



First Session - Thirty-Sixth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(Hansard)**

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Louise M. Dacquay
Speaker*



Vol. XLV No. 57 - 10 a.m., Friday, October 27, 1995

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Sixth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

<u>Name</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Party</u>
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise, Hon.	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary	Concordia	N.D.P.
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	P.C.
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	N.D.P.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	P.C.
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane	Osborne	N.D.P.
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn	St. James	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	P.C.
NEWMAN, David	Riel	P.C.
PALLISTER, Brian, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PITURA, Frank	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
RADCLIFFE, Mike	River Heights	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack, Hon.	Niakwa	P.C.
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupert Island	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Gladstone	P.C.
SALE, Tim	Crescentwood	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin	N.D.P.
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	P.C.
TOEWS, Vic, Hon.	Rossmere	P.C.
TWEED, Mervin	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, October 27, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Emergency Health Care Services—
Community Hospitals**

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of R. Morrison, W. Opalko, L.A. Hueging and others requesting the Legislative Assembly urge the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) to consider making a commitment to the people of Manitoba that emergency health care services in Winnipeg's five community hospitals will remain open seven days a week, 24 hours a day.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Emergency Health Care Services—
Community Hospitals**

Madam Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). It complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

An Honourable Member: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Yes. The Clerk will read.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): The petition of the undersigned residents of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth

THAT emergency health care services are the core of Manitoba's health care system;

THAT Manitobans deserve the greatest possible access to this care;

THAT the government is considering reducing access to emergency services.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly urge the Minister responsible for Health consider making a commitment to the people of Manitoba that emergency health care services in Winnipeg's five community hospitals will remain open seven days a week, 24 hours a day.

**Emergency Health Care Services—
Seven Oaks General Hospital**

Madam Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak). It complies with the rules and practices of the House (by leave). Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

Some Honourable Members: Read.

Madam Speaker: Read. The Clerk will read.

Mr. Clerk: The petition of the undersigned residents of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth

THAT on at least six occasions during the 1995 provincial election the Premier promised not to cut health care services; and

THAT following the election the Minister of Health promised that emergency services would not be reduced at community hospitals in Winnipeg; and

THAT the Minister of Health on October 6 announced that emergency services at these hospitals would be cut back immediately; and

THAT residents of the Seven Oaks Hospital vicinity depend upon emergency service at this hospital.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba go on record requesting the Premier to consider maintaining 24-hour access to emergency health care at Seven Oaks Hospital as was promised in the 1995 general election.

* (1005)

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

**Standing Committee on Economic Development
Sixth Report**

Mr. Mike Radcliffe (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Economic Development): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Economic Development presents the following as its Sixth Report.

Your committee met on Thursday, October 26, 1995, at 9 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 26—The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

Gary Wingate, President, Manitoba Liquor Vendors' Association

John Read, Manitoba Hotel Association

Your committee has considered:

Bill 26—The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 13—The Split Lake Cree Northern Flood Implementation Agreement, Water Power Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant l'accord de règlement de la première nation crie de Split Lake relatif à l'application de la convention sur la submersion de terres du Nord manitobain, modifiant la Loi sur l'énergie hydraulique et apportant des modifications corrélatives

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 14—The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les mines et les minéraux

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

MOTION:

THAT section 4 of the Bill be amended by striking out "December 15" and substituting "September 30".

Mr. Radcliffe: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): I am pleased to table Volume 3, the Summary Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 1995.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us this morning sixty-eight Grade 5 students from Maple Leaf School under the direction of Mr. Bob McQuarrie, Mrs. Val Forsyth and Mr. Gerry den-Adel. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you this morning.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Health Sciences Centre
Emergency Services Investigation**

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Last night, in an open community meeting, a number of people were able to speak up and speak out about the Filmon government's decision to close the emergency wards from ten o'clock at night to eight o'clock in the morning, and, Madam Speaker, universally, the people

at the meeting thought it was a very wrong decision and that the decision should be reversed.

We also heard a number of examples of people who had been put in jeopardy, in the opinion of the public, by the government's decision, and we heard further information about decisions that are made across the so-called integrated system now in place allegedly in Winnipeg.

One example that we were told about was a situation on Saturday night when seven ambulances were in line at the emergency ward at the Health Sciences Centre and an eighth ambulance had to be diverted from that centre. They were in line with patients who could not even be unloaded into the hospital because of the massive waiting lists of people, Madam Speaker, and the number of ambulances that had patients in them because they could not go to other hospitals.

Has the minister investigated this situation that took place last Saturday night, and what can he advise the public of Manitoba about the so-called integrated system?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Madam Speaker, honourable members have brought to our attention, in the past, allegations of one kind or another, and when they were investigated they were not found to have been sustained by the facts of the case at hand.

If honourable members have concerns like this, I would be pleased to have them raise them with me with some detail. The honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) has raised matters with me in writing and surrounded it with very little detail. We had to do a real job of investigating the complaints and we did that, and we found that the honourable member's concerns were without the foundation that he suggests that they have.

Madam Speaker, I remind the honourable Leader—[interjection] Careful, David. The honourable member for Kildonan should be reminded from time to time about the parliamentary language that is allowed and unparliamentary language that is not allowed.

* (1010)

Point of Order

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): On a point of order, I believe Beauchesne indicates that ministers do not have to answer the questions, Madam Speaker, but they should not provoke debate, and I think the Minister of Health ought to be called to order. He is not even remotely dealing with the question that was posed by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McCrae: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, if the honourable member for Kildonan does not want me to provoke debate, he ought not from his seat to call me a liar.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. On the honourable member's point of order regarding the response to the question, I would remind the honourable minister that his response should deal with the question asked and be as brief as possible.

On the allegation by the honourable Minister of Health on the same point of order, I would request the co-operation of all honourable members in paying courtesy to the member who has been recognized on the floor, and if there would be no bantering back and forth across the floor—I recognize emotions run high, but it is a courtesy to afford the member who has been recognized an opportunity to present his or her response or question.

* * *

Mr. Doer: Madam Speaker, I ask the minister to investigate the matter, which is quite appropriate for us to ask; in fact, it is our responsibility to ask these questions and I think it is a responsibility of the Minister of Health to investigate these matters. That is all we are asking for on behalf of the public and patients of Manitoba.

We were further informed, on this same Saturday night—and the minister has indicated before he is, quote, monitoring the situation of his so-called integrated service—that the eighth ambulance was diverted from the Health Sciences Centre because of the line-up of ambulances with patients in those ambulances because of using just the two centres, rather than seven centres

in the city. That eighth ambulance, according to the first responding staff that were there, had to be diverted to the St. Boniface Hospital and unfortunately the patient in the ambulance died on transport to the St. Boniface Hospital.

Has the minister been made aware of that situation? Has he investigated it, and will he look at an independent investigation of this death and the system, whether it had anything to do, or not do, with this very tragic situation?

Mr. McCrae: There are times, Madam Speaker, in the city of Winnipeg and elsewhere where genuine emergencies do occur, and there are times, very tragically sometimes, when people lose their lives and everybody knows that.

Madam Speaker, indeed I have investigated all manner of things that have been raised in this House and elsewhere. Indeed, since the past weekend, I have met with a couple of the emergency doctors from Health Sciences Centre. I have also met with emergency nurses from Health Sciences Centre.

An Honourable Member: It is about time.

Mr. McCrae: It is not a question of about time. I have been doing this for two years, Madam Speaker, meeting with people like that, and I continue to do so.

Those same kinds of people are the people who are involved in the Integrated Emergency Services Delivery Steering Committee. Some 40 of them, hospital people, as well as hospital administrative people, as well as medical and nursing personnel, people representing consumers, people representing seniors and the various unions are represented on this committee. That is an appropriate place for these matters to be addressed as well, but indeed I have looked into the matters raised by the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

I think the best that can be said is that emergency services are hectic at the best of times, especially at busy and peak times, and there was a hectic weekend again at the Health Sciences Centre, but it was a question that the staff there were coping with.

* (1015)

Mr. Doer: Madam Speaker, the minister has not answered whether he would investigate the seven ambulances that were in line at the Health Sciences Centre last Saturday night. Was it due to the fact that other community hospital emergency wards were closed down, ordered by the Premier to be closed down, during those hours? The minister did not answer whether he would have an independent investigation of the eighth ambulance that was sent to St. Boniface Hospital.

I would like to ask the Premier, would he allow an investigation to take place by the coroner's office or somebody else independent, Madam Speaker? Because the whole system has been told to play ball with the government.

There are a lot of individuals in this system who are very worried about the safety of patients, very worried that the word is not getting out to the public, and I would like the Premier to have an independent procedure to look at this tragic situation, so the public will know the full impact of the Filmon government's decision in this matter.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Madam Speaker, I know that the member opposite has difficulty confining himself to the truth, but he ought not put on the record a statement that I ordered the closure of those.

Health Care System Emergency Services

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Premier in this House today saying that the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) made the decision to close the community hospitals without the authority of the Premier and cabinet in the government of Manitoba? Is that what the Premier is saying?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Madam Speaker, decisions that have been made have been collectively taken by those involved, including the administrations of the various hospitals in following up on the withdrawal of services by emergency room doctors at five community hospitals.

I say to the member opposite that he has put on the record false information by way of his attempting to take some political advantage of this situation, Madam Speaker, rather than a concern for the well-being of the patients and the operations of the health care system in Manitoba.

Mr. Doer: A supplementary question. Is the Premier saying to the people of Manitoba that the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) worked alone with the Department of Health officials, and the Minister of Health did not take this decision to cabinet, and it was not approved by the Premier as the chair of cabinet, Madam Speaker?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Speaker, the member opposite said I ordered the closure of those. That is wrong. That is false, and that is not appropriate in this Chamber. That is what I said.

Mr. Doer: Madam Speaker, I would ask the Premier, as chair of cabinet, did he approve the decision made by the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), or did the Minister of Health act alone?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Speaker, that is the point. The Minister of Health never acts alone. He has been involved with the administrations and staff of not only the municipal hospitals, not only the community hospitals, but he has been involved with many different people who have done analyses of health care provision in this province and in this city.

He never acts alone. He acts in consultation with experts, with those involved who work in the hospitals, with those who have expertise to offer, with those who have studied the system, and that is the way in which decisions are made.

Mr. Doer: A new question to the Premier: Did the Premier approve the decision to close the community-based hospitals from ten o'clock at night to eight o'clock in the morning, yes or no?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Speaker, the decision was arrived at as a result of a consensus flowing from all of the various investigations, all of the various investigations that have been done into the operations

of emergency rooms in this province and in this city, and under those circumstances, the minister, under his authority, makes the decisions based on the best available information and advice that is put forward to him.

