly indicate on the record at this time that the proposals under this bill are supported by the Manitoba Teachers' Society. Despite the fact that the Manitoba Federation of Labour did not comment on the matter, the Manitoba Nurses' Union supports this provision. [interjection] Well, I am talking about the credit pension-splitting provisions.

The Manitoba Nurses' Union is on the record as supporting the credit-splitting proposals in this bill. There are a dozen other unions who have also indicated very clearly that they support the part of the bill with respect to mandatory credit splitting and the ability to mutually opt out if there is agreement with certain provisions.

So I think it is very important to put on the record that with respect to the pension-splitting provisions of this act, the changes that allow parties to opt out by mutual agreement, that there is no consensus among the labour movement as to what should happen. There is clearly division, and there is division for good reason, because there are obviously views on this matter, both of which are very legitimate.

This government chose to support the principle that women and men should have the right to make their own decisions on matters regarding their assets, rather than what some have argued, some may refer to as a very patronizing view, that government should settle that issue. So I wanted to make those two points on the record, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I would thank all members who participated in this debate.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 76. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? 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.

Some Honourable Members: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

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

Madam Deputy Speaker: Third reading of Bill 78, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Stand? Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? Leave?

Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I understand that the reason why there is some commotion is that the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) wishes to address the bill later this afternoon or during this debate. I think we would deny leave to stand, but we will certainly try to accommodate all members who would like to speak on the other side.

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

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Leave has been granted.

* (1530)

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Madam Deputy Speaker, I had the opportunity to speak on this at second reading. I am glad to be able to respond to some of the concerns that I heard at the community committee and to add some additional comments to our concerns about Bill 78, yet a further bill dealing with the City of Winnipeg. It is, as I said at second reading, one of the government's many bills which mixes a series of purposes. The government chooses to do this for obvious reasons.

In this case, what they did was to choose to include a large section dealing with French language services with a variety of other issues of diverse origins and purposes, dealing with, amongst other things, community committee issues and

some environmental issues, as well as some issues dealing with political process at City Hall and some issues concerning by-laws and timing on variances. So it was a wide-ranging bill, Madam Deputy Speaker, not one that was perhaps focused in its intentions.

There were a number of sections dealing with the French language services. On this subject, Madam Deputy Speaker, I spoke last time. If I can repeat myself in French this time:

Je crois que l'objectif du gouvernement provincial, c'est à faire plus précises les responsabilités de la Ville de Winnipeg en ce qui concerne les services dans la langue française.

[Translation]

I believe that the objective of the provincial government is to make more precise the responsibilities of the City of Winnipeg with respect to French language services.

[English]

The French language sections have been included in this bill, The City of Winnipeg Act rather, since 1971. At that time, the old St. Boniface became part of the city. The purpose of those sections was, in fact, to retain the existing practices in the old city of St. Boniface, to retain in fact the sense of community in what is now called old St. Boniface, perhaps in a more colloquial sense.

Sections of the act have from time to time caused some difficulties and confusions and have not always perceived to have been useful in practice. This bill attempts to clarify those services, the locations, and the particular boundaries within which such services should operate. We anticipate that this legislation provides the clarity requested by the community on several occasions, including the community hearings and, of course, at the Cherniack committee some years ago.

However, Madam Deputy Speaker, there are two parts of this bill which give us great cause for concern and which we spoke about in this House earlier on and which we attempted to amend unsuccessfully in committee.

First of all, the section 494.71(1), which deals with construction over waterways, has a number of objectionable accounts. First of all, it gives full authority for construction over waterways and for the regulation of such buildings, a very wide definition in fact of buildings to the municipal government. It

seems to me that there is a very strong case to be made for joint provincial-municipal responsibility for waterways, and particularly, first of all, for provincial policy to preserve and protect our rivers and streams.

We all know and we all come from different constituencies, and we will know, particularly on the edges of Winnipeg, the great difficulties that there are with septic fields, the difficulties that the rivers and streams of Manitoba have with waste effluent, with the dumping of snow, for example, by various municipal governments in and around the city of Winnipeg and pouring chemicals in many cases into places like Omands Creek and the Seine and other smaller rivers and streams in the city.

There are many other areas, I think, of environmental concern which people would want to discuss relating to the rivers and streams of Winnipeg. I think all urban and suburban MLAs are very much aware of this problem. What we see here is a government which has reached no agreement in four years with the city over the protection of waterways.

Two or three years ago they touted the idea of a joint provincial-municipal waterways commission. They reached no agreement on that. There seems to have been no further discussions with the city on this issue. The whole principle of sustainable development, one of the things which this government hangs its political hat on, seems really to have had very little impact upon the city of Winnipeg.

We have a Capital Region Committee, which is moving at perhaps the rate of—very small, slow discussions, not even changes, I would say. For two years, they have really had a series of discussions about a variety of issues that face the whole of the metropolitan area.

So the kind of policies, agreements and principles which should be there for the protection of the rivers and streams of this area are not in place. What the province has done, as it did in Bill 35, is in fact to turn over full jurisdiction to the city. Now, there is in this bill a saving grace. The city must have by-laws on waterways, but it must hold public hearings when it has a version of those by-laws, and that is important.

I commend the government for that, but in a manner which is becoming very consistent with the way in which this government operates, one hand is

given and the other hand is taken away. That very principle of public hearings is undermined by a subsequent clause in the legislation, 494.71(3), which says that for changes of a minor nature which do "not prejudice the rights of any person", the city may dispense with that very important public hearing. It is that that concerns me particularly about this bill.

First of all, the principle, the record of the city on waterways and, thirdly, this opportunity that the province is now offering them to forgo the principle of a public hearing. I am concerned, as I said in the committee, by the phraseology, "the rights of any person." That seems to me to be—does not confirm, it does not give to the city of Winnipeg the importance of confirming the rights of a community. A corporation is a person, an individual is a person, but, as I understand it, although I am not a lawyer, the rights of any person does not cover the rights of a community.

Indeed, if we look at the French version of that particular paragraph, it gives us even greater cause for concern, because it adds to the ambiguity of the English section. It says, in fact: "ne brime aucun droit." We can translate that as "not breaching any law" or "not breaching any right", the rights of an individual, the rights of a corporation, the rights of a community. Those kinds of interpretations are not there. There is an ambiguity, I should say, in the translation that is available there.

I ask the minister to check into that. I do not know whether he will be bringing amendments at this time or not, and it may be that he has an alternative legal interpretation or linguistic interpretation than I do. If that is so, we certainly look forward to hearing about it.

I do note that the community that I represent, Wolseley, has had many close calls with the desires of some people in the community to build commercial buildings over rivers and streams, in our case, particularly, Omands Creek. The member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), whose riding abuts on the other side of Omands Creek, has spoken on this in second reading and supported us. The Liberal Party supported us in the amendments that we made on this.

I recognize the common interest that we have around Omands Creek. I recognize the common concerns that we have about maintaining community interest. I think we both recognize that

the action of the community on both sides of Omands Creek has been most significant in saving it on several occasions from commercial construction.

It was also served, as I mentioned in the second reading, by the alert action of the last New Democratic government and its creation of Bluestem Park, which has in fact increased public access and public concerns for Omands Creek. That really is, I think—that public concern, that public access is one of the things that we want to maintain. So we reject the opportunity offered to the city to withdraw the rights of public hearing.

We need to guarantee public hearings. We especially need openness, I believe, in a municipal government which is going to be one of 15 councillors, and where each councillor will now be responsible for at least twice as many constituents as he was before, and the distance between the city councillor and the constituents will certainly have grown.

Indeed, as I constantly try to put it in the context of my own constituency, people who live at the corner of Sherbrook and Portage Avenue, people who are very much inner-city people with all of the difficulties that they face, issues of poverty, issues of trying to maintain neighbourhoods in inner-city communities, are being represented now by a councillor who is responsible to a far larger number of suburban residents, people in fact whose residences are on Kenaston Boulevard in some cases. So it is now a very diverse constituency by a councillor, and whoever is elected is going to face many of those same difficulties in being in touch with their constituents.

So in that context and in the context and the desirability of the openness of government, we opposed this particular section. As I said, we were pleased to have the support of the Liberal Party on this amendment which, of course, the government voted down and unfortunately failed.

* (1540)

Finally, Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to talk about the community committees, because we also have some very serious concerns about this section. I outlined our concerns on this in second reading. I want to emphasize that a number of members on our side have received a large number of letters about this issue. Over 150 letters have been received in our caucus about this particular

issue, so our concerns were confirmed by those letters and by the people who appeared from various parts of the city, not just from the unicity but from some of the suburbs as well, who came to argue for the existing system, that is, of the opportunity for community committees to have the final, political say on variances and, in fact, the local decisions.

They spoke of the need for communities to make local decisions, something that the minister derided as parochial. They spoke of the need for decisions to be political and accountable and to be made by those people who are most accessible to their constituents, but something again which this government derided as too political and too local. The people we heard wanted those decisions to be local, they wanted neighbourhood decisions. They spoke about not just the outcome of the decision, but the process of a community coming together with its councillors to discuss, to debate and to resolve the issues which are brought before a community.

We heard a variety of people: a planner, for example, who spoke of the difficulty of taking people from local constituencies to City Hall to make presentations to a committee, the standing committee of City Council which this minister wants to be the final court of appeal on local decisions, a committee which changes its personnel every year. So much for consistency and for larger scale planning. The planner spoke of the difficulties that people faced who have never been to City Hall and who go to appear in front of a committee on which their own representatives do not appear. They feel very distant and, in fact, often quite overwhelmed by the situation, and there is another option.

There is the option of community committee which is there in the existing act. The planner emphasized that every community has different by-laws, and that community committees were, in fact, as the Cherniack report will say, set up to create the political communities that will help to decide local issues. That is their purpose, and there is an opportunity in the last Bill 35 for that to happen.

Councillor Timmers of the inner city spoke on the importance of accountability, of the importance of a city councillor elected by local people being responsible and being seen to be making those decisions, not back-room decisions, not the tit for tat that has gone on in gang politics at City Hall, but a city councillor elected locally making local

decisions, so that accountability and accessibility is, I think, very important.

The residents of Armstrongs Point came to represent the neighbourhood associations of all of the inner city. They spoke about the impact of this on the inner city and upon the sense of neighbourhood, and again the issue of accountability was stressed by all of those inner-city neighbourhood groups. Madam Deputy Speaker, every one of those people who presented shared one opinion. They said, we have that existing power under Bill 35; give it a chance. Some communities have only operated with it on one appeal, some have had several appeals, but every one of them said, the minister has no evidence that this is not working; give it a chance, and then in three years, after the next City Council is over, come back to us if it is not working, if it has created havoc, if it has created the difficulties that the minister somehow, in his mind, must be assuming are there. Tell us them, and then let us look at it.

But the minister and the government voted down the amendments that we proposed on this, Madam Deputy Speaker, and it became clear, as they were speaking, that in fact the government had made a mistake last time on Bill 35. They had made an error, and the community had taken advantage of it. The minister had never intended, he said, that community committees be used as appeal. He was perhaps somewhat disconcerted and was now seeking to rectify the error that he believed had been made and the advantages that had been taken of it by local communities.

But who agreed with him? Not one of the presenters spoke in favour of this. There was one submission, a written submission, which came later, and it did deal in some part with the amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act. The large part of it, in fact, deals with sections on time limits on variants, but there was the first section which dealt with the appeal process from the board of adjustments.

This particular brief said, very briefly: The appeal process from the board of adjustments to community committee is self-defeating. Once more, politics will result in arbitrary decisions. A far better solution is to refer appeals to a standing committee.

Exactly the same viewpoint of the minister, that these decisions are too political to be made by a local committee.

Well, who wrote this, Madam Deputy Speaker? This came from the commercial real estate services of Pratt, McGarry Inc., who represent over 50 landlords and over 2 million square feet of commercial space. I do not know if they represent the entire real estate community. I am sure that cannot be the case, but I am concerned that this is the only representation and that it spoke in almost the same words as the minister. It is, as it is put bluntly in this document—one might say if one were not more charitable—almost a ludicrous argument. It is a very peculiar definition of politics. Politics is about priorities, it is about choices, and it is about politicians being accountable and accessible to the people who elect them.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, in closing, I want to emphasize that this is a step backward. We were disappointed that the Liberal Party did not support us in our opposition to this, but it is consistent—I will commend them on this—it is a consistent position for the Liberal Party to take, because they were, of course, in favour of the change in boundaries, which, in the case of my community, has resulted in a de facto pie-shaped ward. They were in favour of reducing the accessibility of people to their councillors by creating a much smaller City Council.

So it is a step backward in civic government, we believe, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I want to close with the words of Catherine Collins, President of the McDermot-Sherbrook Residents' Association, who also took the time to write to the committee.

As far as we are concerned, she said, Bill 78 is a step backwards in civic government. Our elected representatives and our local community committee are accountable to us because we elect them. Bill 78 removes their authority and the accountability of the entire municipal government. Bill 78 will do a great deal of damage to the poorer parts of the city which are already under a great deal of stress.

She represents a community committee which is certainly under a great deal of stress and has faced some very difficult situations recently at City Council and with decisions made at City Council, and I commend her for taking the time to write and welcome these particular kinds of representations.

With that, I will close. I regret the changes this government has made. I welcome the support of the Liberal Party on the environmental issues. I

note their consistency in opposing community committees and the role that they should play in local democracy.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to simply reiterate briefly the comments that I made at second reading with some additions at this point now that the bill has gone through committee. The bill, of course, has been spoken to at length by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) with respect to the provision of French language services.

* (1550)

I want to state again for the record that I believe this government made an error and showed its arrogance upon being elected in a majority position, by revoking the section of The City of Winnipeg Act put into place by the former member for Wolseley, Mr. Harold Taylor, when he was on the committee back in 1989, and put into place against the wishes and the votes of the Conservative government at the time, the provision which prevented construction of commercial buildings over waterways in this city.

That was an issue that he had been involved in and fought for, for many, many years. It was an issue that I came to when I came to represent the area, and it of course came to a crescendo when the owner of property immediately east of Omands Creek, the owner of a 500-yard piece of property, a strip going on the north side of Portage Avenue, decided to put up an office building and a car wash over Omands Creek, essentially destroying the linear green belt of Omands Creek Park and Bluestem Park in that part of the city.

Now this provision which was put into the act at the behest of Mr. Taylor was extremely progressive and was extremely popular, and that is important to note. I do not know where this government got its advice on that provision in having it repealed, but I received nothing but accolades, as did the former member for Wolseley, for putting that into place in the first place.

Let me just cite some of the supporters for that amendment. In particular, I recall the Real Estate News, the editorial page, a lengthy editorial proclaiming this amendment as progressive and necessary. Now, the Real Estate News has not, in my experience, been noted for its support generally of issues put forward by members of the Liberal Party, supported by members of the New Democratic Party as that was, but they did. They

took a stand; it was greatly appreciated, and I believe it correctly read and tapped the desire of Winnipeggers to start protecting our waterways.

What occurred in that proposal by that developer was that he was going to get around The Rivers and Streams Act by building a concrete platform which in no way diverted or impeded the flow of the river and did not affect the bank stabilization. With some very, very specific technical drawings and engineering plans the development was not going to kick into place, in other words, the rivers and streams provisions, and then the building and carwash could be built on top of the platform.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I recall that committee meeting. I recall the government of the day voting against that amendment but eventually putting it into place, because they wanted the rest of the bill to go forward. That, frankly, was a sign to me that minority government works, and worked then and worked quite well.

I really thought that once the reviews of that amendment were so positive, I thought the government might see the wisdom of the amendment and say, listen, we opposed it then but, obviously, the support is there. In fact, there was no one, to my knowledge, who did not support it, at least no one who got into contact with me except, of course, that specific developer.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, that unfortunately was not the case. Very shortly after the September 1990 election, very shortly after this government was returned with a majority, what did they do? They buried a provision in a City of Winnipeg amendment act deleting that section of The City of Winnipeg Act.

That, in my view, was a very regressive move environmentally. They referred the matter, of course, back to the City of Winnipeg, the same people who had consistently shown themselves willing to allow that type of incompatible destructive construction over Winnipeg's few but very important waterways.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the government of the day repealed that section with their new-found majority. It was a mistake. They sent it back to the City of Winnipeg, said, you deal with it in Plan Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg has not dealt with it. They have not brought in a by-law saying anything about construction over waterways.

Now the government finds itself in the position of having to demand that the city put into place some sort of by-law dealing with commercial construction over waterways. So, to that very limited extent, this could be seen as positive, because at least now they are saying to the city, look, you have to come up with a by-law saying something about construction over waterways. You cannot just leave it. We intend you to do something, but what this government has not done, has not been willing to do, is show any leadership with respect to the City of Winnipeg in showing the way towards sustainable development, showing the way towards environmental sensitivity and leading with respect to protecting our very important and, I might add, limited waterways in this city.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to have seen that provision applied province-wide. I believe it is a provision whose time had come back in 1989 when it was put in just with respect to the City of Winnipeg.

Obviously, the government does not feel the same way and is content to leave it to the City of Winnipeg—I again stress, the same people who consistently were willing to allow commercial construction over Omands Creek and other waterways in this city are content to leave it to them, to deal with this. This is an issue the province should show leadership on and should not shy away from letting the City of Winnipeg know, letting other municipalities know in this province, how they stand on the issue of waterways.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, they have taken this step and said to the city, now you must come up with a by-law. In that very limited sense and with the caveats of my prior comments, that the whole chain of events stemming from repealing that section has led to this, that could be seen as somewhat, and I stress somewhat, positive because at least the city is going to have to do something. Presumably some accountability will flow from their decision.

I hope, and I have got to say I do not expect, but I do hope that the city councillors see the wisdom of the initial provision put into place by Mr. Taylor, and with the assistance of both myself as the MLA for St. James and our caucus of the day, in putting the initial restriction into place. Madam Deputy Speaker, those are my comments.

Madam Deputy Speaker: As previously agreed, this bill will remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Deputy Speaker, I waive my opportunity to hold the bill. Our critic has articulated our concerns.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 78. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

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.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is third reading of Bill 78, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Alcock, Carstairs, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Driedger, Ducharme, Edwards, Enns, Filmon, Findlay, Gaudry, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Lamoureux, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

Nays

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Friesen, Hickey, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylycia-Leis, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 30, Nays 18.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

THIRD READINGS**Bill 98—The Manitoba
Multiculturalism Act**

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act; Loi sur le multiculturalisme au Manitoba, be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for third reading of Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act? Leave?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

Motion presented.

* (1620)

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlson): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to put some thoughts on the record with respect to Bill 98. It has been a bill that the government has made a commitment to as an extension of its multicultural policy. It is a bill that is important to Manitoba to ensure that laws reflect the multicultural nature of our society, and it is a bill that I hope that all Manitobans would support in principle.

Even though there is some dispute over the interpretation of multiculturalism, even over the application of multiculturalism and what it means, I would say that the intent of this bill is favourable and is positive, and I have said that a number of times. I have said that we support the bill and we support that Manitoba have a multicultural act.

I would remind particularly the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) that our party has a history and a commitment to all the visible minorities and ethnic minorities in our province, and that we have a long history of enacting human rights legislation we brought to the province.

We brought the Manitoba Intercultural Council to the province and The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act to the province. We brought a number of other services. We developed what has been called one of the best English as a Second Language programs to the province which this government has changed, has gone along with their Tory counterparts to change to make it less accessible and sensitive to people's needs.

I would remind the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) as well that developing the Settlement

Services Branch was also an initiative of our party when we were in government, that there is also a development of the immigrant access centre, and that we also developed an affirmative action program for the government.

I would also like to remind members in the House that the number of individuals who would be targeted in the visible minority category has decreased under this government, and it was due to the affirmative action program that our government, the NDP government, put into place that ensured that there was some equalization so that the Civil Service would reflect the multicultural and multiracial nature of our community.

This act that was promised by the government was delayed in such a way, I believe, to not allow full consideration and full debate by the public. We were waiting all session. It was promised in the throne speech. The government claims that they have been consulting on this. The real concern is why was it brought in so close to the summer holidays so that the communities were rushed to have their comments considered.

We saw no specific indications by the government on what was going to be included, and I was quite concerned when I contacted members of the Intercultural Council before the bill was tabled that they were not quite sure what was going to be included in this bill.

I guess I want to remind the House as well that this is not the Multicultural Secretariat act, that this is not the Multicultural Grants Advisory act, that this is the multicultural act that is supposed to encourage all of government to be sensitive to the needs of our multicultural, multiracial society. I think in the Free Press it used the phrase, "bureaucratic turf-splitting," to describe the bill. I am quite concerned that the bill is not going to go far enough in ensuring that the multicultural policy of the government is actually going to reach all of those individuals out there who want to be assured that there is a commitment by government that they have the right to promote and practise their culture.

That is what this bill is supposed to do. It is supposed to not only declare that citizens have that right, but it is supposed to declare that the government is committed to ensuring that right is upheld and supported by the government. It is supposed to ensure and recognize that one of our strengths is the diversity of our community cultures.

It is supposed to recognize that there is a tendency for minority cultures to be subsumed, if you will, and that there is a need for special programming to assist those communities, the need to promote and preserve their culture, to ensure that they are going to have the resources to do that.

It is important for that reason, I think—that is, the government has opened the door to including a policy section in this act, that they would make it a strong affirmation of their commitment to the kinds of initiatives that are going to ensure that that take place. I am not convinced that this act is doing that in as strong a way that a number of people would like to see it. I am concerned that there is not the strong commitment in the legislation to ensuring that there is heritage language programming; commitment to ensuring that there is employment equity; that there are services for newcomers so that they will be able to learn the official languages of our province and that they will be able to access all of the opportunities, the training opportunities, that they need to become full participants in our society.

I am not convinced that there is a strong enough commitment to promoting cross-cultural sensitivity throughout government agencies, and to develop that within the community at large. As I said earlier today in the House, I was concerned, and still am concerned, that there is not enough emphasis to deal with racial discrimination and to make a commitment to eliminating racial discrimination, as well as discrimination on the basis of religion, which is another aspect of multiculturalism that often goes unconsidered. The amendments that were proposed in the committee would have done all those things and it would have done it in a way that I had hoped would have been reasonable, because it would have drawn directly from the wording and the spirit of the government's own multicultural policy.

The other issue that is of great concern with respect to the bill is that it has left out the Manitoba Intercultural Council, and it has left out linking the Manitoba Intercultural Council with the other agencies and giving it some equal status in The Multiculturalism Act.

As I said, this is not the Multicultural Secretariat act or the Grants Advisory Commission act. This is the act that is supposed to be the multicultural act to bring together all of the policy and programs and a commitment to those policy and programs into one act.

We have said before that the minister had made a commitment that all of these issues would have been dealt with together. I notice that there were some news releases today from groups that made presentations that were saying that the avenue to go is to develop companion legislation to deal with employment equity and contract compliance. That is necessary to deal with the specifics of implementation, but I think that a commitment to that would also have been appropriate in the act.

* (1630)

That is directly the kind of recommendations that the Manitoba Intercultural Council was making. I think that the lack of consideration of those recommendations by the minister or the lack of follow through has caused us some concern with respect to her commitment to ensuring that there is a body like MIC that is there to advise government and has that grassroots community contact.

There was concern expressed at the hearings that in some ways this bill is in a quandary, because on the one hand it is talking about inclusiveness and equal participation and those ideals, that it has become politically inexpedient to not agree with. I sometimes question that that is the influence of this government, political expediency. I am concerned that the lack of commitment to having that grassroots agency that is going to link the legislation with the community and link the minister with the community is not part of the act. Having an act that is supposed to be about inclusiveness that does not specify how this is going to happen is indeed a limitation.

Mr. Speaker, there were a number of presenters at the hearings that felt that the process that this bill was created under and brought in was not as inclusive as it should have been. They were recommending that there be a delay.

So there are a couple of reasons for wanting a delay. One of them is because of the lateness of the tabling of the bill. I think that is especially true for a bill that is dealing with the kind of communities that we are dealing with in multiculturalism, the kind of organizations that would want to come out in full force to make their thoughts known on the legislation. But the other reason that the delay for the bill was recommended was that it should not happen until after the Manitoba Intercultural Council review has taken place.

There has been some concern, as I was saying earlier, about the government's commitment to that organization and its commitment to having democratically elected, grassroots community leaders advising the government. It is a concern that the government is trying to exert more control over MIC and that they are not being included in this act until that control is assured. They have done it in a number of ways. They have decreased the funding for the Intercultural Council; they have eliminated their community outreach staff; they have taken away their granting authority which gave them that much more importance in the community.

Another thing that I think they have done is they have influenced—some would even say, through the Secretariat—that they be preoccupied in this navel gazing of trying to reassess what their role should be. Well, until they did all those other things, the Intercultural Council was operating quite fine. But, by requiring them to continually reassess and reassess what their mandate is, the organization has not been as active in the community as it used to be.

It is also compounded, I think, because a number of the appointments, it has been suggested to me, who are on the council, do not support the council's existence. These are some of the things that have been suggested to me. So all of these kinds of things have been happening with MIC. Now there is going to be a review, and there is a lot of concern that review is not as independent as the minister claims.

I, for all of these reasons and for the reason most clearly of wanting this government to make a strong commitment to having the kind of grassroots democracy advising the minister on these issues that will be in place—Mr. Speaker, democracy is not a neat and tidy process at all times.

I am concerned with the minister's and the government's concern to exert some control over what was happening with MIC previously. It has been acknowledged that it was a very lively, active body that oftentimes engaged in some conflict. I have always said that I think that that kind of exchange is very healthy. That kind of exchange happening on a body such as this was healthy, especially if all those individuals who are engaged with MIC were representative and elected from their community.

I am concerned that cannot take place as well because of the number of political appointments and arrangements that have been included on the MIC executive. So I think that we have some legitimate reasons for concern that the review of MIC take place before the act is brought into force.

For that reason, I move, seconded by the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale),

THAT the motion of the Minister of Finance for third reading of Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act, be amended by deleting all the words after "THAT" and substituting the following: Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act, be not now read a third time, but be read a third time this day six months hence.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: This amendment is debatable.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of concerns that I want to put on the record with regard to the bill itself, but first what I want to do is to address the motion that has been brought forward by the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli).

I must say that I am somewhat disappointed. I am disappointed primarily because the member for Radisson obviously did not listen to what was being made in terms of presentations. She has obviously not been listening to the different ethnic communities. Her and I both—and I will acknowledge the member for Radisson attends a large number of events, as I do, as the minister responsible does.

