

Second Session - Thirty-Ninth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable George Hickes
Speaker*

Vol. LX No. 70 – 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, September 17, 2008

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Ninth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BLADY, Sharon	Kirkfield Park	N.D.P.
BOROTSIK, Rick	Brandon West	P.C.
BRAUN, Erna	Rossmere	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
BRIESE, Stuart	Ste. Rose	P.C.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CULLEN, Cliff	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
HOWARD, Jennifer	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSON, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MARCELINO, Flor	Wellington	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McFADYEN, Hugh	Fort Whyte	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Carman	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELBY, Erin	Southdale	N.D.P.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.
<i>Vacant</i>	Elmwood	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, September 17, 2008

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYER

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONS

Pharmacare Deductibles

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These are the reasons for this petition:

The NDP government has increased Pharmacare deductibles by 5 percent each year for the past seven years, with the curious exception of the 2007 election year.

As a result of the cumulative 34 percent hike in Pharmacare deductibles by the NDP government, some Manitobans are forced to choose between milk and medicine.

Seniors, fixed and low-income-earning Manitobans are the most negatively affected by these increases.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the Premier (Mr. Doer) of Manitoba to consider reversing his decision to increase Pharmacare deductibles by 5 percent in budget 2008.

To request the Premier of Manitoba to consider reducing health-care bureaucracy, as previously promised, and to consider directing those savings into sustaining Pharmacare and improving patient care.

This is signed by E. Huzarewich, E. Palson, B. Rosentreter and many others.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with our rule 132(6), when petitions are read they are deemed to be received by the House.

Long-Term Care Facility—Morden

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background for this petition is as follows:

Tabor Home Incorporated is a time-expired personal care home in Morden with safety, environmental and space deficiencies.

The seniors of Manitoba are valuable members of the community with increasing health-care needs requiring long-term care.

The community of Morden and the surrounding area are experiencing substantial population growth.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) to strongly consider giving priority for funding to develop and staff a new 100-bed long-term care facility so that clients are not exposed to unsafe conditions and so that Boundary Trails Health Centre beds remain available for acute-care patients instead of waiting placement clients.

This is signed by Roberta Griffin, Ann Martens and Isobel Ching.

Physician Recruitment—Southwestern Manitoba

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

These are the reasons for this petition:

The Town of Virden has the last hospital in Manitoba on the busy Trans-Canada Highway travelling west.

For the safety of recreational travellers, long-haul truck drivers, oil and agricultural industry workers and its citizens, Virden, a town of nearly 4,000, requires emergency services at its hospital.

On June 30, 2008, the emergency room at the Virden Hospital was closed due to this government's failure to recruit and retain doctors for southwest

Manitoba and its failure to plan for the departure of doctors whose contracts were expiring.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald), to consider creating a health-care environment in which doctors want to work and build their careers in Manitoba.

To request the Minister of Health to consider making it a priority to recruit doctors to southwestern Manitoba so emergency rooms do not have to be closed when they are needed most.

This petition is signed by Lisa Pearn, Reg Kellsey, Garry Morris, Pam Gerry and many, many others.

Provincial Nominee Program—Applications

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

Immigration is critically important to the future of our province, and the 1998 federal Provincial Nominee Program is the best immigration program that Manitoba has ever had.

Lengthy processing times for PNP applications causes additional stress and anxiety for would-be immigrants and their families here in Manitoba.

The government needs to recognize the unfairness in its current policy on who qualifies for a Provincial Nominee Certificate.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to consider establishing a 90-day guarantee for processing an application for a minimum of 80 percent of applicants that have family living in Manitoba.

To urge the provincial government to consider removing the use of the restrictive job list when dealing with the family sponsor stream.

This is signed by J. Aquino, M. Santiago, M. Gonzales and many, many other fine Manitobans.

Recovery Strategy—Manitoba Farmers

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba:

These are the reasons for this petition.

Several regions of Manitoba have been hit by repeated heavy rains since spring of 2008.

This has created serious challenges for farmers, including hay and straw shortages, damage to bales, forages and pastures, barns and corrals, crop losses and lost inputs, among others.

The excess moisture has also caused other problems, including the flooding of homes and outbuildings, sewage backups and septic field saturation.

Local governments have been hit with road washouts and other infrastructure damage.

People affected by the excess moisture and flooding are very concerned that the provincial government has not responded quickly enough and that they are being left to deal with this disaster on their own.

There is fear that without comprehensive strategies to address these challenges, there will be serious lasting economic consequences in the affected regions.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to consider developing a comprehensive recovery strategy aimed at addressing both the immediate and the long-term effects of this year's excessive moisture conditions and flooding.

To urge the provincial government to consider examining all types of programming to help producers recover from this disaster, including emergency one-time programs, as well as improvements to the crop insurance program to address its shortfalls.

To urge the provincial government to consider addressing shortcomings with drainage and the processing of drainage permits.

Submitted on behalf of O. Olson, Larry Henry, Roy Forsyth and many, many others.

* (13:40)

Mr. Stuart Briese (Ste. Rose): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba:

These are the reasons for this petition.

Several regions of Manitoba have been hit by repeated heavy rains since spring of 2008.

This has created serious challenges for farmers, including hay and straw shortages, damage to bales, forage and pasture, barns and corrals, crop losses and lost inputs, among others.

The excess moisture has also caused other problems, including the flooding of homes and outbuildings, sewage backups and septic field saturation.

Local governments have been hit with road washouts and further infrastructure damage.

People affected by the excess moisture and flooding are very concerned that the provincial government has not responded quickly enough and that they are being left to deal with this disaster on their own.

There is fear that, without a comprehensive strategy to address these challenges, there will be a serious and lasting economic consequence in the affected regions.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to consider developing a comprehensive recovery strategy aimed at addressing both the immediate and the long-term effects of this year's excessive moisture conditions and flooding.

To urge the provincial government to consider examining all types of programming to help producers recover from this disaster, including emergency one-time programs, as well as improvements to the crop insurance program to address its shortfalls.

To urge the provincial government to consider addressing shortcomings with drainage and the processing of drainage permits.

This petition is signed by Roy Laycock, Barb Morrisseau, Kevin Morrisseau and many, many others.

Hard Surfacing Unpaved Portion— Provincial Road 340

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

These are the reasons for this petition.

All Manitobans deserve access to well-maintained rural highways as this is critical to both motorist safety and to commerce.

Provincial Road 340 is a well-utilized road.

Heavy vehicles from potato and livestock operations, agricultural-related businesses, Hutterite colonies and the Maple Leaf plant in Brandon use this road.

Vehicles from Canadian Forces Base Shilo also travel this busy road.

Commuter traffic from Wawanesa, Stockton, Nesbitt and surrounding farms to Shilo and Brandon is common on this road.

Provincial Road 340 is an alternate route for many motorists travelling to Brandon coming off Provincial Trunk Highway 2 east and to Winnipeg via the Trans-Canada Highway No. 1. An upgrade to this road would ease the traffic congestion on PTH 10.

Access to the Criddle-Vane Homestead Provincial Park would be greatly enhanced if this road were improved.

The hard surfacing of the unpaved portion of PR 340 south of Canadian Forces Base Shilo towards Wawanesa would address the last few neglected kilometres of this road and increase the safety of motorists who travel on it.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation (Mr. Lemieux) to consider hard surfacing of the unpaved portion of Provincial Road 340 south of Canadian Forces Base Shilo towards Wawanesa.

This petition is signed by Lori Heinrichs, Ron Seafoot, Kim Robinson and many, many other Manitobans.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, I'd like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public

gallery where we have with us today Charles, Eleanor, Jordan and Heidi Boehr, who are the family members of Travis Boehr, who is one of our pages.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

St. Joseph Wind Farm Project Government Support

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): Increasingly, Manitobans are coming to know this as a Premier and a government who are great at news releases and media events, great at making promises but not quite so good on following through on those promises, Mr. Speaker.

The most recent example in a long line of promises made but unkept is the Premier's commitment to follow through on a major new step forward for wind development in Manitoba. In fact, he campaigned on it a year and a half ago. A year later, they made an announcement in April this year, and the *Free Press* reported his minister of Hydro saying that they had finalized a deal for what appears to be the biggest wind farm in Canada near St. Joseph. That was five months ago. Five months later, we received a letter from the president and CEO of Manitoba Hydro in response to an inquiry. He says, in response to a question about the St. Joseph wind farm: Manitoba Hydro cannot speculate when or if these negotiations will be successful.

Five months ago, it's a done deal. This month, it's can't speculate when or even if the deal is going to be done. Why has he left Manitobans twisting in the wind?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, when we came into office, there were coal plants spewing out pollution and there were no wind generators in the province of Manitoba. We've since got the St. Leon operation up and running, and we've since closed down the Selkirk coal plant.

We also, Mr. Speaker, require Manitoba Hydro to hook up any wind power to the grid, something we've made possible in St. Leon. Hydro, we believe, is doing their due diligence on any proposal. They have to justify the cost they pay for the per megawatt to go onto the grid. It's not being sold into the thin air. It's being sold to Hydro. We work with Hydro. We are committed to wind, but certainly we allow the due diligence not to take place by us but rather by

Hydro. They are in discussions, very good discussions on wind activity.

One of the challenges we have is our hydro-electric power is so cheap because of Limestone that it makes some of the cost comparisons more prohibitive. But that's a pleasant problem because that's why we have the lowest hydro-electric rates in North America, because of Limestone.

Mr. McFadyen: Mr. Speaker, I think we could have harnessed at least a hundred megawatts of energy off the hot air coming from the other side.

The fact that he talks about coal generation is interesting, because in the very same letter the CEO of Manitoba Hydro talks about the fact that they expect to be able to use the coal-fired unit in Brandon to support emergency operations right up until the end of 2019. That's another 11 years of coal-fired smoke blowing into the atmosphere in Brandon. It's clear that when it comes to the environment there's a lot of hot air, but there's no follow-through.

Given the fact that he's committed to moving forward on wind power, and at five months after his Minister of Hydro said it was a done deal Hydro is saying they don't even know if they've got a deal, why doesn't the Premier just admit that his talk about clean energy is just a bunch of hot air?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I know when the Leader of the Opposition was the chief of staff getting all his advice, all his Republican advice from Greg Lyle about running government ads—I'm sure Greg Lyle is working for him again today. He can confirm that, Mr. Speaker. When we came into office, we were ninth place on energy efficiency in Canada, nine out of 10. Today, and just a couple of weeks ago, Manitoba was ranked as the No. 1 province with British Columbia on energy efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the energy efficiency program is saving some 400 megawatts of power that we're reselling to our export sales, part of that. One of the challenges in the St. Joseph situation—and I don't know whether the member opposite wants to get into all the details of the negotiations, but their ability to obtain cheaper wind generation equipment hasn't been readily available to make sure that the costs come down. I'm sure the member opposite—if we ordered Hydro to go into a decision on wind, I think it would be inappropriate in terms of the due diligence.

I would point out the reference to the Clean Environment Commission licence that was issued,

the climate change legislation overrides that. That's why we brought it in to deal with the Brandon coal plant. We closed down the Selkirk coal plant. The Brandon coal plant right now, when we came into office and right now is generating electricity for the existing capacity. Wuskwatim is coming in. The Brandon coal plant will only be used in emergencies. It won't be used as part of the regular generation of revenue, and we will be able to reduce by some 200,000 megawatts, or 200,000 tonnes, the amount of emissions at that coal plant.

Mr. McFadyen: Mr. Speaker, no where in that response was there anything to do with the wind farm. The answer appears to be blowing in the wind.

I want to ask the Premier, he talks about needing to do due diligence for St. Joseph. His Finance Minister announced that it was a done deal five months ago. I'm not sure how he could make that statement if they hadn't even done due diligence.

*(13:50)

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the record, never mind the rhetoric, never mind the magazine articles, the news stories, the government advertising. We've seen all of that, but the record is that greenhouse gas emissions have gone up since he came to power. Lake Winnipeg is worse than ever and we have fewer wind turbines in Manitoba than any province west of the Maritimes. Alberta has five times as many wind turbines as Manitoba. Saskatchewan has 70 megawatts more in wind generation than Manitoba.

Why doesn't the Premier just admit that when it comes to the environment he is a reputation in search of an accomplishment.

Mr. Doer: Well, Mr. Speaker, members opposite using wind metaphors, there's lots of interesting old movies that could apply to the member opposite and his team of people.

I would point out—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: Well, Mr. Speaker, members would know that there was zero wind and there's now a wind farm in St. Leon. They also would know—*[interjection]* Well, I know the member opposite laughs, who did nothing on wind farms, and in her own constituency, in River East constituency, she allowed an illegal smokestack to operate in Selkirk, Manitoba, spewing

out toxins to all her residents. So she may laugh at her constituents but we acted on behalf of them.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. When the Speaker is standing all members should be seated and the Speaker should be heard in silence. I've been standing for quite some time here. Let's have a little bit of decorum in the House.

The honourable First Minister has the floor.

Mr. Doer: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes you can negotiate a price with a private operator for windmills, and they can come back and say that they can't meet the price because the equipment that they planned on buying is much more expensive. So you can have a price agreement with a company who then can't meet that price because of the cost of equipment.

I would point out that energy efficiency, which is considered to be the most effective form of energy management and climate change policy, it was No. 9 in Canada with the heckling members opposite when we came into office. We are now No. 1 in Canada through energy efficiency, partly through the good work of Hydro and partly through the good work and policies of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the fact that Hydro can negotiate a price, and I also respect the fact that a company that thinks they can meet that price may fail to meet that price in some of the assumptions that they made in the private sector as costs went up and they therefore can't generate it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a great deal of respect for the private sector proponents that are coming up with the proposals. We know Hydro can arrive at a price with a proponent, and when they go back to try to purchase equipment because of the huge demand across North America, the costs to the companies are certainly prohibitive for them going forward.

I would point out that we have one of the cleanest energy profiles in all of North America. We have the cheapest hydro-electric power in all of North America, and when members opposite are talking about coal-spewing provinces like Saskatchewan and fossil-spewing provinces like Alberta for purposes of wind energy, they fail and neglect to appreciate the fact that we have clean renewable energy to produce electricity which is lower and cheaper.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, we have the lowest hydro-electric costs in North America, and part of the reason we have that is because of Limestone and export sales primarily to the United States, all of which was developed by this government.