Mr. Doer: A supplementary question. The Premier is saying the minister made the decision and the Premier did not approve it. Did the Premier approve the decision to close the emergency wards of the community hospitals? Did the matter go to cabinet? Did the Premier approve it, yes or no? It is a very simple question in a parliamentary democracy. You are the head of government. Did you approve it or did you not, Madam Speaker?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Speaker, the decisions that are made collectively by government are made on the basis of the consensus that is arrived at by government.

The minister, like all ministers, has authority that is vested in him by virtue of his cabinet position, and the decisions that he makes are the decisions that are made under his authority that is collectively given to him on a consensus basis by cabinet, Madam Speaker.

This minister has taken the effort to have several major analyses done of the operations of emergency rooms in this province. That is based on expert advice. It is not based on some political decision-making process that the members opposite would invoke. It is based on the advice of those who work within the system, and that is why he is putting forward a new approach that involves all seven hospitals within greater Winnipeg working together, as opposed to seven operating independently when it comes to such a vital decision as the provision of emergency services in this city.

Mr. Doer: The Premier chairs cabinet. The Premier is the head of government.

An Honourable Member: Splitting hairs.

* (1020)

Mr. Doer: Splitting hairs. My God, and you know that is not true, either.

Madam Speaker, was the Premier part of the consensus to close the community-based hospitals? Did he approve the closure of the community-based hospitals, yes or no?

Mr. Filmon: Community-based hospitals are not closed in Winnipeg, Madam Speaker.

Education System Canadian History

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, this weekend many Manitobans are making the trek to Montreal to support the sense of a country they learned to love. They are fortunate to have grown up in a Manitoba where they had the opportunity as young adults to learn about the past and where Canadian history was valued.

The Filmon government's education reforms will now make it possible for young Manitobans to graduate from high school with American history or European history but not Canadian history.

I want to ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) today, will he reconsider that decision?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Madam Speaker, the member is incorrect.

Ms. Friesen: Would the Minister of Education table any letter, any petition, any phone call that she has received from Manitobans which has asked for Canadian history in high school to become an elective, which might balance the hundreds of petitions that she has received from museum societies, from teachers, from students, from citizens, from seniors right across this province who have asked that she reconsider that decision?

Mrs. McIntosh: The member is trying very hard to imply that, because in the final year of high school we are now saying there will be two compulsory subjects, language arts and mathematics, all other subjects that are being taught to students are going to be ignored.

History is one that will be given renewed emphasis in the first 10 years of schooling.

The member knows we are moving to a model where content that was taught in 12 years will now be taught in 10 and that the increased emphasis on Canadian history and social studies will take place earlier, in more detail. By the time they have completed Grade 10 they should have covered all of the subject area they currently cover by the end of Grade 12, leaving them available in the last two years of high school to take additional history over and above what they would be able to currently get.

As well, the member knows that there are six optional subjects, from which four must be chosen. One of those is history in the last two years of high school.

The member knows that, Madam Speaker. I think to take advantage of trying to make a political point because of a very sensitive situation in the history of this country is very, very unwise for the sake of this country.

Ms. Friesen: Would the Minister of Education at the very least agree to delay the elimination of senior level Canadian history until parents and teachers can examine the proposals for the new plan that the minister says she has from Kindergarten to Grade 10 but which, as I understand it would be, evidence for that, the curriculum for that, the plans for that will not even be available for anyone to look at for at least two more years? So we are going to have years without Canadian history with nothing in place. Will she delay it?

Mrs. McIntosh: I do not know where the member is saying that there will be no Canadian history. There will be Canadian history with increased emphasis throughout the first 10 years and additional available options in Grades 11 and 12. It will be available.

The expectation we have is that of the six subjects from which four must be chosen, it is our expectation the vast majority of people will be taking this increased history in Grade 12. The students therefore will be ending up with more history than they would have been able to have under the current model.

Given the premise upon which the member based her reason for raising this question today, that being the referendum that is going to take place in Montreal and the things that are going to happen this weekend, I would question the wisdom of her trying to leave the implication she is trying to leave on the record.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, I think the minister should be very careful about imputing motives, particularly around a very important vote on Monday because, Madam Speaker, we have asked questions about Canadian history for the last two years, before the PQ was elected, after the PQ was elected.

We are asking Canadian history questions because we believe Canadian history should be taught in our schools, and we do not believe anything else.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The honourable Minister of Education, on the same point of order.

Mrs. McIntosh: Madam Speaker, I was responding to the preamble in which the member very clearly said, given the emotion and the things that are going to be happening in Montreal because of the preparation for Monday, she clearly—I am paraphrasing—indicated that that was the reason, that was the motivation given by her for asking yet another question that implies that we are lessening an emphasis on Canadian history when we are not.

I am pleased to emphasize for all those people this weekend, which is why she said she asked the question, for all those people this weekend, this province is bringing in information on Canadian history—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. A point of order is a very serious matter.

On the honourable Leader of the official opposition's point of order, in my opinion there is no point of order. It was clearly a dispute over the facts.

Health Care System Emergency Services

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Premier (Mr. Filmon).

Yesterday, when I asked a question about emergency health care services, I asked the Premier if, in his opinion, he would reconsider opening the emergency services in our community hospitals, given the fact that we have health care professionals and the public asking for this government to do that. He indicated that he would do that.

My question to the Premier is, does he not believe that the health care professionals are sincere when they say that it should be reopened? Does he not believe that the public in fact do want emergency services open?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Madam Speaker, we are not questioning anybody's motivations or integrity or anything like that, because emergency services are a concern for everybody. There is no question about that.

The honourable member asks about changes in the future. We have been very clear since the end of the doctors' strike that we were embarking on an orderly reopening of emergency services and that as we work towards the end of the year, as suggested by Jack Chapman, the mediator in the dispute between MHO and the MMA, we will have an integrated emergency services plan in Winnipeg.

I ask the honourable member and all the people involved in the process to take a part and also to work with us as we develop emergency services for the long-term future of the city.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the Premier (Mr. Filmon) have to wait for a by-election or a general election before he realizes what he has done is wrong and before he realizes that he has to reverse this decision?

Mr. McCrae: For the first time, the honourable member seems to be falling into the same trap as members of the New Democratic Party in attempting to

raise his questions for the purpose of scoring some kind of political points.

Madam Speaker, what we need to do is score some points for patients in this province by creating the best emergency services system we can create. That is why we have some 40 people involved on the Integrated Emergency Services Delivery Steering Committee so that we can have the best input that we can possibly get as we develop this integrated system.

* (1030)

Mr. Lamoureux: Will the Premier, today, score some points with the public, using the Minister of Health's words, and reopen community health care emergency services in our five community hospitals? Will he score the points, live up to his word that he made to the public of Manitoba?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Madam Speaker, my response to the member is the same as it has been before. We are engaged in a process of consultation with the experts and the stakeholders that flows from the Chapman mediation report. We will be guided by that consultation process, and that is the process that is designed to bring forth the best possible system of emergency care for the people of Winnipeg, and that is the system that we are engaged in reviewing.

So that is what we will be doing and, as I say, we will be guided by the process.

University of Manitoba Labour Dispute

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Yesterday the Minister of Labour once again showed his political bias in an improper and ill-advised attempt to appoint a Tory management mediator in the U of M dispute. Fortunately, the parties in the dispute agreed on an independent third-party mediator from B.C. The government's handling of this matter from beginning to end has been a politically manipulated disaster with students paying the price.

My question is for the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour tell the students at the University of

Manitoba why, after 10 months of conciliation and no progress, he failed to involve mediation last summer when he should have, and has he withdrawn his October 26 letter to the parties since the parties have accepted Mr. Monroe as the mediator?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Labour): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to give the House a bit of an update in response to the question. It is in fact my understanding that the parties have agreed upon a mediator, and I have asked them to confirm whether in fact the condition and terms of my letter dated October 26 were being complied with and that it is being agreed with.

I continue in the same letter, which I am prepared to tender in this House, that, as a result of my understanding that UMFA negotiators specifically publicly committed to returning back to the classroom once negotiations commence, I understand that they will be going back to work.

That is their public commitment, and I see no reason to doubt that their public commitment will be honoured by them. I can tender this letter.

Mr. Reid: In light of the minister's statement here then, can the minister explain to the students, since he sent the letter to the parties yesterday at the University of Manitoba, asking only the Faculty Association to show good faith in returning to work during mediation, what show of good faith demands has either the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) placed on the university administration respecting issues in dispute, or is this the bias or the unfair—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put.

Mr. Toews: I think it would be very imprudent for me to interject into very delicate labour negotiations. The parties apparently have agreed to a mediator. I am pleased with that.

UMFA, as a part of a public statement, indicated that they are willing to go back when negotiations commence. Negotiations commenced last night. I

understand that they are continuing today, and I see no reason why UMFA will not respect what in fact they have stated earlier.

Mr. Reid: Madam Speaker, since the mediation process has started with the parties involved, can the minister explain what he meant in his letter of October 26 when he stated that, in the event that mediation is not successful, the parties would be free to revert to the traditional dispute settlement mechanisms. What does the minister mean by this statement? Does he mean that the government—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put.

Mr. Toews: The honourable member is quite familiar with our Labour Relations Act, what the parties are entitled to do once the mediation process is over.

Department of Natural Resources Staff Biologist Transfer

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Madam Speaker, on October 12 I asked the Minister of Natural Resources to investigate why a wildlife biologist who was doing his job and putting forward recommendations to ensure that wildlife habitat was protected was being transferred from the Swan River area.

I want to ask the minister to tell this House if he has looked into the matter and what is the result of his investigation. Will Mr. Soprovich remain in Swan River?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Natural Resources): Madam Speaker, it is an illustration of what happens when we blow things out of proportion and make a mountain out of a molehill. It is not unusual within the Department of Natural Resources, we move people around all the time. From time to time, we have individuals who are not happy about that kind of move. We try to make it as painless as possible.

In this particular case, Madam Speaker, Mr. Soprovich, the individual who was transferred to

Thompson, is a biologist. He is doing a good job for us, and I take some exception to the fact that people are saying, because he made certain statements related to LP, that he is being transferred for that reason. That is not the case. That is his responsibility in his job to make those kinds of comments to me and my department. So I wish the member would leave the issue alone.

Ms. Wowchuk: Madam Speaker, I am sure there are many issues that this government would ask us not to raise.

Louisiana-Pacific Forest Management Plan

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): I want to ask the minister how seriously he is taking the job of reviewing the forest management plan and the EIA put forward by Louisiana-Pacific when his staff in Swan River has been told to review the document, which is a huge document, some eight volumes, why they have been told to review it and have a report ready in two days and why these people have been told—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Natural Resources): Madam Speaker, I am very serious about it, and that is why the other day I was criticized for it having taken so long until we had agreements. It has taken a long time, and we work through these things on an ongoing basis with all the people whom we have available to us in terms of setting this up.