I feel that this particular bill, even though there are all sorts of wonderful things that we too would like to see in this piece of legislation—we would love to see lots of wonderful things in this legislation. As we had pointed out in the committee, this is a starting point.

This is not the first time this Chamber is going to see a multicultural act. I am expecting the minister to follow through in the next session, based on recommendations, on a multicultural act, because failing that, we will be introducing amendments to the current act. Unfortunately, and I do not know if the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) realizes this, she is putting into jeopardy the multicultural act.

* (1640)

I am sure that if she consulted with the different ethnic groups she would find that the principles of

this particular act, in particular the area around Clause 2, is an area which should be passed, that there really is no need to delay it. What is the difference if we delay it today and have the act "hopefully" come back in next year?

There is no guarantee that the act would in fact come back if you move a six-month hoist. We could prorogue the session as we have done in the previous five sessions. Then we have to wait for the minister to take the initiative once again, as we have stood up on numerous occasions demanding the minister live up to the throne speech and bring forward a multicultural act.

Mr. Speaker, even though, as I say, there are a number of things that we would have liked to have seen in this act, we will be introducing a bill, a private members' bill in the next session in hope that we will see some positive changes to the multicultural act. We will say that we are disappointed that it did not go as far as we would have liked to have seen it gone, but we are going to acknowledge that this is as far as this particular government is willing to go on the multicultural act at this point in time.

I share many of the concerns that the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) has put on the record. We had suggested—we had heard during a throne speech from this government that the multicultural act will be introduced in this session, and it was only introduced a couple of short weeks ago. In fact, it was only called for second reading twice.

The community, the different ethnic groups and individuals, did not have an opportunity to give as much input as we would have liked to have seen them give, but I know—as the minister responsible, as the critic for the New Democratic Party, as I did—when the bill was introduced we ensured that we put out as much material and called as many individuals as possible, so that they would in fact be aware. There was an onus on us to consult and come back and report as to what we feel is the proper way to proceed with this particular bill.

I have come, or the Liberal Party has come, to the conclusion that this bill should be allowed to pass, and it should be allowed to pass when this session comes to an end. If the member for Rossmere were sincere in her comments—[interjection] Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), I stand corrected, I stand corrected. If the member for Radisson—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) just referred to the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) as the member for Rossmere. I do not think either of them would particularly care to be confused, especially on multiculturalism. So I would ask the member for Inkster to withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), the critic of the NDP party. If she were sincere in wanting the public to have more notice, that was an option. Why did she not just stand and continue speaking on Bill 98? Why did she not argue—

Mr. Ashton: You would not let her.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the House leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Ashton) says I would not let her. It is not up to me to decide. The rules allow for every member of this Chamber to speak. She could even have done what I did and taken the Leader's designate, but she and the New Democratic Party were quite content to see Bill 98 pass this Chamber as it was. They knew there was a majority government. There was only one party in this Chamber that was arguing for change and put that as a condition in order to get out of here.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Ms. Cerilli: On a point of order, I think that if anyone in the Chamber or outside the Chamber checked the Hansard, they will see on the committee that I proposed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: I want to address how consistent the New Democratic Party was in committee. They introduced an amendment, an amendment that is two pages. It is fairly extensive, and it virtually took from, verbatim I understand, in terms of the policy, the government's policy. My question to the member was: Has she consulted with anyone? Has she consulted with MIC?

Her response was: Well, I have talked to a couple of individuals of MIC and possibly some other people. She did not, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): What is the harm?

Mr. Lamoureux: The member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) said: What is the harm?

Well, I had abstained from voting, and I want to tell the member why I abstained from voting—because right after that I moved a motion in which the member for Rossmere—Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) voted on, and that amendment was, acknowledge and respond, and this is for the minister's responsibilities: (e) acknowledge and respond to issues brought to the minister's attention by the Manitoba Intercultural Council established under the Manitoba Intercultural Council, and to consult with that council on all proposed changes to this act.

Mr. Speaker, she voted for that. She has a double standard. Here she introduces with no notice to myself a lengthy amendment, no recommendations, no assurances from the member for Rossmere that she had a consensus from MIC—for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli).

Mr. Speaker, I will say right now, whenever I say Rossmere, replace it with the word Radisson.

She cannot have it both ways, and she tried to get it both ways. Now, the reason why I bring this up is because the member for Rossmere—Radisson—had ample opportunity—my apologies to the member for Rossmere.

* (1650)

Point of Order

Mr. Harold Neufeld (Rossmere): I believe that three times now the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has confused me with the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli). I think I deserve an apology.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, knowing the support for the multicultural community that the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) has, I will apologize for making reference to him, because I know he too wants to see this bill pass.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I emphasize this is because with all sincerity the New Democratic Party had an opportunity to ensure that the debate

occurred and they have forgone that opportunity. Now they are introducing a motion, if it were to pass, that could jeopardize The Multicultural Act. Now, I know and I have concerns in terms of what the New Democratic Party's real position is on this act, and the reason why I say that is because during second reading, you will recall, I asked for a recorded vote. The reason why I asked for a recorded vote was because I was interested, given the remarks that were put on the record from the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) in what it is, if they were going to vote for it or against it. Now, I turned to my colleagues and suggested that they watch what the member for Radisson said, and she said no. That is the reason why I asked for a recorded vote. Did she mean no? She ended up coming back in saying yes.

Point of Order

Mr. Ashton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I mean, we allow some latitude in debate on bills, and I think we have allowed particular latitude, but it is not in order for the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to now be debating essentially what he thought happened on the second reading vote. We had the second reading vote. It was very clear what had happened, very clear in terms of anyone who was in this House, and whatever opinions the member for Inkster had, or whatever delusions he should save to himself and not waste the time of the Legislature. He is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised, I would like to remind the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) that what is before the House at this time is the hoist motion as moved by the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), and I would ask the honourable member for Inkster to keep his remarks relevant to said amendment.

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, what I have been suggesting, for those that are questioning the relevance, and I know that the NDP feel very sensitive on this, is that it is relevant. Mr. Speaker, if the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) is willing to stand up and say that is not in fact the case, I will apologize to the member.

Having said these few words on this particular motion, I am going to encourage all members of this House, of this Chamber, in particular the member for Radisson and her caucus, to really think about what it is that she is saying, think about what it is that

she is doing. I recommend to the caucus to not allow this amendment to pass, because if it were to—even without the NDP support I am sure it will be defeated. I would conclude by saying that we will be voting against the member for Radisson's amendment, and I will put the rest of my remarks on the record once we get into the third reading, in hopes that this bill will, in fact, pass.

Thank you.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, a motion to hoist is not a denial. It is merely a deferment; it is a postponement. Any fair-minded person will acknowledge the importance of the very introduction of The Multiculturalism Act in Manitoba, but we have to look into the quality of the act itself, whether it is dealing with the multicultural aspects of our society or not.

This is simply the shell of a very insidious development in the governing of the multicultural community. We should not forget that a culture is the totality of a people's shared values, of what they hold desirable or important, including their collective accomplishments, their common goals and hopes for the future.

This Multiculturalism Act is defective in two aspects. It is a basic derogation of democratic principle, because the act is substituting a nonelected, nonappointed body in the form of a Multicultural Grants Advisory Council in place of a grassroots representative democratic body known as the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

It is a basic doctrine of democracy, one of the shared values of every enlightened and civilized society, that the authority and power to govern derives from the consent of the governed. I repeat that basic principle of democracy. The authority and power to govern derives from the consent of those who are governed. Once this is denied, and it is denied because of this substitution and replacement of a representative, democratically elected body with an appointed, autocratically, unilaterally selected body to exercise the decision-making power which affects the affairs and fortunes of the multicultural communities.

Therefore, we are trying to delay this very magnificent milestone in the advance of multiculturalism in this province because of this denial of a basic, and fundamental, democratic principle.

Another odious, unacceptable development within the framework of what apparently is a desirable multicultural act is the insidious centralization, concentration and autocratization of power. Let me be specific and cite the evidence.

Section 6 states: "the minister may establish an office, to be operated by the secretariat, to provide practical assistance to groups and individuals in dealing with departments or agencies of the government."

Section 7: "the minister may make grants for the purposes of this Act out of money appropriated by the Legislature for those purposes." The word "may" implies the opposite. The minister may not.

"May" means "may" or "may not," so that it is entirely within the unbounded discretion of the minister—with due respect to the present occupant of that position—it is simply an unbounded discretionary power on the part of that office—I am talking of the office, not of the person—to establish or not to establish a secretariat, an access office, for the benefit of the multicultural community to grant or not to grant

* (1700)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) will have 35 minutes remaining.

The hour being 5 p.m., time for private members' hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on House business, again I would ask for leave of the House to call the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections at 7 p.m. tonight in Room 255 to consider the review of the judicial compensation proposal.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to call said committee?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. It has been agreed to.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 24—Economic Summit

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, as per agreement between

the three parties, we are prepared to provide unanimous consent to the Leader of the opposition party (Mr. Doer) to bring forward a resolution that is on the Order Paper at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Which one?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, it is not in order, but we waive the condition that we speak from the top, and it can be brought forward, and I will let the Leader of the Opposition address the specific resolution.

Mr. Speaker: Which resolution do you want to bring forward at this time? Which number?

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Number 24.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to bring forward Resolution 24 of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), Economic Summit. Is there leave?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: There is leave.

Mr. Doer: I move, seconded by the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis)

WHEREAS Manitobans across the province from all sectors of the economy are concerned about the impact of the recession; and

WHEREAS unemployment is rising, people are being forced out of work because of free trade and other economic forces; and

WHEREAS northern Manitoba has the highest unemployment of any region in the country; and

WHEREAS there is no labour force strategy that focuses on the need for training and retraining; and

WHEREAS jobs in the transportation sector are being devastated by the deregulated free trade environment; and

WHEREAS farmers are losing their livelihood and the rural infrastructure is being eroded rapidly; and

WHEREAS Manitobans from across the province have a variety of ideas, solutions, and innovative strategies that can help pull us out of this recession;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba recommend that the Premier consider convening an economic summit immediately which includes farmers, labour leaders, business leaders and other concerned Manitobans that would work together with the

government to find solutions and new ideas to help resolve our economic crisis.

Motion presented.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, this resolution may finally reach consensus in this Chamber, and I would hope that all members likely voted last evening who supported the resolution.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) looks up from his seat like the cat that swallowed the canary, but I would note that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) today acknowledged the fact that an economic summit is a good idea. In fact, 30 business leaders that are now part of the Economic Innovation group and the two labour members that are part of that group, and the few academics that are part of that group are making the same recommendation.

Now, I have asked this question in the Chamber 10 times at least in the last six months, and the Premier says it is a bad idea. Fine, if he wants to say it is a bad idea because the NDP is asking for it, so be it, but if he wants to acknowledge the merit of the idea because his own Economic Innovations Council has now recommended the same thing as what the opposition has been recommending for the last year and a half, so be it. I do not care who gets credit for it, Mr. Speaker. I just want it to happen.

I think if this Legislature supports it, along with the economic innovation council of the government, fine. So let us not play games and amend it, and let us not play games and debate it into six o'clock. Let us give the force of this Legislature as reinforcement to the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) commitment today in Question Period, wherein he stated, as I recall correctly, and I have not got Hansard, that he has already received a similar recommendation from the Economic Innovation Committee of cabinet, and that they will be proceeding accordingly in the fall.

So we do not have to waste a lot of time debating this or speaking it out or amending it or whatever else, because really we should just agree that a summit is good for us. If you look at the RESOLVED, the summit that we are recommending—and the RESOLVED is the operative section of any resolution—the RESOLVED basically says that we recommend to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). I know the government will not like all the WHEREASes and that is fine, but we are dealing with the RESOLVED, because that is the motion that goes on the records of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it basically says that all of us, farmers, labour, business, and government should be working together to develop a consensus to deal with our economic crisis, to find solutions and new ideas. Now there is not one word in the RESOLVED, I would suggest, that members of this Legislature can disagree with, not one word in the RESOLVED. In the WHEREASes I know we will disagree, we have traded statistics around this House long enough, we can disagree with—let us just state that disagreement as a given. Let us not restate it.

There is a tremendous advantage, in my opinion, of people working together. Our strength in this province is our people. We do not have all the proper locations in terms of being close to all the large markets, although we have a tremendous location in terms of time zones and geographic location. We have some assets in raw resources. We have some assets in a diversified economy, in manufacturing, in agriculture, in mining, in forestry, in service sector, in some health care sectors.

We have some advantages in terms of a highly skilled work force in our province. We have other advantages, Mr. Speaker, but our greatest advantage has always been the people of this province. When we ask the people of this province to work together, they are generally much better than one sector or another sector of the economy working apart.

If the business community is only working with the government, or if the labour community is only working with the government, or if the agricultural sector is only working with the government, in isolation from each other, they are obviously presenting their agenda. But when you get them working together, in the same room faced with the same challenges and the same economic reality, they come up with ideas, and they develop consensus that provides the kind of agenda for government that I think is really necessary in this province.

We were in last place last year in economic performance. I know the government says now, that was last year, this is this year, and the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has been raising a lot of very important statistics as well, but that does not mean that we should just develop our agenda for the economy as if it is business as usual. It means that we should use new ways of reaching out.

* (1710)

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of sitting in on an economic summit with people from the business community, and labour community, and government community in the early '80s. I remember sitting in a room with Kevin Kavanagh; Otto Lang; Howard Pawley—at the time I was not in government—Vic Schroeder; Muriel Smith—I cannot remember all the other people—I think a person from the National Farmers' Union; Jackie Skelton; the former president of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce who is now on the board of directors of the Environmental Sustainable Development Centre, Mr. McGinnis.

There was a terrific amount of discussion that went on, and it was all focused on, not what can this province do for me, but what can we do for this province collectively. I believe if the government were to call this summit together, they would get the same kind of advice from all different groups as what I thought we had in the early '80s.

You know, many of the health initiatives that are being announced by the government today came out of a consensus from people, from Manitobans. They were from Manitobans from all walks of life and from all political parties. I mean, we know what Otto Lang's politics were, and we know what other members of that body were. But they all came there, not with political uniforms or not with uniforms from the sector of the economy that they represented, they came there as Manitobans to work together.

Mr. Speaker, this was the first summit in Canada. It was in Manitoba. People studied this from far and wide. Some of the experience was used in Australia. Some of the experience was used in other countries. In fact, even Brian Mulroney's staff came in here, after his election in '84, for his first summit when Stanley Hartt was putting that together. Unfortunately, that federal summit was more of a public relations summit than a real substantive summit where you really do develop an agenda and a consensus.

Mr. Speaker, right now, in British Columbia, a province which is now predicted to lead the country, there was an economic summit two weeks ago, the business community, the labour community, and the government. There was a tremendous amount of consensus about how B.C. should work together, how the various sections in the British Columbia

economy should work together to develop an agenda for British Columbia.

(Madam Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Madam Deputy Speaker, I only refer to the reports from the Economic Council of Canada, and the reports, even some of the people who are economic gurus that are studied by members opposite, I think, many reports about the Canadian economy have identified the same problem.

Canada has to be a country where greater productivity is achieved through greater consensus and greater co-operation. Countries like West Germany and Japan and some other northern European countries that have all of the groups working together are doing better than those countries that have groups working against each other, where there is constant conflict.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would encourage the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) to go door to door with the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) in the next provincial election. [interjection] Well, okay, I will stop that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have also suggested to the government, with the greatest respect, that we go with an all-party committee on the economy. We are pledged, also, to have an all-party committee on the economy like we did on the constitution. So Resolution 25 as opposed to Resolution 24—and I would hope the member for Lakeside reminds his cabinet and his caucus that we did offer and we continue to offer our complete co-operation on an all-party committee on the economy.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that is off the topic, because I believe this resolution for all parties of Manitoba and our economy to have an economic summit is indeed an idea that is long overdue. There are too many good ideas and good people in this province to be left off in their separate sectors to be dealing with the government and leaving the government on an individual basis. We get that as opposition parties.

We get groups coming to us, manufacturing groups, small-business groups, farmers, labour groups, environmental groups, we get them coming to us. But I like sitting in the room with everybody together because then you are not saying, we want you to do this. We are developing an agenda through much more consensus, through debate and through discussions about what the winning and

losing industries of Manitoba will be now, and what we could do to create jobs and opportunities in the future, what kind of infrastructure do we need in terms of our labour force adjustment strategy and labour market training to get us there.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, this idea is not revolutionary. This idea is not difficult to accept. If we see the government amend it or if we see the government speak it out, we will know where the government is at. Where they are at is that they cannot even give the Premier (Mr. Filmon) a recommendation from this Legislature to support the recommendation they have from their own economic innovation fund.

I am not going to speak any longer. The countries of the world that are successful have a co-operative relationship with business, labour, agriculture and government. The provinces that right now are predicted to be No. 1 in the economy have developed a co-operation between business, labour and government—the Harcourt government of British Columbia.

We must do the same thing. If we fail to do so, we do so at our continued peril. I urge all members of this Legislature to not play parliamentary games with this resolution but to support it and let us get on with the rest of the business of this House.

Thank you very, very much.

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to rise to put a few comments on the record as it relates to the resolution before us today. It is actually encouraging to hear the Leader of the Opposition start to talk about people working together in partnerships because, based on his comments over the last few months, one would certainly wonder in terms of the lack of confidence that he far too often shows and his party far too often shows in this House in terms of Manitobans and their ability to compete and produce, and compete with people throughout the world.

That is something that our government works on day in and day out, each and every day interacting with Manitobans, dealing with Manitobans in terms of how to improve the economic situation of our province. That has led to some innovative approaches to economic development that I feel will produce very positive results for Manitobans over the weeks, months and years ahead.

That is what has led to programs like Grow Bonds that get the communities themselves involved, the people of communities coming forward and investing their hard-earned money in economic opportunities in their local communities—a very innovative and aggressive economic development capital fund for rural Manitoba.

That also led to a program that I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer)—he did support, I believe, the Crocus Fund, the establishment of the second employee-ownership fund in all of Canada. In fact, this one has some unique features, has, once again, government and labour working together; the Grow Bonds, government and rural Manitobans working together.

The Vision Fund is the fund that is able to take equity positions and profitable companies, again, an opportunity for government to interact with, in this case, the private sector. They put money into the fund. Government puts money into the fund. Once again, a capital resource that is available for Manitobans to invest in their economic future, Madam Deputy Speaker.

So day in and day out we have an opportunity to interact with Manitobans and work on the economy and the economic development of our province. I go back to February 17, which, I believe, was the first or second day of our session, when the members across, the members of the opposition, brought in a motion for a matter of urgent public importance. [interjection] February 17 was the date; I have got a copy of Hansard in front of me.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we all agreed unanimously in this House to support a matter of urgent public importance and have a debate. But what was disturbing is the void—it is a repeat, and I have to do this occasionally to be sure that my point gets home with members of the opposition. What is showing is that, if you go back in Hansard and read some of the debate of that day, the complete lack of substance and ideas coming from the opposition.

A forum, an opportunity to put some fundamental principles, some ideas, some innovation on the record in terms of their vision, their ideas, what direction Manitoba's economy should go. What do we get? Nothing. No substance, no ideas, no concrete proposals, nothing in terms of any positive recommendations. I do not even believe—I have got the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Doer) comments; I am not even sure he refers to his

summit back then. But, Madam Deputy Speaker, clearly a forum for them to come forward with some of their ideas and to stimulate debate—sorely lacking in terms of any substance.

When it comes to the economic development of Manitoba, we have a plan; we have a program that we have worked out with Manitobans. There are many elements to it, and I wish I had the time to walk through it systematically, so that once again the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and his party could start to develop a better appreciation and understanding.

* (1720)

I will touch on just a few fundamental aspects of economic development. One is that they seem to miss far too often is the value of a positive economic climate for your province or for your region. One need look no further than the days of the NDP government from 1982 to 1987 to realize how they do not comprehend that very fundamental, that very important aspect of economic development.

I have read some of these into the record in the past, but I have to admit, they are worth repeating for the benefit of the members across the way in terms of recalling what they did during their term of office in terms of economic development, and the detriment and the impact they had in a negative aspect, Madam Deputy Speaker, to the economy of Manitoba.

I will only touch on a few of them in terms of the increase in retail sales tax from 5 percent to 7 percent, introduced and increased the payroll tax 2 1/4 percent a payroll, introduced a personal net income tax and surtax, increased corporation income tax from 15 percent to 17 percent. The list goes on and on, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I have read it into the record before, and I am sure the members can look back in Hansard. The total cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba of those tax policies, \$820 million, creating an environment in Manitoba which was the second highest overall tax zone in all of Canada. Talk about deterring economic development with those kinds of tax policies.

If you look at Manitoba today in terms of our positioning within Canada we are now positioned approximately sixth in terms of the total tax climate of Manitoba, much more favourable and creating a much more solid foundation, Madam Deputy Speaker, for economic development in our

province. Anybody who is in this Chamber who thinks that there is a quick fix to economic development is not in the real world. Some have tried by taking taxpayers' hard-earned money and squandering it in some respects in terms of the attempts at economic development in ventures that ended up going out of business, costing the taxpayers money.

We can go back again to the time frame of '82 to '87 and look at the dollar losses in many of our Crown corporations and some of the poor investments of the government of the day totalling over those five years approximately \$500 million, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we take the hard-earned tax dollars of Manitobans very seriously, and it is with that in mind that we have dealt very frugally with our expenditures, and that is a major part of the economic climate that you create is in terms of how you as government lead by example in terms of controlling your own costs and creating, again, a positive economic climate.

I want to talk about a couple of other programs. We have talked a lot, and I know the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) has expressed concerns on many occasions about training and the value of education, and we agree with that—fundamental to economic development. It was with that in mind that our government brought in the Workforce 2000 program, Madam Deputy Speaker. If you look at the statistics for 1991-92 some 15,000 employees benefitted through the utilization of Workforce 2000 and the anticipation is that is the program that will continue to be utilized extensively, and one of many programs that is being utilized to enhance and promote skill development and further training in terms of the employee base and the labour pools of Manitoba.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) I think spends a great deal of time going through economic indicators and attempting to define the gloomiest and the doomiest that he can, but if you look through the list today and look at the projections for Manitoba, Madam Deputy Speaker—and I will not walk through all of them—if you look at the economic growth, while no province within Canada is pleased with the projections in '92, Manitoba is projected to be third in the country in terms of economic growth for 1992. Next year we are projected to have the fourth best growth rate in all of Canada.

In terms of capital investment in the manufacturing sector we are expected to lead the nation, an increase of some 31 percent, whereas Canada as a nation is actually dropping by 4.2 percent. In terms of manufacturing shipments, Madam Deputy Speaker, last month we had the best growth amongst all provinces within Canada. In terms of bankruptcies, again, we heard today in the House that in 1991 Manitoba business bankruptcies declined by 1.7 percent, the second best of all provinces within Canada. In terms of our unemployment rate we continue to have the third lowest unemployment rate in all of Canada, and you can look at housing starts, and you look at retail sales, we are comparing very favourably and we are above the Canadian average in all of those areas. So when you look at the projections for Manitoba in 1992 and 1993, using the traditional indicators, most analysts are suggesting that Manitoba is on the rise.

Just a couple of other brief points I want to make. An interesting survey was done by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, which is really a majority of small businesses. They did a survey of almost 16,000 of their members. The questions related to conditions necessary for firms to hire more employees than presently planned. The biggest concern, the concern of 80 percent of them, was that increase in customer demand occurs. They need more consumer demand and so on. That makes sense; I think we all recognize that. That is something that is required. Consumer confidence throughout our nation in terms of consumer spending will certainly stimulate our economy.

The second biggest area of concern was more confidence in provincial government. That was some 54 percent, I believe—expressed that as the second major concern in terms of hiring more employees than presently planned: obviously a concern for small businesses. But when you look at the provincial breakdowns, while within Canada it was 44.7 percent, I should correct, Manitoba was down to 26.2 percent, the lowest of any province, clearly showing that the business community within Manitoba is telling us that by and large the policies of this provincial government are on the right track. You go to Ontario—52.7 percent, double the rate in Manitoba in terms of confidence of business in the job that their government is doing.

So I encourage the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and his party: get out and talk to some of these people. Talk to them about what they want.

Talk to them about taxes; talk to them about government expenditures. Talk to them about the kind of economic environment that should be created in this province for long-term growth and long-term quality jobs, and you will get the answers. You will get the answers that will concur with many of the things that this government is doing, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Prior to concluding, I want to speak very briefly about the Economic Innovation and Technology Council. We had the bill at committee just the other day. We have 29 outstanding Manitobans serving on that committee, many important functions in terms of the development of innovation and technology in our province, a fundamental part of their role. It is spelled out within the act, the enhancement of awareness and the dialogue and so on with the stakeholders of Manitoba, which really are all Manitobans.

We have a great deal of confidence in that committee which has business, has labour, has academic and research and is well represented with some outstanding Manitobans who are going to help this government and Manitobans to continue to grow and prosper. We are very pleased with the job that they are doing to date.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

It was with that in mind that I want to move the following amendment. I move, seconded by the member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) that Resolution 24 be amended by deleting all words from the second clause beginning with the word WHEREAS and all subsequent clauses, and replacing them with the following:

WHEREAS Manitobans across the province from all sectors of the economy are concerned about the impact of the recession; and

WHEREAS the government of Manitoba has worked through these difficult economic times to establish an environment that is conducive to investment in and expansion of existing and new industry and business; and

WHEREAS the economic future of Manitoba depends on its ability to create and apply new ideas that make it more competitive in the global economy; and

WHEREAS efforts in support of enhanced competitiveness must be both intensive and ongoing; and

WHEREAS the government of Manitoba has established the Economic Innovation and Technology Council involving members from labour groups, businesses, academic and community sectors, as well as other concerned sectors of Manitobans; and

WHEREAS the role of the council is to provide a forum for consultation and dialogue between government, business, labour, research community and the general public and to bring together all groups with a stake in research and the growth of our economy.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba fully support the province's new Economic Innovation and Technology Council in its efforts to foster economic development and to support economic restructuring through innovation and the development and commercialization of technology so as to enable Manitoba to compete effectively in a global market economy; and endorse the Economic Innovation and Technology Council's efforts to provide a forum for dialogue and to sponsor interaction between and among stakeholders.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion presented.