We've gone from ninth place under the Tories to first place. That's not a press release. That's an independent assessment of how well Manitobans are doing, Mr. Speaker.

Wind Power Development Government Support

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, during the Estimates process this past spring, the Premier indicated two things: 1) We are in a desired position in terms of wind; 2) We like wind power. That's a different message than he gave last fall when he said the numbers don't work.

I'm not exactly sure where he's at today. Now we have the Hydro CEO, Bob Brennan, indicating that the feasibility of purchasing additional wind energy will be evaluated in the future, another mixed message. This, of course, adds to the uncertainty of the industry in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of dollars are now being invested in wind energy south, east and west of Manitoba. Is the Minister responsible for Science, Technology, Energy and Mines (Mr. Rondeau) prepared to sit idly by while these investment dollars leave our province?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): The language "done deal" was used by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McFadyen) dealing with the St. Joseph wind farm, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that Mr. Brennan said, negotiations with the wind farm at St. Joseph continue in an attempt to find a way to make the project economically attractive for both parties. So I would point out that that is the letter that was sent to the Member for Turtle Mountain.

Yes, you know, if you're going to make the comparison between Saskatchewan with coal power, the cost there and the emissions that are going on in Saskatchewan, you're going to be into a false discussion because we have hydro-electric power in Manitoba at a very reasonable rate and Hydro knows that Wuskwatim is producing power, potentially, at a certain rate, and wind will produce at a certain rate, and that's all—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cullen: The facts are that wind energy companies are very frustrated with indecision within this government and with Hydro in respect to wind energy development. The request for expressions of interest occurred over three years ago. Over 80 bids came forward for wind power. Most of these were rejected outright. Wind companies are now picking up shop and heading south, east and west of Manitoba due to frustrations.

Mr. Speaker, again I ask the minister: Why the indecision? Is he committed to further development or not, and who is going to make the final decision on wind development in Manitoba?

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Acting Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Hydro Act): Mr. Speaker, a little bit of information in the hands of the opposition is quite dangerous. The letter that the member's quoting from says: Negotiations with the proponent for the proposed wind farm of up to 300 megawatts at St. Joseph continue in an attempt to find a way to make the project economically attractive.

I remind members when we did St. Leon, they laughed. They said it couldn't be done, and when we opened St. Leon, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden the members were mum. There was nothing to be said.

Mr. Speaker, this process will go forward. This process is negotiated. When the wind farms open up, we'll expect members opposite to be there at the opening as they were at the opening at St. Leon even though they said it wouldn't be done.

Mr. Cullen: Clearly, they've dismissed 83 other proposals out-of-hand.

Mr. Speaker, not only are the wind companies very frustrated, but so are the rural communities who've been working hard with the wind developers. For example, Turtle Mountain Sustainable Ventures has been working for seven years on developing wind energy in that particular region, and the frustration is growing. I'll quote the mayor from Killarney, Rick Pauls: Are they moving painfully slow on this? Absolutely. Hydro is controlled politically, but they just keep passing the blame from one to the other.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba communities are seeking ways to bolster their economies through diversification, including renewable energy, but this government is failing them at every turn.

Why is this government reluctant to move forward on renewable energy?

* (14:00)

Mr. Chomiak: I just remind members opposite that it was only a few years ago that there were zero wind farms in Manitoba. I remind members opposite there was no biofuel mandate in Manitoba a few years ago. I remind members opposite, Mr. Speaker, there was no incentive to local communities to do energy-efficient projects. I remind members opposite that there was no climate change plan for Manitoba a few years ago, all of that from the near-Neanderthals across the way who refuse—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Chomiak: I'll withdraw the word "Neanderthal" and I'll substitute small-minded.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I appreciate the fact that some issues get heated once in a while, but I think we have to always be remindful that every member in this Chamber is an honourable member and should be treated as such. So I ask the honourable member to withdraw that.

Mr. Chomiak: I'll withdraw the word "Neanderthal" and just hope that some day members opposite will realize that Manitoba's recognized by *BusinessWeek* magazine as having the best energy and climate change plan in the world.

I had the honour of being in Montréal to receive the award from the climate group at the conference in Montréal, at the United Nations conference in Montréal, as Manitoba being the leader in Canada. That can't be taken away by false rhetoric from members opposite.

Manitoba Hydro Power Line Development Engineering Advice on Location

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): For more than a year and half the official opposition, with the support of scientists across Manitoba, have been calling on the government to change their approach to the Winnipeg waste-water project. A year and a half later, we note that the government today has backed down or is at least signalling their intention to back down in their intention to require nitrogen removal from the plant. I know as renaissance men across the way who believe in enlightened science that they will not be the sort of people who would put

Neanderthal politics over enlightened science when it comes to Manitoba Hydro.

I want to ask the Premier: Given that he's backed down on the issue of nitrogen, will he today do what any renaissance person would do and listen to the engineers at Hydro on the issue of the next bipole line?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): The member opposite talks about renaissance men. We are proud to be a team of men and women on this side of the House, and we're proud to be from every region of the province, too, unlike members opposite.

I would point out that Regina is proceeding. Dr. Levitt is proceeding, recommended to Regina based on the study on the Qu'Appelle Lakes on nitrogen removal at a \$125-million cost because it's after the fact of making a decision on phosphorus. Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, all the major municipal governments in our catchment area, in the sense of our basin, are removing nitrogen.

There are reports from Dr. Schindler recently, but the majority of reports that went to the Clean Environment Commission were very strong on recommending the removal of ammonia, phosphorus and nitrogen. That is still the licensing decision, not of the government but of the Clean Environment Commission. It's also the decision that we've committed a third of the funding to.

There was no funding to clean up these treatment plants in the past. So I would point out that, as an abundance of caution with the latest report coming out and the three-year review that's required under the Clean Environment Commission, it does make sense to take a look at the latest science but we would suggest strongly—[interjection] You know, the member opposite heckles again.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: Regina is spending \$125 million to remove nitrogen, and we think it's sensible for the Clean Environment Commission to review its licensing procedures. But the David Suzuki Foundation, Dr. Levitt and others are strongly recommending ammonia, phosphorus and nitrogen. There is the latest report from Dr. Schindler, and it makes sense, as an abundance of caution, for the CEC to look at it.

Mr. McFadyen: The reference to renaissance men was to the Premier and to the pitbull from Kildonan next to him in terms of the—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Once again, all members in the Chamber are honourable members and they should be treated as such. When making reference to a member in the House, it is by the constituencies, ministers by their titles. I ask the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition to withdraw that comment.

Mr. McFadyen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will withdraw the comment and just say that my reference to the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) was to suggest that they were a year behind—

Mr. Speaker: Order. When the Speaker asks or instructs the member or requests the member for an action, it should be unequivocal without explanation.

The Leader of the Official Opposition, I've accepted your apology. Now I hope you will continue with your question.

Mr. McFadyen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue with the question and to say that the Member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson), who is a female, was a year-and-a-half ahead of the Member for Kildonan and the Premier on the issue of the right thing to do for our waste-water system in Winnipeg. It took them a year and a half to listen to her advice on the issue of the right science to proceed on waste water.

Is it going to take them a year and a half to listen to the advice of the experts, the engineers, the many engineers who have come forward to say that you are jeopardizing our most important asset, Manitoba Hydro, by picking the long, unreliable, environmentally unfriendly, expensive route for the bipole line?

Will they listen to the scientific advice or are we going to find ourselves in the situation of being so far down the road before they've realized their mistake that they'll one day look back and regret that they didn't take the advice of the Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson), the Member for Tuxedo and the other eminent members of this House who are saying they're doing the wrong thing for Manitoba Hydro?

Mr. Doer: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the member would want to wait for that assessment, for the Clean Environment Commission to look at all the research

including in Regina, including in Edmonton and Calgary and many other communities dealing with nitrogen. The majority of reports and the majority of scientists are recommending ammonia, phosphorus and nitrogen, all three ingredients that are, according to Regina—and I want to make this point. Nitrogen from urban waste water was transported downstream to lakes where it resulted in a 300 percent increase in algae production in the Qu'Appelle Lakes. Of course, that treatment sometimes comes to Manitoba.

So I would point out that Regina, after the Schindler report has been released, is still, as we understand it, proceeding. As an abundance of caution, we're not reversing; we're sending it back to the Clean Environment Commission. I want to make that very clear.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite quotes Dr. Schindler on the waste water. Let me quote Dr. Schindler on another topic: "The Manitoba government has made a wise decision, rare in this age when everything is for sale, and most of our politicians seem to be drawn from among the invertebrates. Stand by the government's decision, Manitobans, and see that this priceless area remains intact for future generations to enjoy and cherish. Your children and grandchildren will thank you."

That's dealing with not building the transmission line down the east side through the boreal forest as members opposite are recommending, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McFadyen: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad he's finally addressing the issue of the \$640 million in unnecessary spending, minimum, that they are going to spend on the hydro line going on the west. They're in a process of consultation. They've sent Hydro employees out to go through a process of consultation when they've already made their decision. Their decision is unchangeable and yet they're going through a façade of consultation.

We've already got the advice of the experts from Manitoba Hydro. Why won't they take the advice of Manitoba engineers and other experts who have said that what is right for Manitoba is a shorter, economical, more reliable, more environmentally friendly route down the east side? Is it going to take them as long to listen to the experts on this issue as it took them to listen to the experts on the issue of waste water?

* (14:10)

Mr. Doer: The Clean Environment Commission ordered the former Conservative government to

proceed with clean-up of Lake Winnipeg, including the waste-water treatment plants. Zero, zilch, nada was done by members opposite. It's really important to point that out, because when we're erring on the side of caution, knowing that most scientists have recommended the removal of nitrogen, and Regina is proceeding with it, we do so because we respect the Clean Environment Commission. The Clean Environment Commission has licensed the conditions of ammonia, phosphorus and nitrogen, and, Mr. Speaker, that's why it's not a, quote, government decision in the sense of the Clean Environment Commission. It is the decision, a licensing requirement, a legal document that we're following and members opposite ignored.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of the routing of the transmission line, there are different routes on the west side, not of Lake Winnipeg, which is used all the time by members opposite, but the west side of Lake Manitoba. It is very important to be respectful of some of the sensitive areas that do exist on the west side. We acknowledge that. I would point out that the report commissioned for Hydro had pros and cons of both sites in terms of proceeding, and it did point out that major international concerns could be raised and have an impact on customers south of us which generates considerable revenue. Hydro projections are over \$20 billion in revenue that will arise from the transmission that will be built for sales to Wisconsin and Minnesota.

I know members only want to talk. They throw in the converter numbers for reliability. They throw in everything. I'm surprised members opposite would be opposed to local meetings in Swan River and in other places on the west side of Lake Manitoba. I think the people there have a say and should have a say, and I'm glad Hydro's having meetings, Mr. Speaker.

Manitoba Hydro Power Line Development Reliability of West-Side Location

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): We do know that Manitoba Hydro is hosting a series of open houses in selected communities around the province. We know that the NDP government have made their decision on where Manitoba Hydro is going to put the bipole line. Now Manitoba Hydro employees have to go out and justify this west-side decision.

Trent Hreno, he's a senior environmental officer for Manitoba Hydro, answered some questions about the daffy detour to the *Neepawa Banner*. In that interview, Hreno said that Bipole III is strictly for

reliability and that the current system is under threat to extreme weather.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Hydro to explain how a west-side line, which is 400 kilometres longer, actually increases the reliability, rather than a shorter east-side line.

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Well, Mr. Speaker, again, members of the former Cabinet, we could brief the member, and they should brief him on the fact that reliability has been recommended through the 1990s in terms of two areas: One, the vulnerability of the transmission system that converges in Grand Rapids and is primarily in the Interlake. That has been a recommendation before governments. And, yes, reliability of the system is why people take the easier political route, which is the existing route through the Interlake, which most of the right-of-way has been established.

That's why the discussion takes place between the other two sites, because the whole issue of reliability can't be maintained on the Interlake option even though that's politically easier. So that's a pretty standard question.

Mr. Cullen: Clearly, this NDP political decision will affect all Manitobans and especially Manitoba Hydro customers. Now, if this government were open and accountable, they would be giving Manitobans the whole story on the east-west debate.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to offer this government a suggestion. Manitoba Hydro, as we know when we get our monthly bill, encloses an *Energy Matters* publication each and every month with that bill. I'm just making a suggestion and ask if the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, in the next issue of *Energy Matters*, would like to explain their rationale for the west-side line and what that rationale is and what it's going to cost each and every Manitoba Hydro customer for that west-side line.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Brennan has stated in committee, and he's stated it in the media, and he stated continuously that the transmission line is much more doable with the right-of-way on the west side, albeit it's longer, and with less international, national and provincial concerns about the east side.

I would point out, Mr. Schindler, his comments, members use him selectively, I suppose. But, Mr. Speaker, there are many others that also respect the fact that people on the east side, people in Poplar River and other members of those communities, believe there's more economic potential for the

development of an UNESCO World Heritage Site on the east side.

We expect over \$20 billion in revenue from export sales negotiated in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Yes, you should look at cost but you have to look at revenues and I am confident we'll have the lowest rates in North America again—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Health-Care Services Physician Retention

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, the NDP do a very, very poor job of retaining doctors in Manitoba. Even Tim Sale, the former Minister of Health, in 2005 said that they do a poor job of keeping doctors. Unfortunately, since he left in 2005 it's gotten worse. Over the last nine years, the biggest one-year loss of doctors in Manitoba was last year. That was according to the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Health to tell us why so many doctors do not want to work in Manitoba. Why do we have such a revolving door of doctors here?

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Acting Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in total, rural Manitoba has 105 more doctors practising today, 105 more doctors in rural Manitoba today than when we took office in 1999.

There are 26 rural students in the largest medical class of 110 ever. There are 40 more medical seats training right now than in 1999. So, Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to talk about nurses or doctors I'd be happy to debate it all afternoon, all next day, all next week, because their record of firing 1,500 nurses speaks for itself.

Mrs. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, as it's been pointed out, there are 17 ERs closed in rural Manitoba because of a critical shortage of doctors in rural Manitoba. We're talking about retention right now and, since the NDP came into power, 1,471 doctors have left Manitoba for greener pastures, 1,471 over nine years. That's a very poor record and I believe it equates to something like a 60 percent turnover of doctors under this government's watch. If all of them had stayed, we would not have a critical shortage of doctors today.