I find it interesting that the member keeps bringing up issues of this nature in an area where LP is going to be providing approximately 500 jobs in the area, a tremendous investment in there. I would hope that the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), for example, and the member for Swan River will be very supportive of the issues with Repap and with LP, which creates a lot of jobs and economic spinoff in that area.

But, Madam Speaker, my responsibility and government's responsibility and my colleague the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) are charged

with making sure that things are done in a proper, sustainable way, and we are doing that.

* (1040)

**Department of Natural Resources
Staff Biologist Transfer**

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): I want to ask the minister, if he is so concerned about jobs, why he is transferring out a wildlife biologist who has been doing a good job, but giving a high-paying job to people such as Ivan Balenovic, who does not have a forestry degree but has been given a high position above forest people who have a degree. Why are they paying Tory hacks who have been doing fundraising for them?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Natural Resources): Madam Speaker, I hope the member has a good weekend, too.

I just want to suggest, Madam Speaker, I am prepared to defend any of the positions that I have within my department and the work that they are doing, including the individual biologist from Swan River whom she keeps harping on. I am prepared to defend him, as well.

**University of Manitoba
Labour Dispute**

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): Madam Speaker, virtually all economic analyses point to the role of universities as economic generators, vital to any modern economy. Their pure research role coupled with academic development and graduate faculties bring expertise and excellence to every community in which a good university exists.

Around this excellence develops public and private sector investment in jobs. When you threaten academic excellence and freedom, Madam Speaker, you threaten our province's most vital economic resource.

My question is for the Premier, Madam Speaker.

Will the Premier meet with the government appointees to the University of Manitoba board and tell

them that the labour dispute must be settled fairly, quickly and without compromising academic freedom?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Madam Speaker, nobody is threatening academic excellence. The issue is whether or not courses for which there is no demand, for which nobody wants to take the courses, whether or not that should entitle the university or require the university to insist on continuing to keep people on staff for whom there is no demand.

That would not happen in any other circumstance, in any other sector of society.

Mr. Sale: Will the Premier direct the government-appointed members of the board to honour their commitment to pay—and I will quote from a document, Madam Speaker: honouring the University of Manitoba's commitment to pay teaching assistants, graders, markers, lab demonstrators, tutors, lecturers and instructors and research assistants in virtually every faculty, as the university committed to do but has now said in an internal memo it will not do.

Will he direct his appointed members to honour their original commitment?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Speaker, the board of governors of the University of Manitoba is made up of a broad cross section of people, including representatives of the students, of the alumni association, of the community at large.

Madam Speaker, those people make decisions within their jurisdiction. I know that they are people of competence. I know they are people of commitment to the university, and they are interested—[interjection] They will make competent judgments within their area of jurisdiction, and I know that their commitment to the university is a very serious commitment of desire for excellence, not just the kind of political showmanship of the member for Crescentwood.

**Autopac
Income Replacement Waiting Period**

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

I have a constituent who suffered injury in an automobile accident in Brandon preventing her from going to work and earning income to support her family. She is the only breadwinner. She was an innocent victim of this accident, and yet because of this government's legislation on no-fault insurance, she will be deprived of income replacement for the first seven days of her injury.

She asked, have we not suffered enough with personal injury and loss of our vehicle? Do you have to take a week of our wages away from us and make our family suffer?

I ask this minister, will he now do the right thing, bring forward an amendment to the legislation to eliminate the seven-day waiting period and eliminate this injustice?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): We discussed this and other issues at some length yesterday in committee, and as I have said on a number of occasions when we brought this legislation in, supported, I might say, by the members opposite, we were very clear that we had vetted this against other programs around the world virtually in terms of availability of benefits, and this is viewed as being one of the most generous plans of this type, certainly in North America, and one which we committed ourselves to a three-year review, and we are still committed to that.

I think that while the member may raise certain specific issues, he leaves me at some disadvantage to discuss details of particular cases. I think there might be a few details missing in this case.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Madam Speaker, is this minister suggesting that there is not real hardship caused in this case by this government's failure to accept an amendment of this opposition to eliminate this seven-day waiting period? We made it very clear when the bill was brought in that this provision was not fair and should be eliminated.

Mr. Cummings: Madam Speaker, I categorically refuse to discuss individual cases, but in the broadest

scope, let me remind the member that this is not universally a difficulty in having a seven-day waiting period, and one which we made a decision after some significant discussion and reviewing it in relationship to other plans, and this was seen to be a reasonable approach.

Taking Charge! Program Implementation

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Madam Speaker, on September 9, 1994, amidst great fanfare at the chamber of commerce club, the Taking Charge! program was announced by the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson). This program is now the responsibility of the Minister of Education and Training.

Since there are 12,000 single parents on social assistance in Manitoba, and 65 percent of them do not have a high school diploma and therefore the need for this program is urgent, why has it taken so long to get this program up and running? There is an urgent need to have 4,000 single parents take advantage of this program. Where is it?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): I was not sure if the member wanted to direct his question to me or the Minister of Family Services because he did not indicate, and, also, he obviously does not realize that Taking Charge! is still under the leadership of Family Services.

Education will provide the training for the board. I can take the question as notice for the Minister of Family Services, but I can indicate that the Taking Charge! board has been struck.

They have their staffing in place, they have their programming being developed, and I will take the question as notice for the Minister of Family Services, for whom we are providing staff available if they need it to do the training for that board.

Madam Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

* (1050)

NONPOLITICAL STATEMENTS

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Awards

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): May I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement, please?

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable member for St. Johns have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Mackintosh: I want to take this moment to congratulate, on behalf of all members of the Legislature, the winners of the second Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Awards, which were given last night in the ceremony at which myself and the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) were in attendance.

The awards are sponsored by the Aboriginal Rights Coalition. This year four winners were announced. These winners are chosen for their work in furthering the spirit of the recommendations in the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry report.

Rossbrook House received an award for its preventative programs and providing a safe place, particularly for inner-city youth and youth at risk. Hollow Water First Nation won for the second time for their advances in community-based justice. Mediation Services won for their work in conflict resolution, and Andrews Street Family Centre won for their work in community empowerment and providing programs and opportunities for youth and families, particularly in the inner city of Winnipeg.

I also want to pay tribute to the United Church young adult theatre group, which performed last night, a number of individuals who portrayed the difficulties that faced a young offender who was rejected not only by her family but then went on to rejection by both the community and the justice system.

I think the essence of the play was summed up by the young offender, whose key words were, when talking to the judge, all I am looking for is a family, all I need is someone to care about me and someone to love me, which I think speaks very profoundly of one of the great challenges underlying much of the youth violence

that we are trying to deal with in our community and our province, in particular, today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): I ask permission to make a nonpolitical statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable member for The Maples have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Kowalski: Madam Speaker, I just wanted to add our acknowledgement of the recipients of the awards and congratulate the Manitoba Aboriginal Rights Coalition for putting on the awards and the Interchurch Committee on Youth Justice for sponsoring the forum, Youth Crime, A Positive Response.

I do not have too much more to add than what the member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) has already put forward. It was a wonderful evening and it continues on Saturday. I would encourage any members who have the time to attend the continuation of this forum on Saturday at Regents Park United Church. Thank you.

Ukrainian Canadian Veterans Branch 141– 50th Anniversary

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Do I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable member for Burrows have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Martindale: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to congratulate Ukrainian Canadian Veterans Branch 141 on their 50th anniversary, which they are celebrating this year, culminating in a banquet on October 29.

Branch 141, one of the largest Ukrainian Canadian Legion branches of the Royal Canadian Legion in Canada, currently has 1,400 members. For the past 50 years, Branch 141 has provided exemplary service to their members and to the community. They are to be congratulated for their volunteer work with veterans, youth and seniors, including cadets, Ukrainian dancing,

the Legion Sports Camp and the Peace Gardens, baseball teams, the seniors club, taking part in parades, providing colour parties, visiting in nursing homes and hospitals and making large monetary donations to various hospitals, nursing homes, Deer Lodge Veterans Manor, the legion bus and numerous charitable organizations and worthy causes.

Once again, congratulations to 141 Legion on your 50th anniversary. May you continue to serve your members, particularly veterans, and the wider community for many more years.

Second Annual Manitoba First Nations Peoples Powwow International

Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake): Leave for a nonpolitical, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable member for Interlake have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Clif Evans: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise this morning and offer our congratulations to some aboriginal honourees at last night's banquet at the Second Annual Manitoba First Nations Peoples Powwow International. Last night we were entertained by dance groups and by an entertainer and a fine actor by the name of Lightfoot who provided us with some rap music and rap singing, along with—

An Honourable Member: Do not forget the emcee.

Mr. Clif Evans: Yes, along with our colleague from Rupertsland who was the emcee of this very special event last night.

Last night was a dinner honouring nine First Nations people who have accomplished much, not only in their communities but in the province of Manitoba.

I would like to just express my congratulations and ours on this side, Madam Speaker, to the nine honourees: City of Winnipeg Police Constable Susan Swan from Lake Manitoba First Nations, RCMP Constable Sam Anderson from Dauphin River First Nations, Chief Louis Stevenson from Peguis First

Nations, Adam Beach, an actor, who is from Lake Manitoba First Nations community, Dr. Marilyn Cook, who is from Grand Rapids and practises in Cross Lake, Betty Lou Halcrow, a firefighter from Cross Lake, Tomson Highway, a playwright from Brochet, Reverend Hagar Head from The Pas, and Morris Robinson Jr. from Grand Rapids First Nation.

Madam Speaker, last night was just the beginning of a weekend of international acclaim and international entertainment and competition from First Nations communities not only in Canada but from the United States. It starts today and goes the weekend.

I encourage everyone to make an effort to attend and see the wonderful culture, the dancing, the drum playing and the singing that our First Nations people have in their culture. I wish to congratulate the honourees, congratulate the committee for the First Nations Peoples International Powwow and wish everyone well.

Committee Changes

Mr. George Hickey (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows:

Crescentwood (Mr. Sale) for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar); Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh); Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson) for Monday, October 30, 1995, for 10 a.m.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, there has been an error in the French title of Bill 16 on the Order Paper which requires a motion to correct that. I wonder if I might have leave of the House to do that?

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave to move a motion to correct the title of Bill 16, en francais? [agreed]

Mr. Ernst: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that the French title of Bill 16, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, as it appears in the Order Paper be altered to read: Loi modifiant le Code de la route.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Ernst: Would you call, Madam Speaker, the bills as listed in the Order Paper.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 18—The Housing and Renewal Corporation Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs and Housing (Mr. Reimer), Bill 18, The Housing and Renewal Corporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société d'habitation et de rénovation), standing in the name of the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers).

Some Honourable Members: No leave.

Madam Speaker: No leave. The bill will not remain standing.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on this bill for a number of reasons, partly because I have been involved with housing for many years, particularly co-op and nonprofit housing. I was the former Housing critic for the NDP caucus. So I like to think that this is something that I know something about.