* (1730)

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, you know this government is so two-faced on these things. They talk all day long about providing positive ideas and the first time they get one that we actually can debate in this Legislature with an opportunity to vote on it, they put in a self-serving amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), just sitting there, making the comparison between a debate in this Legislature and the economic summit that we have proposed in this legislation, shows us why this Premier is stewarding a province that was in last place in 1991 and in last place in many of the private-sector indicators. He is all public relations and absolutely no substance. The member talks about the—he is happy about a last place performance in 1991. They talk about what is going to happen in '92 and '93. You know, Mr. Speaker, by the end of 1993, Manitoba will not be back to where they were on January 1 of 1991 in terms of growth, investment and opportunities in this province. Three years of stagnation, three years of absolute treadmill economic development under the leadership of the Premier as chairperson of the

Economic Committee of cabinet, and they give us these absolutely hypocritical amendments, self-serving amendments, in this Chamber.

We had a chance today to recommend to the Premier that he follow through on what he actually confirmed in Question Period today, on calling an economic summit of business, labour, farmers and government. That was the resolution—not the all-party committee, that was the other resolution—that was the resolution before the Chamber. That is something that just took place in British Columbia two weeks ago. No wonder Mike Harcourt and the government of British Columbia is predicted by all the economic people across Canada to be in first place this year and the year after and the year after that.

An Honourable Member: So I suppose Chinese money has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Doer: It does have something to do with it, but I would encourage the Premier to look at the successful countries now in the world. They have co-operation with business, labour and government on developing our economy. Now I want to know why the Premier could oppose a resolution and have to amend a resolution that said, "Therefore be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly of Manitoba recommend that the Premier consider convening an economic summit immediately which includes farmers, labour leaders, business leaders and other concerned Manitobans that would work together with the government to find solutions and new ideas to help resolve our economic crisis."

So, Mr. Speaker, the Premier plays politics and his caucus plays politics with the resolution. That is what it comes down to, because the Premier on eight occasions in this Chamber said that having an economic summit was a bad idea.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Doer: I will give him the Hansard. A number of other times the Premier said having an all-party committee dealing with the economy was a bad idea because this Chamber was the place to debate. He had two different answers to the question. Now that the NDP has recommended it for a year and a half to deal with the dismal economic performance of the Premier and his government, something that has been identified by our caucus and by the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) on a daily basis to deal with this last-place performance, they amend it, because now the Premier is going to convene one because

his own economic innovation committee is saying the same thing. Business is saying the same thing as the NDP in terms of this resolution, saying this Premier needs new ideas and needs to develop a consensus in this province. Hallelujah, the Premier has confirmed today that he has finally changed his opinion, his stubbornness on this issue, and finally has admitted that this government is bankrupt of ideas and needs an economic summit to get this economy going.

Mr. Speaker, you know the Premier (Mr. Filmon) says he does not like to look at what he said in the past, and I do not blame him. I do not blame him. You know, when we asked the question in December, he said, oh, I am looking at the future, I am looking at '92. When we asked the question a year ago, he said, oh, I do not want to deal with what just happened the last year, I want to deal with what is happening in the next year.

Well, let us take a look at what he said six months ago about what was going to happen when he lectured us about asking him about his performance. First of all, we found out three months later he was a last-place government on economic growth which measures private and public sector investment. He was in last place in many of the private sector indicators. This was after he told us a year ago, all he was going to do was step aside. I am a step-aside Premier, I am a step-aside kind of person. I will just sit in my office and just let the thing go along and hopefully it will work its way out. I will just step aside and let things work themselves out.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the results. You have got the report card, last place—last place in terms of private sector investment in many categories, second last in terms of manufacturing investment, last place in terms of residential construction investment, second only to Newfoundland in some other investment factors, declines of 30 and 40 percent in many of these private sector places.

Well, December, he said, just look at the future. Do not look at the past, that is negative, look to the future. Fine, six months later, we look at what the Premier (Mr. Filmon) said to look at in terms of the future. He said to us, 4 percent growth in December, the first Question Period of this Chamber, 4 percent growth. What are the growth predictions right now?—1.1. He is wrong.

* (1740)

He said to us the unemployment rate would be 8.7 per cent. It is 9.7 per cent, it is averaging 5,000 more people than what the Premier predicted. Wrong again. He said to us, look at the manufacturing jobs in this province. They are down 5,000 from December of 1991 when this Chamber first sat. Wrong again.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the Premier for saying, look at '98 and '99 and 2000, because he does not want to look at what he said a year ago. He does not want to look at what happened on the bottom line a year ago. If he brought this bottom line to a group of shareholders or a nonprofit organization, they would fire him. Last place, they would fire him; 10 out of 10, dead last, they would fire him.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows that is true. He knows that is true. Last place for economic performances for most people means you are out the door. They will try somebody else. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was in a caucus that left a \$55 million surplus, and I will go not by the record for the Premier (Mr. Filmon) opposite, I will go with the record and absolute empirical evidence of the auditor's report.

Mr. Speaker, this government promised—I remember the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) when he was in opposition; I remember the member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) when he was in the opposition; I remember the hotshot Leader of the opposition who was called the mouse that roared at that point when he was in opposition.

They said that they would always balance the books. They used to lecture the former Premier Pawley about the finances. So they inherit a situation where they are getting \$4 million a month in surplus revenue. It was not all because of the former government, some of it was because of revenues in mining, some of it was because of equalization and some of it was because of the actions of the former government.

The bottom line is that when he walked into the Premier's office, he was getting \$4 to \$5 million a month more than what the province was spending on all costs. Mr. Speaker, when you take the Fiscal Stabilization Fund and read the auditor's comments about his action, he is now spending \$530 million. So you are now spending—[interjection] Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows that the interest payments in Manitoba, when

they took office, were one of the lowest in Canada—[interjection] Well, I will show them again the Toronto Dominion Bank statement. The \$55 million surplus that he inherited included interest rate payments.

The swing of the deficit under this Premier (Mr. Filmon) has been \$600 million. Howard Pawley's swing went from Sterling Lyon's deficit of \$280 million, and it was about a \$400 million swing and then it went down. You know what, and I know they do not like this and I know they will not admit this, I know they will not like this, but the member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) has run the deficit up \$600 million and he has not told us yet what he is going to do about it.

He is doing the same thing as Grant Devine. Well, they laugh. Conservatives—that is right, it is not so funny, because it is a lot of change in terms of the deficit and the financial situation of this province. We have a situation now where private sector investment, and the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has identified many of those factors and we have identified many of those factors, is way down below 1988 levels. Employment is down below 1988 levels; good-paying jobs in manufacturing, research and development, telecommunications, transportation are all down. The population is stagnating. We have less people today than 12 months ago in this province, just exactly the same as Sterling Lyon.

(Madam Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Madam Deputy Speaker, what have we got to show for it? We have a very serious problem. So, when we propose an economic summit, which I thought was a rather innocent recommendation, something that West Germany and Japan and other leading industrial nations do in terms of economic development and co-operation, this government amends it and plays self-serving games, Madam Deputy Speaker.

They congratulate themselves on their Economic Committee of Cabinet chaired by the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the council now that is costing the taxpayers about \$880,000 a year, and we have not seen one dollar of benefit for the people of Manitoba in terms of results.

Madam Deputy Speaker, when we start seeing employment levels above 1988, when we start seeing manufacturing jobs above 1988, when we start seeing transportation jobs above 1988, when

we see research and development jobs above 1988, when we start seeing population growths year over year higher than what we saw in the '80s, when we start seeing some bottom lines, we will say, hallelujah.

But, on every major economic indicator, this Premier (Mr. Filmon), this member from Tuxedo, has failed the people of Manitoba. I know he has ridden a little post-Meech Lake surfboard to what he thinks to be economic success, but on all the economic indicators this Premier has failed. He is in last place and self-serving amendments will not get Manitobans working.

Thank you very, very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am delighted to follow the mouth that roared.

Mr. Doer: You are the mouse that roared. I have the cartoon and I will bring it tonight.

Mr. Filmon: You are the mouth that roared. I have not developed a lisp. [interjection] Well, I think perhaps my writers should go over and assist the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer); that was quite a contribution he made.

At least when he was the president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, from time to time he came up with some reasonable contributions, as when he said that the New Democratic Party's Jobs Fund, all it did was plant flowers on the side of the highway and put in signs all over the province.

Then, of course, when he called his now colleagues "white-wine socialists," I remember that one very, very well. He also called them fraudulent from time to time. Of course, that was before they offered him the leadership of the party and then he said, oh, I have changed. You are all nice people. Where do I sign?

Madam Deputy Speaker, we know the principles of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). He says, I have principles, and if you do not like those, I have got another set of principles over here that you might like.

In any case, the issue here is not the matter of an economic summit. The matter of an economic summit is a good idea. It is a good idea, but it is not a partisan idea. It is not an idea that is the domain of a political party, and it should be appropriately

conducted by somebody who does not have political motivation, such as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) or the Leader of the government, for that matter.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): You do not call the state of the economy a political issue?

Mr. Filmon: The member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) thinks that the state of the economy should be a matter of a political issue. She thinks that it ought to be the matter that she could use for cheap, partisan purposes. We believe that the economy is too important for that. We believe that the economy should be a matter of getting everybody together to work for the betterment of our province.

That is why it is absolutely essential that something like the Economic Innovation and Technology Council ought to do that, because it has representation from organized labour; it has representation of people who are involved in economic development measures for our aboriginal community; it has people involved from the farm sector, from the rural sector, from the manufacturing sector, from the service sector, from all sectors of the economy.

* (1750)

People who are not there because of their partisanship; people who are not there because of their political leanings; people who are there because they want to contribute to the structuring of a new, improved and strengthened economy in this province, because we are going through very, very difficult times across this country.

Country-wide there is a massive restructuring taking place, a massive restructuring that is seeing us move from a production economy to an information-based economy. I can tell you that in some provinces that restructuring is absolutely just devastating. The province of Ontario has lost 150,000 manufacturing jobs that will never come back again. That is not because of any particular political decision. That is there because of the fact that there is a restructuring taking place as we move from this production-based economy to an information-based economy. What we need to do, of course, is to recognize that change, to evaluate what it means for this province and to utilize the forces that are out there, all of the forces that are working for a better Manitoba: the labour community, the business community, the innovators, the people from the academic

community, the farm community, all elements of society to work together to make this transition.

It is that transition that is going to be the biggest, single challenge that we and every other province in this country face. So to go and take a look and blithely identify for their own partisan purposes the number of jobs that have been lost in manufacturing because factories that no longer can compete in the new era of economy—[interjection] No. It is the businesses that cannot compete, very clearly. You see, the members opposite were not even listening when the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) pointed out what businesses are saying, what the Canadian Federation of Independent Business is saying about what it is that is preventing them from investing.

In other provinces it is their lack of confidence in provincial government policy. In fact, in provinces such as Ontario, twice as many, over 50 percent of the businesses are saying that they are not investing because of a lack of confidence in provincial government policy. That is not the case in Manitoba, not the case. Half that number, 26 percent give that as a response. They cite many, many other areas as being important to them.

Of course, in every province they talk about the tax regime, because in order to be competitive the tax regime is paramount in their bottom line. In this province, this is the only province in the country that five straight years has not raised any of the major taxes, has not imposed any additional burden on individual Manitobans or the business community despite the fact that we were left with a situation by the New Democrats, who want to talk about their growth in government, the growth that was all based on the tax dollars that they confiscated from the public in order to feed into the economy to create artificial growth. That is all that growth was, and the only thing that we had left to show for it by 1988 was the second highest overall tax regime in the country and a per-capita debt that was amongst the highest in the country, leaving us with annual interest costs of \$550 million. You want to talk about growth? I will talk about growth.

When Howard Pawley took government in 1981, \$100 million a year was going to interest costs. When he left government it was \$550 million a year. That is growth—growth in interest payments annually; growth in the amount of taxes that they had to take away from the people of Manitoba in order to pay for that interest cost on the debt that

they created. That is the only growth that the people experienced of a long-term nature out of New Democratic policies.

That is the kind of administration we are dealing with. [interjection] Come and listen. If you cannot take it, do not leave, please. You see, Madam Deputy Speaker, the truth hurts. When New Democrats are faced with the reality of their policies, with the effect that their policies have on the real business investment decisions, they run. They cannot stay here even to listen to the sad tale of havoc that they wreaked on this province.

So that is why this government is taking an entirely different perspective rather than taking a pure partisan perspective and saying, what we have got to do is get people of all different politics together in a room and come out with the answers. No, we have to go to the people who are making the decisions with their pocketbooks, with their time and their energy and their talent, who are saying, I am going to put my time and energy on the line. I am going to invest it in this province because I believe in this province, I believe in its future, I believe in its growth potential. Those are the people whom we should be listening to, not to some people who are politicians on the other side of the House who are trying to make short-term hay for their own personal purposes. No, that is not where the answers are.

That is why the answer lies with an organization like the Economic Innovation and Technology Council that is broadly representative of the people out there who take the real risks, who have to put their own personal welfare on the line, who have to put on the line the welfare of their industries, the welfare of all of their employees and the welfare of their future economic well-being in this province. That is why we turn to people like that who broadly represent all of the sectors of society, who broadly represent the real people who are out there working, taking risks and creating opportunities, not the people like the academic from Wolseley who sits there offering pious responses day after day and quoting scripture and history, Madam Deputy Speaker, without ever having risked her own energy or efforts to make anything work in this world—[interjection].

No, I do not want to talk about the professional politicians who have never worked in the real world, who have lived in their ivory towers.

Point of Order

Ms. Friesen: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I want to respond to the Premier speaking of teachers and people—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) does not have a point of order.

* * *

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, it is because of the attitude of the member for Wolseley and others like her that the New Democrats had to raise the personal income taxes in this province 138 percent in their six and a half years in office. It is because of the attitude of the member for Wolseley and others like her, who always say give more, give more, give more, who always want to take from the taxpayer and force the taxpayer to pay for her interests. That is exactly why we want to turn this issue over—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1800)

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I am mindful that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) did not have an opportunity to speak on this resolution, but I know there will be more debate in this vein later on, because there will certainly be many money bills that are coming where all members will have an opportunity to engage in debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am seeking unanimous consent of the House to sit beyond 6 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: First of all, let us ascertain, is it the will of the House that the Speaker not see the clock until we resolve this House's business matters?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. That is agreed.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask unanimous consent to waive Rule 65(11) as it is likely that Committee of Supply will sit beyond 10 p.m., so that motions may be moved after it rises.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to waive Rule 65.(11)?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: That is agreed.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, the House will continue to sit at this time. I do not know whether I have to have unanimous consent or I already have it. I would suggest we go back to completing discussion on third reading of bills, and I think we were engaged in an amendment on Bill 98. I would suggest that we pick up at that point.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to sit beyond six o'clock? That is agreed.

Committee Changes

Mr. Speaker: Prior to recognizing the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) with committee changes and the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer) with committee changes.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended as follows: Fiin Flon (Mr. Storie) for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

The honourable member for Gimli with his committee changes.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended as follows: the member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach) for the member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae); the member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings) for the member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Prior to recognizing the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), I would ask the House for a retroactive leave. Inadvertently, when I recognized the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) to bring forward Bill 52 on behalf of the honourable member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin)—I am asking for leave of the House to clear up the books.

Is there leave to allow the honourable Leader of the Opposition to bring forward Bill 52?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, that is done. Thank you very much.

DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS

Bill 98—The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act

Mr. Speaker: Now, resuming debate on the motion of the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), and right now it is standing in the name of the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), who has 35 minutes remaining, I believe.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act deals with the culture of all Manitobans, which by definition that particular culture is multicultural in nature. Culture is the totality of the people's shared values, their collective achievements and their common aspirations and hopes for the future. A more enduring basis for any culture is the character and courage to accept what has already been accomplished rather than hope for some grants of money or some kind of temporary benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we view the very introduction of this first multicultural act as, on the surface, a significant milestone in the recognition of Manitoba as a multicultural society, and yet we deplore the glittering generalities of the wordings of the statute itself. We deplore the absence of a specific program of activities, of behaviourally measurable objectives in terms of substantial issues that face the multicultural communities, such as the issues of the Affirmative Action Program, employment equity, equality for social and economic opportunities and the struggle to stamp out racism in our society, in our community.

It has sometimes been argued that, because this is the first multicultural act, let us, therefore, docilely accept it, because we can improve upon it later on. If a person is thirsty and he wants a drink, he does not simply accept the first offer of a drink, if the drink consists of automobile transmission fluid. Rather, it might be wiser for him to wait six months for a good drink like gin and tonic, scotch and vodka, rye and water, Bloody Mary or a drink they call "Sex on the Beach."

If a person is desperately hungry and he is offered at the first opportunity a whole loaf of bread but the bread is mouldy and rotten, it might well be wise for him to wait for six months so that he could have the

second opportunity for a freshly baked health-related, sweetly smelling bread.

In introducing this multicultural act, this government is insidiously introducing undemocratic arrangements in structure in our system of governance of the multicultural community. It is trying to replace a democratically and representative-elected body like the Intercultural Council with an autocratically appointed, unilaterally selected body of elites that are accountable to no one but the minister.

This is a denial of the very basic principle of our government, a part of our shared-value system in which the legitimacy of those in authority will be recognized if they are derived from the concern of those whom they are governing.

The same thing with the decisions that affect the granting authority of government. If the granting authority is monopolized by the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism (Mrs. Mitchelson) and refuse the sharing of such authority with the consent of those who are primarily affected by the decisions that are to be made. There is a denial of the democratic principle that the legitimacy and acceptability of authority to allocate money derives from the consent of those taxpayers, who, in the first place, are the ones who provide the money.

In introducing The Multiculturalism Act, we cannot permit any derogation of the basic democratic principle. We cannot legitimize and allow the unilateral grab for power without accountability and responsibility to those who are primarily affected by the decisions.

* (1810)

(Mr. Jack Penner, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

We would like to see a multicultural act that deals with the basic issues of multicultural society, such as affirmative action programs, employment equity, and enforcement, to assure not only vague generalities but actual achievement in terms of equality of opportunities.

The one redeeming feature of this act is the recognition in the preamble of Manitoba as a multicultural society, not being a collection of separate societies divided by language and culture, but being a single society united by shared laws, values, aspirations and responsibilities within the Manitoba community.

The failing of the act is that it does not specify what a specific program of legislation, enlightened and progressive legislation, a program the government commits itself to do for the multicultural communities, is. It does not specify how such programs will advance the freedom and opportunity to participate in the decisions that are made within the multicultural society.

The denial of the fundamental democratic doctrine is strong enough reason for the motion to hoist and delay this legislation, in order that we can remedy a defect, not of the surface, but a defect in the very substance of the legislation itself.

If only the Manitoba Intercultural Council would be recognized by the legislation, if only the legitimacy of this duly elected body would be linked with the advisory council to the honourable Minister responsible for Multiculturalism, if only the minister were willing to share some of the premises of the allocations the budgetary allocative authority—in the fair distribution of grants, if only the minister would assume the duty and obligation to create, as a matter of duty, the Access Office for multicultural problems, then this legislation would probably be better legislation.

It is the collective power of the people, duly organized and structured according to established procedures, that creates the legitimacy of political authority in government. But, if the government itself denies the very foundation of that authority by denying the grassroots consent of the people they are trying to govern, that is just the surface of autocracy that we cannot tolerate in our democratic society.

One of the enduring principles that we recognize is that the body politic should be accountable to those people whom they govern, and that has been the genius of our parliamentary system in our society. The voters will elect the government. The government therefore exercises delegated powers from the voters, and when the voter is not satisfied, the voter can turf out the government and reclaim to itself that legitimacy of authority.

But in the structuring of the governing of multicultural affairs, there is no democratically elected structure. The instrumentality, the agency, the decisional unit is in the palm of the minister herself, unless the minister is a person like the present minister of Multiculturalism.

We cannot foretell the future, because somebody else in the future may sit in that position and exercise the autocratic authority in the arrangement and in the processes of the multicultural affairs of this province. Remember that we are not dealing with particular persons or particular instances or particular situations. We are trying to devise and design a system of governance that is justifiable in terms of the basic value of our democracy.

The Manitoba Intercultural Council is a legitimate, elected, representative body. That is the institution that was originally created in designing the multicultural affairs of this province. Let not the government deny that basic principle that the elected procedure, accountability to the communities themselves, will be the ultimate standard by which the performance of government will be judged and will be evaluated. Otherwise, we will be governed unilaterally without any responsibility or accountability, because it destroys the very basis of democratic representation in our institutions and agencies of government. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): All those in favour of the amendment to the motion, will please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): All those opposed, would you indicate by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): I would declare the Nays have it.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House on the motion of the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), seconded by the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), that the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) for third reading of Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act, be amended by deleting all the words after the "that" and substituting the following: Bill 98, The Manitoba

Multiculturalism Act, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Friesen, Harper, Hickes, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Wowchuk.

Nays

Alcock, Carstairs, Cheema, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Lamoureux, Laurendeau, McAlpine, McIntosh, Manness, Mitchelson, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 17, Nays 28.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is defeated.

Committee Change

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended as follows: St. James (Mr. Edwards) for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). [Agreed]

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question on Bill 98?

Mr. Lamoureux: I wanted to spend just a few minutes to talk about Bill 98. As I had alluded to previously, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill, in which not necessarily we agree with all aspects of what is in the bill, but we do believe that it is in the best interest of the citizens of the province that this bill does pass at this time.

I was very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that an amendment that we had put forward, an amendment that we had fought very hard for as a compromise of sorts in order to allow the bill, if you will, to go to committee somewhat prematurely, was accepted. We think that is a positive thing. Now, we also believe still that the Manitoba Grants Advisory Council should not be the one that should be handing out multicultural grants and are extremely pleased that we have not legalized any politically appointed body to hand out those grants.

We are also disappointed that another amendment that we brought forward to the committee in fact was defeated. I appreciate the support from the New Democratic Party on this particular amendment, because we in the Liberal Party believe that MIC does have a very valuable role to play. Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that we felt was being brought forward was in fact a very responsible amendment and felt that it was very unfortunate that the government decided not to include it.

* (1850)

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on in terms of talking about the Manitoba Intercultural Council, but I am somewhat reluctant to in the sense that I know that the minister has heard me on many occasions on the importance of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. Our position has not changed. The response has consistently been from the minister that because Mr. Blair is going to be doing a study on MIC, they are now going to wait until the recommendations come forward.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that was a convenient way for the minister to avoid putting the Manitoba Intercultural Council into the legislation. The reason why I say that is because, when we had introduced a private members' bill to this Legislature, the minister stood up to speak on it and told me that what she was looking at, she did not want to address the MIC in a piecemeal fashion, that she wanted to look at it and incorporate it into a multicultural act.

Well, the minister had plenty of time to do that between the moment she said that to the moment that the bill was introduced. As I say, we found that it was unfortunate that the government waited so long in the session. We had stood up during Question Period to ask the minister when she was going to be bringing forward this bill but, unfortunately, we did not see the bill as soon as we would have liked to have been able to see the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have often made reference to Clause 2 of the legislation, because this is a piece of the legislation that really, we feel, does a lot and says a lot, and individuals in the different communities, I believe, feel that this is at least better than having nothing. That is why we had felt that it was so very important that we take this as a two-step approach. We have a multicultural act that we want to see passed. We also want to see some changes. We were fortunate in the sense to be able to

convince the government to withdraw the MGAC, but that is only one aspect.

We want to be able to see additional amendments to this bill, and that is where the second step is. I encourage, Mr. Speaker, the minister to go through some of the presentations once again that were made before the committee—there were a number of ideas that came out of there that I believe this Legislature can and should address—but also to recommend to the minister and to the New Democratic Party that any changes to the multicultural act should be, at the very least, vetted through the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

If, whether or not, the government agrees with whatever the recommendations they might have as a council, they can do whatever they want. If they agree with it, fine. One would think, if they follow up on a recommendation and agree to implement that recommendation, that she will get much more support, that we will not see the type of presentations that were made before committee, that we will not see the concerns that have been expressed as much as they have during second reading and so forth, that there are, in fact, a number of things that could make this bill better.

Having said those very few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to recommend to all members of this Chamber to vote in favour of the amended multicultural act and only hope that we will see additional changes to the act, because as I have pointed out—and one could even go right into the act itself, where there is made reference to the Community Access Office, where it says that “the minister may establish.”

Mr. Speaker, that particular portion of the legislation does not really make a commitment. The reason why I say it does not make the commitment—right now the minister may establish. It does not call upon the minister of the day to continue or to create. Obviously, it has been created, and hopefully through time, we will see this particular office up and running and doing a number of services to the community, things such as what the minister had proposed as an amendment during the report stage, which was the whole question of racial harmony. The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) brought in an amendment last night that we believe is something that should be in this form of legislation. The member for Radisson brought in some other ideas that I believe are essential. On many different occasions, I myself have made

recommendations as to what we believe are necessary to have in a multicultural act.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we see that we are in a situation where there is a majority government. A question for us that has to be answered is—ultimately, the majority government can pass whatever it wants if it is willing to use the different means that are made available to it, the different tools that are made available to the government of the day.

So even though, as I say, we wanted to see additional amendments, we wanted to see more co-operation because the Leader of the Liberal Party in her opening remarks said this is a piece of legislation that should have come in with unanimous support, a lot of support, morale support, not only from inside this Chamber, but outside of this Chamber.

Unfortunately, because of the manner in which the legislation was brought in, because of the manner in which this legislation was not consulted with, the numbers of individuals, in particular, the Manitoba Intercultural Council that made a number of recommendations, we did not see what the minister's position really was on it.

Again, I am going to conclude by saying that we want this bill to pass. We perceive this bill as a first step. We will be introducing, no doubt, future private members' bills if the minister does not accept the responsibility of bringing additional amendments to this bill. I only hope that, in fact, one of those amendments that we will see from Mr. Blair—and I have been assured that Mr. Blair will be in fact meeting with all different ethnic communities. In addition to that, he is also going to be meeting with the members of the Legislature, and I will definitely take that up and look forward to my meeting with Mr. Blair in hopes that we can be able to really and truly do a service to the province of Manitoba. Thank you.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I speak today on Bill 98 because of the importance of multiculturalism. I have been committed to multiculturalism personally. I know it is very important for our own family. In fact, I have had the experience of seeing some of the growth of Manitoba in recent years in terms of multiculturalism. I attended many of the founding meetings of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. In fact, my wife was an elected representative from

Thompson for a number of years when it was first established.