So I'd like to ask the Minister of Health: Why do doctors not want to stay and work in Manitoba under their watch?

Mr. Chomiak: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm very tempted but, net, between 1999 and now in terms of doctors in Manitoba, there are 288 more doctors in Manitoba today. We didn't close any hospitals. We didn't close the Misericordia Hospital. In the dark days of the 1990s, we net lost doctors every single year.

The turnover of doctors occurs regularly. Doctors go to other places and specialities but, net, total number of doctors, almost 300 more doctors in the province of Manitoba today than when the member was the assistant to the Minister of Health.

Threats to Police Officers Prosecution Policies

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, every day police in our province, whether in Winnipeg, Brandon or the various municipal forces, leave their homes and their families to face unknown dangers on the job. Unfortunately, we know that many officers in the course of their work face threats, intimidation and assaults. When charges are laid against those who threaten officers, they need to be treated seriously and officers need to be treated with respect.

Can the Minister of Justice indicate what prosecution policies exist in his department when it comes to dealing with charges that are laid against individuals who threaten, intimidate or assault police officers acting in the line of duty?

* (14:20)

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I think, Mr. Speaker, the attitude taken by this government of funding over a hundred additional police officers in Winnipeg and a 40 percent increase in police officer funding and funding to special investigation units and funding to integrated task forces speaks very well of the attitude that we have towards the safety and security of the men and women who spend their time every day, 24/7—24/7—in difficult situations working on our behalf.

Yes, there is a prosecutions policy in place, and I will provide the member with a copy of that particular policy.

Mr. Goertzen: Mr. Speaker, I've been advised by police authorities that charges were stayed in a case involving an individual who was charged with threatening and intimidating two Winnipeg police officers who were admitting the individual to the

overcrowded Remand Centre. According to the police authorities, the police officers were not consulted or notified that the charges of intimidation and uttering threats had been stayed and were not being pursued.

Can the Minister of Justice indicate whether or not the policy which he alludes to was followed in this case, where these officers weren't advised about the charges being stayed in regard to intimidation and threatening these officers.

Mr. Chomiak: First off, the member knows full well that I cannot comment on individual cases. In fact, the case could be thrown out of court.

Second, I think the member's track record on introducing information in this House is pretty bad, Mr. Speaker. There have been occasions when he's had to apologize to the mayor and to the police for the information he's provided. I would like the member to provide the so-called information that he's providing, that we could review it, on the specific instances of a specific case that I cannot talk about. If I did talk about it, the case could be tossed.

I don't know if members want that to happen or not, Mr. Speaker, but the reason they ask these questions—[interjection]—the member says cases are over. The member knows full well that it's inappropriate to talk about specific cases. He knows he's been burned on that in the House before and should be careful.

Ambulance Fees Federal Invoice

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I know the Premier (Mr. Doer) is reeling after the terrible marks his government was given on health care in the 2008 *Canada Health Consumer Index* released yesterday, but today I'd actually like to talk about the millions of dollars in ambulance fees the Premier has said that the federal government owes to the Province. As of last December, I believe the figure was \$7.5 million for Winnipeg alone.

Can the Premier today tell us what the present bill is in total for the Province, and can the Premier tell us what action has been taken to collect this bill from the federal government, as his government promised last December? What sort of negotiations have gone on, and has the Premier, in fact, sent the invoice to the federal government?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite should know that some of the

unilateral decisions that were made on transporting patients in remote and rural communities started off under the former Liberal government, so he shouldn't be too holier-than-thou on this point.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, on the issue of the independent study, I'm surprised somebody that purports to be in favour of the Canada Health Act would be supporting an advocacy body that's against the Canada Health Act and wants to remove it but, if that's the research he wants to use, he's entitled to use it.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, on the issue of ambulance costs, we have supported the City of Winnipeg in the sense that they were stuck with the bill that we believe is the responsibility of the federal government. We now have an agreement on—that was a form of Jordan's Principle, because the other alternative was not provide ambulances for people from First Nation communities who were in Winnipeg who required ambulance services. We are discussing that with the federal government.

We have a new protocol. It was just agreed to with the federal government and announced by the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) just recently. I hope that protocol can resolve the bill, but we did provide the service first and argued about the bill second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave to complete the two supplementary questions.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to complete his two supplementary questions? [Agreed].

The honourable Member for River Heights, on his first supplementary question.

Mr. Gerrard: As usual, the Premier plays a bit of a blame game, instead of standing up for his responsibilities.

The author of that report, by the way, said that Manitoba's wait times would be called barbaric in the extreme if they were happening in Europe. So there's some room for improvement, major room.

I ask the Premier why he doesn't know the full amount of the bill. Isn't he keeping track of the total bill properly? Give us the amount of the bill. Has the Premier actually sent the bill to the federal government or are you just doing negotiations? Are you so sure of your grounds that you're ready to take

the federal government to court here? What is the situation?

Give us some clarification on the millions of dollars of ambulance fees that the federal government owes the Province.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the former Liberal government unilaterally decided to change air ambulance costs for many Aboriginal people which, you know, the member opposite feigns concern in the House, but we had a chance at the Cabinet table. In the '95 budget, they just started walking away from the social costs for Aboriginal children. They then walked away from education costs for Aboriginal children, which are now quite a bit below the Frontier School Division. They walked away unilaterally from transportation of First Nations people in air ambulances that we're now picking up the costs.

We did ask the former Minister of Health, including the last one, the minister, Mr. Dosanjh, from British Columbia, Minister McLellan, and on and on, and Minister Rock, many ministers actually that sat in Cabinet with the member. It started off in the '95 budget and so he should be very sure of his facts.

On the issue of the ambulance, I'll get the numbers, but we tried with the former Liberal government to get their obligations met, but we're still meeting them ourselves with air ambulance. We're trying now with the federal government to get their obligations met, but we're still not sticking the bill with the City of Winnipeg. These are two unilateral decisions, both of which we're opposed to.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, I'm not arguing that there was a unilateral decision. What we are arguing is that it's time for the Premier to stand up for the Province of Manitoba and say, as you have said, that this federal government owes the Province money; we're ready to go to court to get that money.

Are you ready to go to court? Is your case as strong as you say? When will you go to court? Instead of snuggling up to Stephen Harper, when are you going to stand up for Manitoba?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad we've got a conversion on the road to Damascus from the Liberal Cabinet member that made a decision to unilaterally pull out of transportation and air ambulances for First Nations residents in Manitoba. I'd ask the member, first of all, to write a written apology for that mistake and secondly, agree with us to join a

court action to start at the first unilateral action, be a witness to why the former Cabinet was dead wrong.

The member opposite talks about one unilateral decision. There have been two unilateral decisions, and we're opposed to both of them.

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, that concludes question period. We will now move on to members' statements.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Brandon Student Recognition

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon West): I rise today to acknowledge three Brandon students who have ranked internationally in academics. Mr. Speaker, the International Baccalaureate Program is an international education program widely recognized by the world's universities. Three students at Neelin High School have scored in the top 20 percent. Congratulations to Larissa Stewin, Emil Reid and Maria Jacob who placed very high on this worldwide standard.

More than 28,000 students in 128 countries wrote the IB examination in May. The IB program requires students to study certain subjects at a higher level. Students pursue their interests and strengths at this higher level. An extended essay is also required for IB certification as well as a community service component. Students feel prepared for university and the program opens doors to potential scholarships and international study.

Neelin principal, Greg Malazdrewicz, believes success is due to hard work and preparation by teachers and students. Students also attribute their success to not giving up when the work got difficult. The success of these students shows that our students are globally competitive.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Larissa, Emil and Maria on their success in the IB program. I would also like to recognize the teachers of these students for preparing them to do so very well. Ms. Stewin, Mr. Reid, Ms. Jacob, I wish you the best in your future education.

*(14:30)

25th Anniversary of Grandparents' Swim Program

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the North Centennial Seniors Volunteers on the 25th anniversary of their grandparents' swim program. It started as an

experiment in 1983 by lifeguard Bernice Feledechuk. The program is designed to connect young children from area day cares with senior citizens for water orientation.

For an hour each week, 30 to 40 grandmas and grandpas hop into the North End Centennial Pool with children from neighbourhood day cares, including Gretta Brown, Action Centre, Champlain Community Child Care and KEEP Childcare. Children swim one on one with a volunteer, with focus not only on swimming skills but also on developing gross motor and interpersonal skills.

While the program allows these young children to learn how to swim in an atmosphere that is fun and safe, it also connects them with seniors who provide the reassurance and comfort that sometimes only a grandpa or grandma can.

In addition to weekly swim class, the senior volunteers also throw a Christmas party for the children complete with Santa and his helpers, treats and the Santa bag filled with presents both donated and knitted by the seniors themselves. A wind-up party is held in June where the children enjoy a mini carnival and free lunch.

Mr. Speaker, the grandparents swim program is an extremely important program for North End Centennial Pool and the surrounding community. It offers children who may never have had the chance to take swimming lessons the opportunity to swim and learn in a safe and friendly environment. It also offers them the valuable experience of senior citizens who know and share a connection with them.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Barbara Morris, a long-time volunteer with the swim program who now donates her time as a co-ordinator. I would also like to recognize Mrs. Feledechuk for the many years she dedicated to running the program. Thank you also to the staff at North End Centennial and the City of Winnipeg for providing lifeguards and free access to the pool.

Most of all, I call on this House to recognize the North Centennial Seniors Association's 25 years of commitment to the children of the Centennial Pool community.

Dr. John Bock

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House today to pay tribute to Dr. John Bock, who recently, on July 10 of this year, received the Order of Manitoba.

Dr. Bock is a resident of Headingley and has been for over 50 years. Dr. Bock played a vital role in developing services and programs that have benefited our youth and seniors and enhanced education and justice issues in Manitoba and in Canada. Dr. Bock was responsible for the development of clinical health services to schools in rural and northern Manitoba; a member of the provincial task force on special education, drinking and driving, and juvenile corrections; a provincial representative to the U.N. conference on crime prevention; the co-founder of Teen Touch crisis line; the initiator of a program to train unskilled inmates at the Headingley jail; the recipient of the 1988 Lieutenant-Governor's Award for Excellence in public service management; and the person responsible for Camp Manitou and the success it is today where many inner-city children can experience a great summer adventure. Dr. Bock was able to raise over half a million dollars for the renovations of the camp and the building of the Friendship Centre which bears his name.

John was also heavily involved with the evolution of the Municipality of Headingley from before secession in 1992 until present day. He helped facilitate many public open houses when Headingley developed its land-use plan and was first chairperson and draftsman of the constitution of the Headingley Community Round Table. He was also instrumental in establishing seniors services in Headingley and was appointed by the R.M. of Headingley as a representative to the regional health authority board. Dr. Bock was also the driving force behind the Canada-Manitoba infrastructure grant for the Headingley Heritage Centre which opened in 2005, replacing the old North Hall, as it was affectionately called in Headingley.

My husband, Wilf Taillieu, and I were pleased to attend the ceremony and witness Dr. Bock receiving the Order of Manitoba, a very well-earned designation. Congratulations to Dr. Bock on a lifetime of accomplishments in his field of expertise and his community. Thank you.

Samantha Chrol

Ms. Erna Braun (Rossmere): I rise to recognize the achievement of Samantha Chrol, a 2007 graduate of River East Collegiate. Samantha is the recipient of the 2008 Oscar Peterson Grant for Jazz Performance. This prestigious award is one of eight \$10,000 awards granted annually to developing artists by the Hnatyshyn Foundation, a private charity founded by

the late Right Honourable Ramon John Hnatyshyn, Canada's 24th Governor General. This award identifies exceptional young Canadians in post-secondary performing arts programs who are committed to the enrichment of our arts community.

Ms. Chrol has an extensive list of achievements. She is both an accomplished saxophonist and clarinetist. She received the outstanding soloist award from the Brandon Jazz Festival two years in a row, and in 2007 she was the first Canadian to win an outstanding soloist award in the Essentially Ellington High School Jazz Band Competition at Lincoln Centre in New York. She is starting her second year of a Bachelor of Jazz Studies program at the University of Manitoba this fall.

With great pleasure, I would like to acknowledge the addition of the Oscar Peterson Grant to her list of accomplishments. The grant is named after Oscar Emmanuel Peterson, the Canadian-born jazz pianist and composer. It is open to all Canadian citizens and permanent residents studying at a Canadian post-secondary institution. Sam was identified as showing exceptional promise in performance and was nominated for the award by her faculty. She wowed the jazz jury during the selection processes with her strong performance and stood out amongst the competition.

I had the privilege of hearing Sam perform at her former elementary school, John De Graff School, at their graduation assembly in June and I can attest to her outstanding musical talent. I would like to congratulate Sam on this achievement and wish her the very best in all her future endeavours. Thank you.

Sisler Teens Against Nicotine and Drugs

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): A few months ago I had the pleasure of meeting a remarkable group of young people from Sisler High School, some of whom are sitting in the gallery today. These students are members of STAND, Sisler Teens Against Nicotine and Drugs, an organization that was founded in May of 2006 to educate students about the negative effects of tobacco and drugs.

The top priority of the group was to ban smoking on the grounds of Sisler High, and they immediately went to work collecting over 800 names on a petition in support of the ban. They were successful. The group then took their message to the school division which led to the Winnipeg School Division passing a division-wide tobacco ban in January, 2007. In the

spring of 2007, STAND reached out to the tobacco farmers of Ontario offering support in their work to aid farmers choosing to transition to other agricultural products. Following this, the group launched a second petition calling on the provincial government to ban smoking on all publicly funded educational property. Over 4,000 signatures were collected and presented to the ministers of Education and Healthy Living, with the list of supporters calling for this action. STAND also met with me and we, the Liberals, prepared legislation to introduce to achieve this objective.

Last week the provincial government decided to act and has directed all school boards to ban smoking on school grounds throughout Manitoba. This is a major victory for STAND. I understand they're now looking at taking this national and I wish them all their success in getting a national ban on smoking on school grounds. I want to note that STAND was awarded the Manitoba youth volunteer award during the 2007-2008 school year and sponsored the first No Tobacco Day at the 2008 Red River Ex.