An Honourable Member: Did they fire you or what?

Mr. Martindale: No, I was not fired. I was promoted to be the critic of a much larger department.

An Honourable Member: Do you mean Housing is not important?

Mr. Martindale: I believe that Housing is very important. In fact I think that housing is a right, shelter is a right which I believe is recognized by the United

Nations. I would even acknowledge the importance of the mission statement or the principles that are embodied in legislation which we read in the Annual Report of the Department of Housing every year about Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

* (1100)

It says that the purpose of MHRC is to (a) ensure there is adequate supply of housing stock in Manitoba, (b) to enhance the affordability of, and accessibility to, adequate housing for Manitobans, particularly those of low and moderate incomes or those with specialized needs, (c) to maintain and improve the condition of existing housing stock, and (d) to stimulate and influence the activities of the housing market to benefit Manitobans as a whole.

Madam Speaker, this role for MHRC began when it was created in 1967, '68. Since that time there has been a considerable amount of public housing built in the province of Manitoba, particularly under NDP governments but also under Conservative governments, and that was financed on a cost-shared basis, 75 percent by the federal government and 25 percent by the provincial government. I believe that is true not only of the capital costs of the housing but also of the ongoing costs, particularly in terms of subsidies, both subsidies in terms of the mortgage and subsidies to individual occupants.

That is actually an area that has been a thorn in the side of the federal government for many, many years because, although the federal government has a presence at the official opening of every new housing building, the minister or his representative, usually a member of Parliament, brings the Canadian flag and presents it to the people who are going to live in that housing project—they usually have a bronze plaque, quite an attractive bronze plaque, that says, you know, CMHC helped fund this housing. It is to be mounted on the wall, although some of them, I know, are gathering dust in corners. There is always a sign out front saying, this project financed by the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba.

The federal government has never felt that they got credit for their 75 percent of the dollars, and that has

always been a problem for them, because once the place is built and the sign is taken down, people forget that there is 75 percent federal funding. I suspect that is one of the reasons why the federal government wants to get out of the field of housing, which they have quite successfully done. It began under the Conservatives, under Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, whereby all of the nonprofit and co-op housing programs were eliminated and the funding for these programs to the provincial government was eliminated.

The Liberals had a task force on housing which the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) sat on when they met in Winnipeg. I do not suppose the member for Inkster got to tour from Newfoundland to B.C., I am sure he would have liked to, but I think he only sat in Winnipeg. Guess who the chair of that committee was? The chair of that committee, as I remember, was Paul Martin, because I was at those hearings; I think I made a presentation because I can remember having a debate with Paul Martin at that time.

They wrote a report, and it was a very progressive report that their task force on housing wrote. Of course, it was before the federal election in 1993, and there are promises. In fact, I should have dug out the Liberal red book and their promises on housing in the 1993 election, but I suspect that they had some pretty progressive promises on public housing, because I know that when the Tories withdrew funding for nonprofit and co-op housing, the Liberals in Ottawa expressed outrage over this, and so, by implication, they were saying that if they were the government, this funding would be restored.

But what did they do? Well, they have had two budgets. They have had two opportunities to restore funding for public housing, and did they restore that funding, Madam Speaker? No, they did not. I think the agenda of the Minister of Finance, who used to be interested in housing when he was chair of a task force, a Liberal caucus task force on housing, their new agenda of reducing the deficit seems to have taken over their former interest in housing.

So what did the provincial government do? Well, the provincial government, I guess they had a choice. They could either make up for the 75 percent federal

funding that was lost or eliminate the programs themselves, and so the provincial Conservative government did exactly what their federal counterparts did and they eliminated almost all of the social housing programs in Manitoba, both public nonprofit, private nonprofit, co-op, infill—everything.

There used to be probably a dozen programs, and now they are all gone, because these governments, while they believe in tax breaks for the rich, they do not believe in subsidizing the poor in public housing. That is a shame, because there is a great need for it.

In fact, I have had this debate with individuals who support Habitat for Humanity, for example, and they compare Habitat with public housing, which is not a fair comparison, because Habitat is privately owner-occupied housing, and they say, oh, this public housing like Lord Selkirk is a disaster. They do not believe in it.

In fact, I have had this discussion several times with a good friend of the Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), but it is an unfair comparison for a number of reasons.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

I think this argument against public housing fails to understand the difference between the quality of housing provided by public housing and public assistance in Manitoba and the quality or the lack of it in the private rental market, particularly for people on social assistance.

So when you look at it, sure, there are some failures. In fact, when Paul Hellyer was the Minister of Housing in the federal government, when he was the cabinet minister in 1969, he toured Canada and looked at especially these large-scale public housing projects, and he concluded that they were a failure, and the former Minister of Housing knows all about this. I am sure he is familiar with the history of public housing in Canada.

He said, we are not going to build any more of these large-scale public projects like Lord Selkirk and Gilbert

Park. I think the federal Minister of Housing realized that when you build 250 or 500 units on one site, you tend to ghettoize the poor. Now, it was not that way when it was originally built.

When it was originally built, I am told that 75 percent of the people were working and only 25 percent were on social assistance because, in rent-geared-to-income, you can work and live in public housing, which most people do not realize. Most people, when they drive by a public housing project, particularly a large-scale one like Lord Selkirk or Gilbert Park, they assume that everybody there is on social assistance, and it is a false assumption. It is really rent-geared-to-income.

Now this has completely reversed; in fact it has more than reversed. There is more than 75 percent of the people now on social assistance in those two projects. There is probably close to 99 percent. One of the reasons that people move out—there are many reasons why people move out, but one of them is that when their rent goes up higher than the private rental market, perhaps because they get a job, they move out to get cheaper housing. You cannot really blame people for that, but it does cause a whole lot of problems. It causes a lack of stability due to the high turnover and concentration of people on social assistance.

So I think Paul Hellyer was right. He said, let us not build any more of these, so, since 1969, there have not been any built that are that scale, that size. There have been much smaller projects, still on the same formula, rent-geared-to-income. Now the rent-geared-to-income is another change that has been made that has made publicly assisted housing less affordable because, for many, many years, it was, 25 percent of your income went for rent; now it is 27 percent. It is heading for 30 percent, probably in all provinces. In Manitoba, they have added more items to income. The result has been that people have not been getting an increase of 2 percent; some people have been getting increases—in examples that have been drawn to our attention, it was as much as 17 percent in one year. Just this week, I was visiting a tenant who had a \$50-a-month rent increase, somebody whose only income was probably a Guaranteed Income Supplement and Old Age Security. So some people are experiencing hardship because of this policy.

* (1110)

I began by saying that I believe that housing is a right, that shelter is a right. People have the right to decent and affordable housing. As a society, in the past, we have tried to provide that, and we continue to provide that in the large numbers of publicly assisted units. There are about 20,000 units in the province of Manitoba that are publicly assisted. Then I gave a little bit of background about the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation that have built all these units in Manitoba, units for seniors, units for the disabled and mixed accommodation. For example, I was involved in converting St. John's United Church to the Charles Cathedral Housing Co-op, and, when it was originally built, the mix was, 25 percent of the units were people on a subsidy and 75 percent of people were paying the full rent, although it was not really full rent because the mortgage was being subsidized by the federal and provincial governments. Because of vacancies, it was increased to 50 percent.

Now, we did what I think was an interesting thing, maybe even a unique thing in Manitoba. Since I was part of the resource group, along with Winnipeg Housing Rehabilitation Corporation, we decided, in order to keep the rents down, we would have no paid office staff and no paid janitorial staff.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am enjoying the discussion that the honourable member is bringing forward at this time, but he is speaking in general to housing as such. This bill is not speaking in general. I would appreciate if the honourable member would pay close attention to Citation 665 within Beauchesne which states that we should be dealing with the principle of the bill at this time and not having general discussions on housing.

The honourable member for Burrows, to continue.

Mr. Martindale: Well, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for that advice. You will be pleased to know that we are going to pass all the bills on the Order Paper by 12:30, so we will move things along.

This bill is about a major reorganization of MHRC and what I am talking about is the history of MHRC.

I was just giving an example of one of the projects that they fund, Charles Cathedral Housing Co-op, which is very successful. They now have paid office staff, but they still do all their own janitorial work.

This is one of the innovations that I think we need in public housing, for example, at Gilbert Park. The tenants have demanded that they have a say in management. They really want tenant control of the whole project. They have had some limited input.

It has been very successful, and I commend this Conservative government and the Minister of Housing (Mr. Reimer) for allowing tenants to be more involved. My understanding is that the tenants have been involved in tenant selection committees and also have a role in evicting tenants. The result is that they have gone from about 40 vacancies to being full. We hope that this kind of success can be applied at Lord Selkirk as well.

More recently there have been major changes in public housing in Manitoba. For example, under this government, there were 98 public nonprofit housing organizations, each with their own board of directors. What did this government do several years ago? They abolished all of them and amalgamated them into one, now called the Manitoba Housing Authority. What did they do with those board members, 650 board members? They fired them, every single one of them.

This government talks about volunteerism in their Throne Speech Debate and what did they do with 650 volunteers who were board members of public housing authorities? They fired every one of them, and now they have a Tory-appointed board of people on the one provincial Housing Authority.

Now this bill is proposing another change, and we think this is a major change, because in the past the MHRC, Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, had a board of five senior civil servants appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council plus the minister as chairperson and the deputy minister or designate as vice-chair. That is going to change to a board of between five and 13 members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council who may also designate a chair and a vice-chair.

So what we think is happening here is that the MHRC board and the Manitoba Housing Authority board are being amalgamated, and the board is being enlarged. There is also going to be the appointment of a chief executive officer, a CEO, who is made responsible for performing duties of the corporate board.

Now, on the surface of it, Bill 18, it appears that there will not be any major changes. It is a very short bill, less than two pages, and it looks like it is only a structural change. Where we had two boards and one of them was Conservative, government-appointed individuals on the board of Manitoba Housing Authority and the other one is mostly civil servants and the minister, now there is one board. So what difference does that make? You could argue that it is just kind of a corporate reorganization, but we are suspicious of the motives here.

We think that this is setting the stage for a major change or that it has the potential for a major change, because the new board could be at arm's length from the government and, whenever there is a criticism of what the new board is doing, the minister will stand up in the House and say, oh, well, that was a decision that the board made, just like when I ask questions of the the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) about Winnipeg Child and Family Services, the minister says, well, we give them the money, and they decide how to spend it, so ask Mr. Keith Cooper or ask the chair of the board or ask the board of Winnipeg Child and Family Services.

So, after this bill is passed and becomes law and something happens in public housing and we do not like it and we object to it, we will ask the minister in Question Period, why are you allowing this to happen? Well, as a result of this bill, it is quite possible, quite likely that the minister will stand up and say: Well, I do not really interfere in the day-to-day operations of this board. They are an entity unto themselves. Why do you not ask the chair of the board? Why do you not ask the CEO of the board why they are making such and such a decision?