I can indicate that multiculturalism to my mind goes to the heart of the Canadian identity. That is why I stand in my place to speak today. I think it is important to put on the record very clearly what was said and what is being said by the New Democratic Party in terms of multiculturalism.

I want to begin, by the way, Mr. Speaker, by correcting some misinformation that the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) put on the record about what happened in second reading. I would like to note for the record that the Liberals spoke on Bill 98. We attempted to be recognized, and in fact, the member for Inkster was recognized instead of one of our members, similar to what, I might add, happened earlier in private members' hour when I feel the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) was unfairly missed and should have had the opportunity to speak.

* (1900)

So we attempted to be recognized, Mr. Speaker, and through an error at that time in terms of the normal process, we were not able to do so, but let us go one step further and recognize that the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) spoke every time the bill was called. He had indicated he wanted to filibuster the bill and having had the opportunity to speak at length on previous bills, it should be put very clearly on the record that we were caught in the position of not being able to speak on the bill for more than 10 minutes without running the risk of not getting the multicultural bill to the committee to hear the views of the multicultural communities.

So it was because of the tactics of the Liberals that debate was cut short on second reading. We voted in favour of the principle of a multicultural bill. That is very clear. We also went to the committee to hear the concerns of the multicultural community and to propose amendments to make it a better bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is the bill was not significantly amended. The bill includes a number of fine statements about multiculturalism, but it does not go anywhere near as far as we should in terms of multiculturalism.

Mr. Speaker, multiculturalism is more than about culture and heritage. It is more than about fine ideals. It is about day-to-day life, and we need a multicultural policy in every facet, including in terms of economic concerns, so we get full equality in this

province for everyone regardless of their ethnocultural background. That is something the MIC has been pushing for, for many years. That is not fully represented in this bill, so there are many faults.

What I want to indicate is that is why we called for an opportunity to do it right, not to kill the bill. We did not vote on the hoist to kill the bill. We are back here in October, by agreement of all three parties. We have a guaranteed fall session for the first time, Mr. Speaker, in a considerable period of time, a guaranteed fall session.

We could have brought this bill back in. We could have properly consulted with the multicultural committee. We could have made it a far better bill if we had accepted the hoist and brought it back in. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are wrong if they believe that introducing a private members' bill is going to correct any weaknesses in this bill, because there was not a single private members' bill in terms of matters of public concern in this session that has been passed.

It is very rare that they ever pass. We have even had bills such as the antisniff bill which was passed and never enacted, Mr. Speaker. The only real opportunity is through a government bill. This is not necessarily the first step and that concerns us. There needs to be the second step.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the Liberals and Conservatives have voted down our hoist motion, we will be continuing to push for a real, substantive multicultural bill that goes beyond some of the principles outlined in this bill, that goes into some real substance in terms of multiculturalism. Indeed, we will be raising that in the next session of the Legislature.

We need a substantial, substantive multicultural act, Mr. Speaker. While this may be not a negative bill per se, while it may take some positive steps by even recognizing the concept, it can be far better. So we, the New Democratic Party, say, do it right; do it right when it comes to multiculturalism.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question for the House is third reading of Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act; Loi sur le multiculturalisme au Manitoba. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: That is agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to indicate that there was unanimous support for this particular bill.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader): Yes, I believe, Mr. Speaker, if you would call for further debate on third reading, Bill 70.

Bill 70—The Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), 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, standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to speak on this bill tonight. We had hoped that after the minister listened to public presentations last night in committee, that he might have changed his mind, that he might have listened to the community, that he might have learned from his mistakes, that even though he consulted the SARC committee and did not follow all of their recommendations, that he might have listened to the people he did not consult with, namely the churches in the inner city of Winnipeg, the Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization and Choices, and that he would have listened to their advice because they were unanimous. They all condemned the major flaw of this bill.

He did not consult with them. In fact, he did the opposite. He bragged about how he had consulted people. Well, the only people he consulted were people from rural Manitoba, elected officials, and one representative from the City of Winnipeg in spite of the fact that the vast majority of people who will be affected by this capping of welfare bill, the vast majority of people affected by this are residents of the city of Winnipeg.

The minister could have called these groups. The minister knows about the existence of the Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization. He knows about the other groups in the community, and he did not ask them. He did not ask the people who are the most affected, and that is the poor and the people who are working with the poor. In fact, the

minister last night talked about whom he did consult, but he did not talk about whom he did not consult.

Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to the main flaw of this bill, namely the capping of welfare. The minister, though, is being very coy about this. He is hiding behind his regulations. He will not tell us whether or not he is offloading \$5.6 million in expenses to the city of Winnipeg. We asked him in Question Period. We asked him in committee last night.

We said, you must have taken this to Treasury Board. What is the financial implication of this bill? How much are you going to save or how much are your expenses going to increase? The minister will not tell us. He is hiding behind his own regulations. So all we can assume is that the bill and what the minister says in the bill is what is actually going to happen.

I wish that I could take the minister with me canvassing in Burrows. Burrows is one of three constituencies and the riding in Canada that has the second highest incidence of poverty in Canada, Winnipeg North Centre federal riding.

Door after door he will see many people who live in incredible poverty, and I know that, probably, all members here have pockets of poverty in their constituencies including in rural Manitoba. But there is an extremely high concentration of poverty, probably exceeded in Broadway and Wolseley and Point Douglas, but numerous people living in poverty in Burrows.

I can remember campaigning during the election and going into a home where there were children present and there was no food in the house. So I went to my former place of employ, to North End Community Ministry, and got groceries for this family. People in this household had obviously been sniffing.

We have an antisniff legislation that was approved by all three parties in this House and has not yet been proclaimed. Why is that? Does the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) not care about the problem of sniffing and children, especially, who are being affected by this problem in our community?

I know that the minister has agreed to come with me to a food bank outlet. I have yet to take him up on that since he accepted my offer; but I will. We will go perhaps to Colony Street, to West Broadway Community Ministry and their food handout at All Saints Church every Tuesday morning, where there

are up to 150 people accepting food for at least 300 people in families, or to North End Community Ministry where they have a sharing circle every Wednesday morning and up to 150 people come for food from the food bank.

I would like the minister to come and sit at the back of the sharing circle and listen to the stories of people as they talk about their problems on social assistance, as I do and as the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) does, as we go and we try to answer some of their problems about social assistance and this minister's department. We believe we are going to hear a lot more complaints if this bill goes through as is and the minister does what he says he is going to do.

Well, we are not really sure that he is going to do what he says he does because the minister will not come clean with us. He will not tell us exactly what the implications of this bill are, whether they are going to pick up more responsibility or whether the City of Winnipeg is going to be forced to pick up \$5.6 million of additional expenses. We wish the minister would tell us now instead of waiting for the regulations.

Well, why is this government not following the recommendations of the SARC report? Why will they not pay above the minimum rates? Well, either they are trying to save money or they do not care. It could be that in their obsession with reducing the deficit and keeping government costs down that they have decided that this a very convenient way of saving at least \$5.6 million of expenses just in offloading to the City of Winnipeg; or it could be that they do not care.

* (1910)

Now we have heard the members side say, oh, we care about these things and that is why have made priorities of certain government departments. I have even listened to speeches from government members, even backbenchers. It was a common thread through one of their speeches during budget debate, probably all written by the same person. They said, we are the kind of people who care. Well, if you care, you would not be supporting this bill. If you had been in the committee the other night—and some members opposite were at the committee the other night—they heard Greg Selinger, city councillor, say the implication of this bill if implemented is that it is going to force more children and adolescents onto the street in

Winnipeg where they are victims of prostitution and homelessness, where they are extremely vulnerable. That is what City Councillor Greg Selinger said, this bill will force more youth onto the street. If these members cared, they would not be doing that. They would not be forcing more adolescents onto the street in Winnipeg where they are extremely vulnerable.

Another example that was used, the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg pointed out that there is a very large difference between the infant allowance for food between the city and the province. The City of Winnipeg infant food allowance is \$160. The provincial infant food allowance is \$85. If members opposite cared about infants, they would not be passing this bill as is. They would have supported our amendments last night, because what they are doing is they are taking food out of the mouths of infants. It is very obvious from the social assistance rates.

If they cared, as they say they do, they would not be passing this bill as it is. Why is this government passing this bill without amending it? If they cared, they would not be reducing expenses on the backs of the most vulnerable members of our society. If this government cared, they would not be doing that.

Mr. Speaker, the presentations at committee were very interesting. For example, the Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization submitted a brief, three pages, but very interesting, very well written. For example in the third paragraph, and I quote: The stereotype of people who are on welfare as being lazy, irresponsible and drinking their money away does not wash.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The people we talked to at MAPO are caring and responsible and are on the system by circumstances not by choice. The frustrations of being on welfare can destroy a person's self-esteem and emotional well-being. This becomes even harder when money is constantly being juggled around each month for things not covered in the initial budget.

Then they go on to itemize things that are not covered in a social assistance budget. In fact, one of the things that I came across, which I found very interesting and which I believe MAPO has access to and used in presenting their brief, is guidelines written by home economists employed by the

Department of Agriculture of the provincial government.

It talks about minimum costs for different items in a household, yet when you compare that schedule or table with what people on social assistance get, you will find that there are huge differences between what a home economist in the Department of Agriculture says a family needs to survive on or to live on adequately and what people actually get on a social assistance budget.

But did the minister consult with MAPO? Did the minister consult with churches? No. He probably did not even consult with the staff, the home economists in the Department of Agriculture who are experts in devising household and family budgets.

On page 2, they said, and I quote: Food banks are already overloaded and provide a temporary, band-aid solution. Food banks are for emergencies only and will not carry a person long-term. If a person needs more than a couple of days food assistance depending on their circumstances, sometimes welfare will provide an emergency food voucher. Unfortunately, the person is then dealing with an overpayment, causing even more of a strain on their budget for the next few months until the overpayment is cleared up.

Well, as we heard from Mr. Selinger last night, there is a food bank in Winnipeg. We all know about Winnipeg Harvest. But do people know that they are distributing food through 173 different churches, social agencies and organizations, mostly in the inner city of Winnipeg but certainly not confined to the inner city of Winnipeg, because at Transcona United Church they are serving huge numbers of people every week, over 700 families a week being served out of Transcona United Church, and we commend them for that. But we have a philosophical problem. The problem is we do not believe that food banks are an adequate response to poverty in our society. They are only, at best, Band-Aid.

It is very significant that David Northcott from Winnipeg Harvest has changed his position. Whereas at one time he was opposed to lobbying on behalf of Winnipeg Harvest food bank, now he has publicly said that he is joining with other organizations to lobby governments to do something about poverty in the province of Manitoba.

This problem is not restricted to the city of Winnipeg. We have a food bank in Beausejour in the constituency of the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik). We have a food bank in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), in the constituency of Morris, and we have a food bank in the constituency of the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), in the town of Selkirk.

This is a measure of the seriousness of this problem in our society when people's income is not adequate, that they are forced to rely on charity. They are forced to beg in order to subsist in our very affluent society.

In this paragraph, MAPO points out a problem: If people get emergency assistance from welfare, they are faced with an overpayment. Now we have a very interesting case before the Supreme Court of Canada, the Jim Findlay case. He has already appeared before the Supreme Court.

We are waiting for the judgment which could be out in a matter of days. Lower courts have already found that it was illegal to deduct payments from his social assistance cheque because people on social assistance are already living at a bare subsistence level.

In fact, people probably do not know that social assistance is calculated ostensibly on people's need, and the Canada Assistance Plan provides for people's basic needs in three areas, food, shelter and clothing. So if people's minimum needs are not being met, how can you possibly subtract from their very minimal needs?

The Supreme Court may rule that it is illegal, and that is going to pose this minister with a very serious problem because if the city rates cannot be lowered, then this minister is going to have to come up with more money, as much as \$5.6 million in order to cost-share the rates which are not being covered by the Province of Manitoba.

As my honourable friend for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) points out, if this minister and his government were to institute some meaningful job-creation programs, perhaps they would not have to put out \$90 million more in social assistance this year than last year. In fact, on page 3, the recommendations from MAPO have to do with job creation.

Their recommendation No. 5 is: Education and training programs must be realistic and lead to real jobs that pay enough for the individual and their

family to live healthy and productive lives. The current minimum wage reinforces poverty and keeps people living below the poverty line.

In fact, this is a recommendation that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) should be listening to as well, because when the minimum wage is at \$5 per hour, thousands of Manitobans are working full time but living way below the poverty line. This is a group that we do not hear nearly enough about in our society, people who are working and working very hard, many of them at what are now called McJobs, working at minimum wage or close to minimum wage. In fact, many of them are worse off than people on social assistance.

This Minister of Labour, if he cared about people and poverty, could do something about it by raising the minimum wage. But what happened? They did not raise the minimum wage for about two years, and so we got behind other provinces. In fact, the percentage of minimum wage to the poverty line has decreased over the years, and it has become much, much less than the poverty line.

The recommendations of MAPO were excellent recommendations. They actually start off with a commendation. They say: We applaud the provincial government's move to standardize welfare rights. MAPO has been actively advocating for a one tier system for the past decade. However, there are a number of major issues that need to be considered in this recommendation.

Then they go on to list five of their recommendations, the first one being: Current welfare rates do not reflect the actual cost of living within the province of Manitoba.

As I mentioned, the home economist's calculation of family needs are considerably above what welfare rates provide for family needs. Their second recommendation is: This is an opportune time to review the overall rates and to ensure that they adequately cover the basic necessities. Rental guidelines need to reflect the actual cost of rental accommodation.

A serious problem for renters is that their rent allowance does not cover the actual rent that they are paying. What do people do in that circumstance? How do they pay their rent if welfare only gives part of it and their rent is higher? Well, what they do is, they take money out of food or personal need or household need in order to supplement their rent.

* (1920)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Another brief mentioned the problem of security deposits and the fact that many tenants do not get their security deposits back. In fact, it was in an excellent brief written by Karen Tjaden of St. Matthews-Maryland Community Ministry. We know that this is also a serious problem, and it was discussed at committee the other night. The problem is that security-deposit complaints in the landlord and tenant department are complaint driven. Unless a tenant complains, the department does not investigate, and so frequently people take money out of their food budget to pay for the next security deposit when they should not have to and when they do not have to.

The third recommendation in the MAPO brief is: Any changes to the current legislation should include consultation with community organizations, such as MAPO, who work directly with welfare recipients and who have valuable insights into the needs and conditions of people who are on the system.

I am going to conclude with this recommendation because this is an excellent recommendation, one of the areas where we are very disappointed with this minister. MAPO was saying, consult with us. Consult with people who are affected by your decisions. Consult with the other groups that made presentations: St. Matthews-Maryland Community Ministry; Genevieve Funk-Unrau who also works at St. Matthews-Maryland and came as a private individual last night; Erika Wiebe, community development worker, Winnipeg Child and Family Services, Central Area; and two people who are registered, who could not make it last night, Aileen Urquhart of West Broadway Community Ministry and Mary Davis of North End Community Ministry.

These are the people who work with welfare recipients on a daily basis, day in and day out, year in and year out. The minister did not consult them and he should. If this minister has a heart, if this minister cares, he will amend this legislation and not offload responsibility to the City of Winnipeg, not save money on the backs of the most vulnerable members of our society, not force children and youth on to the streets, and not take food out of the mouths of infants, as he is going to do if this bill passes. As my colleagues say, shame on this minister.

I hope he is going to speak and rationalize and tell us what is behind this. I hope he will put some comments on the record so that we know exactly where he stands, because he refused to answer our questions in Question Period and in committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): I would just like to indicate to my honourable friend that we have met with some of the groups that he has mentioned in his remarks. While they have not been on a regular basis, certainly I have had a number of meetings with MAPO and with some of the ministries to discuss areas of concern with social allowances.

One of the earlier speakers for the NDP talked about a reluctance to talk about our track record. I would be pleased to mention some of the reforms that we brought into being this year. Certainly, I have been able to mention this a number of times in response to questions. I would say to the honourable member who just spoke that we have consulted with a number of those people on a number of occasions and have listened to their concerns. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 70, The Social Allowance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

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): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

The question before the House is 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.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Vodrey, Sveinson.

Nays

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carstairs, Cerilli, Cheema, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Edwards, Evans (Brandon East), Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Harper, Lamoureux, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 25, Nays 22.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call adjourned debate, third reading, Bill 85.

Bill 85—The Labour Relations Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [Agreed]

Mr. Jerry Storie (Filn Flon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that I am pleased to be able to join debate on third reading on this particular bill, but clearly I think the House will know that is not the case, that no one on this side, certainly no one in the NDP caucus—I will not pretend to speak for members of the Liberal caucus—is pleased to join in this debate. Our caucus does not believe for a minute that this debate should be taking place.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that there is no substantive evidence that this bill, introduced by this Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), was necessary to correct any circumstances in the province of Manitoba. The province of Manitoba, as we have

pointed out time and time again, and the Minister of Labour has not been able to refute, has enjoyed relative labour peace over the last number of decades based on the existing Labour Relations Act.

Contrary to what the previous Labour critic and the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) when he was in opposition said, the labour relations amendments that were introduced by the NDP government, whether it was final offer selection or other expedited arbitration amendments to The Labour Relations Act, none of those amendments did anything to encourage the deterioration of labour-management relations in the province of Manitoba. Every factual account, every factual basis that you can discuss, labour relations peace in Manitoba showed that Manitoba's record of labour peace continued to improve. In fact, in the last part of the 1980s and when this government took office, Manitoba enjoyed the second lowest days lost to strike in the country.

Only Prince Edward Island, which has a work force of less than one-tenth of the province of Manitoba, lost fewer days to strikes, Mr. Speaker, and those were times when often unions were seeking significant increases, increases beyond the rate of inflation, when there was considerable potential for strikes and lockouts and labour difficulties.

* (1940)

Mr. Speaker, we did not have that in the province of Manitoba. That was quite different from what other provinces were experiencing. Certainly the province of Saskatchewan, the province of Alberta, the province of British Columbia, the province of Quebec, not so much Ontario, were experiencing extreme labour difficulties. The number of days lost to strike increased in the mid-'80s to really unacceptable levels. What was sought in the labour relations amendments in the legislation which was introduced by the previous government was a balance.

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

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think that is what labour and management want. I know that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) may be taking advice from people like David Newman, who is as anti-labour as anyone in this province, or maybe he is taking advice from some of his other colleagues who may share those particular views. What the

people of Manitoba and what working people expect, what the labour movement expects, what the Manitoba Federation of Labour expects, is for the Minister of Labour to look at the facts and decide not what he wants to do based on ideological assumptions, not what he wants to do based on the wishes of his friends to improve their relative position in terms of the balance between labour and management, what they want the minister to do is to do what is right and what is fair and to keep the process working.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I asked in this Chamber before, and I ask the minister to explain if he wishes when he comments at the end of this debate, before we close debate on third reading, to tell us on what basis he has introduced this legislation. I would ask him to do a second thing. I would ask him to tell us why this legislation, this government, if it wishes to maintain some sort of balance, did not introduce a piece of legislation that was balanced, that represents maintaining that equilibrium between the rights and obligations of unionists in the province and the rights and obligations of management, because as I pointed out in my previous remarks and has been pointed out by my colleague the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), as was pointed out in briefs presented at standing committee, the proposed amendments to The Labour Relations Act do not achieve the balance that I think both union and management want.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I point out again that what this legislation does is create an obligation for unions and a new right for management. That is not balance. There is no evidence to suggest that we need to tip the scales in one direction or the other at this particular time in the province of Manitoba. There is no evidence, for example, that the government's last attack on labour, the decision that it made to eliminate the final offer selection, to repeal final offer selection, has done anything to improve the harmony or the co-operation between management and labour.

In fact, we know that quite the reverse is true, that since the repeal of final offer selection, and the minister will confirm this, the number of days lost to strikes have increased dramatically. [interjection] Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, that is most certainly the case, because in 1987 or 1988, there were some 3,000 days lost due to strikes—[interjection]—while this government was in charge of the nurses' strike.

What this minister's comments prove is that this government has no interest in labour-management peace. What they have is some sort of death wish when it comes to their life in government. The minister knows just as well that there have been a number of other private-sector strikes in the province of Manitoba that have bumped up the totals. I do not know if he has looked at the total number of days lost due to strikes as of today. They are significantly higher than they were in 1977, 1978.

This government, Madam Deputy Speaker, is dancing to the tune of a very few individuals who have on their agenda the eliminations of rights, won through collective bargaining, won through legislative action over a significant period of time, certainly the last 30 years. [interjection]

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) wants to know whose tune I am dancing to. I have tried to remain quite neutral on this question, tried to urge the government to look at facts before it acts. That is all I have ever counselled this government to do. I have said time and time again that there is no evidence that this legislation is going to do anything constructive. In fact, I believe that quite the reverse is true.

What this legislation does, as it attaches a new obligation on unions and confers a new right on management, is to ensure that the kind of conflict that we wanted to resolve when we introduced final offer selection is going to be ever present in the workplace. It is not going to be there just when we are talking about collective bargaining, because there is significant anxiety, certainly, when the two groups are bargaining—I think that is certainly the case—but the minister has added a new twist by introducing this particular obligation on unions with respect to both the number of people who are required before certification is automatic and by limiting or adding another obligation on those who are involved in the certification drive to ensure that all the i's are dotted and the t's are crossed, an obligation which has never existed previously in Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, apart from that obligation, the more significant danger I believe, and certainly many people who have been involved in organizing believe, is the right that is conferred on management. That is the right to offer what the legislation calls reasonable opinion. Well, with all due respect, I have heard honourable members on

that side and, yes, honourable members on this side offer what they thought was reasonable opinion which was certainly not fact and in many cases not reasonable.

We have listened to each other debate and because of our biased position, because of our prejudice for or against certain ideas, often our arguments and the logic we bring to those arguments is not reasonable opinion. It is a statement of belief, not fact; a statement of opinion, not fact; a statement of ideological principle, not fact; a statement of faith in some cases, not fact—

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): We never heard facts from this one.

Mr. Storle: The Premier may believe he has never heard fact from me. Well, it will come as no surprise to the Premier that I have never heard fact from the Premier. In fact, I view the Premier's statements as ideologically biased and tinged as statements that I make quite often. Well, that may be a statement of fact just for the Premier's edification.

An Honourable Member: An opinion reasonably held.

Mr. Storle: It certainly is an opinion reasonably held. The problem is that we are introducing this new right to management at a critical juncture in the creation of a union, at a time when you are dealing with people who are already timid, nervous, apprehensive about the collective bargaining process, about becoming union members, about the reaction of their employer, the reaction of management. On the other side of the coin, of course, we have management who are apprehensive about becoming a unionized "shop"; management who are worried about the collective bargaining process and the obligations that having unionized members may bring to bear on their bottom line and on their operation—so you have that situation.

* (1950)

I think it is a significant leap of faith for the minister, or anyone else, when it has not been done in the province of Manitoba before to say now that we are going to add another voice in this process. Not the one that the workers should have the right to decide—and that is, do we want a union or not—but the reasonable opinion of the employer. Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) one very simple question. What employer in this province, in his opinion, is

going to offer the reasonable opinion that the workers have the right to decide? What employer can the minister bring forward to this House to say, well, certainly, I would only offer objective information, factual information rather than opinion—[interjection]

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, the minister may want to put on record the details of this particular company. We know and the minister knows as well, or he should, that in many cases because the certification drive in itself creates apprehension. The voice of management, when it comes to the benefits of unionization, is going to be biased in the main and is going to reflect the ideological opinion and otherwise of management. Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe that it is going to bring a certain bitterness to the certification drive which does not exist and which is not necessary.

So you have to ask the minister the question: What is the purpose of this legislation? Is it to deny certification, unionization to the remaining work force, the nonunionized work force in the province of Manitoba? Because, clearly, it is not going to improve labour relations whatsoever amongst those groups who are already unionized. All it is doing is affecting the rights of employees who are nonunionized, who may want to become unionized.

I pointed out to the minister last time that in the main the groups who remain to be unionized in the province of Manitoba come from smaller employers and represent, in the main, workers on the lower end of the wage scale. They are women, single parents, often working for minimum or just above minimum wage, workers who require the kinds of benefits that unionization and the benefits of collective bargaining bring to workers in our province and in our country.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am not certain why this government is so terrified, so apprehensive about unionization. I pointed out that unionization and the percent of our work force that is unionized is not an economic problem. The other countries in the world who have a far greater proportion of their work force unionized are doing much better than we are economically—France, Germany, Sweden and now even Japan.

We have nothing to fear from unionization. What we have to fear is creating a system which is antagonistic, which creates an adversarial kind of bargaining process. If, in the initial stages, when a

group of people are deciding whether they want to be unionized or not, were introducing this new element of doubt, this new potential element of conflict—depending of course on what management says, and I will concede to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) that there may be some managements who view unionization more benignly than others—the fact of the matter is, there is significant potential for hostility and animosity and conflict.

The Minister of Labour is introducing this into The Labour Relations Act at a point in time when we do not need it, at a point in time when there is no evidence that we need to tamper with the balance that exists in a labour relations legislation that has been operating in this province for many years.

Madam Deputy Speaker, certainly we are always interested in amendments to The Labour Relations Act or any act, if we perceive it to be an improvement, but this legislation is not an improvement. This legislation is a step backward. It is going to ensure that people who need the benefits of unionization, who could benefit in terms of pensions and wages and other ways from collective bargaining, are going to be denied that because of this legislation. I am not sure that in the long run anyone wins, including the proponents of this legislation who may be members of the government and perhaps the Chamber of Commerce and a few others. Simply because this minister's friends want this legislation is not reason enough to impose it on the working people of the province of Manitoba. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Deputy Speaker, on Bill 85, I would like to say from the onset, again, that we will be voting against this bill. I am going to try to be as short and as concise as possible as to why it is that we are voting against this bill.

I want to start off by quoting from legislation in which the president of the Manitoba Federation of Labour started off in her presentation, and it goes as follows: "WHEREAS it is in the public interest of the Province of Manitoba to further harmonious relations between employers and employees by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining between employers and unions as the freely designated representatives of the employees;"—by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining, again, Madam Deputy Speaker. Ms. Hart-Kulbaba then went on to say that these two phrases that have been taken

together embody what should be the standard against which proposed amendments to The Manitoba Labour Relations Act are measured.

Well, I really and truly believe that both this administration and the previous administration are in violation of The Labour Relations Act, that really what is necessary, Madam Deputy Speaker—and Ms. Hart-Kulbaba goes further on. She talks about why she feels as the president of the MFL they are in violation, in this case, for the government. She infers that the reason why they brought in Bill 85 was to appease or to make happy a few selected individuals.