On September 18, that's tomorrow, the executives of STAND will receive an award from the Manitoba Lung Association in honour of their continuing work. I want to congratulate STAND on their work to date and wish them all the best of success in the future. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Government House Leader): I wonder if you might call report stage amendments on Bill 17.

REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Bill 17—The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities)

Mr. Speaker: We have amendments.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I move, seconded by the Member for Carman (Mr. Pedersen),

THAT Bill 17 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out "the Schedule" and substituting "the regulations" in the proposed subsection 40.1(1).

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable Member for Lakeside, seconded by the honourable Member for Carman,

THAT Bill 17—dispense?

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

* (14:40)

Mr. Eichler: What this amendment does is it removes a schedule of municipalities listed in Bill 17 and allows this schedule to be dealt with regulations instead. As we know and have heard recently, municipalities may have an opportunity to expand and allow the government to delete or add to the list as the minister sees fit.

For example, we see a large number of hog barns leave one area for one reason or another, and the total area of pigs is changed. This will allow the provincial government to change the municipality listed through regulations while having to reopen the bill and go through this debate all over again. This will consequently save the Manitoba taxpayers thousands of dollars, and I also ask the government to support this amendment.

I know that in discussions in the briefing notes with the minister on this particular bill, it was one of those areas of concern that we brought up at that point in time. We know very clearly that boundaries change, things change, new science comes about and, with the opportunity to be able to deal with this through regulations rather than having to change the bill and bring it back to the House and the cost that's involved in that, the minister simply would only have to do it through regulation in order to add or delete a particular municipality.

So I know this is something that we on this side of the House feel is very important. We know the government is going to be moving forward on this bill. We had certainly hoped that the government would support these particular amendments as we bring them forward. They have been done through consultation with the various farm groups. We feel very strongly that these amendments are good amendments, that we've put an awful lot of time in, an awful lot of effort.

We heard from 319 presenters on this bill, and also we had another submission that was brought in just a bit later from Credit Union Central, asking the government to have another look at this particular bill. They feel it's not going to work. Also, we got a letter of support from the R.M. of De Salaberry. I know the Minister of Conservation certainly held them up as the municipality that was in support of Bill 17. However, they've made it very clear through a letter to the Premier of the province and to the

minister that in fact they would not be supporting Bill 17 and asked for Bill 17 to be withdrawn.

We heard from those 319 Manitobans. We certainly hope that the government listened. We know there was a number of different committee members there. In fact, I know everyone on my side of the House that had the opportunity to listen to the debate listened to those Manitobans who brought their voices forward. There was far more numbers of presenters that wanted to present on that particular bill.

Ms. Marilyn Brick, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

Unfortunately, because of the timing, because of the sensitivity of the bill and the period of which we call committee, not all presenters were able to be heard but certainly we did hear loud and clear that there was not support for Bill 17.

What we'll talk about on this particular amendment is a simple amendment. By allowing the schedule to be withdrawn and put into regulations gives the government that opportunity in order to deal with this in a very simplistic manner, by how to make it complicated and bring it back. It would help eliminate the fact that you're pitting rural against urban. That's one thing that we certainly don't want out of this. Government doesn't want it, but it has caused a significant wedge between the urban and rural. So anytime we can get away from that particular issue, I think that would be a good way of going.

Certainly, this amendment would do that as far as opening up the door to the minister being able to have the ability to change municipalities from the schedule, like I say, and not have to bring the bill back. In fact, do that through regulations. There are a various number of avenues that he can do that; through the manure management regulations would be probably the simplest. I'm sure he has the staff and the capabilities within his department to decide which area that would fit in, best suited for the minister.

I know it'd certainly take a lot of pressure off the director as well because the director does have significant powers in this particular piece of legislation and I know that the minister would like to see some of those stresses taken out of the director's responsibility. This would be one of the ways for that to happen.

I know that—coming back to the presenters that we had heard from—a number of those presenters did

address this particular issue. Out of those 319, I think there were actually four presenters that presented in favour of Bill 17, out of the 319 submissions that we actually heard. We know that those four presenters certainly had their voices heard. We know the 315 had their voices heard, that actually had the opportunity to present. We certainly know that there's need for improvement. We don't have all the answers. That's why we have committee. We certainly hope that we didn't go through this committee process and have it all for naught because we feel these amendments are important.

This is the first one that I'm bringing forward out of 11 amendments, and I feel passionately enough that I'd certainly like the government to see that there's support for this particular amendment and, by doing so, as I say, it would certainly go a long way in order to take some of that stress off as we move forward and those municipalities do in fact get in line with the balance that we need. As we know, this could happen in a day. It could happen in a month. It could happen in a year. It certainly gives that flexibility in the long term.

The other thing I want to put on the record in regard to this particular amendment is that we know that we want to encourage innovation. We want to encourage anaerobic digesters, and that's also one of the questions that we'll be addressing a bit later on in one of my other amendments. But we have to look at good, science-based technologies. We have to look at new ways of protecting the environment. We all want clean water, and the best way to do that is to make sure that we do that in a way that's going to be sustainable in the long run.

So we're not going to debate this amendment long and hard, but certainly I want it on the record as being supportive of this and look forward to the government's support.

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation): I appreciate the efforts made by the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler) bringing forward this, among other amendments that he is bringing forward to the House, and I appreciate the advice that he gives to me and my colleagues on Bill 17 from the beginning, when it was first introduced, right through to today debating this amendment he's brought forward. I also want to say that we appreciate the advice, not only the people that presented at the public hearings but the people that I've heard from since the introduction of Bill 17, through e-mails, through letters, phone calls and face-to-face discussions.

Certainly, water protection is an important issue, whether you live in rural or urban Manitoba. I want to underline this right off the hop because I get a little worried when members opposite try to paint this as a rural versus urban kind of a wedge issue. I don't think this is news to members opposite, but there are people in rural Manitoba, living and working in rural Manitoba, farming in rural Manitoba, who understand the importance of protecting Manitoba's water.

When people homesteaded all throughout agro Manitoba, they made decisions in the 1800s and 1900s to locate in specific areas because of an abundance of clean water, useful water, water that they could drink, their livestock could drink and it could sustain their crops. So water has always been very important in rural Manitoba. So I wouldn't want people to listen in on our conversations here and mistakenly think that rural Manitobans don't understand the need to protect water. I want to make that very clear.

I also don't want to leave the impression that everybody who lives in urban Manitoba doesn't understand how important water is to agriculture. I think that we've come a long way in this province to understand, both rural and urban Manitobans have come a long ways in understanding the importance of this issue to the future of our province, both from a water protection perspective and a sustainable development, economic development perspective.

The reason that we would not accept the amendment brought forward by the Member for Lakeside here today is that the amendment would deal with the 35 or so R.M.s that are covered in the moratorium in Bill 17. These three areas: 1) The southeast part of the province, which Terry Sargeant yesterday made very clear, has virtually run out of room in terms of its ability to expand. There are problems in finding spread fields in the R.M.s in that part of our province, and we have to understand that. Certainly, to their credit, Manitoba Pork has told me that R.M.s such as La Broquerie and Hanover do have challenges, so I don't want members opposite just to stick their head in the sand on these things when other groups out there are taking a realistic look at it.

* (14:50)

The Red River Valley is another part of that moratorium area. The Red River Valley which is awfully prone to flooding, we all remember 1997, but it's more than just the one event in 1997. Year

after year, spring after spring, summer rainfall after summer rainfall, we're reminded of how prone to flooding the Red River Valley is and we're reminded that because of that it has been treated and designated as a special management area.

Then the third area, which these R.M.s fall in, some of them at least, is the Interlake. Interlake, between the lakes, between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, with a high water table, marshy areas, boggy areas, swampy areas, gravelly areas, limestone karst areas much of which is unsuitable for spread lands and for expansion in the industry.

Madam Acting Speaker, what the amendment would do is move from the act to regulation, which means we would weaken our support for these municipalities in these areas. Legislation is much stronger than regulation. The Member for Carman (Mr. Pedersen) knows that, and I do not want to weaken our approach in these R.M.s, to water protection.

Ms. Bonnie Korzeniowski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

In a sense what the members are asking me is to take the permanency of the ban and attach it to the changing conditions of the land, the changing conditions of the environment in those areas, but those aren't going to change. It will—years from now the debate will be about marshy, boggy country in the Interlake. The Interlake will still be between the two lakes. The Red River Valley will still be a valley prone to flood and, Madam Deputy Speaker, the parts of our province that now are close, or if haven't been saturated or close to it, they still will be.

So I do not believe it would be in the best interest of protecting Manitoba's water to weaken our approach to this bill, with the amendment that has been brought forward by my friend from the Lakeside. Thank you very much.

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman): Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to put a few words on the record in regard to this amendment and how it pertains to Bill 17, The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities), and I listened with great interest to the minister's comments. This is a rural versus urban political move. That is what is behind this bill. There is no doubt in my mind that that's what it is and that's the only purpose because I know that the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) can sit in his home in

Winnipeg and tell his neighbours that we're going to fix Lake Winnipeg by banning hog farms.

I guess he's going on the premise that pigs stink and urban Manitoba doesn't care about the hog business and that's an unfortunate way to do legislation, to pit one sector against another. We've seen the Premier (Mr. Doer) do this with speaking in northern Manitoba, talking about how southern Manitoba doesn't care about northern Manitoba and it reflects that back in this bill.

What we've asked by this amendment is to move this into regulations out of the legislation because he has just stated his argument for not doing this, for not accepting this amendment. His argument is based on, conditions will never change, and that's an unfortunate way to look at the business. There's new technology every day. You look at the technology—and I know that the Minister of Conservation was at the Business Council meeting yesterday, and he heard from the panel explaining how technology has come ahead. Even in the last 10 years, it's changed immensely. To turn around and say that we have to draw the line right now—there will be no changes in the next 10 years—is completely false. To have that premise and to say that this is why we cannot accept this amendment is false. It's politically motivated in this whole Bill 17. There is no science involved in this.

Again, yesterday, when we sat at the Business Council and heard about the lack of science in this debate, we heard it again through the committee hearings. Time and time again, we have professionals who know the science of this coming in and saying, we've made great strides, we can make more strides, but what you're doing with Bill 17 is you're shutting the door to all changes, to all new technology—and I might add—that no one, no one understands the importance of clean water better than the people who live on the land and use their own water. They have pumps; they have wells. They understand the importance of clean water. They don't simply turn the tap on and the water comes from wherever, like it does in urban areas of Manitoba.

Farmers and rural people understand the importance of clean water. They are willing to work, continue to work and continue to improve on the quality of the spreading of phosphorus on the land.

It's unfortunate that this government will not get out there and understand the technologies that are available, that are coming on-stream. It's unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) is

not standing up for our family farms in Manitoba. She sat there through the committee meetings and would not support the farmers who came out. That's very unfortunate.

This amendment would make this legislation much more user-friendly in the years to come but apparently user-friendly and this government don't go together, and they are going to stick by their guns on this one and not accept this amendment.

I would urge them to take a second thought about that. Support this amendment. At least make one small change to a very bad piece of legislation. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, just to say that Liberals support this amendment as a reasonable, common-sense approach. Thank you.

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

An Honourable Member: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those against, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

An Honourable Member: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division. It's defeated on division.

* * *

* (15:00)

Mr. Eichler: I move, seconded by the Member for Carman (Mr. Pedersen),

THAT Bill 17 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out "or" at the end of subclause (i) of the proposed clause 40.1(2)(a), adding "or" at the end of

subclause (ii) and adding the following after subclause (ii):

(iii) an environmentally sound treatment that results in

(A) no phosphorus being applied to the land, or

(B) phosphorus being applied to the land at a rate that does not exceed the amount of phosphorus to be removed by the intended crops over a five-year crop rotation cycle;

Madam Deputy Speaker: The proposed amendment to Bill 17, The Environment Amendment Act, moved by Mr. Eichler, seconded by the Member for Carman—

An Honourable Member: Member for Lakeside.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Oh, I'm sorry.

—moved by the Member for Lakeside, seconded by the Member for Carman,

THAT Bill 17 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out "or" at the end of subclause (i) of the proposed clause 40.1(2)(a), adding "or" at the end of subclause (ii) and adding the following after subclause—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense.

The honourable Member for Tuxedo.

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Thank you very much, Madam—*[interjection]*

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Member for Lakeside.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I was trying to help one of my colleagues out by letting them go ahead of me, but, certainly, we are ready to go and speak to this amendment.

Certainly, what this amendment does is allow the director to approve a hog operation if it can demonstrate that it can remove nutrients at one times phosphorus removal rate over a five-year cycle. Again, the director has the authority to examine the operator's records to ensure that these steps are being followed. It's a very good amendment that follows a science-based approach that I would ask the government to support on this particular amendment.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, when we look at any type of an amendment that we want to bring

forward on any piece of legislation, it's imperative that we look at the overall, long-term effects of this particular amendment. This is an amendment that allows the government to take that next step, the step which is going to be able to allow a size base, allow the structure to be put in place where a producer, if he can demonstrate that he has one times removal rate—and actually, it was talked about on Monday at the Manitoba Pork Council's release that they had put out. I know I've read the comments that the minister has put on the record in regard to the *Free Press* on September 16 in his press release in regard to this, and he said he's not going to allow the Manitoba Tories or the Manitoba Pork Council to get Bill 17.

Unfortunately, we in the House want to make sure that each amendment is debated in the House in a way that's going to be able to convince the minister that this is actually a very good amendment. We hope that he does listen, and maybe he'll have a change of heart after hearing what we have to say on this side of the House in regard to that. In fact, after yesterday's meeting that was put on by the Business Council of Manitoba, he received a letter from the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce—which we also received a copy of—and I think it's important that we read this into the record. I do think that the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce has a very influential voice here in Manitoba, hearing what Manitobans have to say. Also, KAP was there along with a lot of other very influential people, people that have an awful lot of knowledge: Dr. Don Flaten, Terry Sargeant, and a number of others that were there that made it very clear that we need to have the best science, the best technology that we can have in this province in order to sustain this industry, which is a multibillion-dollar business through jobs, through business ideas. The last thing we want to do is have a stagnant growth. So I hope the minister does listen to this particular amendment. I think it's important.