So the government can maybe give them instructions but not be responsible for what they do, or maybe they

have a plan in mind for what they should be doing and maybe even appoint the five to 13 members who agree with their plan.

Now, what might this plan be? Well, there is probably Plan A and Plan B. I think they are planning to privatize public housing in Manitoba. Well, maybe not all of it, maybe not everywhere, but maybe a management company or a developer or an investor might approach the government and say: You know, there are some nice units in Niakwa, and we think that we could manage them more cheaply than the Province of Manitoba or better than the Province of Manitoba. Why do you not let us manage them?

Well, I think this bill is setting that up for the new board.

In the short term, it might look advantageous, it might save the government a few dollars here or there. But I believe that it would be less responsive to the needs of Manitobans because, if there was a problem in there and you contacted your MLA and said, you know, can you help me with this problem, the MLA might phone the Minister of Housing's office, might phone the Housing Authority organization or the CEO and say, can you solve this problem?

They will be told, well, no, because we do not control it anymore, you see, it is being managed by XYZ corporation.

What can you do about it? Well, almost nothing, because it is not in the public sector anymore, and we think that is a dangerous trend.

Now, what is even more troubling is that they could sell off the units. Who would buy them? Most of these people could not afford to buy them because most of them are on social assistance or unemployed. They are in rent-g geared-to-income housing, and if you earn over a certain amount, you do not qualify to live there.

These are low-income people. So they could not buy them, but a corporation could buy them and rent them back to these individuals, but we would lose the control over public housing in Manitoba, public housing that, as I was starting to say a little while ago, is much better

quality in many cases than the private rental stock, particularly for people on social assistance.

I knock on doors on many of those houses. Many of those houses are in the inner city, they are in the north end, they are in Burrows constituency, and people are living in just appalling conditions.

Just to give one example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was door knocking as I regularly do and asking people, do you have any problems that I can help you with as your MLA? Of course, probably 99 percent say no, but the 1 percent turn out to be very interesting.

In this one case on Arlington Street near the Arlington Bridge, an individual said, well, you know, we do not have a sink in the washroom, and we think there should be a sink in the washroom. We do not think it is right to use the washroom and have to use the bathtub because there is no other running water or go to the kitchen sink. I said, well, you know, I think you might have a point there. I phoned the Health department and found out it is against probably The Health Act of Manitoba, which the City of Winnipeg enforces in the inner city.

* (1120)

I think a notice was given to the landlord to provide the sink. The landlord did not do it. The place was placarded insanitary and closed and those people moved to Pritchard Avenue to a better place. So this is just one small example. I can give you all kinds of examples.

There is a place that I go to every year in January to make sure that they have heat, a place on Winnipeg Avenue, and can you get a response out of the landlord? No, because the landlord is in Florida and he will not give direction to his management people to spend any money to improve the place. So every year I help people fill out work orders and I get the Health department involved and the housing people at the Residential Tenancies Branch, and we try to bring pressure to bear on this slum landlord. Meanwhile, he is raking in thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in rent from the taxpayers of Manitoba.

One of the things that I have always argued is that the taxpayers of Manitoba are not getting good value for their money in the private rental market. Occasionally I have written to the Minister of Family Services. I am sorry, I do not have the letter with me to give you the exact figures, but it is something between \$50 million and \$60 million a year that goes in public money to private rental accommodation, most of it in the inner city and much of it substandard.

I do not know why landlords should be allowed to make, in some cases, huge profits at the expense of taxpayers and at the expense of people on social assistance who are living in such deplorable conditions.

I know one slum landlord—I will not mention his name because my wife's cousin is his daughter and some people here might recognize his name—but I talked to him at I think it was his 40th wedding anniversary. He was bragging to me that his revenue—well, if you divide up his revenue—70 percent is profit and 30 percent is expenses. That is disgraceful. I mean, I would not care if he got 10 percent or 20 percent profit but 70 percent is unconscionable because he is not spending anything on maintenance or repairs.

There are thousands of slum landlords who are doing the same thing at the expense of their tenants and at the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba who are putting out this money and we are not getting good value in return. I think we are getting a much better value for our dollars in publicly assisted housing because the quality is so much better.

Getting back to the point I was trying to make about selling off these assets, that is something that we are opposed to and that is something that I think this bill will open the door for. What will happen when we have less public housing units is we will not have access to affordable and decent housing, particularly for low-income people.

I think there are many creative solutions that this government could move to. One is tenant management. The other is tenants taking more responsibility like at the Charles Cathedral Housing Co-op where they do all the maintenance and save themselves \$25, \$35 a month on their rent or more.

Another is land trusts. In other places in the world, I believe there are land trusts in the city of Minneapolis in the States. People are using land trusts to keep down the costs of housing.

I think co-op housing is another alternative. I have talked about Charles Cathedral Housing Co-op which is an example of a rehab project. When people have control over their own housing, they have a greater stake in it. They feel better about their housing. They feel better about themselves. They are empowered to take responsibility.

I lived in Willow Park East Housing Co-op and I would like to congratulate them. In November they are celebrating their 25th anniversary. Willow Park Housing Co-op, the first large-scale continuing housing co-op in Canada built here in Winnipeg, I believe that their mortgage is for a period of 35 years and I think next year they are burning their mortgage. I asked them, are your rents going to go down, and they said probably not, because we have had a lot of problems here. The roofs are flat and they spend a bundle all the time repairing and replacing roofs.

So in spite of the fact that you might assume or think that with no mortgage the rent would go down, in fact, it is not going to. However, I would suggest that their rents probably will not go up either.

We have advocated, in fact, I remember—oh, there are no members—oh, there, the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), I believe it was his colleague Reg Alcock who had a private member's bill or resolution about converting public housing to co-ops.

An Honourable Member: That was mine.

Mr. Martindale: Oh, the member for Inkster sponsored that bill or resolution, and I think he borrowed it from Don Scott and myself and others who had been talking about this for 10 years, long before the member for Inkster thought about running for this Legislature. We proposed that Gilbert Park was a perfect place to change something from—[interjection]

I lost my train of thought. I am being heckled by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

Well, he borrowed this idea from other people who proposed it many years ago, and we suggested that Gilbert Park in his constituency would be an ideal candidate to convert from public housing to co-op housing.

Now, you can still keep the same kind of subsidies in place, although I would recommend—[interjection] Well, the management at Willow Park East suggested it as well. I would suggest though that having a mixture of people makes much more sense. This is what they do in Sweden; this is what they have done in downtown Toronto in some instances where they have required developers to put housing in commercial buildings, for example.

When there is a mixture of tenants and a mixture of income, we do not ghettoize or stigmatize people. That is one of the advantages of co-op housing; there is a mixture of incomes and a good mixture of people. In fact, that is very helpful, because when you want to have a board of directors, it helps to have people who can bring skills from their day-to-day lives or occupations to the board, including management skills. If everyone in a public housing project is low income, does not have much education, sometimes it is hard to keep a board together and to have the level of expertise that board members should have. So there are many, many advantages to co-ops.

All I am suggesting here is that some public housing units could be converted to co-ops and there would be benefits in terms of people taking responsibility for their own housing, people running their own housing, people managing their own housing, and keeping the costs down. I mean, that is a major reason why there are advantages to looking at other models, is in order to keep the costs down.

We are going to have a crunch in the future. Our briefing notes here point out that in the future, probably because of Bill 2, the balanced budget legislation, the capital costs for housing are going to be part of the Housing department's budget.

Now, I am sorry that the minister is not here to—I am sorry I cannot confirm this by anybody in the Chamber, but I believe that is correct. I guess if I had time I

could read this and try and get it right. But I think that is going to cause a problem.

What we are told is plans for the next budget will include changes on how modernization and improvements are financed through Manitoba Housing. Next fiscal year, these expenditures will not be capitalized, but will be included in the operating budget. This has been a directive from the Department of Finance.

The maintenance budget is not keeping up with the need for maintenance. Well, I think those are two different items. But, certainly, if the Department of Housing has to include capitalization in their operating budget, I suspect that there is going to be less money to do new things. In fact, they are really not doing new things other than putting some subsidies into life-lease projects.

My understanding is the life lease is almost the only kind of housing that is being built, mainly attracts and is to the advantage of affluent seniors and other individuals who can afford to put \$20,000 or \$30,000 equity into a life lease, but some of these buildings have people in them who are on a rent-geared-to-income subsidy, and so it is helpful to provide a few units for them. I think probably what we are going to see is the number of new construction units, either rent-geared-to-income or subsidized units reduced to zero. There will be no new construction, partly because of the cutbacks by the federal government and partly because of the balanced budget legislation here, which is going to restrict this Conservative government and what they can do in terms of trying to supply decent, affordable housing.

I would also like to point out that this government has made some grabs of money through the Department of Housing, which is really quite amazing. They have done it by increasing the rent-geared-to-income from 25 percent to 27 percent of income and adding a number of categories to what is considered income, but they have also included foster parent per diems as income for the purposes of calculating RGI, rent-geared-to-income.

I do not think I have an accurate figure on how much money this is going to provide them, but what it is

doing is, it is taking money from the Department of Family Services and recovering it to the government through the Department of Housing, which seems like a crazy thing to do and, also, it is a hardship on individuals.

I think I better wind up here because I already mentioned on the record that we are going to pass all the bills on the Order Paper this morning, so I better give my colleagues an opportunity, and I am speaking on the next bill as well. So with those remarks, we are going to pass Bill 18 to committee. Thank you.

* (1130)

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

The question before the House is second reading, Bill 18, The Housing and Renewal Corporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société d'habitation et de rénovation). Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

**Bill 19—The Intercountry Adoption
(Hague Convention)
and Consequential Amendments Act**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson), Bill 19, The Intercountry Adoption (Hague Convention) and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi concernant l'adoption internationale (Convention de La Haye) et apportant des modifications corrélatives), standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid).

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No? Leave has been denied.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I almost feel like apologizing for people

having to listen to me speak twice in a row and also for not having time to prepare, but our homiletics professor always said you should not apologize at the beginning of a sermon, so I withdraw that apology. However, I do promise to be much shorter this time.

We believe that this bill is not contentious. We support this bill. I will be the first and last speaker, and it is going to committee at ten o'clock on Monday morning so that presenters can present and we can get it passed during this session. This bill is actually very interesting. It would actually allow a speaker to talk about some international issues. But I promise I will not do so, at least not at great length. The title of the bill is The Intercountry Adoption (Hague Convention) and Consequential Amendments Act.

What the Province of Manitoba is doing is basically ratifying an international agreement. The agreement is published in the bill, so it looks like a long bill because it is 21 pages. All of the articles of this Hague Convention, which is actually called the Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption—the entire schedule is printed. In fact it starts on page 4 and goes to page 21. All of the articles of this convention are printed, and they are very interesting to read.