On this particular bill, I agree with her on that point, but when I had the opportunity to ask a question of her, I also included in that that not only is it the Conservatives, but it is also the New Democratic Party that have done the same thing, that have violated The Labour Relations Act. Madam Deputy Speaker, as both parties—if you will, the official opposition and the government of the day—talk about the importance of the worker, both are willing to forget about the worker and cater to a select few individuals who have control over their respective political parties.

I believe that is wrong. The reason why I believe it is wrong is because the biggest loser is the worker, is the small businessman. I look at it and if we were to follow the act, what the act is saying, what the government of whatever political stripe should be doing, is getting a consensus from both labour and management or small business and so forth and introduce on a consensus from both sides legislation that could change The Labour Relations Act.

Now, I guess, I understand why it is that they feel it is necessary to do this. I would suggest, Madam Deputy Speaker, that if the current government, or any potential future New Democratic government—I would suggest to them that they might want to do it in two ways, by bringing in two bills. If they want to have the political fight and try to appease their catered few, they can bring in a bill for that. Everyone will know it is a political bill and understand why it is that they have brought it in.

But for those recommendations, Madam Deputy Speaker, where there has been a consensus from the Labour Management Review Committee, in particular, from labour and management, those, I would suggest to you, are in keeping with the

legislation. If the government took that approach, I am sure that we would see legislation passed which all political parties inside this Chamber support. Of course, you will see the legislation that might come forward in which the Conservatives want to take one stand and the New Democrats want to take another stand in order to please a few.

* (2000)

Madam Deputy Speaker, I had said that I was wanting to be very concise on this particular bill because I have talked on the bill both in committee extensively and also during second reading. I have played on the importance of having strong unions, and the importance of having management in small business. It is now that I would suggest to you that if we want to have both sides working together, then we need to start consulting with both groups, as opposed to attempting to make political points, pleasing a few individuals and dividing both labour and management.

That is the sad thing about this particular bill and the reason why it is that we feel that we have to oppose the bill. Had the government gone out and achieved that consensus in keeping with the bill, with the preamble of The Labour Relations Act, we would in fact be more than happy to support this bill, but for the sake of the workers, for the sake of the business person and management, I would encourage all members of this Chamber to vote against Bill 85.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I rise with a certain sense of mixed feelings on Bill 85, Madam Deputy Speaker.

To members opposite, I guess when one participates in debates in this House, one hopes that sometimes one's words, one's arguments, one's pleas sometimes will be heard at least to some extent. Madam Deputy Speaker, particularly in regard to this bill, industrial relations, I am referencing those comments now, because we did have a fairly extensive debate on second reading. The minister spoke, the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) and myself.

We raised, I think, on second reading debate, concern over the very principle of this bill. I

referenced what I felt was the true background to this bill and the fact that rather than representing strictly a matter of principle on behalf of the Conservative Party, it represented instead more their biases and perceptions. I pointed to the biases as evident in certain sections of the bill which seemed, Madam Deputy Speaker, to imply time and time again, if one looked at the construct of this bill, that Conservatives still do not believe that when someone says they want to be represented by a union, they mean it.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I referred also to the obvious pressure from the Chamber of Commerce for this particular bill, the reference in their own document, their own brief to the government in 1990, about the perception of an antibusiness climate in Manitoba. Of course, as I pointed out, if anyone has been contributing toward that perception, it has been the Chamber of Commerce itself, those in the Conservative Party and from time to time, those in the Liberal Party who have supported that view.

We then went to committee. I want to say very clearly on the record what happened at committee. There were a number of very significant presentations, some very excellent briefs. The Chamber of Commerce sent in a written brief, a very small brief. There were a number of people there, mostly from different unions, different labour organizations, outlining their concerns with the principle of the bill in specific sections.

Madam Deputy Speaker, some amendments were introduced, some fairly substantive amendments in regard to concerns we addressed, that we had raised in second reading, concerns that I had raised personally, concerns that were expressed by the presenters at the committee.

Do you know that despite some of those amendments, the two key provisions of this bill remain in place today as we debate it on third reading, the provision that opens up the ability for employers, in my opinion and in the opinion of many who are versed in labour relations, to apply undue influence in the very difficult decision employees make as to whether they want to be represented by a union or not.

In addition, there is another very significant provision of this bill which has raised the percentage requirement for mandatory certification from 55 percent to 65 percent, making it more difficult, even

when a significant majority of the employees have said yes to a union, for them to be able to achieve that certification.

Well, perhaps, Madam Deputy Speaker, some would dismiss the importance of that. I know the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), on May 13, when he introduced the bill, said that he felt it was like a scene out of Casablanca. I will not relate the specific scene that he was referring to—we have heard it too many times—but I would suggest some of us on this side might agree, but the scene we are referencing—and it is somewhat misquoted sometimes. I will use the more well-known version of it—[interjection] That is right. It is "Play it again, Sam." Those are not the exact words of the movie, but it is the version that we have come to know.

I would say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that if we want to talk about Bill 85, the Chamber of Commerce has said, play it again, Sam; play it again, Mr. Premier; play it again, Mr. Minister of Labour. It is the fifth session you have been in government. We want another tune. What has happened is the minister has jumped to it. The Chamber's brief to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has been acted upon. It is funny, the same Premier who would not even listen to one of his own backbenchers has listened to every cord and bar that the Chamber of Commerce has requested—play it again, Sam.

So I suggest that before the minister quotes back movie scenes from that great movie, that he just learn the ability to say no once to the Chamber of Commerce and perhaps that the Premier who is, as I said, quite adept at not listening to whomever he does not want to listen to—and I cite the member for Portage (Mr. Connery) as the best living proof of that—that he might just for once say no, just say no.

I want to deal with some other comments that were made by my Liberal counterpart, the Liberal critic, because I found it a very different sort of speech. The Liberal critic in this case—and I am sure members will remember his speech on this bill—indicated that he was opposed to this bill, but spent much of his time attacking the New Democratic Party. Madam Deputy Speaker, that is fine. Believe you me, we can take it, certainly, from the Liberals and the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) in terms of labour relations. Debate is positive and we certainly welcome that.

I guess what I think the member for Inkster and the Liberal Party have misunderstood in Manitoba is no one is disputing the fact—and I will put this on the record, Madam Deputy Speaker, because the member for Inkster kept saying, well, some working people vote for the Liberal Party. Indeed, they do. They support the Liberal Party, as is their right. Some even support the Conservative Party. Some are members of unions. That is their democratic right.

I hope the Liberal Labour critic will understand one thing. The real issue here is not which party receives that support from working people. The real question to my mind on issues such as this is which party supports working people. On issue after issue involving labour relations and in the industrial relations climate in this province, not just on this bill, but other significant bills that we saw introduced, like final offer selection, only the New Democratic Party has consistently said we stand for fairness and equity for working people in this province.

That, Madam Deputy Speaker, is something I say to the Liberal critic, and I appreciate the fact the Liberals are opposing this bill. The bottom line is I appreciate that in this case, they have realized this is a bad bill. I think the Liberals would do well to understand that they cannot oppose matters such as final offer selection, some of the key debates that we have had in this Legislature when they are on the verge of government, as they thought they were between 1988 and '90. They spoke too soon.

* (2010)

Now the Liberals are reduced in their numbers, and some I know have suggested are concerned about being on the brink of oblivion. It is not simply good enough for them now to be born-again supporters of working people and born-again supporters of the rights of working people to say yes to a union, Madam Deputy Speaker. Some of us find some irony in that particular position and wish that the Liberal Labour critic would have been making the same speech when we were debating the final offer selection bills that were brought into this Legislature, when the New Democratic Party and only the New Democratic Party stood firm and fast in opposition to the antilabour agenda of the Conservative Party.

I do not want to criticize the Liberals too much, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I am reminded of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs

(Mrs. McIntosh) who in committee when I supported one of the amendments that we had actually proposed initially to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) that he was introducing, when the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs asked me to explain why I was supporting the amendment, presumably I guess she thought that, if I was in favour of it and our party was in favour of it, she had to be against it. I had to explain to her again and again and again that in this one area there was some agreement between the two parties and that she should not be quite so paranoid.

This bill brought up a number of very important debates and issues. It involves the question of the very existence of collective bargaining itself and whether working people have the right to select to be represented by a union. It also goes further and deals with the process by which that will can be determined, how the will can be determined and deals very much with the certification process, elections, et cetera. I want to say that is what is wrong with this bill, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I believe it still increasingly reflects the fact that Conservative members cannot recognize in 1992 that there is nothing wrong with working people democratically, without fear of pressure and coercion, saying that they wish to be represented by a union and wish to bargain collectively.

I want to dwell on that because from what I have been able to see from this Conservative government, there has been a significant shift since the Lyon period. I do not just want to talk, as I did in second reading, about particular legislation but in terms of attitudes towards unions. There is a significant turning back of the clock, the more traditional views of Conservatives on unions. There are those in the Conservative caucus who think that unions are evil, wrong and they oppose them fundamentally.

That is most clearly indicated by those who support the so-called right-to-work concept that has been developed in the United States which has destroyed the Rand Formula, which has destroyed the organizational base of collective organizations, most particularly unions. Madam Deputy Speaker, I would say there is a significant group in the Conservative caucus who believe that is the approach that they should follow in labour relations, and that if some of those members had their way, we would be dealing with right-to-work legislation. I remember the debates and I remember the member

for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae), the member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) and the current Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) supported right-to-work legislation. There is the group who feels that unions are evil.

There may be another group in there, smaller in number, who believe that unions are a necessary evil, that can see that working people may wish to be represented by a union, but it is not particularly positive and that somehow this is the reason. So there are those, Madam Deputy Speaker. Then there maybe others who feel that if people want to be represented by a union, that is fine. But there is still a segment of that group who say that even when people say, well, maybe we should be represented by a union, even when they have gone through the process of making a very difficult decision, that somehow they were mistaken. I believe that is where much of this bill comes from—the section on union dues.

Every presenter before the committee said that the first question that anybody asks is how much is it going to cost me. So the section in here, the only jurisdiction in Canada now to require that union dues be disclosed, well, that, I think reflects that. It is the same thing with the increase in the percentage from 55 percent to 65 percent. The government is now saying that when 64.9 percent of the employees in a unit say, yes, we want to be represented by a particular union that they somehow did not really know what they were doing; that there should be another vote; they were somehow forced into it; or it was under false pretenses; or they were not given the right information; or they just do not know how to make that decision for themselves. Because what other justification is there for moving from 55 percent to 65 percent? It is because they do not believe that. They do not believe that working people, even if they are not as opposed to unions as some of their caucus colleagues, can make that decision and, in fact, through this legislation suggested that the Conservative government knows better. That is why I really believe they have brought in some segments of this legislation.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it is interesting because what we are seeing from this government is an attempt to roll back the clock in terms of labour relations, because this bill does that. It does it in one of the most significant ways possible. It is an attack on collective bargaining, and the ability of people to organize collectively. It is not isolated.

Bill 70 last year on the public sector wage freeze was an attack directly on the current collective bargaining process. They went further this year in terms of going back. Last year, they told people who were certified and in some cases who had reached agreements, they could not have the agreements that were reached through collective bargaining and this Legislature had the ability to say, no, it does not matter what was bargained, what your employer has said. That does not matter; that is what they said in Bill 70.

This is even more—what a clever attack on the rights of working, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am sure some Conservatives have figured this out. I am sure the Chamber of Commerce has definitely figured this out. If people do not get to unionize in the first place, they do not have to worry about collective bargaining. They do not have to worry about first contract. They do not have to worry about the concerns of workers in terms of how they are represented in the workplace. That is, to my mind, the bottom line of this bill. It is designed, I think, by some deliberately and by others through their biases and perceptions; perhaps more indirectly than directly, it is designed to make it more difficult.

Well, I just want to take that in context, because I want to look at how important that right is and of all places, Madam Deputy Speaker, in the City of Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba the fundamental right to collective bargaining should be recognized by all. I went back, perhaps given some of the comments that were made in committee, and did some really serious thought about how important that right is. It did not just arise out of the blue. It was not granted by a government. It resulted out of the struggle of working people for decades in this province, for decades. To do what?—to be able to bargain collectively.

I was struck by how that process developed. What particularly struck me was this is the province of the 1919 General Strike. I was reading a book recently in terms of the life of J. S. Woodsworth and the background of the 1919 General Strike. What precipitated the General Strike? It was what, demand for wages, demand for better working conditions? Indeed, Madam Deputy Speaker. But one of the key issues was the right to collective bargaining itself. The machinists in the metal trades were fighting for nothing more than the right to bargain collectively, which had been denied them by

their employers, the iron masters. That was one of the basic issues in the 1919 General Strike.

Well, I am not going to go through the detailed history, although maybe I should for the benefit of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), who could do well to learn from the history of labour relations in this province and the struggle of working people for the right to collective bargaining.

* (2020)

You know, what struck me the most was J.S. Woodsworth, a minister, who had been unemployed for some time and had, through his progressive views, allied himself with the progressive labour parties. He was elected, in fact, in 1921 for the Independent Labour Party in the north end of Winnipeg, but out of his experience of being someone who was unemployed immediately identified himself with the strikers and published a bulletin expressing the concerns about the strike that was in place.

Indeed, Madam Deputy Speaker, he was arrested for his efforts. He was later let free, unlike some others who were arrested, tried on seditious conspiracy, were jailed. I might add, many of them were elected to this Legislature and to the House of Commons, including J.S. Woodsworth, who were arrested.

What was the response of the business community and the Conservative Party in those days? They formed the Committee of One Thousand citizens of the business interests. The mayor was associated with it, the Conservative Party of the day. They immediately pushed for the federal government to intervene, which they did.

I know the memory still lives on in many areas of this city, particularly in the north end, of the day in which the North-West Mounted Police, in those days, crushed a parade by returning veterans where 30 people were seriously injured, one was killed. What they did was they immediately phoned up their political contacts in Ottawa. They changed the immigration laws. They made it legal to deport anyone, British subject or foreign citizen, for being involved or associated with the strike, and indeed immediately moved to implement that agenda. The federal government immediately dispatched the Attorney General at the time who met with the Committee of One Thousand and refused to meet with the strikers. Lo and behold, Madam Deputy

Speaker, the strike was, through the force of the North-West Mounted Police and the force of the entrenched business communities, crushed.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there were many at the time who could not believe what was happening. I think this is a lesson in terms of labour relations. J.S. Woodsworth, in particular, was always an optimist. Mediators have failed, he said at the time, possibly something might be done if the principles could be brought face to face. In spite of the words in the newspapers, there are very reasonable men in both camps.

Nothing was done to bring the parties together. The strike was crushed. The right of workers to organize collectively was set back in a serious blow.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Why did they drop the charges against him?

Mr. Ashton: Indeed, the member for Burrows asked why the charges were dropped. Indeed, they were unfounded.

Mr. Martindale: Then tell us. Because the Crown was embarrassed. Now, why was the Crown embarrassed?

Mr. Ashton: Well, indeed I have no doubt that they were embarrassed by the arrest of a man of the cloth who was concerned only about speaking out on a matter of principle in terms of that situation.

Mr. Martindale: It was because he was quoting the Bible. That is why they dropped the charges.

Mr. Ashton: The member for Burrows points out he was quoting the Bible. That was considered seditious conspiracy, Mr. Speaker. I suppose if this was 1919, the member for Burrows would have been arrested earlier this afternoon. That was how ridiculous it had gotten.

What happened? J.S. Woodsworth was elected to Parliament. One of the first things he did was get the removal of the insidious changes that had taken place in the Immigration Act. He went on to have a distinguished career in Parliament, raised many matters. Many of the strike leaders continued the fight on behalf of working people.

You know, in the 1940s, with yet another war, in the middle of another war, a very significant development occurred with the introduction of labour legislation. Canada recognized in legislation the right to collective bargaining, recognized the Rand Formula and finally led to a situation where

there was some recognition of the right to collective bargaining.

Well, after that happened, were working people allowed to make a democratic decision without coercion, without undue influence on behalf of the employers? Were they, Mr. Speaker? I could cite time and time again where they were not: The great Eaton's organizing drive of the late 1940s. In fact, the previous deputy minister of Labour was very much involved with that. I had the opportunity to talk to him about some of the incidents that took place.

I could cite time and time again where direct coercion and interference on behalf of employers resulted in employees not having a clear, unfettered democratic choice. That is why the New Democratic Party government that was elected in the 1980s felt that there was only one fair thing to do, and that was to say very clearly in terms of legislation that the collective bargaining choice, the choice of whether to be represented by a union, is that of the employees, not the employers.

I outlined on second reading how logical that is. No one expects the Americans and Mexicans to be participating in our elections in Canada in the next federal election because they are implicated in the results of a North American free trade agreement. It is our decision, and we should be able to make that decision without coercion, without interference. No one would question it.

Indeed, it is the same in terms of collective bargaining. Why should an employer be able to coerce employees not to support a union when it is not the choice of employers? It is the choice of employees. That is why we brought in the legislation. [Interjection] Well, Mr. Speaker, I hear the member for Rossmore (Mr. Neufeld) talking in terms of what choice the employers have. They have the choice as to who will bargain for them. They can hire David Newman. They can hire any of the antilabour lawyers we have in this city. They can, and they do.

All the employees are asking for in many cases is the chance to have the equal opportunity to have someone bargain on their behalf collectively so that they have the exact same right. That is all they want. They want the same rights as employers, an equal, unfettered right to be represented by whom they want to be represented by. So let us put it in perspective in terms of that.

That is why what this government is doing now is so negative in terms of its impact. It is not just tinkering with The Labour Relations Act; it is not dealing with something as significant. But a stand-alone feature of The Labour Relations Act is final offer selection. When final offer selection was withdrawn, it was a significant blow, I think, to labour relations in this province, but it still did not get to the issue of what this bill does. This bill is an attack on the ability of working people to say yes, they want to collectively bargain.

You know, Mr. Speaker, all the people are asking for is fairness. The provisions in this act would never be accepted by a democratic people in an election. They are not paralleled in The Elections Act. There is no equivalent of the 65 percent rule that we have in this in The Elections Act. This government gets 42 percent. No one questions that. No one questions an election, the ability to electioneer on election day other than in the polling booth, but this minister has introduced a prohibition that will apply, not just to supporters of the union or opponents of the union on election day, but to anyone, anyone. I look to Conservative members. Are they aware they introduced something that will penalize someone for electioneering on election day, for saying to someone, do not forget to vote "yes" or "no" for a union, no matter what side they are on, whether they are associated with the union or not. They are now bringing in a clause that will penalize them under the act.

You know, what we are asking for is simply fairness. No one suggests, Mr. Speaker, that the employees should be able to decide whether the employer is represented by David Newman at the bargaining table or not. I just saw what happened with the CKY strike. No one in NABET, Local 821, really wanted to have some say over who was representing the employer at the bargaining table, so why should employers have the same right in terms of employees? Does that not make sense to anyone on the Conservative benches? Does that not make sense to anyone?

That is why—and I reference the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) as well, because she was vocal in the committee, very vocal. I want to say, I am extremely disappointed in the fact that the Conservatives, having brought in this bill, have had one speaker, the minister, have not once given any reason or justification for many of the significant changes in this bill. Why is that?

I have been in this Chamber for 10 years. I have seen other bills. I remember when we were in government, I remember when we spoke on matters of principle, important bills and important legislation. Have we really deteriorated to the point where, for the Conservative government, the only thing that matters is what goes on in their caucus room, Mr. Speaker, that it does not matter about what they have done, that they do not have to justify it to anyone in the public? Is it only their own caucus and their political supporters in the Chamber of Commerce that they have to justify this bill to?

* (2030)

Where is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), who was very vocal in the committee, putting her views on the record as to why she supports this bill? Where are the other members, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) who, I know from previous debates, is a very strong supporter of the right-to-work concept? Where is he on this debate? Where is the member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) who, I remember, led a direct attack on many of the provisions outlined in this bill? Where are they? Where are the Conservatives when it comes to justifying what they are doing? They are not there. I want to say that this shows the level to which we have sunk in terms of public policy in this province.

I think it is dangerous, by the way. It is very dangerous in terms of the Legislature itself. What I believe is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is very much a showing of disrespect for the parliamentary process. Simply because this government received a majority—and we are seeing on a daily basis that it is very much a temporary majority—simply because they can now push through items, they hope—because their majority is pretty slim right now—simply because they can do that, does not give them the right, for whatever reason, to listen only to whom they wish to and then to come before this Legislature and not even justify what they are doing.

They have not even given us the courtesy of more than an opening statement on this bill by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik). What we are seeing is a deterioration in the democratic process right in this Chamber, and we are seeing it increasingly: a government that wants to use private members' hour as a rubber stamp for its own policies; a government that will not debate its own policy initiatives; a government that we saw last night in chaos on a bill, that was drafting a bill as the

committee was sitting, because there were 300 police officers who were upset over the bill.

Is that the level we have gotten to? Should the labour movement have packed the galleries with 300 angry people calling on them to withdraw this? Is that the only way they function, they do whatever they can until they cannot get away with it anymore?

Then they go and they had this spectacle yesterday of amendments being run back and forth on the second last day of the Legislature on a matter of major public importance because the minister did not even have the courtesy to consult with the people involved by the bill. Is that the way we are going to function? Is this leadership? Where is the leadership from the Conservative government?

I am not just here echoing the concerns of the member for Portage (Mr. Connery). I am not talking just about the Premier (Mr. Fillmon). The Premier does seem to be conveniently out of the country, out of sight when anything controversial comes up, anything that might deflect from the Teflon image here, which is getting rather chipped, I might add, Mr. Speaker, recently. That is not leadership.

If the Premier is not going to be here to defend the policies of his government, why is it that none of the other members will defend it? Why is it they will say many things from their seat in committees. [interjection] Indeed, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) is saying a lot from her seat again. I have not heard her once on this bill. I have not heard her once speak about labour relations. That is not democracy. She is not speaking out on behalf of her constituents as are any of the rest. We are not a society which is governed by cabinet fiat or, even more with this government, by those who control the Premier fiat, because even, I think, some of the government members are recognizing even they do not have any say anymore, Mr. Speaker.

This is an important issue. This government cannot just push through matters of this kind and assume that things will just continue. They cannot, for example, assume there will co-operation on labour matters. We need co-operation. We need it desperately in this province when they are every session introducing antilabour legislation. Some will say perhaps we failed in the opposition on this side, and being a minority, I do not think it takes anything to recognize that when the final vote takes place, unless some Conservatives vote with their

conscience and support us on this bill—I can always hold that hope out, perhaps in the same way J.S. Woodsworth hoped for some sanity and reason in 1919 from the then-Conservatives and then-Chambers of Commerce.

If we do not succeed in that, Mr. Speaker, there is something that is probably just as equally as important. I want to say that first of all, I do not think it is going to be any surprise to anyone in this House that this bill is a temporary bill. If the New Democratic Party forms government, we will, I am sure, expeditiously vote out every single one of the negative amendments in this bill. So it is a very temporary bill, because that will not be too far away. I said on second reading, it was two years or two members. It is now two years or one member. In fact, I think that two-year clock is ticking away rapidly.

There is a role for oppositions. I was struck by a comment that was made by an historian remarking on J.S. Woodsworth. You know, J.S. Woodsworth never served a day in government in his life. He sat as a two-person labour caucus in the House of Commons in the 1920s and extracted old age pensions out of the Liberals. He sat as part of the later CCF in 1933.

An historian wrote, just shortly after his death, what I felt was probably a fair comment. It was echoed by his daughter in her book that was brought out a number of years ago. He was more important, the historian said, for what he represented, rather than his actual accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, that is the importance of this debate. The government will accomplish yet another attack on the ability of working people to organize. The government will accomplish more implementation of the Chamber of Commerce agenda; the government will accomplish pushing through this bill on third reading, but that is not a failure on our part.

I will say that we have an even greater achievement, because we are here representing the true rights of working people and the rights of working people to democracy. That is all we are asking for from this government. This is a democratic society; we are blessed with a democratic society with all its faults.

It has always struck me that why we can be so democratic in public life, political life, and yet not be democratic in our economic lives. Why is it? There should not even be any question that if working

people want to be represented by a union, that they cannot be represented by a union. Why should there be any doubt, the working people know how to choose on that very decision, any more than—even though I disagree with the members opposite, even though I did not like the last election result overall in the province, I always said, I have always said, and I know the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) has been in this Chamber for many more years than I have: The people are always right. The Conservative government may be wrong, but the people are always right.

So why can they be right in their political lives but not in their economic lives? That is what I say. This is what this debate is all about. It is what it represents more than the immediate day-to-day accomplishments. This represents the same attitudes of the 1919 General Strike, when we saw the people opposite in this same Chamber, I am sure, only a few years later, when this Chamber was opened, make the same kind of speeches.

I could hear those echoes increasingly as this government entrenches itself, increasingly puts itself in a bunker, where it listens to increasingly few Manitobans and increasingly only the Chambers of Commerce and those that are its closest supporters. We are seeing it increasing.

We have seen the same attitudes even after the recognition of the right to collective bargaining in the 1940s. We have seen it. I put this in context as of a recent example of how that continues. I could cite cases in Manitoba, but I want to cite a case in Nova Scotia, the Westray Mine.

Mr. Speaker, that was not a unionized facility. Many questions have been raised about what occurred at that mine with the tragic deaths that took place. They have labour legislation very similar to what this province is moving toward. They have no automatic certification. It is very difficult for people to organize; we have seen the Michelin organizing drives fall.

Indeed, the irony is that the Westray Mine may now unionize after it has closed, because I know many people are considering that. I cannot help but wonder, if those people had been represented by that union, by a union, if they had been at the table with the employers, might not that have been avoided. That is why this bill is so important. It is the right of miners, such as the Westray miners, to say yes to a union if they wish.

It is the right of employees here in Manitoba, whatever area of the province, to say yes to a union, to bargain for wages and working conditions, in some cases to bargain for the very existence of the kind of safety and health measures that are necessary to preserve their own lives.

* (2040)

That is what unions are about, by the way. That is all they represent. People talk about big unions. Unions are democratic organizations made up of people. I say, the government has accomplished one thing today passing this bill, but they are accomplishing very little because what they represent is a throwback to those days decades ago when people did have to fight for the right to collective bargaining. They did have to be subjected to coercion and intimidation in the workplace.