So I'll come back to where I wanted to come back, to the Chambers of Commerce. It's sent by Graham Starmer, addressed to the minister: Dear Mr. Struthers: Bill 17. Today I attended the Business Council of Manitoba's conference entitled *Cultivating a Sustainable Pork Industry in Manitoba*. It was a very informative event, and I attended to compare my previous conversation with you, namely that the hog industry is in flux of scientific knowledge, deepens technology advances, and the industry itself creates and adopts new processes. Sections 40.1(2) and 40.1(4) of Bill 17 seem to give approval process to flexibility to respond to those

changes in relocation of manure managed storage facilities and confined to livestock areas. For example, these sections state the director is able to issue a permit to make the handling of manure more environmentally sound in the director's opinion. However, that flexibility is missing in relation to 40.1(5) which bans the increase of animal units under any circumstance. This is a great disservice not only to the industry but to the cause of environmental sustainability.

It goes on to say: Accordingly, we propose that Bill 17 be amended to allow for the expansion of the number of animal units where it can be demonstrated that it will render the handling of manure more environmentally sound in the director's opinion. The clause could be as follows: 40.1(5) If any application for a permit under clause 2(b), (c) or (d), subsection (3) or (4) will result in an increase of the number of animal units capable of being handled by the livestock operation, the permit may be issued if the construction, expansion, or modification would make the manner of handling manure more environmentally sound, in the director's opinion. This not only will ensure that section 40.1(5) is consistent with the rest of the legislation, it will allow the industry to grow in a way that ensures improvements in environmental sustainability in a true win-win. Again, submitted on behalf of Graham Starmer.

This ties in very well with what our amendment is talking about when we're talking about one times the removal rate and applied. We have the technology. We have the GPS systems. We have those tools at our disposal right now, and we know that if we're allowed to have this grow and prosper, we need to continue to have new developments in those tools so we can measure.

I know the minister knows in his heart that the last thing we want to do is overspread. We don't want to waste any of this—[interjection] The Minister of Education (Mr. Bjornson) says you don't have a heart. I think he's probably right. But it is a valued commodity that we want to put back into our land. It's organic. It's natural. The last thing we want to do is use more or take any of that value away of that very reliable resource that we're able to put back into our land in a way that we're able to sustain agriculture in a meaningful way.

I know that we on this side of the House believe this is a very good solution. It's a way of dealing with the manure that is, again, sustainable in the long run.

It's a way of dealing with the next generation of farmers. The last thing we need in this province is to send out a message that we're not open for business.

I know that will have the ripple effect, and they say, well, you know, we've got the rest of the province open and we can build there, but there are things that come into play there: the water resources, the land, the soil capabilities of that land. Is it conducive to hog operations? Most of it's not. That's why it's not developed already. So, when the minister claims that there are lots of areas for expansion and growth, that's going to be gone. They're either going to go to North Dakota, they're going to go to Saskatchewan, any of the other places that are open for business.

What this does is, if this amendment's not passed and the bill goes forward as is, what we're going to see is an exodus of that industry, and that I can guarantee. The lifespan, we know, of these barns is no more than about 20 years and these barns need to be replaced. With this legislation, the way it currently stands, is detrimental to the expansion of these operations. In fact, they can't expand in those areas that have been designated in the bill.

*(15:10)

We gave the government an opportunity to remove that schedule from the bill on my first amendment. This amendment would give the minister and the director the authority to deal with these issues where they can certainly demonstrate that one-time removal rate is there. If they have the land base, if they have the tools, that they're able to either move that manure—most of it can't be moved long distances, but it can be moved short distances, just because of the simple matter of the cost to move it. But, certainly, if they can demonstrate that through the acceptance of this bill—and, quite frankly, I have to disagree with the minister. Don't gut the bill.

What it does, it gives him one more tool at his disposal where he can say to the director—the director can demonstrate to the minister that is his only one time, just one time the applied rate. So I think it's very important that we look at this bill seriously, this amendment seriously, before we just dismiss it as it's something that's political, something we don't want to do. We need to make sure that, when we leave this building on October 9—and the government has the power to either withdraw the bill or to amend the bill or whatever, because they have the majority. They can do what they want. We know that, but we

certainly hope that they do listen to these amendments and that they do support this particular amendment.

I know my light's flashing. It certainly goes a little faster than you think whenever you're trying to get a lot on in a short period of time. So I ask the minister to respond in a positive way, ask his House to support this particular amendment. It's just, as I said, one more tool for the government to be able to have, as a director, look at a one-time phosphorus rate. Certainly, it's a very good amendment.

Mr. Struthers: Madam Deputy Speaker, first let's deal with the question of my heart. I'm a Toronto Maple Leaf fan, so every spring, my little heart gets broken over and over and over again. It may be in a broken condition, but I want to remind the Member for Lakeside, it's down there somewhere. It's in here and my heart is set on protecting water in Manitoba.

I have to disagree with what the member has said. The amendment that he puts forward, trying to amend Bill 17 is much less an amendment as it is a gutting. This is gutting Bill 17 and I can't allow that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this is an attempt—and members opposite have been consistent. They have said from the beginning to withdraw Bill 17, to get rid of Bill 17. They have said, previous to that, to get rid of the regulations that have been put in place. Their own leader has been very clear, saying that he would get rid of the phosphorus regulation that was brought in in 2006.

We know where they stand on this and we know that this is a gutting of Bill 17 which fits into their view of water protection in Manitoba. So, on the basis of that, we can't accept this amendment.

Mrs. Stefanson: The minister talks about pulling on his heart strings and so on and talks about all sorts of things to do with this amendment, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I ask him if he truly has a heart and he really cares deeply for Lake Winnipeg, that it goes against logic to vote against this.

I strongly urge the minister if he does care about Lake Winnipeg and the quality of water in Lake Winnipeg to actually support this. I would urge all members opposite—this specifically has to do with nutrient loading into the watershed of Lake Winnipeg. It says: No phosphorus being applied to the land or phosphorus being applied to the land at a rate that does not exceed the amount of phosphorus being removed by the intended crops over a five-year rotation cycle.

Madam Deputy Speaker, what that means is phosphorus which is put onto the land will be removed from the land before it has a chance to be run off, the same amount of phosphorus, so that prevents phosphorus from being loaded into the watershed of Lake Winnipeg. That is a good thing for Lake Winnipeg.

We've talked time and time again in this Legislature about the need to reduce phosphorus loading because we know that phosphorus is the main nutrient that contributes to algal blooms and eutrophication in Lake Winnipeg. That's what this specific amendment has to deal with. So it would be in the minister's best interest and it would be members opposite best interest to support something that is in favour of reducing nutrient loading, in this case, specifically, phosphorous nutrient loading into Lake Winnipeg watershed.

So it makes absolutely no sense what the minister just said. He talks about this amendment as gutting the bill. It has nothing to do with that. I would suggest that by voting against this, members opposite are, in fact, voting against better water quality for Lake Winnipeg. So, if they want to and they choose to do that, that's, you know, they can go out and they'll have to answer to the people in their communities about this. But I will tell you that this amendment has everything to do with helping clean up Lake Winnipeg and reducing the nutrient loading in Lake Winnipeg.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think what we need to do and what we on this side of the House have often done is we've looked to scientists and science and when it comes to the decisions that are being made in this Legislature. I think members opposite, rather than looking at science-based evidence, just look at politics. What are the politics of this issue? The water quality issues in Lake Winnipeg are very serious and I would suggest that members opposite listen to the scientists when it comes to these issues. I specifically had the opportunity to visit the National Centre for Livestock last week with a number of my colleagues on this side of the House and we had a chance to meet with Dr. Karin Wittenberg, who is the Associate Dean of Research at the University of Manitoba Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences. Now she came before the committee on Bill 17. I want to quote something that she stated because it's important that when we're looking at the issues of cleaning up Lake Winnipeg, it's about nutrient management and nutrient management strategy. It has nothing to do with anything else other than that

and that's the point that Dr. Karin Wittenberg says when she says, and I quote: "... a traditional regulatory policy is a high level of assurance that the number of pigs will not increase in many parts of our province. That is not the same as development of policy to reduce nutrient loading of Lake Winnipeg. Innovative-incentive-based regulatory tools have greater potential for environmental returns, through improved cost effectiveness and promotion of innovative technology for environmental controls."

Madam Deputy Speaker, what Dr. Karin Wittenberg is saying is that if members of the agriculture community want to come forward as they have in the last number of months and have said, we care about Lake Winnipeg, too; we want to make sure that we're doing our part to contribute to the better water quality there.

They are the ones that have come forward with this type of an approach, which is actually in this amendment. I would suggest—and these are the kinds of innovative approaches we want—incentive-based approaches that we need toward environmental sustainability in our province. These are the types of innovative approaches that we need to provide incentives for the business community to come forward to help. And all the government is saying is, no, forget it; we refuse to listen to you.

I think that that is extremely unfortunate. These are people. These are their livelihoods. They're coming forward to present to us ways that they can better our environment in our province and all this government does is slam the door in their face. Madam Deputy Speaker, in order to help Lake Winnipeg, we don't need to kill jobs, we don't need to kill business and kill people's livelihoods in this province. People are coming forward with innovative solutions to make this a better province. I think it's unfortunate that the only reaction from this government is to slam the door in their face. I think that is extremely unfortunate.

I would encourage members opposite—this is a complex issue. This is about people's livelihoods. This particular amendment deals to the very issue that members opposite like to talk about a lot, okay, the water quality issues in Lake Winnipeg. I love Lake Winnipeg. I care about the water quality issues in Lake Winnipeg. That's what this amendment deals with. So, if you care about the water quality issues in Lake Winnipeg, then you would support this amendment. Thank you.

* (15:20)

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): It is a pleasure for me to rise to participate in the debate of the proposed amendment to Bill 17, The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities).

I'm pleased the sponsoring minister is present this afternoon to hear the debate. I certainly encourage him to listen because what we have all done and are exhibiting through the amendments that we propose here this afternoon is a reflection of those individuals that took time out of their busy schedules to attend to committee and to share with us their experience and their expertise in the hog industry. It was not done without a lot of consideration because many people that made presentations were doing so for the very first time. It was an experience that they said brought a great deal of heightened emotion and anxiety, but they thought it important to share with the minister their thoughts in regard to this legislation.

The minister said that he is interested in water quality. I don't think that there's a member of this Assembly that isn't interested in improving water quality here in the province of Manitoba.

One of the presenters that I listened to very intently was a constituent of mine that related their own experience, where they settled in an area where there were numerous farmsteads. Those individuals were not overly acceptant of a hog barn being located in the proximity of their farmsteads. The department which the minister is responsible for made certain, absolutely certain, that the hog barn location had no impact on the water quality or the quality of life of the farmsteads in existence prior to the hog barn being located there.

There were more than half a dozen wells drilled and monitored by the Department of Conservation to make absolutely certain that there was no contamination of the ground water; no impact whatsoever. After many, many years of very good stewardship of the land by the colony located north of Oakville, there was clear evidence that there was absolutely no contamination from the hog barn to the ground water.

I will go even farther to say that the individuals that had existing farmsteads were concerned about the quality of life, and, as we all understand it, there is an odour that comes with livestock operations. But they recognize now that there's only a period of

perhaps two days out of the year that there is any smell emitting from the hog barn because that is the only time that the slurry tanks are stirred and that the manure is injected into the land at a rate prescribed by the department that has acknowledged their livestock manure management plans.

This is the type of responsible activity that we see all across the province of Manitoba, yet this government seems to disregard all of that. We know that there are improvements being made each and every year with the equipment that is used, with the science that is engaged and with the dedication of educated individuals involved in the livestock operation here in Manitoba. We are seeing continuous improvement.

What I'd like to do is encourage the minister to take time out of his busy schedule and take a tour of the University of Manitoba's Glenlea Research Station, which is now known as the national centre for environment and livestock research and is the home for a national research chair position dedicated to the improvement of livestock practices so that the environment is not only maintained and sustained but improved. We witnessed equipment down there that is now being tested and will be employed in the livestock sector that uses GPS management, constant regurgitation of the manure so a consistency of the nutrients remain at any time prior to injection into the soil. Therefore, the prescribed fertilizer and nutrient levels are applied to the land so there is no volatility or inappropriate application at any time being made. This is the type of technology that we now have, and this government does not want to acknowledge that.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

This community hog barn that I referred to as being north of Oakville is within the banned area. This community of individuals has done everything humanly possible to make certain that their neighbours are not impacted by the operation of the growing of hogs. Yet this government says, that doesn't matter, it's all history, we don't care what you've done in the past and we are basically going to say, through this legislation, that it didn't matter at all. We don't care what you've done and how you are received now in the community.

That is truly an injustice, Mr. Speaker, because these constituents have done as all Manitobans that I have knowledge of. They recognize the environment as one that is our responsibility to maintain and not to have an ill impact because, indeed, as stewards of

the land, we know that our children are going to inherit the land that we are now responsible for, and we want to make sure that they receive the land in as good a shape or better than when we ourselves received it.

Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that we here in the Legislative Assembly keep in touch with the people impacted by the passages of legislation, and that's why we have the committee process. We heard time and time again as to the improvements through technology that are now employed in the hog industry. It really, truly is dismaying that this government did not listen, and because the example that I have just given, under all scrutiny, has demonstrated that the technology and the will is there amongst our hog producers here to make sure that they are good neighbours.

This legislation flies in the face of that performance and does indeed an injustice to all those that have shown and demonstrated their dedication to the environment and to the water quality here in the province of Manitoba.

* (15:30)

So I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to participate in the debate this afternoon, and I encourage all members to adopt the amendment as proposed by the honourable Member for Lakeside, because, indeed, it is one that engages science and is one that I support wholeheartedly. Thank you.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): It's with great trepidation that I get up to speak to this amendment today, Mr. Speaker, on this Bill 17, a bill designed to bring havoc on an industry in Manitoba that has had a tradition of stewardship in this province.

The minister today, at one of the comments of our leader today in regard to the Premier (Mr. Doer) was that he was a reputation in search of an accomplishment, well, I only want to put on the record today that all the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) is going out of this with is a reputation. There is no accomplishment.

The bill that he has brought forward will not—and he knows it—will not accomplish the objectives that he has set out in his bill to have accomplished for Lake Winnipeg. There are many factors much greater than what he is targeting that impact the algal blooms and other issues in Lake Winnipeg. But he has chosen to target one particular industry and one

segment of an industry that helped settle and establish this province as a leader in Canada.