What this bill does is it regularizes and regulates intercountry adoptions so that when member states of the United Nations all approve of this convention, we will all be approving intercountry adoptions in similar ways. The intent of this is to prevent some problems that already exist, some rather serious problems that have to do with exploiting children and with buying and selling children and their labour. So I guess that is one of the reasons why Manitoba is approving this, and we commend the government for approving this. In fact, Manitoba did not have to because my understanding is that only three provinces in Canada have to approve this, as well as the federal government, and I think three provinces already have approved this convention.

There are other problems around adoption that The Hague Convention addresses. There are some states in the world, some countries in the world, where there have been problems that The Hague Convention

attempts to address. There was a very interesting article in Maclean's called, Bringing Home Baby—Maclean's, August 21, 1995. It is a long article, and it is very interesting. It is mostly about Canadian parents who are adopting children from other countries, but it is also about individuals who are, shall we say, brokering children for adoption in other countries.

It names a couple of countries where there were very serious problems, I guess, of large numbers of children leaving the country, for example, Romania, but this debate has taken place in a number of countries. For example, I had a constituent phone me, and they had been to Ukraine. They had filled out some papers there at an orphanage, and they had met the child that they wanted to adopt. They came back to Canada, and then they were waiting for officials in Ukraine to process the paperwork so they could go to Ukraine and pick up the child and bring the child back as an adopted child to Canada. Nothing happened after a couple of years, so they phoned me and asked for my assistance.

So I made some inquiries, and it turned out to be quite interesting because I phoned one of my Liberal friends in north Winnipeg who is Ukrainian to see if he had some information, and he did. He said that he was looking at legislation and issues before the parliament in Ukraine around adoption, and it turns out that they were having a very interesting debate. Some people were saying, well, if children are allowed to be adopted to Canada and other countries, they are going to have a better life; yes, we should allow this to happen. Other people were saying, no, children are our future; we should not allow children to be adopted to Canada. Apparently, at that particular time, there was a moratorium.

On the Internet, there was actually a name and a phone number for an individual in Buffalo, New York. So I phoned him up, and I said, you know, what was your experience; maybe I can learn something from you that would help my constituents or maybe they can phone you.

He and his wife had successfully adopted a child from Ukraine. They were Ukrainian Americans. So he explained to me what they had to do and how they did it. I believe they did it without any bribes, as a matter

of fact. I phoned my constituent and said, you know, why do you not call these people in Buffalo, New York, but they had given up. They decided not to pursue it. So there are some very interesting issues in other countries and, of course, there are some issues that touch on Manitobans that I think we should be aware of.

I consulted a number of people about this bill, in the community, and they all agreed that there are some cultural implications that we should take into account. People here will remember that many Manitoban children, particularly aboriginal children, were adopted out of province and out of country, and during the 1980s, I believe the early 1980s, Judge Kimelman was appointed as a one-person commission of inquiry into this problem. He issued an excellent report.

The main recommendation was that this stop and that there be no more aboriginal children adopted out of country. So a moratorium was put in place that is still in place, but the legacy of this problem still haunts us because many of these children are in the United States, many of them are coming back to Manitoba, many of them are trying to find their birth parents.

I have been involved with some of these families and have heard their stories of how the birth parents in Manitoba have tried to find their children in the United States. I remember one example of an individual who had a son in the police force in Winnipeg so used the police computer network to try and trace people. I guess, if they have a criminal record, you can find out information. So they traced one child in Florida that way and they found another child in Florida living very close by. They were aboriginal and they had been adopted out of Manitoba to the United States. This was actually quite a large family and this mother was able to reunite I believe half a dozen siblings.

It was a very happy occasion, but there was also a lot of sadness. I remember the first time I heard the mother's story, there were a lot of tears as she told about how she had missed these children and their growing up and observing them and being part of their life as they grew up. What happened when they came back was they brought photo albums and they had 20, 30 years of their life to share with their mother, mainly

through photographs because they had not grown up in their home.

So one of the considerations that I think we should make is when people adopt children from other countries into Manitoba, there should be consideration given by the parents to exposing these children to the culture of their country of origin. Now I considered bringing in an amendment to this effect, but it is really not feasible. You cannot force people to expose adopted children to the culture of their country of origin. I think it would just be impossible to enforce.

But there are some good models around of how it can be done. For example, my former colleague at North End Community Ministry Verna McKay set up Project Opikihiwawin—and I will have to find the spelling for that because it is an aboriginal word. I am not sure what it means—and what Project Opikihiwawin has done is to provide cross-cultural education to adopting mostly white parents for themselves and aboriginal children and has taken them to reserves and has taken them to powwows and has tried to expose them in a positive way to their culture of origin, to the culture of their parents.

* (1140)

So I would hope that people who adopt children from other countries to Manitoba would do the same thing, because we know that people's identity is important and that when people do not know who they are and they do not know their identity and when they do not have pride in their culture and their identity that it causes very great problems. Probably the best example of that is the out-of-country adoption of aboriginal children.

With those few comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be the last speaker on this bill. We are going to pass it to committee now so that it can be there at ten o'clock on Monday morning so that the two Family Services bills go to committee at the same time. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is in fact a very important bill and we have absolutely no problem seeing it passed. In fact, I think the primary reason why a bill at this stage is

necessary, you can actually find in the convention of objectives, if you will, and it states and it is the (a) which is most significant—it is to establish safeguards to ensure that the intercountry adoptions take place in the best interests of the child and with respect for his or her fundamental rights as recognized in international law.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, international adoptions have pros and cons just like every other aspect of life, but what has to be of most concern to each and every one of us in society is that the child's interests are put in proper perspective and that perspective being a first priority.

There are many good reasons as to why it is important to try to get more international standards. I know, and I speak from experience with respect to working in immigration cases where many constituents of mine try, attempt, and generally are fairly successful in adopting internationally, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I know that those individuals would be very pleased to see more standards being looked at in legislatures throughout the world, if you like, adopting policies of this nature.

With those very few words, we are quite pleased to see the bill in the first place. This is a bill which the government did not have to bring forward, but I think it speaks volumes in terms of the goodwill that the government is expressing, and, hopefully, we will see it not only pass today but also go to committee Monday, pass, and get Royal Assent without any dissention whatsoever. Thank you.

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

An Honourable Member: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is second reading, Bill 19, The Intercountry Adoption (Hague Convention) and Consequential Amendment Act (Loi concernant l'adoption internationale (Convention de la Haye) et apportant des modifications corrélatives). Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

**Bill 32—The Proceedings Against the Crown
Amendment Act**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey), Bill 32, The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les procédures contre la Couronne), standing in the name of the honourable member for Crescentwood.

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I began my remarks yesterday and I am glad to conclude them today. We are not quite certain yet whether we will pass the bill today, immediately, or whether we will have another speaker on it. So I am not sure yet what we are going to do there but we will let you know.

The federal Bill C-88, I remind members, is the bill that intends to implement the Agreement on Internal Trade, and that legislation is currently in second reading before the federal House.

In commenting on that bill, I would point out that the legal counsel for the government of British Columbia has expressed very serious reservations about the appropriateness of C-88 in terms of the potential effects that it could have on the NAFTA and on the Free Trade Agreement and that it may have the effect of severely limiting provincial rights under Section 92 of the Constitution Act.

For example, insofar as the federal legislation purports to approve the Agreement on Internal Trade, to actually implement it, there has been a definition of this verb in Supreme Court cases which have held that that confers some necessary understanding that the approving body had authority to do so, and when they go on to take a look at this issue, they suggest that Supreme Courts could then find that the provinces have given up some of their sovereign rights under Section 92 of the Constitution Act.

So I have passed this information to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey) and asked

him to very specifically review it and report back on whether his government is concerned about the same issues that the council for British Columbia has raised.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me express the great concern on the part of members on this side of the House that this minister has had this information since June 23 of this year, and when I asked him yesterday whether he had read it, he indicated that he was not aware of it.

This causes, I think, great concern when a matter of potential constitutional change is raised, and the minister responsible is not able to state clearly that he knows that the issue has even been raised, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is also a great concern on the part of the municipalities of Manitoba in regard to the implementation of Bill 32, which would enforce the Agreements on Internal Trade. I would like to quote from a document that raises some of these concerns, particularly in regard to the health sector, which is part of the currently excluded but going to be included sectors.

They say that eliminating the current exemption for provincially purchased health and social services could undermine the ability of the provincial government to support local, nonprofit providers of health services. It could lead to the gradual privatization of health services, exactly what we are seeing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Consequently, provincial governments would lose control over expenditures in the health care sector, certainly something that none of us in this House, I think, would welcome.

This could happen, this document further says, because the agreement makes no distinction between nonprofit and for-profit entities. Corporations are able to make short-term, lowball bids in order to secure long-term market share and future profits anticipated from an expansion. Nonprofit providers are not.

The agreement is built on the premise that contracts to provide services should be awarded to the lowest bidder. Thus services increasingly would be provided by those corporations able to bid low and secure a contract from publicly funded entities like our

municipalities and our schools, unable to use other criteria that would serve the public interest.

One need only to look further south of the border to understand the negative impact on costs and quality care that corporate involvement in the health care sector can bring, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We cannot vote in favour of legislation such as Bill 32, which is intended to give legal effect to an agreement which most honourable members have never seen and fewer still have ever read. I hope the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey) has read the agreement he signed, but we have no evidence that this is the case.

I would respectfully ask that the minister confer with his House leader (Mr. Ernst), who is sitting opposite in the House and, I trust, listening to this debate, to determine whether anything would be lost by withdrawing this legislation from consideration at this time and tabling the Agreement on Internal Trade for consideration by all members and especially the government members who have never seen it, likely through the House committee on Economic Development would probably be the most appropriate committee.

* (1150)

Then, if it seems wise, Bill 32 could be reintroduced in the spring sitting of this House. After all, there are not likely to be any requirements for this enforcement mechanism for some years to come, given that the dispute mechanism processes have not yet been set up and the process of handling any dispute under those mechanisms will necessarily take at least months if not years.

So there is absolutely no urgency for this legislation to be passed. Therefore, we would request that the honourable government House leader (Mr. Ernst) confer with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey) as to the possibility of deferring consideration of this legislation until the Agreement on Internal Trade itself has been considered by the House.

It has never been brought before the House, never been brought before a committee. So why are we passing legislation to implement something this House has never considered? I think that is a very important point of procedure, the fundamental right of all members, and a privilege matter in fact. We are being asked to pass legislation to enforce an agreement which we have never studied, we have never seen. Most members, including I am sure all of that backbench, have never read it.

Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would note for the record that Manitoba has not by any means been a clear beneficiary of the Free Trade Agreement or of NAFTA. Our export trade has indeed grown but, in constant dollars, it has not grown by a great deal up to and including this past year.