What we are fighting for, Mr. Speaker, is for the hope that in 1992 we can at least learn that in terms of labour relations we need more harmonious labour relations. We need to recognize once and for all in this country that it is positive to have people represented by whom they want to be represented, in that case, whether it is a union or not, and that we would all be far better off.

We might even get some of that co-operation that is so important to saving our economy in this province if for once this government stopped trying to just accomplish the passage of a bill and stood for something, stood for something positive, stood for something that is going to move this province ahead in labour relations and not roll back the clock decades.

That is why we in the New Democratic Party, for the fifth session in a row, on every item of antilabour legislation that this government has introduced, is going to vote no to Bill 85. Thank you.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act. I listened with interest to the presentations that were made in committee on this bill, and there were many interesting presentations that were made, and the concerns that these working people in the province of Manitoba had with respect to their rights being infringed upon by this particular piece of legislation that is proposed.

But I will deal with that a little bit later. I want to relate somewhat of my own working experiences

during the course of my 25 years in the work force and what it has meant to me as an individual. I have worked both for nonunion shops, and I have worked for union shops as well. I have seen both sides of the fence. I know what it is like to work in these operations.

I will start first by speaking about the nonunion shop that I worked in which was back a number of years ago. While working in that operation, of course, I was employed as a labourer in that particular plant. It was a manufacturing plant here in the city of Winnipeg.

After having worked at that particular plant for a year doing heavy labouring work, the employer at that time had decided that for various reasons he no longer needed certain members of his employees. So the employer one day, at the lunch hour, came up to the employees, myself being one of them, and indicated that as of four o'clock that day our services would no longer be required and that we were laid off.

Now, this came as a total shock to us, Mr. Speaker. We had not expected this to happen; business seemed to be good. There were a lot of sales going out the door of that particular plant, and the employer seemed to be thriving. We found it very strange that we only had four hours' notice, but being very young at the time, we did not know what the rules were.

This is where labour legislation comes into play, because I think it is important that we continue to have that protection. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I was unaware of what the labour legislation of the province was, and I did not know where to go for that advice and that counselling. It was a few days later, after finally searching and seeking the advice and the information that I desperately needed at that time, I was put in contact with the Labour Board in this province.

(Mr. Jack Penner, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

They made me aware, at that time, that it was a requirement in this province, where the individual was paid on a two-week basis, that two weeks notice was required. I went back to my employer, that I had been laid off from, and I notified the employer, at that time, that it was a requirement, by provincial law, that if the employer were going to lay off the employees in that operation, that two weeks notice had to be given or two weeks pay in lieu of that.

Well, the employer became very upset with that and after consulting, I am sure, with the Labour department in this province, came back a day later and indicated, yes, they would be willing to follow the law. But had it not been for that labour legislation, Mr. Acting Speaker, that employer would have taken advantage of myself and other members of that particular plant who were laid off at that time. So labour legislation does play an important role in this province in protecting the nonunionized workers.

But at the same time, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have had the opportunity to work in a union shop for a number of years—over 20 years. I served on both the union board itself as a shop steward and, as well, I was part of the management team of that particular operation. So I have seen both sides of the operation, and I know how the system works in heavy industry as far as union-company relationships are concerned.

In that particular operation, where I had worked for many years, we have had, in my years there, three strikes, in which I participated, as a unionized employee, in two of those. I can assure you, Mr. Acting Speaker, that there were not any employees whom I detected during that time who wanted to go on strike. This was a last resort for them. They did not want to deprive the families of the income that they desperately needed to maintain their quality of living, their standard of living, but they saw no other recourse then but to withdraw their services from this particular company.

Had the negotiations continued in good faith, I am sure that it could have arrived at a negotiated settlement, but it did not, and the strikes occurred at that time. Of course, from that, the employees were forced out on to the picket line. But they saw no recourse, and they saw that the only way that they could achieve the goals that they needed, by way of wage settlements that would allow them to keep up with the cost of living, was for them to withdraw their services and to go on the picket line at that particular plant's operations.

It was some 10 or 12 days later that the employees were ordered, by federal legislation, back to work, and that it went to binding arbitration. The employees did not achieve through binding arbitration all that they had hoped to achieve, either through the strike process or through the negotiated process. But, nevertheless, they were deemed to be essential services, so the federal government

chose to legislate them back to work. The employees were bitter, and they had, for some period of time, a resentment towards the events that had taken place. There were a lot of hard feelings that were created and it took years for those hard feelings to disappear. The employees lost the money by going on strike, but at the same time saw that as their only recourse.

In the other strike, Mr. Acting Speaker, where I was a member of the management of that particular company, I saw the difficult times that these employees had, the difficult decisions that they had to make before they opted to take that action. It was not easy watching them on a daily basis on that picket line, and knowing full well, because many of them are my friends to this day, that their families were suffering, but had they chosen not to do that, their families too would have suffered, quite possibly even greater than the suffering that they incurred while they were on strike.

It is very important that we have labour legislation to protect the rights of these individuals, but, by what we see here in this Bill 85, we see a watering down, a reduction or elimination of the rights of companies' employees to unionize.

I think back to the one presentation that was made in particular that caught my attention. It was made during committee on this piece of legislation, where the one presenter indicated that a certain company in this province was taking its employees aside on a one-by-one basis and quizzing them on whether or not they had been questioned or had been contacted by any members of a particular union organization with respect to organizing that particular company. Now, it is my understanding from the comments that were made during that committee, Mr. Acting Speaker, there was no organizing that was intended for that company. The organizing that was taking place was happening in the province of Saskatchewan, and yet this particular company had the fear, because it was their operations in Saskatchewan that were in the midst of a certification drive, that it would move to the province of Manitoba.

* (2050)

So what they were doing by their actions in this province was confronting these employees on an individual basis by taking them aside and attempting, I believe, to in some form pressure or intimidate these employees or coerce these

employees into not entertaining the thought of becoming a union member should the certification process come to this province for that particular company. Now, that is only one example, Mr. Acting Speaker, of the means that a company can use to coerce its employees into a particular direction.

I know, looking at the legislation itself under Section F, where it indicates that an employer can communicate to an employee a statement of fact or opinion, reasonably held, with respect to an employer's business.

Now, looking at the case of that company that had contacted their employees here, and I saw this take place in my own experience, my own years of work experience, where the senior managers of a company would instruct their lower levels of supervision to communicate with employees certain aspects of management's beliefs to try and impress upon them the management position. That is a role that a lot of first level or middle management supervisors have to perform on behalf of the senior management of the company.

I believe by that presentation that was made in committee that it was the same type of action that was taking place, and by this, Mr. Acting Speaker, I know it to take place, management does have a role where they do, from time to time, to further their own ends, communicate directly with the production line employees, with the employees of the operation, their opinions, their thoughts, hoping to influence in some way the employees of that operation.

This particular segment of this legislation I think is a step in the wrong direction. I know there were many presenters at the committee who asked that this bill in general be withdrawn, but at the same time, they were very concerned that sections of the bill such as this would be forming part of the new labour legislation in the province of Manitoba, and they raised that to the attention of the minister and other members of the committee at that time. As my experiences have shown, employers will use every available opportunity to further the ends of the company itself, and it is in their own interest to do so. One would expect that they would do it, but this will now allow and permit them to influence the opinions that are held by the employees of that operation.

Other sections of this legislation are repugnant to myself because of what it will do to the rights of the

working people in the province of Manitoba who wish to become part of a union organization, to afford themselves with protection for themselves and their families, so they can have some sense of security.

There are members opposite and other members of our society who say that some unions are too strong and that the unions have too much power. My experience has shown that the unions are forced by the courts of this land to represent their members to the best of their abilities, otherwise charges can be brought through the court process against the union by members of the union itself. So the unions have a strong role to play, not that they would ever shirk that responsibility or that duty from my experience, but having read some of the decisions of the courts over the years and having heard of specific cases, I know that the unions are in a difficult position where they must, to the best of their ability, and I am sure they accept this responsibility willingly, represent the rights of their members.

In my short time in this House, Mr. Acting Speaker, we have seen many attacks on the labour movement of this province. I can remember in the first session of this House and even prior to my time in this House, having had made my thoughts known on the final offer selection legislation when it was attempted to be repealed under the minority government in this province, and later, when I became a member of this Legislative Assembly, when final offer selection was in the process of being repealed, and the attack on labour legislation in the province at that time, and the comments that were made that final offer selection was an unfair opportunity for employees in this province.

Then we saw after that other legislation that affected the working people in this province by way of Bill 56 in 1990 and Bill 59 last session, Mr. Acting Speaker, that eroded the rights, protection and security that working people have in this province.

This legislation allows the employers to make statements of fact or reasonably held opinion. As I indicated earlier, whatever is required for an employer to say to further the ends of the company, I am sure that they would leave no stone unturned if they could influence in any fashion the decisions that are made by the employees who are working for them. Statements that could be commonly heard, Mr. Acting Speaker, and I heard this in my years of experience working in the work force, that the company would refuse to open up its books to

indicate the financial position of the company. They wanted the unions to believe just *carte blanche* that the company was in difficult financial times, and I heard that argument used over and over again during contract negotiations.

I believe, Mr. Acting Speaker, that by this legislation allowing companies to speak directly with and communicate with their employees during the process of certification prior to the voting on acceptance of the unionization of their company, that the company will use the argument that if a union comes in, it will bankrupt a company.

There are many areas of this legislation that are not in the best interests of the working people in this province. I look at a particular piece of correspondence, and I think back to the comments that have been made by this government reflecting the interests of the Chamber of Commerce, and looking at the communiques that have come from the Chamber of Commerce, they specifically state that their mandate is to bring about changes to labour legislation in this province that will, as they say, and I quote, to improve the climate for business and investment in Manitoba.

Well, the only thing that I can see that this will improve for these companies to change the climate of business and investment is to lower the wage and benefits packages that are offered to employees in this province, and by that, it will mean a reduction in the standard or quality of life for these employees employed in our province, whether they be in union or otherwise, and will of course reduce the opportunities for them to provide for their families.

* (2100)

It is not in the best interests of the working people in this province to reduce the labour legislation, to restrict the rights of individuals in this province, and I think that this government is moving in the wrong direction. It should be looking to strengthen the labour legislation.

I know the minister, when he was in committee, I hope he heard the presenters that were making comments during committee at that time, that he would have listened, but it is obvious that he did not listen to the presentations that were there. They were from unions that are not normally part of the up-front debates and discussions that are taking place in this province as far as labour legislation. I think of the comments that were made by the MNU during the presentation at this committee just a short

time ago, where they asked for this legislation to be withdrawn because they saw it as a direct attack on their members and the rights of their members for the future.

So I hope this minister will look seriously at what the intent of this legislation is supposed to do and he will, in the future—because I doubt, Mr. Acting Speaker, that he will consider making or withdrawing this legislation at this time, even though we encourage him to do so. I hope that he will look seriously at the rights of the working people in this province, and that he will stop bringing forward any further legislation that will erode the rights of the working people in this province.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to having my opportunity, as I am sure all other members do, to vote on this particular piece of legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my remarks on third reading to this bill. The member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), made reference to another image in the movie *Casablanca*, but I would just suggest to honourable members that there was a very valuable lesson in that particular movie.

At the beginning of that movie, the central figure, Rick, started the movie by trying to escape from the world that was rapidly changing around him. He buried himself away in *Casablanca* and tried to ignore what was happening in the outside world. By the end of the movie, he had come to the realization that he could not escape from that world, that he would have to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, that lesson is one that all of us have to wrestle with. Whether we are government, whether we are political parties, whether we are businesses or whether we are a union movement, labour movement, we have to be prepared to deal with the future. During the course of this debate, several members opposite made reference to the need to work together, to have harmonious relations, to work together to overcome problems.

Mr. Speaker, I very briefly just want to share with members an experience I had today, when as Minister of Labour, I presented a safety award to the No. 1 firm in Manitoba, with the safety record. I presented it to the company and three unions. The nominations for those awards were made by the

Workplace Safety and Health Committee jointly, by both the management and labour chair.

Mr. Speaker, the company which won that award, Abitibi-Price, United Paperworkers International Union, the lumber and sawmill union and the Office & Professional Employees International Union, the three unions and the company that won that award are a model of labour relations and working together.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Federation of Labour, where were they during the presentation of this award? They were outside picketing an award being granted for that harmonious relationship.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I just point out to members that at committee we were able to make some amendments to the bill suggested by many of the presenters, particularly Mr. Christophe of UFCW and Irene Giesbrecht from the Manitoba Nurses' Union. I was very pleased we were able to make those additions to the bill.

I would, as well, just point out to members opposite that Mr. Christophe from UFCW had no difficulty with allowing freedom of speech with respect to statements of fact. He did express some concern with opinions reasonably held. I think that part of the amendment will be tested at the labour board and will not prove to be the great difficulty that many have argued.

Mr. Speaker, I would also just point out in reference to comments made by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) about the need for co-operation in matters where there was agreement at Labour Management Review Committee. I would point out that some of the areas that did have unanimous agreement at Labour Management Review Committee and were therefore included in the bill were opposed by the Manitoba Federation of Labour when they made their presentation.

So that puzzled me, but I will allow others to draw their conclusion. Again, I think this matter has been thoroughly debated in the course of the House in committee, all positions have been put on the record. As I started this debate, I would say I would like to thank the presenters by and large who made presentations, and I am very happy that we were able to adopt some of those amendments that I think make the bill a much better piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House, third reading of Bill

85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. 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): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

The question before the House is third reading of Bill 85, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

Nays

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carstairs, Cerilli, Cheema, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Edwards, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Friesen, Gaudry, Harper, Hickes, Lamoureux, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 26, Nays 24.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

* (2120)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to move into Committee of Supply to deal with the concurrence motion, and after that time we will come out and begin to deal with the Finance bills.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), 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.

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 to consider the following motion:

Moved by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), seconded by the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), that the Committee of Supply concur in all 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 the House ready for the question? The question, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Chairperson: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): I would request a formal vote, Madam Chairperson.

Madam Chairperson: A count-out vote has been requested. Call in the members.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 25, Nays 26.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Chairperson: Order, please.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I request another count, Madam Chairperson.

Madam Chairperson: The honourable government House leader is indeed in order, and I have been informed by the Clerk of the House that this is not breaking with tradition and custom.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 25, Nays 24.

Madam Chairperson: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Ashton: Best two out of three?

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I was paired with the member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard). Had I voted, I would have voted with our side.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Madam Chairperson, I was paired with the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), and had I had the opportunity to vote, I would have voted with this side.

Madam Chairperson: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered and adopted the concurrence motion relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993, which have been adopted at this session.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that this House concur in the report of the Committee of Supply respecting concurrence and all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993.

Motion agreed to.

* (2140)

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mrs. Shirley Render (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to present the Second Report on the Standing Committee of Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to report? [Agreed]

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections presents the following as its Second Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, June 16, 1992, at 10 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building and Wednesday, June 24, 1992, at 7 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider the report and recommendations of the Judicial Compensation Committee.

Your committee adopted at its June 24, 1992, meeting the following recommendation:

MOTION:

THAT the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections adopt the proposal in Schedule A and recommend the same to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

**SCHEDULE A
RECOMMENDATIONS ON JUDICIAL
COMPENSATION**

1. That salaries for provincial court judges be maintained as follows:

- a) Provincial Court Judge \$91,274
- b) Associate Chief Judge \$93,279
- c) Chief Judge \$98,272

2. That effective April 3, 1993 salaries for provincial court judges be increased 3% to as follows:

- a) Provincial Court Judges \$94,017
- b) Associate Chief Judges \$96,017
- c) Chief Judge \$101,117

3. That Order-in-Council 831/89 be rescinded.

4. That the Civil Service Superannuation Act continue to apply to Provincial Court Judges as though they were employees within the meaning of that Act.

5. That effective July 1, 1992 for full-time service as a Provincial Court Judge accrued on and after that date, a supplementary pension plan for Provincial Court Judges be established based on the following terms and conditions:

- a) the supplementary plan provides benefits and entitlements that, in combination with those provided under The Civil Service Superannuation Act, will equal those that would be provided under that Act if the calculation of the allowance was based on an accrual rate of 2.61% per year of service;
- b) the maximum number of years of benefit accrual equal 23.5;

c) the supplementary pension plan be administered by the Civil Service Superannuation Board and the Lieutenant Governor in Council may provide for payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund to the Board of such amounts as he fixes to reimburse the Board for the costs of the administration of this part; and

d) all payments made under the supplementary plan be a charge upon and paid out of the Consolidated Fund without any further or other appropriation by the Legislature.

Your committee reports that it has considered the Report and Recommendations of the Judicial Compensation Committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for St. Vital, seconded by the honourable member for Niakwa, that the report of the committee be received. Agreed? That is agreed and so ordered.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): I wonder if I might speak on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It has been moved by the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), seconded by the honourable member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the report of the committee be received. Was that agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. All those in favour of presenting the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, 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.

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

Second Report on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable government House leader, with said message.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a message respecting the motion from the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections from the Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable government House leader, seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, that the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be concurred in.

Mr. Chomlak: I wanted to spend a few minutes with respect to this motion that is being tabled in the Legislature this evening in order to discuss some of the background of it and our position with respect to that particular motion, Mr. Speaker.

At the onset, we want to indicate that the entire process that we went through with respect to the Committee of Privileges and Elections and dealing with this matter was, in the best way I can phrase it, ad hockery. It was stunted; it was cumbersome. It was awkward, and the process simply did not work. I want to lay out a little bit of history with respect to this particular matter as it occurred.

The government put in place a statutory process to review the salaries and pensions of judges. They put a process in place. A committee was struck to review judges' salaries and pensions, and the committee provided a report, the report to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That report came to the committee last July.

At that time, the government that had put the process in place had no recommendation with respect to the report, absolutely no recommendation. Despite our inquiries and our pressing the government, no recommendation was made for that report. In fact, the deputy minister, the government's representative on that committee, had indicated that basically they approved of that report but that the economic circumstances at the time would not permit the government to proceed with the report.

Subsequently, another meeting of the committee was held, at which time the government again had no recommendation with respect to that report. At that time, under questioning, the minister indicated

that certain aspects of the report the government did not agree with and certain aspects they agreed with.

We at no time had any direction or idea as to what aspects of the report were agreed with, so we as committee had no direction as to where we were going with respect to this matter, Mr. Speaker.

At the end of that last meeting, the government indicated to us that in fact, contrary to what was indicated in the report, the government had already increased the salaries of judges, but the government was asking our advice on pensions.

We asked the government what their options were. They were presenting to us at the end of the last meeting; we were presented with three options with respect to pension.

When we went into committee this evening, the government presented us with a fourth option that was unrelated to the three options that were presented the last meeting.

The system was awkward; it was cumbersome; it was ad hockery. It did not work. We did not approve of the government bringing in this procedure, not dealing with the recommendations, not providing recommendations.

Tonight was the first time the government ever came about with a concrete recommendation which provided us no opportunity to review it at caucus and no opportunity to deal with this particular long-term recommendation and the ramifications.

As a result, the approach does not work. We did not participate in that approach. It was stunted. There was no meaningful background, no meaningful information provided, and we, therefore, at committee stage, abstained from dealing with this matter. Those are my comments, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is that the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be concurred in. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No? 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. Ashton: On division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Mr. Manness: I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that in accordance with subsections 11.1(5) and (6), of The Provincial Court Act, the Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections respecting judicial compensation received on June 24, 1992, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave? Does the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) have leave?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

* (2150)

Hon. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be concurred.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It has been agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), that the fees paid with respect to the following bills be refunded less the cost of printing, namely Bill 39, The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital"); and Bill 90, The Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation

Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Seven Oaks General Hospital").

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It has been agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the fees paid with respect to the following bill be refunded less the cost of printing, namely 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").

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. Manness: I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means with the member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair.

SUPPLY—CAPITAL SUPPLY

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay): Order, please. Will the Committee of Ways and Means please come to order. We have before us for our consideration the resolution respecting the Capital Supply bill and the Main Supply bill.

I would remind all honourable members that as the 240 hours allowed for consideration of Supply, and Ways and Means resolutions has expired, pursuant to Rule 64.1(1), these resolutions are not debatable.

The resolution for Capital Supply reads as follows:

RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$380,917,000 for Capital Supply, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993—pass; and

RESOLVED that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1993, the sum of \$5,058,392,500 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund—pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted certain resolutions respecting Main and Capital Supply, reports the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to recognizing the honourable government House leader (Mr. Manness), I would like draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left, where we have with us this evening the Honourable Fred Stewart, who is the Minister of Technology, Telecommunications and Research. He is also the MLA for Calgary-North Hill.

Also, we have the Honourable Tom Perry, Minister of Advanced Education, Training and Technology, from British Columbia.

On behalf of all members, I would like to welcome you here this evening.

* (2200)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 103—The Appropriation Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that leave be given to introduce Bill 103, The Appropriation Act, 1992 (Loi de 1992 portant affectation de crédits), and that the same be now received, read a first time and be ordered for second reading immediately, by leave.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader (Mr. Manness) have leave to introduce Bill 103? Leave? That is agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 103—The Appropriation Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 103, The Appropriation Act, 1992 (Loi de 1992 portant affectation de crédits), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House, by leave.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader (Mr. Manness) have leave? Leave? It is agreed.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 102—The Loan Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that leave be given to introduce Bill 102, The Loan Act, 1992 (Loi d'emprunt de 1992) and that the same be now received, read a first time and ordered for second reading immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader (Mr. Manness) have leave? Leave? It is agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 102—The Loan Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 102, The Loan Act, 1992 (Loi d'emprunt de 1992) be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader (Mr. Manness) have leave? Leave? It has been agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bills 102 and 103, The Appropriation Act, 1992, and The Loan Act, 1992, for third reading.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills 102 and 103 with the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill 102—The Loan Act, 1992

Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay): Order, please. Will the Committee of the Whole please come to order to consider Bill 102, The Loan Act, 1992. We shall proceed to consider Bill 102, clause by clause.

Clause 1—pass; Clause 2—pass; Clause 3(1)—pass; Clause 3(2)—pass; Clause 3(3); Clause 4(1)—pass; Clause 4(2)—pass; Clause 4(3)—pass; Clause 5—pass; Clause 6—pass; Clause 7(1)—pass; Clause 7(2)—pass; Clause 7(3)—pass; Clause 7(4)—pass; Clause 8—pass; Clause 9—pass; Clause 10—pass; Clause 11(1)—pass; Clause 11(2)—pass; Clause 12—pass; Clause 13—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

Bill 103—The Appropriation Act, 1992

Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay): We will now proceed to consider Bill 103, clause by clause, The Appropriation Act, 1992.

Clause 1—pass; Clause 2—pass; Clause 3(1)—pass; Clause 3(2)—pass; Clause 4—pass; Clause 5—pass; Clause 6(1)—pass; Clause 6(2)—pass; Clause 6(3)—pass; Clause 7(1)—pass; Clause 7(2)—pass; Clause 8—pass; Clause 9—pass; Clause 10—pass; Clause 11—pass; Clause 12—pass; Schedule A—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees): The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 102, The Loan Act, 1992, and Bill

103, The Appropriation Act, 1992, reports the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 102—The Loan Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 102, The Loan Act, 1992 (Loi d'emprunt de 1992), reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave? Leave? It has been agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

* (2210)

THIRD READINGS

Bill 102—The Loan Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with leave, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 102, The Loan Act, 1992 (Loi d'emprunt de 1992), be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave? Leave? It has been agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 103—The Appropriation Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 103, The Appropriation Act, 1992 (Loi de 1992 portant affectation de crédits), as reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 103—The Appropriation Act, 1992

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move,

seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 103, The Appropriation Act, 1992 (Loi de 1992 portant affectation de crédits), be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave? Leave? It has been agreed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I want to take this opportunity to add a few comments to the record, Mr. Speaker, on third reading. [interjection] We are a little earlier than we thought, to the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), in terms of the schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few remarks. It is quite appropriate to say a few things at the end of a session, even though we are only adjourning and not proroguing this evening. Nothing I can say today is as dramatic as the vote we just had just a few moments ago in terms of the energy that we saw from members opposite draining away from their faces, and their bodies and their souls. The member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) smiles now, but there was not a smile on his face on his face about 45 minutes ago, I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to you, you have had an interesting session, I might say. We have always felt that you are a fair and honest person who has guided us in our debate, has put up with all of our traditions of democracy that, of course, I think are quite appropriate for this Chamber.

I remember once you lost your temper, only once in six months. I tried to stop you, walking down the hall. I will never try to do that again. This is not a person you should try to stop by putting your hand on his shoulder. But, Sir, you have conducted yourself with the dignity of this Chamber and the fine traditions of our Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Speakers from time to time get together with other Speakers. Opposition leaders get together with other opposition leaders, Premiers get together, ministers get together. If you ever have the chance to visit England, there is a new Speaker who was elected, a Labour Party representative, whom I think you will find quite interesting. She was elected by all members of the Chamber after the most recent elections. Please pass on our regards from our New Democratic Party to her. She is quite a fascinating person and quite an interesting person.

We also want to pass onto the Clerk and staff and Pages and Hansard staff all of our thanks—Legislative Counsel, too—for all our amendments both in terms of private members' bills, many of which never see the light of day in terms of debate, but we do work hard trying to draft those ideas and put them forward. Those bills, by the way, we do not necessarily feel, because they are temporarily stalled on a government Order Paper as private members' bills that they are indeed a waste of time, because they will be part of a huge agenda that we will put forward to the people of Manitoba for an alternative agenda.

So the Legislative Counsel's time has not been wasted, and we thank them for their technical expertise. We also pay tribute to the Fifth Estate. I noted last year the Premier (Mr. Filmon) said he was keeping a Christmas card list about the Fifth Estate. But there is an interesting debate always in terms of the media and their role in our democracy.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to pay tribute to the Lieutenant-Governor. I know that the term is over and it has been extended and extended again. Dr. Johnson is honoured as a person who has hosted a number of us at a number of different times, all of us when we are first elected, I suppose, in our first session. He is a person who has served Manitoba well and continues to serve Manitoba well in his role as Lieutenant-Governor.

Because his term is potentially over and being extended, I just wanted to pass on our caucus' respect to him and his tremendous contributions both as a cabinet minister in the former Roblin government and as a deputy minister in the Department of Health later on, and now serving in the highest office as Her Majesty's representative in this Chamber. He is a fine person and a fine Manitoban.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. In December when we started this session there were 57 members. There are now 55 members in this Chamber, and we have lost two people since we all gathered here together in December.