I had the opportunity, as a farm leader, to deal with many pork organizations across the country of Canada. I found them to be extremely good stewards of their operations and leaders in an industry that provided food not only for Canadians but people around the world.

Manitoba was a leader in the development of the pork industry in China, Mr. Speaker. Maybe not too many people are aware of some of the history of the Richardson family in regard to the exports of breeding stock in the hog industry into other sectors of the world that have made China one of the leaders in production in this area today in an effort solely to help feed their citizens.

That's part of the reason why these export markets are so important to the Canadian quality of product that we have on our farms here in this very province today, whether it's the export of the quality product of meat that we export, or whether it's the quality of the weanlings that are so acceptable to our neighbours to the south and in other areas, because they know that they're getting quality product that will gain faster than weanlings from other areas of the world—and their own, in many cases, to the south—is just a fact of the stewardship and the care that this industry has taken to be extremely careful with how it has developed in this province, not just all of Canada, but particularly the quality of the product in this province.

I think this minister, while he may have thought he was well intended by placating to his Premier in bringing this bill forward on his Premier's behalf, he and his Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) are going to go down in history with a very detrimental reputation in the rural part of Manitoba. I want to say that I think that will be expanded to the whole province, certainly within the Perimeter Highway, because people, yesterday, at the Leaders' Forum with our leader, the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. McFadyen), that the Liberal Leader from River Heights and the minister from Thompson, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ashton) debated this issue yesterday at the Canadian Club luncheon.

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that when such renowned people—and I didn't always agree with him politically—but when a renowned individual like Otto Lang, the Honourable Otto Lang, comes up to the mike and directs a question at the Minister of

Intergovernmental Affairs in this province and very succinctly, yet very politely, in only a way that the Honourable Otto Lang could do—and I had a few opportunities to deal with Mr. Lang, as a farm leader, in his days when he was a member of Parliament from Saskatchewan. He was well respected for the work that he did across Canada and the outspoken work that he did as a Liberal in Parliament for western Canada. He knew how to reduce trade barriers, and he led the force in reducing trade barriers in western Canada in the late '70s, early '80s.

So I want to say that when Mr. Lang came to the mike yesterday in front of hundreds of urban citizens from this province and asked the minister, succinctly, why his government was moving forward with this bill, when clearly they didn't have any science to back it, why was the government so determined to move forward with this particular stance. Of course, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ashton) didn't have an answer. He really was lost for words in regard to coming up with any kind of science. It's not often that the minister for Thompson is lost for words—[*interjection*—the Member for Thompson. But he certainly could not supply any kind of, even selective science, as his Premier (Mr. Doer) quoted today on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make that point that this man has a tremendous reputation amongst the agricultural community and all of Canada, and yet the government couldn't provide a simple answer as to why they were moving forward with no science or where the science was coming from that they were using.

I don't take any solace today from the minister's backtracking and flip-flop in regard to asking the Clean Environment Commission to come forward and recheck whether the mistakes they made, in not doing their homework in the first place and not removing the nitrogen request from the future of Lake Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker—I don't take much solace from the fact that they've gone back and asked the Clean Environment Commission to relook at this position, because they don't listen to the Clean Environment Commission anyway.

If they would have done that, if they would have listened to the Clean Environment Commission in its report on the hog industry and its sustainability, which said that the hog industry was sustainable, going back and asking them to take another look at it today—if they were really clearly of the understanding that that's where they wanted to go—

and I believe it's solely because they know that they can save tens of millions of dollars by taking it out, taking the nitrogen and only looking in the future at removing phosphorus from Lake Winnipeg. It'll save them tens of millions of dollars, if not hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, money that this government probably doesn't even have in spite of the fact that they've had over \$3 billion of extra transfer payments in the last few years from the federal government.

The objectives of removing nitrogen are only based on the science that's come forward from many, many speakers who have criticized this government for what it's doing. However, not only are they just saying, we're asking the Clean Environment Commission to review it, they have also hired a private consulting group, a private engineering group in Manitoba, to provide them with advice and expertise on this issue as well.

Now, if they were sincere about it, they would have done one or the other but I question—and maybe they can tell us—why they're doing both.

Is it because they want their own answers to refute what the Clean Environment Commission will come up with this time? Or is it because they're afraid of what the commission might come forward with and they need an escape clause to continue to do what they're doing?

Mr. Speaker, I urge the minister to consider the fact that the rules in place today, put there by his own government, allow citizens, the farmers in Manitoba and the pork industry to do everything that they need to to comply with the rules that he's already put in place. He put them in place so that we could have a standard of understanding in the province to maintain the environment that we have in a friendly manner.

Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking of my experience as Intergovernmental Affairs critic years ago, when we changed the planning rules to allow land use to be dealt with by each R.M. in the province of Manitoba, under this government. They also turned the rules and the regulations that we had into rules for manure management, and the zero plan that the minister thinks we baked up on this side really comes right out of his own department.

The pork industry is just desperately trying to work with this minister to make sure they can continue to do business in this province.

* (15:40)

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to close by saying that I beseech the minister to pass this amendment or else hoist the bill until he can accomplish what he needs to do with the pork industry to make it sustainable in Manitoba. Thank you.

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I do want to speak to this amendment and thank the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler) for bringing it forward and, actually, for all of the work that he has done on this bill.

You know, this bill and this amendment are not just about the hog industry. When we bring legislation into this House to be debated and we go through first and second readings, and then we go to committee to have the people of Manitoba come forward and speak, it's not just about the particular bill, it's about democracy. It's about allowing people to come and have their say in how the bill is going to affect them. We heard numerous people at that committee. I think an unprecedented number came out in record numbers to speak to this bill which really says how important it is to the people of Manitoba. We heard from scientific experts; we heard from business leaders; we heard from the industry; we heard from producers, and over and over again we heard that this was not a bill supported by the people in the industry.

I happened to be at a meeting last night when someone came up to me and said, will the government withdraw Bill 17? And I said, I don't think they're going to do that.

Well, why wouldn't they? Because so many people at committee spoke out against this bill. They said to me, is committee just a sham? Is it foregone conclusion that the legislation goes through once it's proposed? Why do we come to committee? Why do we speak? Why did we sit there till 4 o'clock in the morning when no one listens to us? Is it just a sham? Is it a mockery of democracy? Is that what this is? Are we not listening to the people that came and presented, the people that brought forward science, scientific evidence?

Certainly, if we were listening to the people with the evidence, the people that are the producers, I think the minister would have to agree that if he's listening to what they said, he knows what they said. They said that this bill is not a good bill. It's motivated more by politics than by science. The Clean Environment Commission did not recommend a moratorium, and yet, again, the minister consults

with the Clean Environment Commission and doesn't follow their recommendations.

I support what the Member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson) was saying when she said, if you care about Lake Winnipeg, you will listen very carefully to this amendment and you will vote for this amendment, because this amendment does the right thing by reducing the nutrient loading into Lake Winnipeg. When industries can flourish, they can adopt new technologies, they can look to innovation and, certainly, we have seen that. There are many ways that producers can spread organic fertilizer on the land in such a way that it is taken up by subsequent crops. Certainly, we should be looking at natural fertilizers and not chemical fertilizers and using it in a way that is productive to future crops and in such amounts that can be withstood by those future crops. That in itself will disallow future runoff of phosphorus and nitrogen which run into waters. We don't want to see that happen. No one, no one in this province is against clean water. Everyone is in favour of clean water, and everyone is in favour of environmental issues and clean water in Lake Winnipeg.

But there's a balance, Mr. Speaker. There's a balance. You do not kill an industry. You do not kill an industry. There must always be balance. Good government is about balance. It's about balancing the needs on either side of an issue. When you don't get balance and you see governments who are more attuned to their political masters and passing legislation purely for political purposes, then we have not good governments. This is what we are seeing with this NDP government. There's not good governance for the people of Manitoba when you only pay attention to certain interest groups who are your political puppet masters. That's what's happening with this bill.

I believe that the Member for Lakeside has done a lot of work with a lot of the industry people and he knows the science behind the proposed amendment. He knows that it's good; it's a good amendment.

The minister just says, no, he's not willing to listen. When you're not willing to listen to what Manitobans are saying, then you do make a mockery of democracy in this province. I would just say to the minister, he needs to be open and listen. He needs to work with people. He needs to work with the industry. He needs to work with the pork producers. He needs to work with all of the people that support

the pork industry. I don't know if he knows that there are 15,000 jobs in this province that are related to this industry. Should those jobs go elsewhere, it decreases the ability of this province to move forward and strengthen our economy.

So the balance that is necessary here—you can do both. The Clean Environment Commission has made the recommendations. You can do both here. You can sustain the environment and you can sustain the industry. I don't know why the minister will not do that. Provide some balance.

Look at the proposed amendments instead of just saying, no, I don't want to listen, I'm not going to do that, it's going to gut the bill. He should pay attention. He's getting some very good advice, no different than he got very good advice at the committee hearings.

If you don't pay attention to those kinds of people coming forward, then it is a sham. You bring forward your legislation and you pretend you're consulting, you pretend you listen to the people and you don't. That's not democracy.

I would ask the minister to reconsider. I think that he's thinking, well, if I back down it shows weakness on my part. I don't believe that's the case. I believe that backing down—maybe backing down isn't the right terminology. I think that you could say, I've listened to what the people have to say and I believe that we can strengthen this legislation by looking at the amendments proposed and accepting them and listening to the people of Manitoba.

With that I would just ask once again for the minister to reconsider his decisions on Bill 17. Thank you

Mr. Gerrard: To rise to speak to this particular amendment, I want to, first of all, say as Liberals we believe that this legislation is fundamentally flawed. It would have been far better to not have had the moratorium and to have had, for example, the sort of measures that the hog industry themselves had called for, uniform injection of hog manure into the land so that there is very little, if any, run-off into the waterways and not a problem for the waterways, so that there is an approach which applies the manure and the rate that it can be taken off.

* (15:50)

The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) has moved to start to pay attention to phosphorus in the last year or two and to start putting some measures in

terms of phosphorus on the land but I would suggest that there are some basic questions which have not been answered.

Let me ask the minister because I asked the scientists and they said there wasn't good evidence as to whether you got more or less runoff from a field which had been applied, chemical phosphorus versus one which had got applied manure when it was injected into the land. If you don't know this, whether chemical phosphorus is better or worse in terms of the amount of phosphorus going into the land than manure, I mean you don't know some of the very basic science that you need in order to make good decisions.

Clearly, when we get to this amendment, which I will put a few comments on, I don't think this is a perfect amendment by any means. I think it would have been better, in clause A, instead of having no phosphorus, to have phosphorus below a certain concentration or amount because you're not very often going to have zero phosphorus, but below one milligram per litre, or 0.1 milligram per litre, or whatever is decided, would have been a better, I think, measure.

The second part, which deals with the phosphorus being applied to the land not exceeding the amount of phosphorus to be removed from the intended crops over a five-year cycle, we're really most concerned about the amount of phosphorus that gets into the waterway. So I would have worded this so that we have less than a certain concentration of phosphorus getting into the waterway so that the water is clear and we've managed the farming operation, the agricultural operation in a way that we're not getting significant concentrations of phosphorus into the water.

That being said, you know, we will support the amendment as being a step toward where we need to be but, Mr. Speaker, fundamentally, we don't think that this legislation is in the right direction and, disagreeing with the legislation, we don't think that you can necessarily amend it in a way that's going to be satisfactory. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the amendment moved by the honourable Member for the Lakeside (Mr. Eichler).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Formal Vote

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition Deputy House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could be so kind as to summon the members for a recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

Order. The question before the House is the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler).

Division

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

Yeas

Borotsik, Briese, Cullen, Driedger, Dyck, Eichler, Faurshou, Gerrard, Goertzen, Lamoureux, Maguire, McFadyen, Mitchelson, Pedersen, Stefanson, Taillieu.

Nays

Allan, Ashton, Bjornson, Blady, Braun, Brick, Caldwell, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Howard, Irvin-Ross, Jennissen, Jha, Korzeniowski, Lathlin, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Marcelino, Martindale, McGifford, Melnick, Nevakshonoff, Reid, Robinson, Saran, Selby, Struthers, Swan, Wowchuk.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 16, Nays 30.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll move on to the next amendment.

Mr. Eichler: I ask leave of the House to propose an amendment. I move, seconded by the Member for Carman (Mr. Pedersen),

THAT Bill 17 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out "or" at the end of subclause (i) of the proposed clause 40.1(2) and adding "or" at the end of the subclause (ii) by adding the following after clause (ii):

(iii) an environmental sound treatment that does not result in an increased amount of phosphorus being added to an area described in the regulations;

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave for the amendment? [*Agreed*]

It's been moved by the honourable Member for Lakeside, seconded by the honourable Member for Carman,

THAT Bill 17—dispense?

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

THAT Bill 17 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out "or" at the end of subclause (i) of the proposed clause 40.1(2)(a), adding "or" at the end of subclause (ii) and adding the following after subclause (ii):

(iii) an environmentally sound treatment that does not result in an increased amount of phosphorus being added to an area described in the regulations;

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for leave and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What this amendment does is it gives the director the authority to allow a new hog operation if it has an anaerobic digester, or if it uses other environmentally sound treatments similar or better than an anaerobic digestion. Again this offers a science-based approach to nutrient management to ensure that there's not an increase in the amount of phosphorous being added in that area.

This is a significant amendment. I know that this will give the minister that second chance in order to try and better the bill in a way that will be meaningful. I know that, when we on this side of the House bring these amendments forward through consultation with buyer sectors, it's imperative that we make sure that we do have those right amendments in place.

I want to talk about the regulations we have right now. We have the Livestock Manure and Mortalities Management Regulations, the Nutrient Management Regulation, The Planning Act, amid many others. The livestock producers know what's in their best interest.

*(16:10)

I want to quote a couple of quotes here from the University of Manitoba. Dr. Michael Trevan, Dean of the University of Manitoba's Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, has pointed out that the hog industry contributes only a small percentage of the nutrients going into Lake Winnipeg. Dr. Trevan told the *Winnipeg Free Press*, and I quote: The contribution of the total hog industry in Manitoba to the phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg is probably at 1.5 percent. Consequently, if you actually took all the hog barns out of production, you wouldn't actually make any sensible dent in the amount of phosphorus into Lake Winnipeg, end of quote.