Our trade deficit, on the other hand, has grown. It has grown sharply by 70 percent over the past four years. We are, as Manitobans, under the NAFTA agreement exporting some \$1.2 billion to finance our trade deficit. Bill 32 attempts to put an enforcement mechanism in place to enforce a further free trade agreement, albeit an internal one, which is not clearly of benefit to Manitoba.

I would also ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why Manitoba did not see fit to protect its farm industries from the AIT as Saskatchewan did, why it did not set aside a number of critical areas for provincial control as British Columbia did. Manitoba is simply lying down and playing dead in the face of the move to remove all possible protections that a provincial government might rightly use under its constitutional authority, to protect the employment and the needs of its communities against predatory bidding by multinational corporations.

Virtually all of us want to see fair and freer trade. Most of us, I think, support the idea that Manitoba has great natural advantages in the world trade environment, that they are advantages we ought to protect, not give up as the AIT does.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps you could indicate, I have one minute? Thank you. If I get my hand off here, then I could see the light.

In closing, I would indicate that we will oppose this legislation and will ask that the Agreement on Internal Trade be tabled in the House for study by an appropriate committee, and then, if necessary, enforcement legislation should be reintroduced.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with that, we will conclude debate on this bill.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, from what I have been led to believe, the amendment is required to allow for the enforcement of some of the provisions of the new Agreement on Internal Trade which came into effect on July 1 of this year. Each signatory government must amend its laws to allow a private person to enforce an award of cost made against the government by a dispute resolution under the agreement.

We have found, over the years—and there has been a considerable amount of debate on the whole concept of free trade. In fact I can recall, even before being elected, going down to a policy convention over in Ottawa where we co-sponsored a resolution for our own political party which said that it is time that we started to open up the barriers that prevent intraprovincial trade, that it is time that we start having more free trade amongst the different provinces.

We were also concerned, and I was one of those individuals, when the Free Trade Agreement first came into effect in which I expressed a great deal of concern in the potential impact that it was going to have. At the time I had argued that I do not oppose freer forms of trade, but I would like to see it applied more than just to the United States, to countries abroad.

I think that there are wonderful opportunities in the Asia-Pacific, on the European continent but, most importantly, I believe that Canada needs to take down some of the barriers that are in place between different provinces. There are all sorts of initiatives that government wants to be able to take in order to take down some of these barriers. It is important that we protect the industries that we currently have in the province of Manitoba. If there are some things that we can do to facilitate the growth, I believe that Manitobans are able to compete on the world scene, but

we have to ensure that everyone is being put onto an equal playing field.

Given the intent of this particular bill to try to appease some of the concerns with respect to the dispute mechanism, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have no problem in terms of seeing this bill go to committee stage to hear of any particular objections that other individuals might have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 32, The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

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

Bill 34—The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development, Bill 34, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités et apportant des modifications corrélatives), standing in the name of the honourable member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans).

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No. Leave has been denied.

Mr. Stan Struthers (Dauphin): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak on Bill 34 today in the House. It is a bill, I think, that is going to have an overall negative impact on my constituents in Dauphin. I think, from a broader perspective, it could possibly have a negative impact throughout the province of Manitoba, and I will go on to explain what I mean by the ways it could have a negative impact in the next few moments that I speak on Bill 34.

Bill 34, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act, essentially exempts

the province from paying grants in lieu of taxes on Crown land that is being used in whole or in part by the municipality in which it is located. Quite simply, Bill 34 will remove the liability of the province for payment of grants in lieu of taxes.

Now, this may not be a major concern right now here today. On the surface, it may not be that bad. But what I am worried about, my concerns are what will happen down the road into the future. As I said, it may not be a big deal now, but, in the future, I think there could be some ramifications that we must consider before we pass this legislation on.

Of course, my first concern is that the province can unilaterally opt out of the grants in lieu of taxes. I want to point out that right now the province is obligated to pay grants in wildlife management areas. This is one example where this will have an effect. In some of the wildlife management areas, it does have this obligation. In others, it does not pay the grants, for example, in parks, in public recreation areas, some natural areas and buffer strips.

My concern in this area is the amount of offloading that will take place from the provincial government on down to the municipal level. My worry is that the government will take the opportunity to opt out of paying these grants in lieu of taxes and leave municipalities across the province, including my constituents in Dauphin, holding the bag in terms of funding for different projects that are now contained within these provisions.

* (1200)

My understanding is that the UMM is not in favour of this type of a change. The folks in the municipalities have expressed the same concern that I am expressing here today. I agree with their analysis of the impacts of Bill 34, and I want to impress upon the government and the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) to consider this as this bill moves through the process in the Legislature.

I am sure that by the time third reading comes along, we will have much more opportunity to impress again upon the government that some caution must be taken

in this area, and I would hope that some sober second thoughts would take place on the opposite side of the House to consider the impacts that could potentially affect the normal, smooth operations of municipalities across the province of Manitoba.

I have a concern about transferring responsibilities not only from the province to the municipal level, but also transferring responsibilities from the provincial level onto the shoulders of universities and colleges, transferring their responsibility on properties that they own or occupy.

What Bill 34 will do, it will provide for block funding. Now, the first question that comes to my mind is, does that mean that this government intends to reduce funding over time, or will this government reduce its funding right away? It is not a matter of, will it reduce funding or not, because I am convinced that it will. It is just a matter of how long it is going to take the government to reduce this funding to our colleges and universities, or will the government just unilaterally opt out of paying grants in lieu of taxes when it comes to universities and colleges?

I think that my scepticism is probably well founded in the track record of this government over the last seven years when it comes to funding for education. I think that the general drift of the present government is towards cutting universities and colleges loose in terms of funding. I think they have set them adrift. I think they have said, you guys are on your own in certain areas, and they have been doing this chunk by chunk over the last seven years with a variety of different Education ministers in place.

According to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), the purpose of Bill 34, the purpose of this act is to make colleges and universities responsible for payment of grants in lieu of taxes on properties they own or occupy and thereby, he says, will be accountable for any future decisions they make with regard to those properties. The minister says that the institutions will be receiving the same amount of money as before, but this portion will now be part of block funding. Again, I wonder. Does that mean that the cuts will take place quickly and all at once, or will they be dragged out over a period of time?

Given the track record of the Filmon government in regard to funding of post-secondary education, there is little reason to trust the minister's promises about continued funding. We have had dozens of examples over the last seven years that point in the direction of reductions in funding to education by this government. We have no reason to believe that funding will remain stable; we have no reason, Heaven forbid, to think that funding might increase.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair)

All indications have pointed, in the past seven years, to reductions in funding to education, to our universities and our colleges. It is my suspicion that this will continue. It is my suspicion that Bill 34 enhances the government's ability to cut money to post-secondary education, as if this government needed any help in doing that in the first place, but I think Bill 34 will speed that process along.

The experience of colleges and universities has been the unilateral cutback of funding by the province. In 1991, for example, the province cut funding for community colleges by \$11 million and then, in January of 1992, cut over \$2 million from the existing budget of universities from that year's current budget. Those happened. That is not something that I am making up; that is not something that is coming from outer space someplace. That is factual. That is what this government has done.

Do I have any reason to believe that they will do anything different in the future? I say no. I fully expect that the government will continue to cut the budgets of universities and community colleges and education generally, and I put to the House that Bill 34, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act, will enhance the government's ability to do that cutting. It is more than likely that the purpose of this legislation is to hide future cuts to post-secondary education.

My main conclusion, my main summary of what I have said so far is that basically, Madam Speaker, I do not trust the minister or this government to fund fairly universities and colleges. I will also point out that this government has failed to act on their own Roblin

report, a report that has been available to the government for some time, a report that has some good directions and some good ideas that this government could be implementing which it is not.

Basically, the way I see Bill 34 is simply a thin veneer, a mask, hiding the cuts that this government intends to perpetrate on our education system, our post-secondary education system, cutting back on the very aspects of Manitoba resources, i.e., students going to universities and then graduating and returning to Manitoba, returning to the workplace, returning to our communities.

The cuts affect negatively the ability of this province to train and to educate its citizens and have them come back into our communities and make a positive contribution. My hope is that this government will sit down and consider some of the suggestions, some of the thoughts that myself and other members in the NDP have suggested on Bill 34.

My hope is that there can be some changes to this bill to make it much more palatable for people in the province, and I would hope that the changes that we can look forward to in Bill 34 will go a long way in assuring that the cuts that I fear are coming in education at the post-secondary level will not in fact occur.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would just like to conclude by thanking the House for listening, and maybe I should talk a little bit while the government Whip gets back to his seat. Thank you.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I have some committee changes.

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. I will call the question on the bill. It is not standing.

* (1210)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Speaker, very briefly, we are quite suspicious of Bill 34, primarily because, rather than having a grant in lieu of taxes being paid by the province to the municipality, the consequential acts and Universities Grants

Commission instructs that grants shall take into consideration the fact that universities and colleges are now paying property tax. So no more grant in lieu of, rather property tax. It will be difficult to determine whether colleges and universities will be adequately compensated for the loss of these grants. That is our primary concern about the bill. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Okay.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is second reading of Bill 34, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités et apportant des modifications corrélatives.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Agreed and so ordered. The honourable member for Gimli.

Mr. Helwer: Madam Speaker, I can wait till later.

Bill 36—The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: To resume debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), Bill 36, The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale, standing in the name of the honourable member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Speaker: Leave has been denied. Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 36, The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Could you call Report Stage.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 2—The Balanced Budget, Debt Repayment and Taxpayer Protection and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Speaker: Report Stage, Bill 2, The Balanced Budget, Debt Repayment and Taxpayer Protection and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur l'équilibre budgétaire, le remboursement de la dette et la protection des contribuables et apportant des modifications corrélatives).

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): On behalf of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Toews), that Bill 2, The Balanced Budget, Debt Repayment and Taxpayer Protection and Consequential Amendments Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in. Now we can debate it on Monday once we get through this.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable government House leader, seconded by the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Toews), that Bill 2, The Balanced Budget, Debt Repayment and Taxpayer Protection and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'équilibre budgétaire, le remboursement de la dette et la protection des contribuables et apportant des modifications corrélatives, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in. Agreed?

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Speaker: Not agreed?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I guess it is more so on procedural matters that I would rise. It would be my intention that I would like to be able to propose an amendment—we had no idea that the bill would be reported at this stage—and to authorize the table officers to release the amendment at this time so that other members would have a copy of it. We do have the amendment actually printed. Would this not be the appropriate time to do that?

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The motion by the government House leader is not debatable. I will recall the question.

Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Ernst: Madam Speaker, in order to facilitate the proposed amendment by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), I would seek leave of the House to withdraw, with the concurrence of my seconder, my motion that previously was put.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave of the House for the honourable government House leader to withdraw his motion? [agreed]

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I would move, seconded by—

Madam Speaker: You need leave.