The first one to go was Jim Carr, the member for Crescentwood, who resigned to go into journalism. Some of us would argue that that is not necessarily a more honourable profession; some of us would argue that it is. But I always respected Jim Carr. I had some good debates with Jim Carr over some items over the years. But he certainly, no matter

what political party we are from, added a lot to the debate in this Chamber. He is a person now who is missing from our ranks, when we first started.

Of course, yesterday, Ed Connery resigned from his caucus and from this House after six years. I was elected when Mr. Connery—when I was first elected in the class of '86 along with lots of other members, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway)—I am going to miss people now when I start this.

We did have some members elected that year, many other members opposite. [interjection] Yes, I know. I always had some good arguments with the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) over the years, particularly when he was in his Environment portfolio, but I always respected his ability in his constituency. I think he always fought for the community of Portage la Prairie, and we wish him and his family all the best in their upcoming endeavours.

I would urge the government—I have been disappointed that the Crescentwood by-election has not been called earlier, notwithstanding where we think we are going to be in that by-election. For all the parties, I think it is important that all 57 constituencies have a representative in this Chamber, and I would urge strongly that the Premier practise democracy and call by-elections in those two seats. It is important that Manitobans have representatives in this Chamber and speaking on behalf of the interests of their constituents.

* (2220)

Mr. Speaker, I remember last year saying that there were two ways to go in my speech at the end of a session. One way to go was those self-serving speeches where we just repeated all our revisionist history in terms of the past, and another good way to go is just to put a few comments on the record about the future of this province. I noted last year that the Premier stated that none of us will win in a mud fight. This is the Premier, the member for Tuxedo, in Hansard: None of us will win in a mud fight. The people of this province deserve more. They deserve a competition of ideas. They deserve honest acceptance and recognition of the challenges that face us, and they deserve, in my judgment, an honest approach to the solution of those concerns.

And then he went and proceeded to knock the heck out of us all the way through his speech. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those words are quite appropriate, because you, Sir, have cited members of this Chamber on decorum and words before. I would suggest to all members of this Chamber that if we were to keep the personal attacks away from the debate, to keep the personal attacks away from people's professions, from people's families, from people's communities, from people's motivations, and only dealt with the competition of ideas, this place and all MLAs would be held in much more respect. So why do we not all pledge tonight? You know, we are discussing all these technical rules together. We are discussing whether we should have a notwithstanding clause in paragraph 78 of subparagraph 46 of some obscure ritual that we practise. But why do we not in that rules discussion agree on the most fundamental rule of all humankind, and start the session off whenever it is called next time with an agreement that no personal attacks will be made? Because we have an honourable profession, all of us, on behalf of the people of this province, and we should practise it in an honourable way.

We should not take for granted the fact that we are two members short from six months ago. We should not take that for granted. We should not, I think, forget the fact that we have the responsibility to bring the pride and respect of our profession back to the people we all serve. So that is a pledge we are making tonight at the end of the session. That does not mean you are not having feisty disagreements on substance. I think we all love feisty debates, but we respect each other as human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few other comments about issues that are facing this government and all of us in this Chamber in the next few months ahead. Canada's 125th birthday will be celebrated within a week. Within that same week the Premier (Mr. Fillmon) and the Minister of Constitutional Affairs (Mr. McCrae) will be meeting in some type of forum with the Prime Minister. I want to say on behalf of our caucus that we wish the Premier and his minister well, and we wish him well in those discussions on our country and the issues before all of Canada. Manitobans, as I said before in other resolutions, have always been the bridge between eastern and western Canada. We have always been the bridge between the have and

have-not provinces. We have always been the bridge between those provinces that see the weakening of federal governments and those provinces like Manitoba that want to strengthen and enhance the federal role.

I want to say to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the government that we on this side remain as committed today as we were six months ago to the all-party task force that our members were proud to sign. The member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) and the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) signed the all-party task force on behalf of our caucus but, more importantly, on behalf of the Manitobans who presented their public views in public hearings. I just want to say that we will be supportive of any initiatives that the Premier and government return with that are consistent with that all-party task force review which is consistent with the views of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just go over those, a couple of items, in that all-party task force. When we looked at the public hearings and the public presentations, a couple of major themes came through loud and clear—whether you were in Brandon or Dauphin or Thompson or Winnipeg—the absolute strong vision of Manitoba in a strong national government. I remember the words in the first recommendation on a strong national government. It said the ability of a federal government to redistribute wealth from region to region or the ability of Canada to redistribute our great wealth to individuals within our great country. What greater priority could we not have collectively than that role of a strong national government that we see in medicare, in post-secondary education and the floor being maintained in equalization? So I say to the government, you will have our support in that recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, we also saw Manitobans from all walks of life, from all communities, saying that 350 years of a relationship with our aboriginal people must be reformed in the Constitution of Canada, and we must collectively as Canadians redress our constitutional deficiencies with Canada's First Nations. We too are committed to that recommendation, and we too will support the government in achieving those proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is also a very important item for this government and for all of us in this Chamber. We have traded statistics and numbers and facts and figures and blame and

not-blame across this floor since December. [interjection] The economy, I am sorry. You get into the Constitution and you cannot get out.

But, Mr. Speaker, the economy is an item, as I say, that we have been discussing for the last six months, since December. I think I have asked about 75 to 80 questions on the economy since our session started, and I think the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has answered and not agreed with me on 80 or 85 questions that I have asked in terms of the economy or the analysis.

Mr. Speaker, whether we are in first place or last place or medium place, we have a lot of people unemployed. We have a lot of people going on social assistance. All the statistics aside, I have not gone to a family event or an event with friends in the last year where I have not heard from somebody who has either been laid off themselves or a member of their family is being laid off or a very close friend is being laid off. That is very, very serious for Canadians, and it is very serious for Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the government, again, to follow through on the idea of an economic summit. We believe that Manitoba's greatest strength is the ability of our people to work together, that we are all equal in wanting a future for ourselves and our children and that we are all equal stakeholders. There is no such thing as a better stakeholder than one or the other, that business, labour, agriculture and government working together gets more of us working.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the government to look at what happened in British Columbia two weeks ago in terms of their economic summit. I would ask the government to use the experiences of the early '80s. It is a positive experience. It is positive to get people working together. We do not need solitudes in our own economy. We need consensus. We need vision. We need people working together in co-operation, not people in solitudes or conflict. So we would urge the Premier to consider that idea and follow through with that idea.

Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to be very careful about the free trade agreement with Mexico. It is an item that is going to be dealt with, potentially, before this House sits again. When we had the leaders' debate, the Premier very carefully said no to the free trade agreement with Mexico. I think he said on August

30 specifically: I am not going to be supporting free trade with Mexico.

*(2230)

Since that time, the government has developed six conditions. We have suggested to the government that there be an additional condition and that is the involvement of the public of Manitoba which was not one of their conditions—I know there is surveying, et cetera, et cetera.

But, Mr. Speaker, we see now, and we believe we have lost a lot of jobs under free trade with the United States. The Premier disagrees, but we believe we have lost a lot of jobs with the existing trade agreement. We believe the state bears this out. Not every job that is lost is because of the Free Trade Agreement with the United States, but we have a lot fewer jobs today in many of those key sectors. I read back to the Bank of Nova Scotia predictions in terms of free trade with the United States, and it was quite interesting. On the food industry, on the food processing industry, on the manufacturing industry and some of the other industries in this province, they have been bang on, unfortunately, in terms of "winners and losers."

So we move—I am not here to debate the past, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest to the government that we have serious problems with the free trade proposals with Mexico. We believe that this is not a trade agreement where we raise the common denominator up. We believe this is a proposed trade agreement where the common denominator goes down.

Environmental groups in the United States have already identified that. People in Canada have already identified that, and Manitoba has some very major risks, notwithstanding the philosophical disagreements in terms of the role of the public to be involved in the sovereignty investment decisions of a country, which we will disagree with with the Conservatives opposite because we have a different philosophy, but very specific industries are very definitely at risk in Manitoba.

The apparel industry in Manitoba will be devastated by the triple transformation proposals that are on the table, something we have been raising and the government confirmed last week in this House, 7,000 jobs with that proposal.

The province of Manitoba, I believe, because we are a net importer of energy, will be devastated by the energy proposals in the trade agreement. Mr.

Speaker, the 1,700 farmers who are part of thousands of people, who are involved in supply-management farming, will not be better off under this trade agreement. Do not listen to the NDP, Sir, listen to Ritchie, the person who was involved in the former free trade negotiations with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, farmers and agriculture in rural Manitoba are already under tremendous strains in western Canada and Manitoba. All of us have attended town hall meetings across this province and heard the number of people going bankrupt. You know, when we heard five or six years ago, when people were going bankrupt, we used to hear farmers saying, well, they were not a good manager, or that person maybe was just a little marginal in their operations. We do not hear that anymore. They have been devastated by the world prices. They have been devastated, in our opinion, by a number of other factors. In their communities and their town halls, we have heard them loud and clear.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford, we believe, to move again on another trade agreement. We do not believe the families of Manitoba can either. So we leave that with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in the next crucial few months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, another area that is a very great concern for us in the economy, and I am not going to list everything, is the Port of Churchill. We are so fortunate to have a port like Churchill in Hudson's Bay, a seaport in the centre of North America. I think all members here, notwithstanding our little disagreements about what was said or what was not said, are committed to the Port of Churchill and the rail line to the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that we are continuing to work together. I say to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Driedger), we respect his efforts. I say to the Premier (Mr. Filmon), with all the energy you have and with all the efforts you will put into play, do not let the federal government and the Wheat Board kill the Port of Churchill. Let us keep it alive in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in this 125th birthday of Canada, I want to say to the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), congratulations on 23 years of elected service. It was the June 23rd week, I believe, in 1969—

An Honourable Member: Is he leaving, too?

Mr. Doer: Well, I just mentioned that because the June 23rd week should play a very special importance to all members of this Chamber who were around a couple of years ago, particularly the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper). Mr. Speaker, the member for Brandon East joins the other dean of the Legislature, the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), in a long and illustrious career.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying that I really, really do enjoy the dedication, the work, the integrity, the intellectual commitment to the issues of all members of this Chamber. I really enjoy being part of debates in our own caucus, which I find fascinating and enjoyable. I really enjoy the debate from all members of this Legislature, whether it is in committee or debate in this Chamber. I wish all of you good health to both yourself and your family. Thank you very, very much.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to suggest to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) that no matter what I say, I am not resigning, so you do not have to run out of the House, as you did last year, and announce to the media that I was giving my swan song inside the Chamber. I can assure you that it is not a swan song and will not be for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank you, not primarily, interestingly enough, for your participation in this Chamber—because we do that every year, and it's become a bit of a tradition—I want to thank you instead for the warmth of your personality and your caring about every member of this Chamber outside of this Chamber.

There have been notes that I have received from the Speaker in which I obviously had a bad head cold and he has noted it, and I got this little note saying, I hope you feel better soon. Those kinds of expressions of your concern for us make, I think, everyone of us feel that we are part of a family, and like all families, we have disagreements on occasion, but there are times when we have to reach out to one another with a sense of caring and compassion.

That is why I have urged my caucus whip to pair with individuals on occasions such as that, when they need that particular reinforcement and concern that we are in fact human beings and that we can have our disagreements, but there are also times when we need to treat each other as a bit of a large

and extended family. We will continue to have disagreements, and we will continue to vote against one another on various issues. We will continue to complain about positions taken by various ministers or by various members, but we also have to, I think, fundamentally remember the humanness that goes into all of us.

I thank very much the Pages who do a great number of running back and forth and errand runnings. Tonight, I am sure they were somewhat confused as these bills kept running through the place. There did not seem to be any debate on them. They just seemed to be distributing them one after another. But they perform a very important function. I know that they, in many cases, had to work a little harder in their academic studies this year because of the extra burden of being with us for many of their hours. I thank them for that. I hope that they have learned, and I hope we have not turned them off completely from the political system and that they will still choose to perhaps become participants in that political system.

* (2240)

I thank the table staff, of course, and the Hansard staff and Legislative Counsel for providing innumerable numbers of services. I thank the security guards, who have always been extremely concerned about all members but, I think, particularly for the female members, because they want to assure our safety and our security. They have frequently walked me to my vehicle late at night just to make sure that I got into it safely. I thank them for that.

I want to talk about a number of issues affecting us as a province. Just before I do that, I want to pay some very special tribute to the House leader of our caucus. The House leader's job is a difficult one. I happen to consider it the most difficult one in this Chamber. Some people think that is the Minister of Family Services' (Mr. Gilleshammer), but it is not. I really think it is the House leader's job. It is a difficult one. It is demanding. It is time consuming, and there is not a lot of thanks.

I pay tribute to the other two House leaders while I am doing this, but I have to suggest that I do not deal with them on a day-to-day basis as I do with my own. I want to say to all of this House how much confidence I have in our House leader and how much support that we give him. He is the youngest member of this Chamber. I think that he has grown

in maturity enormously since his election in 1988, but more importantly, he has grown in the affection that each one of us hold for him.

A number of events are going to take place this summer, not the least of which is Canada's 125th birthday, but another person in the Chamber, at least one other person, has a very important birthday coming up this summer, in August, I think. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) will also reach that milestone of being 50, and I wish him a very happy birthday. The class of '42 is doing it again.

But as to the issues that I am particularly concerned about, I did not get the opportunity to participate earlier in the debate on the resolution with respect to an economic summit. I want to make it clear to the Premier that I think it is a very valid idea and one that he really should consider very seriously. If he wants to exclude all politicians from that economic summit, then that is fine. I can go along with that. What I do not want to see excluded, however, are those who are in the workplace and those who, more importantly, are not in the workplace. We talk about these summits as often being government and business and labour and farmers. We often do not talk about young people being at an economic summit.

I am unfortunately dealing with the prospect of having two daughters who will never live in the province of Manitoba, and I think many of you are facing that same prospect. They will not find the occupations of their choice here in the province of Manitoba. That is tragic. I would like to see those young people invited to a summit, because I think they have very valid ideas about where this province should be going and what would draw them and keep them here in the province of Manitoba. So, if he has to exclude those of us of political parties as government participants in such a summit, I would gladly give up our places for young people to be in attendance at such a summit, so that they could offer their good ideas for where we should be going in the future, because we all agree that the future is going to be very different from the past.

The kinds of jobs that are going to be available are going to be very different from those that we had. The opportunities that they have are going to be very different. The technology and the skills they are going to have to acquire are going to be very different, and I hope that they would become participants in such a summit.

I also hope that in the field of health care reform which we have supported in terms of the announcements of the ministry do not get side-railed. I am very concerned that if the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is not very up-front with the public every single step of the way, that fears will grow. Those fears will mushroom and the reform process could be stymied. That would be very bad for our province because medicare will not survive if it is not reformed.

It is essential that it be reformed, but reform must involve the participation of the people. That means that they have to be kept informed about the reform process every single step of the way. There can be no obfuscation. There can be no hidden agendas. There can be no concerns of not enough seriousness that they are not shared with the public, because the public will decide whether they can move with the government on these reform proposals or whether they cannot. It is very important that they be involved.

I would like to speak just briefly about the Constitution, Mr. Speaker. This is Canada's 125th birthday and if I had my real choice, I would like to see a referendum offered to the Canadian people on would they like to put the Constitution to bed until Canada's 150th birthday. I think we would get universal support because I think they are terribly fatigued about the Constitution. I have come to the conclusion that I would rather see the maintenance of the status quo than the rolling draft text which I saw over the last few weeks because, to me, it does not evoke what this nation is all about.

I have been a fortunate Canadian in the fact that I have lived in a number of provinces, having been born and raised in Nova Scotia, living for some time in Ontario, then in Alberta, and now in Manitoba. I am, first and foremost, a Canadian. I will always be a Canadian first. For me, my Canada, and I hope the Canada of many Canadians, is represented by a strong central government with national standards on a variety of issues.

I would like to see Canadian standards on education from kindergarten all the way through, so that our young children could move around this country and that their mobility rights, as expressed in the Charter, would be genuinely that, that their Grade 9 would be recognized as Grade 9, that their Grade 3 would be recognized as Grade 3, and yet we seem to be moving away from national standards, even at the post-secondary education

level and training level, and that concerns me very much for the future of our young people.

Medicare is the most important social program for all Canadians. They believe it is their birthright. They believe it is fundamental to their rights as Canadians, and if we do not have participation of the federal government, and that means federal dollars and federal standards, then we will not have medicare as we know it. When we talk about offloading, when we talk about devolution of powers, we see a country, or I see a country at least, and my party sees a country that is becoming more and more separated and less and less of one with one another.

Equalization is part of that answer, but it is not the only answer. EPF funding which is essential to the support of medicare and post-secondary education must also be guaranteed. But we must accept the fact that if the federal government only writes cheques and if that federal government is not expected nor allowed to take responsibility for programming, then that federal government will quickly find a way so that it no longer has to write the cheques, and then we do not have in my opinion the country that we have today.

Before we gather on October 20, hopefully we will have had a couple of by-elections, and we will be back to our number of 57. I hope that each and every member of this Chamber will spend the time to heal themselves because I think healing is a necessary part of this business after four or five months in this Chamber.

I think it is important for us to step outside this building and discover that there is a whole other world out there, to learn that often the hours we spend debating that we think are so critically important, often nobody has paid any attention to what we have had to say. We have to understand that politics is important, democracy is critical to our system, but the most critical thing is for us to be full and complete human beings, because when we are full and complete human beings, then we can serve our constituents better. We can be true to ourselves and we can, I believe, fulfill ourselves and our responsibilities as MLAs which I still consider to be of the highest calling.

Every one of us has been blessed by our constituents, every single one of us. They have said to each and every one of us, we are putting our faith in you. We owe it to them to be fully restored

and to be in full health to be able to serve them to our utmost ability.

* (2250)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with my colleagues, the Leaders of the other two parties, in thanking you for your continued strong leadership in this Assembly, the manner in which you make everyone feel equal and at home here in this Chamber and the manner in which you are able to preside in such a fair and impartial fashion.

Along with you, of course, I want to echo the thanks that have been extended to the table officers, to the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, the Hansard staff, the clerks, the Journals Branch staff, the Pages, of course, for whom I hope this has been a positive learning experience, all of the staff in the building whether it be the security staff, the maintenance staff, the people who so ably serve us and enable us to do our jobs in this Chamber. I, certainly, on behalf of all of my colleagues want to extend thanks.

I do not want to ignore people who are often maligned, often perhaps unfairly bear some of the shots that all of us bear in this Chamber and that is our political staffs, our support staffs, people who sometimes act as human shields for us in many situations. I say that they all serve us very, very loyally and probably put in longer hours than anybody in the public believes or understands, and they do it because of a dedication to what they believe in by way of what our government is doing, what they believe in for the future of our province. I thank them all very much.

I want to compliment and thank the Leaders of the opposition parties for the manner in which they have spoken this evening. I dare say that if more speeches were given of that nature, more people might get interested again in a positive way in the Legislature and the things that we do here. More people might change their views of all of us, and I say it in a collective sense very definitely.

None of us can point a finger because I can pull out all the Hansards of the things that have been said about me and, vice versa, the things that I have said about you. I think that none of us benefits by that. When we gather together from time to time, when some of our numbers are retiring, and I can think of some of the nice speeches that were made when the former member for Churchill retired or

others stepped aside in this Chamber, and we all lament at the disrespect and the disrepute in which politicians are held in this country and perhaps internationally. It is probably because we bring it on ourselves. It is probably because we all seem to spend so much time in the latter days of the session that we end up thinking alike, but it certainly was my full intention in coming here to pursue the same line of thought that our opposition Leaders have this evening.

I want to begin by extending my thanks to the former member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery), to congratulate him for his service in this Legislature, for his service to his constituents. I know that he always was loyal and committed to the people of Portage la Prairie, and I know that he always came here with the best of intentions to serve out his responsibilities to the people.

I can say in all sincerity that we have spent many enjoyable years together, and during that period of time, he and I have not always agreed. I think that as we look back on matters, we probably agreed much more often than we disagreed, but reality is that I suppose you always remember more strongly those points upon which you have conflict and disagreement. But he always fought hard. He always held firm. I believe that in the end, unfortunately, our differences, not necessarily on policy, but growing personal differences that stemmed from perhaps the most difficult decision in my career in government, led him to make his decision.

I respect the choice that he made and the decision he made. I believe, in the final analysis, that he will be a happier individual and a more productive individual, because he has freed himself from the unhappiness that he bore in latter times in this Legislature. So I certainly will, as I extended personally to him earlier today, extend my best wishes to Ed and Bev for good health and a happy time together in future.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that despite the fact that we are taking what I believe is the right approach with respect to evaluating our problems and our challenges here, we have to all recognize that we are facing some very, very difficult times, not only in Canada, but throughout the world. I have had some experiences even in the last month that, I think, have affected me very strongly in terms of the things that I believe are important and the challenges that all of us are going to have to face.

I think that this is a time when the public are very rightfully looking for elected officials who will level with them, who will not try and sugar-coat the pill, who will talk openly about what are the big issues that we face in our country and in the world. I think, without question, people are looking for people who will set aside petty politics and seek to tackle the very difficult issues in a way that sets aside partisanship, but the difficult issues that are going to be required in order to make major, major adjustments in preparation for what I consider to be perhaps the pivotal decade of this century and maybe the pivotal decade—and this may be going too far—in the world's history.

In Canadian terms, we have only just begun with matters. I was very impressed when I had a series of four meetings with the Leaders of all the provinces and territories and the federal government that began December 21, 1991. I wish that others in this Chamber had the opportunity to participate, but what impressed me most was the willingness to set aside partisanship in trying to deal with difficult issues at that table.

It reminded me, I might say, of a lesson that I think was a good lesson, that I learned early on in my political career, when I sat on the Works and Operations Committee of the City of Winnipeg in my first term on council in about 1976 and I became good friends with Magnus Eliason, somebody known well to members opposite. Magnus said to me at one particular meeting, Gary, it is important that you never judge an idea by the person who brings it forward. He said, you know, I have fundamental philosophical differences with many people on City Council, but I often find myself agreeing with them on issues and being engaged by their debate and their position on matters. So I have repeated that message to people from time to time, and I think it serves us well.

* (2300)

That is precisely the kind of thing that we were dealing with at the First Ministers' table in the series of four meetings, because everyone of us, when we examined it, was facing exactly the same challenges. None of us are going to be able to easily deal with the budgetary constraints that face us over the next while. It may make for some great exchanges here in the Legislature, but the incredible shrinking revenues are an issue not just for the Province of Manitoba and our Finance minister, but for every administration in this country.

We have gotten used to inflation taking care of a lot of our needs, and we still do not see the point in the future—and I say we, not just this province, but every province—at which we are going to get our revenues back up even to inflation. Now what that means is that there are huge challenges for the vital services that face us. The social safety net that Canadians pride themselves on so very, very much that separates us I think in a very positive way from every nation in the world is in great jeopardy unless we are prepared to throw away some old assumptions and to, in essence, reform the manner in which we deliver those fundamental services.

We begin by talking about health care. If there is any service that Canadians depend upon most, take most pride in, of all of the public services that any government provides, No. 1, it is health care. It is the best system in the world by far, but if we do not fundamentally reform it, we are in danger of losing it. I know that I am preaching in many senses to the converted, and that is exactly what the health care reform program that was put forward, an approach to health care reform that was put forward by our Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), is intended to do.

I say to you that when it was discussed in a nonpartisan forum with leaders of New Democratic stripes, with leaders of Liberal stripes, there was no disagreement as to what had to be done, and there was no disagreement as to what the fundamental shifts had to be. I know that there will be, undoubtedly, in every jurisdiction in Canada, some quibbling as to whether or not the process is correct or whether or not the checks and balances that are put into the process are correct or whether or not it is managed properly, but the fundamental shifts absolutely have to take place. It does not matter who is in office, of what political stripe, that is going to be the challenge for the future for all of us in every province.

What struck me was the offer, the open offer, of the leaders of other political persuasions of, in essence, standing together, holding hands and walking down the beach together on this, because we are all going to be faced with the same criticisms. We are all going to be faced with the same demands, and we are all going to have to have the courage to do it together or else it will fail.

If once we gave into the temptation of blaming each other or comparing as we used to do—and I remember 12 years ago when I was in cabinet and we used to go to federal-provincial meetings, and

every province would give statistics to prove that they were doing more for medicare, so many beds per capita, so many dollars per capita, such and such a percentage of their budget. Everybody felt they were doing a better job.

Today, in the eyes of our electorate, none of us is doing a good job. That is the reality. Everybody is not getting enough out of the dollars that we are spending.

I believe that this is a challenge that is going to be there for all of us, and I would hope that in our preparations for this challenge, that perhaps we do consult with our other political parties across the country and just see whether or not somebody is reading the signals wrong. So far, I have not found a jurisdiction, I have not found an administration which has a different view of what is going to have to be done in that respect.

The No. 2 challenge for reform was alluded to and I think introduced very nicely by the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs), and that is reform of education. The world that we are facing today is a world in which our competition is no longer the people down the street from us, in another community in our province or across this country. It is competition that is worldwide. As I said earlier today, we are moving from a production and industrial economy, a production-based economy to an information-based economy, and the information is created instantly by electronic communications, and the people of the world will be our competitors in terms of this kind of challenge.

In so doing, we are going to have to ensure that our education system is not up just to the test of the people around us or the people in other provinces, but to the test of whether or not we meet with the best in the world. That is an immense challenge, and it is one that we have no way of avoiding. It is going to happen whether we like it or not and whether or not we are flexible enough in changing our delivery mechanisms, in changing our form of evaluation, testing and standard setting that the Leader of the Liberal Party, and I agree wholeheartedly with her, talked about.

We are once more going to have to go back to the things that were important in the past and I think will continue to be important in the future, and that is having standards that we can aspire to, that we can measure and that we can evaluate, because ultimately, we are all evaluated in the performance

of our responsibilities. People in the private sector are evaluated in the performance of their responsibilities. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) said earlier today that I would be fired if I were evaluated on a private sector basis for my performance, but that is reality. Everybody is evaluated.

Education is going to be no different and education is going to have to adjust, and that reform in education, I believe, will be another major challenge for the '90s.

Thirdly, of course, is the challenge of shifting our whole economy, because when you think in terms of the changes in jobs—and we can argue, and I am glad the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) left open the question of whether or not the loss of jobs in certain sectors of our economy was as a result of trade agreements, or whether or not it was as a result of major structural shifts that are taking place in the world's economies, and we are just a small part of it.