With the introduction of Bill 17, what we're doing is taking a heavy-handed approach to this issue. What is politics instead of science?

Dr. Trevan also pointed out, and I want to read into the record and I quote: What really troubles me is that the minister is pretending he's working on the basis of the recommendations by the Clean Environment Commission, implies that the science is supporting his case and it doesn't. As soon as you get into that sort of situation, where politicians pretend that they have the evidence that supports what they're doing, you damage both the political machinery, and the machinery in this case, the university that's providing that evidence, end of quote.

This is significant. This is a very significant quote, Mr. Speaker, that we need in this House to heed the evidence that's been brought forward to us. We rely on these professors, these scientists that deal with us each and every day, that whenever we make decisions that is for the betterment of our province, the betterment of clean water, which we all agree to. We all want clean water. We work in harmony with our professors. Work in harmony with the industry. Work in harmony with our business people. Work in harmony with the people in Winnipeg where we all want to go and play in rural Manitoba. That's important enough that whenever we have somebody with the credentials—I mean he did not get here by accident, he got here by studying, working hard,

making sure that when we, as politicians, have that evidence to be able to move forward on good science-based evidence then when we bring bills forward then that's what we talk about.

Why don't we go back to 2003 when BSE broke out. Members of this side of the House, members on that side of the House talked about—let's base the BSE on science. Let's base this on the best technologies that we have in order to get the border open, so our cattle can go back and forth across to our biggest trading partner in the United States.

When we look at the overall benefits of what science does, it gives us those tools in order to deal with those issues on good science rather than on a political basis. I've talked about a couple of the other issues that we had earlier and, unfortunately, we did by House agree that we would do three amendments today, and I know that the minister looked at the CEC report and I have a number of the colleagues that want to be able to get some information put on the record here today, so I'll keep this short.

But, out of the 188 page report and the 48 recommendations, the industry and those supportive industry groups have made it very, very clear, Mr. Speaker, they are prepared to work with the government. They're prepared to implement those regulations, those recommendations in a way that's going to be meaningful in order to keep the water clean, keep the water safe, keep the water the way we want it for our next generation. It's imperative that we as agriculture people, the people that are stewards of the land, and we've said that they're the great stewards of the land, who want to leave that in a better state than whenever they got it and want to hand it off to the next generation.

So this amendment was not drafted just to be a duplicate to the member that brought it forward just a few moments ago, it is an opportunity for us to re-evaluate. An opportunity for us to look at the science, look at the technology that we want to see prosper, see grow within the hog industry. In all the other sectors it's important that we look at the feed rations, look at the science base, look at the technology, as we know that we're not the only one in the country raising pigs. We have a lot to learn from the other countries, have a lot to learn from our neighbours to the south, our neighbours to the west. It's imperative that we make sure that we sustain this industry in a way that'll be meaningful in the next generation. So ask support of the minister, ask support of the members on the other side of the

House to please have an opportunity to review this amendment and support it.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Struthers: Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the member opposite for bringing forward this amendment, for his contributions to consideration of this Bill 17, and, of course, the considerations in terms of protecting Manitoba's water.

This amendment, much like the one before it, which is fairly closely related to the one before it, was, I think—I don't know if it was the intention of the member opposite, but, certainly, I think the result of this amendment would be to gut the bill. That's not what I'm here for today. We're not here to do that.

I do, though, want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the member opposite talks about innovation, talks about technology. I thought there were some very good discussions at the public hearings having to do with technology, both in the technology that has taken place in the past and the technology that we can foresee evolving down the road. I'm quite optimistic in terms of that kind of innovation. I'm very confident in producers, in the business community, in the folks that work at the universities, to keep their minds focussed on innovation. Certainly, any of us who live in rural Manitoba understand that that technology has been evolving over a long period of time in our part of our beautiful province, so I fully expect that will continue. I fully expect that folks at Manitoba Pork and others will continue to place a high focus on research and development, a high focus on innovation. Certainly, in my opinion, that is not something that will stop because of Bill 17. Certainly, in this government's opinion, innovation research will continue, along with the introduction of Bill 17.

So, just with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I can say to the members opposite that we cannot accept this amendment that's been put forward by the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler). Thank you.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): I just stand up to make a few comments in support of this amendment that has come forward from the Member for Lakeside. Certainly, it is something that I believe we do need to support.

I'm disappointed that the minister is not prepared to listen to people, research doctors, to the presenters, as they give their expertise in support of lifting this Bill 17. It reminds me a little bit of the situation that we go through in schools, and I know

that this Minister of Education (Mr. Bjornson) has indicated that he is opposed to bullying. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is doing exactly the same thing. It is pitting urban against rural Manitoba, and there is no scientific evidence at all to support that.

I'm just going to give you a quotation, and I know that the minister has had this and has seen it, but I need to reiterate it again. It's from Dr. Trevan and he quoted, and I'll read the quote that he gave: What really troubles me is that the minister, pretending he's working on the basis of the recommendations by the Clean Environment Commission, implies that the science is supporting his case, and it doesn't. As soon as you get into that sort of situation where politicians pretend that they have evidence that supports what they're doing, you damage both the political machinery and the machinery—in this case, the university—that's been providing the evidence. So there are many like that. I know I could go on, and I could give other instances and quotations. I realize it's sort of like hitting your head against the wall. The only thing is it feels better when you quit hitting your head against the wall.

It's the same thing here. The minister, the members opposite, are not listening. If they had sound evidence to prove what they are saying, I would be open to listen. I talked to the minister yesterday, and I said there's one thing about life as we get older and that, we should all adopt the area of lifelong learning. I'm sorry to say, but I think that is something that we're forgetting at this point.

I listened to the minister. He was in an interview on Radio Southern Manitoba at noon today. I was very disappointed. The interviewer had very good questions, but the minister has made up his mind. It doesn't matter what's going to come forward, whether it's going to be science, whether it's going to be any appealing toward his sense of justice in taking away the jobs, the vocations, the ability to earn a livelihood from people. He's dead-set opposed to it. I can't understand the minister's position on this.

* (16:20)

As again, I've said, he doesn't have the sound evidence to support what he's doing, but obviously he's made up his mind, or maybe it's the Premier (Mr. Doer) who's made up his mind that they are going to bully people into this kind of a situation within the province. I thought we lived in a democratic country. Obviously, we do not.

So, with those few words, I just want to register my disappointment in the minister, in the government of the day, for bringing this bill forward, for imposing it upon Manitobans who really honestly want to make a living. I will leave with the last quote—well, it's not a quote, but it's a story that was told by one of the ministers from the colony when they came out here and gave their presentation. First of all, he said, I don't believe that we as Hutterites should be here doing this sort of lobbying, but we had no choice but to be here. Then he went on to indicate that it appeared from this bill that the Premier wanted all Manitobans from rural Manitoba to move to Winnipeg. Then he went on to say as well, listen, he says, I now will read the pledge that the Premier made later on. Then he also indicated, he said, our children are not prepared to move to the city; we don't know how to steal cars.

Now this was after the Premier had said, I pledge to never deny people a culture and a way of life.

An Honourable Member: Who said that?

Mr. Dyck: This is what the Premier said. It's in *Hansard*. Yes, it's out there. So I'm disappointed. I'm disappointed in this government. I'm disappointed in the direction that they have taken and are not listening to good science, good sound evidence out there which would indicate that they withdraw this bill. Thank you.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): It is, indeed, a pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill 17, and I do thank the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler) for bringing this resolution forward. Clearly, if this government is not going to withdraw Bill 17 in the best interests of all Manitobans, we on this side of the House are going to do whatever we can to make the bill a little more palatable, if you will, for Manitobans and for the industry.

My colleagues here, they have certainly I think hit the nail on the head here, and this is all about sound science. We have had the research people here. You've heard quotes from different professors about the science-based approach to managing nutrients in Manitoba, and what we've done with this bill, the government has chosen to ignore the research and the work that has been carried on by scientists over the years. A number of our colleagues in the PC caucus had the opportunity to tour the University of Manitoba; I went out to the Glenlea Research Station just last week and had a chance to

see some of the ongoing work that's being done by the professors out there. We could certainly sense the frustration that they are feeling when this government has chosen not to listen to the advice that they have been putting forward. They've put forward this advice to the Clean Environment Commission. They came and sat through committee hearings and brought forward the advice. They brought forward the advice to the government in hopes that the government would listen to the sound science and the years of research that they have put in. Instead, this government is blindly going down the path, playing politics with the environment and choosing to ignore good sound political science and developing very poor public policy in the process.

Mr. Speaker, do we really need this particular piece of legislation? I would submit to you that we, in fact, have the tools in place to deal with nutrient management in the province of Manitoba. The minister has the wherewithal within his department, with his staff, with the regulations currently in place. If there is someone or some organization out there that is polluting the landscape, he has the ability now, without Bill 17, to go in there and stop that operation, stop that pollution from happening.

Clearly, this bill is an attack on one certain industry, and we certainly feel that it's politically motivated. This is a \$2-billion industry in Manitoba, and my fear is, along with the presenters that came, over 300 presenters that came, there's going to be a significant change in industry in Manitoba. In fact, what may happen, the fallout from Bill 17, is that we may see this industry move outside of Manitoba, and, if the industry moves outside of Manitoba—and there are places like Saskatchewan and North Dakota which are certainly open for business there in terms of the hog industry.

The thing we have to bear in mind if we're really talking about protecting Lake Winnipeg, we have to bear in mind that the watershed for Lake Winnipeg covers four provinces and four states. So what we're going to do is, essentially, we could be driving the business out of Manitoba to places that have less stringent regulations in place to protect waterways. So, in essence, Mr. Speaker, what could happen, what the net result of Bill 17 could be is actually a worse situation for Lake Winnipeg. I think it's important that this Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers), the Minister of Water Stewardship (Ms. Melnick), and the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) stand up and take notice of what the ramifications for this bill could be.

I think the rural members in the NDP caucus should be standing up for the agriculture producers of this province and that's something that they haven't done. The government uses the excuse about water. We know the facts, the research suggests a very small percentage of the phosphorus that goes into Lake Winnipeg can actually be attributed to the hog industry, Mr. Speaker.

Now, if Bill 17 proceeds, as it probably will, the question remains: what sector is next? I know the Minister of Conservation stood in this House just a few months ago, and his comment was: sector by sector by sector. So, clearly, today, he is picking on the hog industry here in Manitoba. What industry is going to be next on his hit list? That's the concern we have when a government takes on a moratorium, a complete-ban approach to governance. It flies in the face of common sense, good science, and certainly, the public of Manitoba deserves something better.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, this is a very important issue for rural Manitoba, as we heard 300 presenters come forward. It's certainly going to affect their livelihoods. It's going to affect the value of their farms. That's something I don't think this government has really stopped to think about, how they can justify bringing forward a piece of legislation like this that's going to have such a dramatic impact on rural Manitoba.

So I hope the minister will reconsider this particular bill over the next few days and certainly consider the amendments that are being brought forward. Thank you.

Mr. Stuart Briese (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise to speak to the amendment that was brought forward by the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler).

About an hour ago, I had a call from Tom Hofer at the Starlite Colony wondering where we were on this bill and what was happening right now. You may remember them from the hearings. They have a vested interest in this. They've bought property that is only six miles inside this moratorium line, planning to set up a new colony. A lot of the colonies depend on the hog industry for their livelihood. If this bill goes through, that colony cannot do the expansion they want to do. And we've heard them say, we'll go. We'll go to some other jurisdiction where these rules aren't in place. I would suggest that places like Saskatchewan and North Dakota are ready for them to come. They're welcoming business.

This is an attack on free enterprise and entrepreneurship. The tools were already all in place. I have a lengthy background on municipal and I've been there on the committees that worked on COSDI, the Consultation on Sustainable Development and Implementation, on Bill 40, the bill that did get dropped on this, and on the amendments to The Planning Act. The tools were there. The Manure and Mortalities Management, The Planning Act, municipal by-laws, tactical review committees. We had all the tools that were necessary to deal with these operations on a one-on-one basis. We could deal case-by-case and deal with what needed to be done in a certain area. There is absolutely no need for moratoriums to be put in place. Moratoriums are always a weak approach to a problem or an issue. This is a political solution and it is not science-based, and I believe that there will be a political price to pay by this government.

* (16:30)

It's a dangerous precedent that's being set here, a dangerous message going out to business. It's a message that government can come along and say, you've worked your life building up this business; we're going to shut you down. This can go from this issue, from the hog barn issue, to a number of other issues. Barns, the argument is about—that the government's trying to make is, it's all about water. If they're really concerned about water, and I heard the Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Lemieux) mention it, why are we not doing things about things like contaminated sites? There are some 200 of them in this province. They're ignoring them. They're sitting there in limbo. Nobody's cleaning them up, and the Province isn't making any move to clean them up. They're certainly a risk to water supplies, more so than most of these hog operations.

Boil water orders. A number of years ago, when I was with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, we were told there are between 50 and 60 boil water orders in this province. I think that number remains kind of similar from year to year, and we were told at that time, and I was told again last spring, not a single one of those boil water orders is related to livestock. They're all human contamination. That is a very telling factor.

I would think, in my view, that we have two options here. One is to stand up for the right to farm, the rights of the agricultural communities in this province. The other option is to sit on our hands, let the farming community die, and I challenge the government to follow the first option.

I would like to quote Harold Breimyer. He was a 60-year career ag economist in the United States, and he said: To enable proprietary agriculture, farmers and ranchers to survive an increasingly industrial, commercial and technological farm and food system, the primary consideration should be to those who provide our food. Thoughtful people should rule policy. Policy shouldn't rule people.

Farmers and the agricultural community in general think in generation terms. We're not going out there and poisoning our surroundings. We're not going to do something that leaves the land in poorer shape than it was when we went there. The nutrients that come out of these barns are a valuable product, and as the price of fertilizer goes up, they become a more valuable product. One of the most telling statements I heard in the hearings, and I think probably went over some members' heads, was the presenter from De Salaberry that said they'd been doing this, incorporating the manure since 1995, and they've seen the organic content of their soil double in that time, and they've been testing the soil. We watch all the garden supply places in this city; people carrying out the bags and bags of stuff to bring up the organic compound of their soil. *[interjection]* This was a major accomplishment to double your organic composition in those soils.