Mr. Lamoureux: I would ask that the amendment be distributed.

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable member for Inkster have leave to distribute his amendment on report stage of Bill 2? [agreed]

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski),

THAT Bill 2 be amended by striking out subsection 3(2) and substituting the following:

Authorized deficits

3(2) The government shall not be considered to be in contravention of this Act by reason only of having incurred a deficit in the fiscal year if

(a) the deficit is a result of one or more of the following:

(i) an expenditure required in the fiscal year as a result of a natural or other disaster in Manitoba that could not have been anticipated and affects the province or a region of the province in the manner that is of urgent public concern,

(ii) an expenditure required in the fiscal year because Canada is at war or under apprehension of war,

(iii) a reduction in revenue of 5 percent or more in the fiscal year, calculated before transfers to the Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the Debt Retirement Fund, other than a reduction resulting from a change in Manitoba's taxation laws;

(b) Manitoba's economy is in recession at any time in the fiscal year and, for this purpose, the economy shall be considered to be in a recession at a time if Manitoba's gross domestic product has declined for the last two consecutive quarters ending before that time; or

(c) the deficit does not exceed the deficit projected for the year in a four-year financial plan

(i) that is tabled by the government at the time of tabling its budget for the first fiscal year commencing after the general election, and

(ii) under which the total of the projected deficits does not exceed the total of the projected surpluses for the four-year period.

Motion presented.

* (1220)

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, just to very briefly speak to the motion, in essence, what it is that we are suggesting, if you listen to what many of the presenters had to say and if you contact members of the public, we ultimately believe that the concept of a balanced budget is a good one, that ultimately the public want government to reflect its wishes. The wishes are that

government has the responsibility to have balanced budgets, and there is no doubt about that.

What we take objection to considerably in this piece of legislation, Madam Speaker, is the fact that it does not take into consideration recessions or the business cycle. As I posed, on behalf of our party, questions to the Chamber or to the Taxpayers Association, any good business person would indicate to you at times there is a need to borrow money and that is something which we believe is important not only in the private sector but also the provincial or the government sector.

If this motion was in fact adopted, we believe that it would make for a better piece of legislation overall. I think that the public would be quite pleased. In the long term it is indeed in our best interest to ensure that government does have the ability to borrow money, as opposed to having to sell things off in order to meet the demands of running government.

With those few words, Madam Speaker, we are quite prepared to have the question put.

Mr. Ernst: The government, unfortunately, cannot accept the amendment.

Madam Speaker, while I am on my feet, I might ask for leave that we not see the clock for a few minutes so that we can complete the report stage on Bill 2 and a couple of other matters of House business, committee referrals and committee changes.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave of the House not to see the clock to attend to House business? [agreed]

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): I would request leave of the House to distribute an amendment to the act, Madam Speaker—[interjection] Oh, I am sorry, I thought you said right now.

Madam Speaker: No, I have to deal with this amendment.

Is the House ready for the question? Is the House prepared to accept the amendment?

An Honourable Member: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: No? All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we just want to indicate that it was on division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski),

THAT Bill 2 be amended by adding the following after subsection 3(6):

Report of Provincial Auditor

3(7) The Provincial Auditor's annual report under section 13 of The Provincial Auditor's Act in respect of the fiscal year shall include

(a) a statement as to whether the Manitoba economy has been in recession at any time in the year; and

(b) The auditor's observations regarding the government's compliance or failure to comply with this act.

Motion presented.

Mr. Lamoureux: Again, Madam Speaker, the primary reason for this particular amendment is to try to acknowledge that the Provincial Auditor should have a very significant role to play in terms of what this government is actually saying is a balanced budget.

Given the actions of this government in the past, we believe that the government can manipulate the books in such a fashion that might not necessarily portray what actually occurred in that particular year. We can cite, for example, the Fiscal Stabilization Fund as

probably the most visible way in which Manitobans have seen in the past where government has been able to manipulate exactly what the deficit was for that particular year.

That is the primary purpose. Ultimately, it would be nice to see the Provincial Auditor get the final word on the government's books and be able to take some form of strong action.

Madam Speaker, there have been other concerns that we have had with this particular bill. These are the two amendments that we had that were prepared. We are equally very concerned about the whole question of referendums, and, unfortunately, because we were not necessarily members on the committee, we were not able to propose all of the amendments that we would have liked to have seen brought to this particular bill and thereby also acknowledge and appreciate members granting me leave to propose these two amendments this afternoon.

Madam Speaker: Is the House prepared to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: No?

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, just so it is noted that it was on division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

Mr. Sale: Madam Speaker, I request leave of the House to distribute an amendment to Bill 2.

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable member for Crescentwood have leave to distribute his amendment? Leave? [agreed]

Does the honourable member for Crescentwood have leave to make some minor revisions to the printed and distributed amendment? The amendment distributed was a committee stage, not a report stage, amendment and there are some minor revisions required. [agreed]

Mr. Sale: Madam Speaker, I thank honourable members for granting leave to consider this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I would move, seconded by the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers), that Bill 2 be amended in the following manner.

THAT subsection 3(1) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

Calculation of deficit or surplus

3(1) In determining the deficit or surplus of the government for a fiscal year for the purposes of this act,

(a) transfers to the operating fund from the Debt Retirement Fund; and

(b) the net proceeds from the sale of all or any part of a Crown corporation;

shall not be included in the calculation of revenue for the fiscal year.

Motion presented.

* (1230)

Mr. Sale: As I said, I appreciate the leave given by honourable members to consider this amendment at report stage. Madam Speaker, the current bill, as framed, allows a government to do exactly what they have done this year in regard to the sale of a Crown corporation, in this case, McKenzie Seeds, or the stripping of assets from a Crown entity, such as the Manitoba Mineral Resources fund, both of which are being taken into ordinary operating revenue of the

government in the current fiscal year. There is nothing in this legislation which would prevent a government from selling all or any of a Crown corporation, such as one of the four divisions of the Manitoba Telephone System that they have recently established, and using the proceeds from that sale to comply with the requirements of the balanced budget legislation.

The issue here is twofold. First of all, it is the role of the Crowns within our provincial economy. Both our largest Crowns, Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone, and some of our smaller Crowns, including the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and others, provide a very valuable function in serving the citizens of Manitoba and providing what both this government and our previous governments have pointed out is either the lowest or very close to the lowest costs of such services in Canada and in North America. In particular, Manitoba Hydro provides hydro at a cost which is lower than any other such utility in the country.

So our Crowns are very efficient and very important in the overall economy of our province. When an economy goes into recession but does not trigger one of the three conditions under which the balanced budget legislation would not apply, it would be possible for a government to meet its needs by selling any or all of a Crown corporation.

Madam Speaker, a family does not balance its budget by selling its car or selling its house or cashing in its savings. That is not a balanced budget in any meaningful sense of the word. Any family who did so would clearly understand that they had sold an asset, that they had not balanced their budget. They may have met their daily needs for food, but they would have done so at the risk of impoverishing their future ability to meet those needs.

So we have proposed this amendment which would prohibit, as is the case in Saskatchewan, and as is the case in Alberta, any government from selling a Crown corporation or any part thereof and bringing the revenue into current operating revenue.

Let me say that when this motion was presented in committee, the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr.

Stefanson) replied that this was simply standard accounting procedure. That standard accounting procedure required in fact that governments treat income from the sale of Crowns in this manner.

Our response to that is that this bill is not standard operating procedure, and that if we are going to change the fundamental way in which we budget in the public sector, we ought to recognize that it is not appropriate to dispose of assets and to use them for balancing the operating budget.

Again, I thank honourable members for giving me leave to introduce this amendment.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the amendment proposed on Bill 2 (The Balanced Budget, Debt Repayment and Taxpayer Protection and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'équilibre budgétaire, le remboursement de la dette et la protection des contribuables et apportant des modifications corrélatives). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: No? All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Madam Speaker, on division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

Mr. Ernst: I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Toews), that Bill 2, The Balanced Budget Debt Repayment and Taxpayer Protection and

Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur l'équilibre budgétaire, le remboursement de la dette et la protection des contribuables et apportant des modifications corrélatives), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development be concurred in.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: Agreed? No?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

An Honourable Member: On division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

Mr. Ernst: Madam Speaker, for Law Amendments committee, which is called for 10 a.m. on Monday, October 30, I would like to refer Bills 19, 23, and 32.

Then, Madam Speaker, I would like to call, with leave, to sit concurrently with the evening sitting of the House on Monday, October 30, the Municipal Affairs committee to sit at 8 p.m., if I have leave.

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave to call a standing committee running concurrently with the House sitting on Monday evening? [agreed]

Mr. Ernst: In which case then I would like to refer to the Municipal Affairs committee for 8 p.m., Monday, October 30, Bills 18, 34, and 36.

Committee Changes

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the member for Morris (Mr. Pitura), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) for the member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst); the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson) for the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik); and the member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) for the member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

Motion agreed to.

Madam Speaker: The hour being 12:30 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, October 27, 1995

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Petitions

Emergency Health Care Services—
Community Hospitals
Lamoureux 4289

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Emergency Health Care Services—
Community Hospitals
Lamoureux 4289

Emergency Health Care Services—
Seven Oaks General Hospital
Chomiak 4289

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Standing Committee on
Economic Development, 6th Report
Radcliffe 4290

Tabling of Reports

Volume 3, Summary Financial Statements
Stefanson 4290

Oral Questions

Health Sciences Centre
Doer; McCrae; Filmon 4290

Health Care System
Doer; Filmon 4292
Lamoureux; McCrae; Filmon 4295

Education System
Friesen; McIntosh 4294

University of Manitoba
Reid; Toews 4296
Sale; Filmon 4298

Department of Natural Resources
Wowchuk; Driedger 4297
Wowchuk; Driedger 4298

Louisiana-Pacific
Wowchuk; Driedger 4297

Autopac
L. Evans; Cummings 4298

Taking Charge! Program
Martindale; McIntosh 4299

Nonpolitical Statements

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Awards
Mackintosh 4300
Kowalski 4300

Ukrainian Canadian Veterans
Branch 141—50th Anniversary
Martindale 4300

Second Annual Manitoba First Nations
Peoples Powwow International
C. Evans 4301

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Debate on Second Readings

Bill 18, Housing and Renewal
Corporation Amendment Act
Martindale 4302

Bill 19, Intercountry Adoption
(Hague Convention) and
Consequential Amendments Act
Martindale 4309
Lamoureux 4311

Bill 32, Proceedings Against the
Crown Amendment Act
Sale 4312
Lamoureux 4314

Bill 34, Municipal Amendment and
Consequential Amendments Act
Struthers 4314
Lamoureux 4316

Report Stage

Bill 2, Balanced Budget, Debt
Repayment and Taxpayer Protection
and Consequential Amendments Act

Lamoureux	4318
Sale	4320