Having just come back from the Western Governors' Conference, I know that the United States job losses in the manufacturing sector have been absolutely awesome over the last couple of years. Even if we talk about 150,000 jobs lost in the manufacturing sector in Ontario, that pales by comparison to the major structural changes taking place in the United States. So they think that the Free Trade Agreement has caused—their opponents to the Free Trade Agreement say they think it is because of the Free Trade Agreement with Canada.

It is not so. It is a major structural shift that has taken place throughout North America and, indeed, throughout the world from the production- and industrial-based economy to the information-based economy. So the key, and we get back to education, is what are all those people going to be doing who are displaced from employment in areas in which they had skills and no longer have marketable skills? That is going to be retraining and retraining in a whole series of venues, whether it be in our colleges and universities, whether it be industry based that we help sponsor innovatively through so many other means, those are going to be the major shifts for the future. That is the big picture that I think we are going to have to keep in mind as we again go into the decade of the '90s strongly seeking new answers, new visions and new opportunities.

That is why I am so happy with the Economic Innovation and Technology Council. I had the pleasure of being with them for part of their two-day seminar. In keeping with the Magnus Eliason advice, I encouraged them and they were very supportive of and are going to be organizing this fall a major conference on the economy, bringing together all the players. I think they are better positioned to do it.

* (2310)

The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) assumed that I was saying that no politician should be involved. I would like to be there because I am very excited with the prospects of the kind of people who they would like to bring to the table to stimulate discussion on these major shifts and challenges in the economy that we are going to be facing. I would certainly like to be there as one who could learn from many of the big thinkers and the people who can participate from a variety of different viewpoints. That does include the people who are on the labour front, the people who are on the educational front, the people who are in all of the sectors of our economy and how they might be affected by the shifts. They have to be there and we have to be there, hopefully to learn from.

In following up on the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Doer) strong recommendation on that, I would hope that all the parties in the House would want to participate. I know the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) is interested in it and asked about it as the critic for Finance and Trade and other matters in this House. I am sure that he has ideas and suggestions to contribute to that. I know that members of the New Democratic Party do have recommendations and suggestions to contribute.

I would hope that people look upon that conference as an opportunity to listen to what the people who are out there in the real world, as they like to call it—I apologize for that, it is not a slight to members here—but as the Leader of the Liberal Party said, we have to get out there from time to time, out of this House to recognize that the debates that we go through are not necessarily relevant to the real problems that people face out there.

I would hope that those people from the real world will provide us with more than an opportunity to get a 10-second clip taking a shot at the economy. I hope that they will provide us with the opportunity to really turn this province onto the right path in

following those massive, massive shifts, changes and challenges that are before us.

The Leader of the Liberal Party mentioned young people. Well, I am not going to suggest that there is not a problem with respect to young people not having employment here in their home province, our sons and daughters who we all want to have around us. I have a daughter teaching school in British Columbia. I have a son at Osgoode Hall law school in Toronto. Sure, Janice and I think about whether or not they will ever be back living in their home province. I do say that, in particular, there are reasons why maybe not, and there are reasons why I feel that they will be back. That has not changed.

I am going to be going later this summer to a class reunion, my graduating civil engineering class of 1964. Where? In Alberta. Why? Because a third of that graduating class went to Alberta. Those were the '60s, and those were the boom days of the Roblin era when all sorts of things were happening here. But in various specialty areas, particularly engineering, the opportunities were where the resource developments were and all of those kinds of things. So that is why a third of my 1964 class went to Alberta and some of them to British Columbia and so on. Since we have had several reunions back here, they said we have to come to them this time.

I am just saying to you that has not changed, it has not changed over many, many decades. At the same time, we should never be in a position where we do not want to have opportunities for everybody who goes through our education system and who develops the expertise to add to our economy and to the future of our country and our world.

It is interesting that we start to think so globally. That brings me, very naturally, to the Earth Summit at Rio de Janeiro. I want to begin by thanking the Leader of the Liberal Party for giving me her personal pair so that I could go to that. Among other things, I think that was a conference that did mark a watershed in the future of the world, not only because it put the issue of sustainable development at the top of the political agenda for the countries of the world, but because it allowed people to start to think about what are going to be challenges that are implicit in sustainable development for the world's future, because sustainable development is more than just an environmental issue. Sustainable development is not an antidevelopment concept.

As Madam Brundtland said, you do not have the option of saying no growth and no development for the future of the world. If you do, you will condemn the poor people of this world to a life of poverty and misery. They must have continued development in order for them to be able to achieve a better standard of living, a standard of living such as we have. They may never aspire to that, but we have to keep working towards that goal.

We are the most favoured, most blessed nation in the world. We have the greatest standard of living of any country in the world, in my judgment, in so many ways. The United Nations recognize that. That is the good news. The bad news is that there is such a huge proportion of the world who live in abject poverty.

That was the other half of my experience in Brazil, because I spent two and a half days with people from the Manitoba Council for International Co-operation which successive administrations, going back into the Schreyer years, have funded—almost a half million dollars out of my budget last year, funded \$12 million on Third World development projects—thanks to the tremendous commitment and dedication of many church-based and charitably based organizations who multiply that effective of our money, and then CIDA multiplies it by four or five and we get a tremendous impact out of a very small amount of money.

We went into the interior of Brazil and we visited projects that I think all of us would be proud of. YMCA in one very small community about an hour and a half into the mountains outside of Rio de Janeiro has a variety of projects. Their major one is a camp that gives a positive wholesome experience in the summertime for basically street children, people who would otherwise not have this opportunity for a wholesome experience of playing sports, learning crafts and doing things that might have a chance of altering their outlook on life. They also have a preschool that they developed by renting a very small space in a little building adjacent to a grocery store in this tiny village, and they carry out a preschool for four- and five-year-olds. These are children, again, who may or may not ever have a school experience, but thanks to the YMCA they do.

They also have another building in which on alternate days they have a pediatrician and a dentist come in and provide free services to these people in this terribly, terribly impoverished area. In that

same building, they carry on a sewing workshop to teach women, primarily, to sew, so that they can not only make their own clothes but perhaps to sell some. That was what the YMCA was doing with a very, very, very little bit of money and a lot of volunteer help.

Then we went into MCC outside of Recife about a 250-kilometre drive from Recife inland and there we were only about three degrees from the equator in a semiarid area, and we went to see two primary projects. One at Belo Jardim in which the Mennonite Central Committee works in conjunction with the local Catholic church padre who somehow has acquired 28 acres of land, and it has been put into tiny plots that are about six metres by 20 metres and the Mennonite Central Committee helps families to build a six metre by five metre house, 300 square feet.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Speaker, In the Chair)

Of course, the major effect of it is that Mennonite Central Committee volunteers teach them how to do it. They take and they mine the clay off the banks of a little creek that runs through, and they fire the bricks in an oven by themselves. The Mennonite Central Committee teaches them to make the border and they build this little house. We were in one that was only three metres by five metres, 150 square feet, in which there were nine children and mother and father. Yet, they were happy as you could imagine, because this was the only house that they had ever had in their lives and this was a huge step forward.

It is a co-op, so that with a little bit of income that they do earn—there are odd jobs—they pay back the money—most of them—to the pot and so it gets recycled. MCC, in that project, they built 280 houses in the last decade. Of course, the volunteers who in this case were a Manitoba couple, Marvin and Evelyn Koop, they live there with their little children, and they devote three years of their lives to this endeavour.

Then we went to a farming area near Caruaru, and there we had a young woman who was a graduate of Guelph University in Agriculture and helped to organize a farmers' co-op and with a little bit of money helped each farm family buy five hectares of land, 11 acres approximately of land. On that 11 acres again, they could grow, because it is continuous cropping over the space of 12 months, and they would go from fava beans to corn to

cassava root to fruit trees and honeybees, all of these things.

* (2320)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Again, we were on the farm a family—and I might say to you to give you another dimension of some of the challenges that they face. The woman who was 44 years old was in her 22nd pregnancy. If the child lives, it will be her 14th living child. Yet they live on this five hectares of land, and this again is a source of tremendous pride and tremendous opportunity to them.

I could go on and tell you these stories, but the unmistakable conclusion of this is that the problems and the challenges that we face in the developed world pale by comparison to the problems and challenges that the world will face. Last year, and the year before, we all talked about how delighted we all were that the cold war is essentially over in the world. That something that we never thought would ever happen did happen. The world is evolving out of communism, and that threat that we all had hanging over our heads as we grew up no longer exists.

I think that there is an even greater, I will say threat because it is a threat, that if we do not bridge the gap between the wealthy nations of this world and the poor nations of this world, it will explode upon us some time in this decade. They still have access to all of the public information. There are television sets even in the smallest, most impoverished villages, and they know how the rest of the world lives. Eventually, their desires for greater economic status, for greater opportunity, for better living conditions, because where we were in Brazil, the average life expectancy in that interior region is 35 years of age. Thirty percent of children die before two years of age. You are dealing with cholera; you are dealing with AIDS; you are dealing with immense killer diseases, and all of those things say that their quality and standard of life is a horrible one, that we would not want anybody to ever be condemned to it. They are condemned to that lifestyle unless we, in the developed world, are prepared to recognize that and do something about it.

So when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) talks about trade and being against trade with Mexico, I say to him that one of the speeches that I heard from Andrew Steer of The World Bank at the

N.G.O. Forum at Rio was about the role of trade in helping us to bridge the gaps between the poor and the wealthy. I think unmistakably if we were to create a situation in which all we did was continue to harvest the resources in those countries and not develop a true relationship in which they could produce goods and sell them to us to improve their standard of living as part of it, if we did not allow for trading relationships on a fair basis—and I will stress this absolutely.

I went through this discussion again at the Western Governors' Conference where they have exactly the same concerns as we do about the NAFTA agreement with Mexico. Those six conditions that I read out and shared with the western governors—they have those same kinds of concerns. It has to be a fair situation; but at the same time, it is one of the keys to ensuring that as the world develops we find a way that is as painless as possible of bringing up the standard of living of the poorer nations. Mexico certainly is a nation of contrasts with a very thin layer of wealth and a very large layer of impoverished people.

We cannot ignore the fact that there has to be some trade on a fair basis, on a basis that we can live with in order for us eventually to get those standards of living up, in order to ensure that we protect the world's environment, because we have to go to sustainable development. That is the only basis upon which the world's environment will be protected in the long term. Otherwise, resources will be indiscriminately harvested in a nonsustainable way to the detriment not only of those impoverished countries but everybody in the world.

So as we look forward to this decade, it will be a decade of huge issues. On the home front: health care reform; education reform; perhaps expanded world trade; certainly sustainable development; immense, immense issues, the whole shift to the information economy; challenges that I think would boggle the mind. Even one of those would boggle the mind of most people, and we are going to have to make all of them. We are going to have to make all of them at the same time as we, in Canada, go through perhaps our biggest internal crisis that both Leaders have talked about, and that is the Constitution and the unity talks.

When you consider how much is at risk, all of us want those talks to succeed, all of us, of course, just as we want trade to be on a fair basis, want the

Constitution to be settled on a fair basis. It cannot be, as we believed Meech Lake was, a one-way street that was really addressing only the problems and concerns of one province.

Now, in this round, I think we are addressing more problems and concerns, but not necessarily the ones that were identified in the Manitoba Task Force on the Constitution. That, of course, is a concern to our government and a concern to me in going to the table for the next round of discussions, as to whether or not we can achieve an agreement that will indeed meet the challenges and meet the tests that are put forth by our all-party task force. That is our goal; that is our objective. That is our hope. I hope that we can come back with something that not only meets those tests in our all-party task force report but that keeps Canada, in its 125th year, unified and obviously on a stronger footing to meet the challenges of the future. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker's Statement

Mr. Speaker: Prior to putting the question on the main appropriation act, I also too have a statement for the House. On behalf of all those who cannot speak, and that includes the table officers, the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, our gallery attendants, our messenger room attendants, our Pages, the journals clerks, Hansard, the Clerk's office staff and myself, it has been indeed our pleasure to serve and help guide each and every one of you.

Now, let me draw a little parallel. Many of you have been able to pull a horse along or guide him along by the reins, not difficult. You hook two together on a cutter, it gets a little bit more difficult. You have all marvelled at the fact when you have seen a six- or an eight-horse hitch and you have wondered how they could all move ahead. Now, picture 57 trying to pull together for one common goal, and that goal being to leave this place a better place than when we found it.

So on behalf of everybody, all Manitobans, I want to thank each and every one of you, because the distinction is very clear, whether you are a minister, a critic, a legislative assistant, a Whip, a caucus chair, a government House leader, I sincerely want to thank each and every one of you on behalf of all Manitobans.

* (2330)

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is, it has been moved by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), seconded by the honourable Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 103, The Appropriation Act, 1992; Loi de 1992 portant affectation de crédits, be now read a third time and passed. 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.

ROYAL ASSENT

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Roy MacGillivray): His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

His Honour George Johnson, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent:

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

Bill 6, The Denturists Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les denturologistes

Bill 7, The Real Property Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels

Bill 8, The Garnishment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la saisie-arrêt

Bill 9, The Economic Innovation and Technology Council Act; Loi sur le Conseil de l'innovation économique et de la technologie

Bill 10, The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Hydro-Manitoba

Bill 11, The Bee-Keepers Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur les apiculteurs

Bill 12, The Animal Husbandry Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élevage

Bill 14, The Highways and Transportation Department Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le ministère de la Voirie et du Transport

Bill 15, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route

Bill 20, The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale

Bill 34, The Surveys Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'arpentage

Bill 38, The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la preuve au Manitoba

Bill 39, The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital"

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

Bill 43, The Farm Income Assurance Plans Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les régimes d'assurance-revenu agricole

Bill 44, The Milk Prices Review Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le contrôle du prix du lait

Bill 46, The Jury Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les jurés

Bill 47, The Petty Trespasses Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Intrusion

Bill 48, The Personal Property Security Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les sûretés relatives aux biens personnels

Bill 49, The Environment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement

Bill 52, The Pas Health Complex Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Pas Health Complex"

Bill 53, The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la manutention et le transport des marchandises dangereuses

Bill 61, The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4); Loi no 4 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur

Bill 62, The Business Practices Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les pratiques commerciales

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

Bill 68, The Public Trustee Amendment, Trustee Amendment and Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le curateur public, la Loi sur les fiduciaires et la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille

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 71, The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act; Loi sur les bénéficiaires des régimes de retraite

Bill 72, The Law Reform (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act; Loi sur la réforme du droit (modifications diverses)

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

Bill 74, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau

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

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

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

Bill 79, The Highways Protection and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la protection des voies publiques et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois

Bill 80, The Dental Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association dentaire

Bill 81, The Optometry Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'optométrie

Bill 82, The Farm Practices Protection and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la protection des pratiques agricoles et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois

Bill 84, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation

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

Bill 86, The Provincial Police Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Sûreté du Manitoba et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois

Bill 87, The Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les enquêtes relatives à l'application de la loi

Bill 88, 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

Bill 89, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire

Bill 90, The Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Seven Oaks General Hospital"

Bill 91, The Liquor Control Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

Bill 92, The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le vérificateur provincial

Bill 93, The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale

Bill 94, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992; Loi de 1992 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité

Bill 95, The Tax Appeals Commission Act; Loi sur la Commission d'appel des impôts et des taxes

Bill 96, The Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act; Loi sur l'Office de financement des organismes de service spécial

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"

Bill 98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act; Loi sur le multiculturalisme au Manitoba

Bill 100, The Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act; Loi modifiant les lois sur les régimes de retraite

Bill 101, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992;
Loi de 1992 modifiant diverses dispositions
législatives

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

* (2340)

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these bills:

Bill 102, The Loan Act, 1992; Loi d'emprunt de 1992

Bill 103, The Appropriation Act, 1992; Loi de 1992 portant affectation de crédits

Mr. Clerk: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

**(God Save the Queen was sung)
(O Canada was sung)**

Mr. Speaker: Please be seated.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that when the House adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable government House leader that this House do now adjourn. Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered. This House is now adjourned.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Wednesday, June 24, 1992

CONTENTS

Speaker's Statement			
Resignation, MLA for Portage la Prairie Rocan	5401	Northern Manitoba Ashton; Filmon	5409
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Presenting Petitions		Nonpolitical Statement	
Dutch Elm Disease Funding Friesen	5401	Western Canadian Bantam Hockey Championship Cheema	5410
Brandon General Hospital Funding L. Evans	5401	ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Independent Children's Advocate Office Carstairs	5401	Third Readings	
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees		Bill 34, Surveys Amendment Act	5411
Committee of Supply Dacquay	5401	Bill 49, Environment Amendment Act	5411
Ministerial Statement		Bill 79, Highways Protection and Consequential Amendments Act	5411
Seniors Day Ducharme	5401	Bill 82, Farm Practices Protection and Consequential Amendments Act Plohman	5411
Santos	5402	Bill 93, Mental Health Amendment Act	5412
Carstairs	5402	Bill 96, Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act L. Evans	5412 5412
Oral Questions		Bill 86, Provincial Police Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act Edwards	5413
Economic Growth Doer; Filmon	5402	Bill 87, Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act Chomiak	5414
Rural Economic Development Wowchuk; Derkach	5404	Bill 101, Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992 Chomiak	5416
Constitutional Proposal Carstairs; Filmon	5405	Third Readings - Private Bills	
Economic Growth L. Evans; Manness	5406	Bill 52, The Pas Health Complex Incorporation Amendment Act Doer	5417
Post-Secondary Education Friesen; Vodrey	5407	Report Stage - Private Bills	
Universities Review Friesen; Vodrey	5407	Bill 90, Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act	5418
Post-Secondary Education Friesen; Vodrey	5407	Third Readings - Private Bills	
Dutch Elm Disease Carstairs; Enns	5408	Bill 90, Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act Lamoureux	5418
Pharmacare Santos; Orchard	5409		

Debate on Third Readings

Bill 42, Amusements Amendment Act Ashton	5418
Bill 76, Pension Benefits Amendment Act Ashton Praznik	5420 5422
Bill 78, City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3) Friesen Edwards Doer	5423 5427 5428

Third Readings

Bill 98, Manitoba Multiculturalism Act Amendment Cerilli Lamoureux Santos	5429 5431 5434
---	----------------------

Private Members' Business

Proposed Resolutions

Res. 24, Economic Summit Doer Amendment Stefanson Doer Filmon	5435 5437 5440 5443
--	------------------------------

Debate on Third Readings

Bill 98, Manitoba Multiculturalism Act Santos Lamoureux Ashton	5446 5448 5449
---	----------------------

Bill 70, Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act Martindale Gilleshammer	5451
--	------

Bill 85, Labour Relations Amendment Act Storie Lamoureux Ashton Reid Praznik	5455 5458 5459 5467 5470
---	--------------------------------------

Supply - Capital Supply

Committee of Supply	5472
---------------------	------

Presenting Reports by

Standing and Special Committees

Privileges and Elections, 2nd Report Render	5472
--	------

Supply - Capital Supply

Committee of Ways and Means	5475
-----------------------------	------

Introduction of Bills

Bill 103, Appropriation Act, 1992 Manness	5476
--	------

Second Readings

Bill 103, Appropriation Act, 1992 Manness	5476
--	------

Introduction of Bills

Bill 102, Loan Act, 1992 Manness	5476
-------------------------------------	------

Second Readings

Bill 102, Loan Act, 1992 Manness	5476
-------------------------------------	------

Committee of the Whole

Bill 102, Loan Act, 1992 Bill 103, Appropriation Act, 1992	5477 5477
---	--------------

Report Stage

Bill 102, Loan Act, 1992	5477
--------------------------	------

Third Readings

Bill 102, Loan Act, 1992	5477
--------------------------	------

Report Stage

Bill 103, Appropriation Act, 1992	5477
-----------------------------------	------

Third Readings

Bill 103, Appropriation Act, 1992 Doer Carstairs Filmon	5478 5482 5484
--	----------------------

Speaker's Statement

Rocan	5490
-------	------

Royal Assent

Bill 5, Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Amendment Act	5491
---	------

Bill 6, Denturists Amendment Act

Bill 7, Real Property Amendment Act

Bill 8, Garnishment Amendment Act

Bill 9, Economic Innovation and
Technology Council Act

Bill 10, Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act

Bill 11, Bee-Keepers Repeal Act

Bill 12, Animal Husbandry Amendment Act

Bill 14, Highways and Transportation
Department Amendment Act

Bill 15, Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Bill 20, Municipal Assessment
Amendment Act

Bill 34, Surveys Amendment Act

Bill 38, Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act

Bill 39, Salvation Army Grace General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act
Bill 42, Amusements Amendment Act
Bill 43, Farm Income Assurance Plans Amendment Act
Bill 44, Milk Prices Review Amendment Act
Bill 46, Jury Amendment Act
Bill 47, Petty Trespasses Amendment Act
Bill 48, Personal Property Security Amendment Act
Bill 49, Environment Amendment Act
Bill 52, The Pas Health Complex Incorporation Amendment Act
Bill 53, Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Amendment Act
Bill 61, Consumer Protection Amendment Act (4)
Bill 62, Business Practices Amendment Act (2)
Bill 64, Child and Family Services Amendment Act
Bill 68, Public Trustee Amendment, Trustee Amendment and Child and Family Services Amendment Act
Bill 70, Social Allowances Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act
Bill 71, Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act
Bill 72, Law Reform (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act
Bill 73, Health Care Directives and Consequential Amendments Act
Bill 74, Law Society Amendment Act
Bill 75, Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act
Bill 76, Pension Benefits Amendment Act
Bill 78, City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)

Bill 79, Highways Protection and Consequential Amendments Act
Bill 80, Dental Association Amendment Act
Bill 81, Optometry Amendment Act
Bill 82, Farm Practices Protection and Consequential Amendments Act
Bill 84, Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)
Bill 85, Labour Relations Amendment Act
Bill 86, Provincial Police Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act
Bill 87, Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act
Bill 88, Homesteads, Marital Property Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act
Bill 89, Family Maintenance Amendment Act
Bill 90, Seven Oaks General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act
Bill 91, Liquor Control Amendment Act (2)
Bill 92, Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act
Bill 93, Mental Health Amendment Act
Bill 94, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1992
Bill 95, Tax Appeals Commission Act
Bill 96, Special Operating Agencies Financing Authority Act
Bill 97, Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary Incorporation Amendment Act
Bill 98, Manitoba Multiculturalism Act
Bill 100, Pension Plan Acts Amendment Act
Bill 101, Statute Law Amendment Act, 1992
Bill 102, Loan Act, 1992
Bill 103, Appropriation Act, 1992

PROCLAMATION

“Richard J. Scott”
Administrator

CANADA
PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the grace of God of The United Kingdom, Canada and Her other Realms and Territories, QUEEN, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

PROCLAMATION

To our beloved and faithful Members elected to serve in the Legislative Assembly of our Province of Manitoba, and to each and every of you — GREETING.

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba now stands adjourned;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed appropriate to request His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by a Royal Proclamation effective on the twenty-fifth day of November, 1992, to prorogue the Third Session of the Thirty-Fifth Legislature of the Province of Manitoba and to summon the said Legislature for the dispatch of business on the twenty-sixth day of November, 1992;

NOW KNOW YE THAT, for divers causes and consideration, and taking into consideration the ease and convenience of our loving subjects, we have thought fit, by and with the advice and consent of our Executive Council of our Province of Manitoba, to hereby prorogue the Third Session of the Thirty-Fifth Legislature of the Province of Manitoba effective on Wednesday, the twenty-fifth day of November, 1992, and to convene the Fourth Session of the Thirty-Fifth Legislature of the Province of Manitoba on Thursday, the twenty-sixth day of November, 1992, at the hour of 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon for the dispatch of business in our Legislative Assembly of our Province of Manitoba, in our City of Winnipeg, there to take into consideration the state and welfare of our said Province of Manitoba and therein to do as may seem necessary.

HEREIN FAIL NOT.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Our Province of Manitoba to be hereunto affixed;

WITNESS, His Honour Richard J. Scott, Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba;

AT OUR COURT HOUSE, at Our City of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this fourth day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ninety-two, and in the forty-first year of Our Reign.

BY COMMAND,

“J. C. McCRAE”,
Minister of Justice and Attorney-General.

“Richard J. Scott”
Administrateur

CANADA
PROVINCE DU MANITOBA

ELIZABETH II, par la grâce de Dieu, REINE du Royaume-Uni, du Canada et de ses autres royaumes et territoires, Chef du Commonwealth, Défenseur de la Foi.

PROCLAMATION

À nos bien-aimés et fidèles députés élus à l'Assemblée législative de Notre province du Manitoba, et à chacun d'entre vous, SALUT.

ATTENDU QUE l'Assemblée législative de la province du Manitoba est actuellement ajournée;

ET ATTENDU QU'il est jugé opportun de demander à Son Honneur le lieutenant-gouverneur de lancer une proclamation fixant au vingt-cinq novembre 1992 la date de clôture de la troisième session de la trente-cinquième législature de la province du Manitoba et convoquant la Législature pour la reprise des travaux le vingt-six novembre 1992;

SACHEZ DONC MAINTENANT QUE, pour divers motifs et de l'intérêt de Nos aimés sujets, Nous avons jugé à-propos, sur l'avis et du consentement de Notre Conseil exécutif pour la province du Manitoba, par les présentes de clore la troisième session de la trente-cinquième législature de la province du Manitoba le mercredi vingt-cinq novembre 1992 et de vous convoquer à l'ouverture de la quatrième session de la trente-cinquième législature le jeudi vingt-six novembre 1992, à treize heures trente, en Notre Assemblée législative pour la province du Manitoba, en Notre Ville de Winnipeg, pour la reprise des travaux, ce afin de porter votre attention sur l'état et le bien-être de la province du Manitoba et de poser les actes appropriés.

CE À QUOI VOUS NE DEVEZ FAILLIR.

EN FOI DE QUOI Nous avons fait délivrer les présentes Lettres patentes et à icelles fait apposer le Grand Sceau de Notre province du Manitoba.

TÉMOIN: Son Honneur Richard J. Scott, Administrateur du gouvernement du Manitoba.

EN NOTRE PALAIS DE JUSTICE, en Notre Ville de Winnipeg, dans la province du Manitoba, ce quatrième jour de novembre de l'an de grâce mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-douze, dans la quarante et unième année de Notre Règne.

PAR ORDRE.

Le ministre de la Justice et procureur général,
“J. C. McCRAE”.