Once again, I urge the minister to rethink his position on this bill. This isn't the right way to go. It's sending a bad message out to agriculture in general, but it's sending a message to all the people in Manitoba. It's the wrong message that's being said. It's a dangerous precedent, as I said before, and I implore the minister to reconsider his position on this bill and to accept some of the—at least accept some of the amendments to it, but preferably to hoist the bill or pull the bill totally.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): First of all, let me begin by commending my colleague from Lakeside for the work that he's done, not only on the amendments that we've seen here this afternoon, but, indeed, throughout the process of this bill in working with the Pork Council, working with the various stakeholders involved to raise the awareness of what this bill will do and to try to get through the clutter and the rhetoric of the government as they try to put forward a message that's incorrect on what the true intention and the true result that Bill 17 will be.

I've listened intently to those in my caucus who have more experience on some of these issues than I

do, and I appreciate the comments that they've put on the record. I want to speak to something slightly different, not specifically about what this bill and the process by how this bill came forward would do to farming in particular, but to something that touches on each of us as individual members of the Legislature, and that's trust in government and the confidence that people have in the government system, generally.

When the pause came in on the hog expansion, I remember very clearly the Premier of this province, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), standing up, both in this House and in other forums, and saying, we're simply to going to stop, look, listen and learn, I believe it was. It was one of those typical comments that the Premier would say that's a catchy line that the people might remember. I did remember it. I think that many of the pork producers throughout Manitoba remembered it as well, because what they took from that is, well, this is going to be a temporary thing and the government is simply putting on a temporary pause. I think they believed that in good faith. In fact, most of the producers that I talked to at that time, and I remember very clearly them saying to me, well, this is something that isn't going to last very long. We don't like it. It caught us by surprise, and we trust that this is something that won't be here for a very long time.

The Premier made some comments that I think could have been interpreted that way, to give confidence to pork producers and to others in the agriculture industry regarding his comments on the pause. Then he went on to appoint the CEC to do a study. I remember the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) coming to, I believe, an annual meeting of the Pork Council, and saying that, well, the study is going on and we believe in your industry and we believe that ultimately it's going to be shown to be a clean and sustainable industry in the province of Manitoba.

I know, talking to many of the producers who were at that meeting that evening, they came away with confidence as well. They believed, from the comments by the Minister of Agriculture, that the CEC report would be relied upon, that it would be valued and trusted, and they also believed that their industry would be shown to be clean and sustainable based on the evidence, the science that they'd seen before, some of the science which comes directly out of the Minister of Conservation's (Mr. Struthers) office himself. So those producers, those good men and women who are pork producers in our province,

took on good faith the word of the Minister of Agriculture, the word of the Premier, the word of the Minister of Conservation, that the Clean Environment Commission report would be relied upon and that the pause was simply that the report would take a study and then things could move forward with some sound, sensible policies from there.

I think it's the nature of people and, I would say, all Manitobans, but particularly in rural Manitoba and the farming community, to have that sort of trust, not just in government and institutions, but in their neighbours and in their friends and their associates. They're a trusting lot. When the minister said that she believed that the industry would come out to be shown to be clean and sustainable from the CEC, and that the evidence and the science would be relied upon, they believed that. They believed in the government. They believed in the institutions that they have supported, not necessarily a party, but the institutions that they have supported in the province and that many have fought for here and before us.

So, when the report came out and indicated, in fact, that the industry, while certain things could be done to improve it, but didn't go so far as to suggest the moratorium, that that was a government decision, they were surprised. I think that in many ways they felt betrayed because they trusted the system up until that point. They believed the Premier when he said that this was simply a pause. They believed the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Conservation when they said we're going to rely upon the CEC, and then the report comes out and they put a political decision over top of the CEC. Even the commission chair himself said that that was not something that the CEC recommended, that that was a political decision. I think, at that point, a great deal of suspicion started to come into the minds of producers, and wonder whether or not this government was going to listen to the science, and whether or not they were going to listen to good sound public policy.

But I think, because of the nature of farmers and the nature of rural Manitoba and the nature of Manitobans generally, they still wanted to give one more chance. So, when the government said, well, you know, there's going to be an opportunity, we're going to have hearings where you're going to be able to come to the Legislature and make your case—I know that there were MLAs here, I believe the Member for Wellington (Ms. Marcelino) who said, I'm going to listen at the committee and have an open

mind; I haven't made up my mind which way I'm going to vote on this bill.

* (16:40)

I think that farmers and producers and agriculture representatives wanted to believe the government. Now, I don't know if in their hearts, at that point, they were believing them, but they certainly wanted to believe them. They wanted to believe that, if they could go and make their case to the government, they would be listening. If they could bring forward solutions and alternatives, the government would be listening, and they did. They came out in droves. They came out at hours of the night that most Manitobans would think to be sane to be at home and in bed and with their families. But they spent the time. They came here not knowing when they are going to have to present. They came here not knowing if they'd be able to present that night. They came at 12 o'clock, 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock in the morning. I remember, in particular, a young person from my constituency, Julianna Klippenstein, I believe she is 19 or 20 years old. She came at 2:30 or 3 in the morning to make a presentation to this committee about what it would do to her future, because she wants to be in the pork industry—and to her family. I think that they trusted still; in their hearts, they may have had doubt, but they wanted to believe that this process wasn't a sham, that it wasn't something that wasn't going to be relied upon.

So you could imagine the betrayal. I suspect that, for many of the producers, the first time that they really believed in their heart of hearts that this whole thing has been a charade is when they read the Minister of Conservation's (Mr. Struthers) comments earlier this week when he attacked the Manitoba Pork Council's solution on the zero percent solution. I think, up until then, a good number of producers still wanted to believe; in fact. I know that because they would come to me over the course of the summer and other times and say, I still think that the government might accept some of these amendments, or maybe there's a way we can do this or that. They were still looking for alternatives. They still believed in their heart of heart that there must have been a reason why all of this took place, and there must be a way to change the government's mind. But I think when they saw the comments of the Minister of Conservation attacking the Manitoba Pork Council on the solution—and the other groups that were involved, in fairness, too, in bringing forward a reasonable solution—that that's probably when, for many of the producers, they realized for

the first time that this whole thing was a charade, that this whole thing was a sham, that the pause that went in and the Premier (Mr. Doer) said that it would only be temporary, that the CEC commission report that the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) said would be relied upon, that the hearings at the committee that they were told were going to be listened to, all of that really was a sham.

It was something just to get to a certain end that the government determined. I think that reflects badly on all of us because I truly believe that many of those producers—why they won't support the government because of the actions that they took—will look less upon government overall because they acted in good faith. They believed that the government, if they brought forward a case, brought forward solutions, would listen to them, and that hurts each and every one of us. It doesn't matter if you're a farmer, a rural or urban member, the fact that you're here as a legislator, it will hurt all of us because I truly believe that those Manitobans will look at the government system less optimistically and less positively than they might have before, because they felt betrayed by the system.

So I say shame on the government. I hope that for that reason alone, just to have confidence in this legislative system, they'll withdraw the bill and listen to some of the proposals to, in fact, make the industry sustainable and protect water in Manitoba.

Mr. Gerrard: Let me speak, Mr. Speaker, briefly, to this amendment dealing with environmentally sound treatment that doesn't result in an increased amount of phosphorus being added to the area described in the regulations.

We're going to support this amendment, although I think that there's probably little better ways that this could have been put, to be honest. For example, we have quite a number of soils in Manitoba which are quite low in phosphorus, and I wouldn't want to limit the amount of phosphorus being added to low-phosphorus soils so that they can grow good crops. So I mean, I think that that's really what we're about here, is to handle the soil properly.

I also think that the critical thing is not just to how much phosphorus is applied to the soil, whether it's manure or chemical phosphorus or whatever other approach, what we're interested in is the amount of phosphorus in the water which comes off the land. We want that to be low because that's the water which is going into Lake Winnipeg.

One of the very strange things about the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) is that he's going to put a ban, right, on somebody who wants to expand their operation and, at the same time, manage the water flowing off in such a way that, for example, putting a small dam in there so the phosphorus settlement's out, having a treatment of that water, so that the end result is you've got water coming off the land, which has got a tiny fraction of the phosphorus, a dramatic reduction in the phosphorus coming off the land, combined with an expansion of the hog barn. But the minister doesn't believe in reducing phosphorus coming off the land, so he wants to ban all hog barns. We don't understand this minister, as do a lot of other people don't understand him either, but the bottom line is that, Mr. Speaker, we will support this amendment though, in fact, we believe that the better thing would be not to have this bill in the first place.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Briese) made reference to the Starlite Colony, and that just kind of reminded me of an opportunity I had a few weeks back in regard to being able to go out to Starlite Colony. I thought maybe it would be kind of appropriate at this point—and I'll maybe get another chance during third reading—but I wanted just to express my appreciation to, I believe it was Tom Hofer, who provided a tour of the facility. I was able to learn a great deal in terms of the industry. Looking at the size and the way in which they have it down to an art in terms of the production of hogs, I was really quite amazed. In fact, the first room I entered into—after taking a shower, of course—was a computer room, where you sit back and you can watch how the hogs are actually being monitored going through the system and just how much feed is being fed to them and the whole nine yards. It was really an eye-opener for me personally, and I very much valued and appreciated the opportunity that Mr. Hofer provided to me and an acquaintance that I brought through at the same time.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, one of things that I've noticed on Bill 17 is that the government seems to be preoccupied about the environment to the degree in which they're bringing in legislation that, in essence, is really causing a great deal of frustration and is damaging a very important industry here in Manitoba, that being our hog industry. We within the Liberal Party, my leader has often talked about the importance of the environment. He's brought forward initiatives that would have a much more positive impact in improving the quality of the water, in

particular in Lake Winnipeg, doing better things for our environment that the government could, in fact, be acting on that would make a very real and tangible difference.

But, whether it's my leader or it's members of the Conservative caucus standing up, addressing Bill 17, whether it's inside this Chamber or outside this Chamber—and, again, I'm not a scientist, by any stretch of the imagination, nor a hog farmer, but I like to think that, if I'm presented the facts and try to get an understanding of the issue, I do have the ability to make a good decision. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government is making a bad decision. The government needs to start listening to what our hog producers and farmers, what the opposition is saying in regard to the industry, because, at the end of the day, we are here to serve all Manitobans. I believe that there's a need for the government to review exactly what it is that's happening.

* (16:50)

In regard to the Starlite Colony, I, too, was under the impression that they were wanting to expand and it was in the moratorium area. At least I believe that to be the case. I'm not 100 percent sure but, just reflecting on what I was told, I think that's what was implied to me, and it's somewhat sad that if, in fact, the government appears to be overreacting in an area that's causing so much resistance in the communities, and if it was something that was proven to be to the detriment of our environment, then the minister should be standing in his place and saying, here is why, here is specifically why this is causing damage.

The farm that I saw, in conclusion, clearly showed that they were at such a state of art in terms of making sure that they were taking good care of the hog manure, and the way in which they were being fed, I would maybe somewhat challenge whether or not some of our own municipalities are doing as well of a job in dealing with some of those environmental issues.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak in favour of the amendment, and as you can detect from our leader, we don't support the bill itself. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Maguire: I just want to put on the record that I am outside the ban on this that's been imposed by

this government on this bill. I represent an area that's outside the ban, but if the minister thinks it's not affecting my area, he's wrong.

People have indicated at the hearings that they would not relocate in the area where the ban is not in place because they will, if they're moving, they'll go somewhere else. They'll go to North Dakota, the United States, or they'll go to Saskatchewan, who are waiting with open arms, as the Member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Briese) indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to reiterate that the minister's using a sledge hammer to kill an ant with this bill, and it's certainly not a friendly bill for Manitoba.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Formal Vote

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a recorded vote.

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

Order. The question before the House is the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Lakeside.

Division

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

Yeas

Borotsik, Briese, Cullen, Driedger, Dyck, Eichler, Faurshou, Gerrard, Goertzen, Hawranik, Lamoureux, Maguire, McFadyen, Pedersen, Stefanson, Taillieu.

Nays

Allan, Ashton, Bjornson, Blady, Braun, Brick, Caldwell, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Howard, Irvin-Ross, Jennissen, Jha, Korzeniowski, Lathlin, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Marcelino, Martindale, McGifford, Melnick, Nevakshonoff, Reid, Robinson, Saran, Selby, Struthers, Swan, Wowchuk.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 16, Nays 30.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I think, considering the movement on the second hand on the clock and given the hard work that's been done today, that we might call it 5 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it 5 o'clock? [*Agreed*] It's been agreed to.

The hour being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, September 17, 2008

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Petitions		Ambulance Fees Gerrard; Doer	3259
Pharmacare Deductibles Taillieu	3249	Members' Statements	
Long-Term Care Facility–Morden Dyck	3249	Brandon Student Recognition Borotsik	3260
Physician Recruitment–Southwestern Manitoba Maguire	3249	25th Anniversary of Grandparents' Swim Program Martindale	3260
Provincial Nominee Program–Applications Lamoureux	3250	Dr. John Bock Taillieu	3261
Recovery Strategy–Manitoba Farmers Eichler	3250	Samantha Chrol Braun	3261
Briese	3251	Sisler Teens against Nicotine and Drugs Gerrard	3262
Hard Surfacing Unpaved Portion–Provincial Road 340 Cullen	3251		
Oral Questions		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
St. Joseph Wind Farm Project McFadyen; Doer	3252	GOVERNMENT BUSINESS	
Wind Power Development Cullen; Doer	3254	Report Stage Amendments	
Cullen; Chomiak	3254	Bill 17–The Environment Amendment Act	
Manitoba Hydro Power Line Development McFadyen; Doer	3255	Eichler	3262
Cullen; Doer	3257	Struthers	3264
Health-Care Services Driedger; Chomiak	3258	Pedersen	3265
Threats to Police Officers Goertzen; Chomiak	3258	Gerrard	3266
		Stefanson	3268
		Faurschou	3270
		Maguire	3271
		Taillieu	3273
		Dyck	3277
		Cullen	3278
		Briese	3279
		Goertzen	3280
		Lamoureux	3282

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/index.html>