

Second Session - Thirty-Eighth Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report**  
**(Hansard)**

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

**Vol. LV No. 49B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, June 3, 2004**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Eighth Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
AGLUGUB, Cris	The Maples	N.D.P.
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
LOEWEN, John	Fort Whyte	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon	Riel	N.D.P.
VACANT	Minto	
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
MURRAY, Stuart	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa	Seine River	N.D.P.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack	Southdale	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Carman	P.C.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SALE, Tim, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Wellington	N.D.P.
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
SMITH, Scott, Hon.	Brandon West	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
VACANT	Turtle Mountain	
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**

**Thursday, June 3, 2004**

**The House met at 1:30 p.m.**

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PETITIONS**

**Highway 227**

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

These are the reasons for this petition.

It is unacceptable for the residents of Manitoba to travel the unsafe gravel roads of Highway 227 in the constituencies of Lakeside and Portage la Prairie.

Inclement weather can make Highway 227 treacherous to all drivers.

Allowing better access to Highway 227 would ease the flow of traffic on the Trans-Canada Highway.

Residences along Highway 227 are not as accessible to emergency services due to the nature of the current condition of the roadway.

The condition of these gravel roads can cause serious damage to all vehicles, which is unacceptable.

Residents of Manitoba deserve a better rural highway infrastructure.

We petition the Manitoba Legislative Assembly as follows:

To request that the Minister of Transportation and Government Services consider having Highway 227 paved from the junction of highways 248 and 227 all the way to Highway 16, the Yellowhead route.

To request the Premier of Manitoba to consider supporting said initiatives to ensure the safety of all Manitobans and all Canadians who travel along Manitoba highways.

Submitted on behalf of L. Kelly, Ben Bernadin, Jim MacMillan and others.

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

**Minimum Sitting Days for Legislative Assembly**

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

The Manitoba Legislature sat for only 37 days in 2003.

Manitobans expect their government to be accountable, and the number of sitting days has a direct impact on the issue of public accountability.

Manitobans expect their elected officials to be provided the opportunity to be able to hold the government accountable.

The Legislative Assembly provides the best forum for all MLAs to debate and ask questions of the government, and it is critical that all MLAs be provided the time needed in order for them to cover constituent and party duties.

Establishing a minimum number of sitting days could prevent the government of the day from limiting the rights of opposition members from being able to ask questions.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to consider recognizing the need to sit for a minimum of 80 days in any given calendar year.

Signed by Bert Nagutom, Cres Santiago, Primo Imocencio and others.

**Alzheimer's Disease**

**Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood):** I wish to present the following petition.

Alzheimer's is a debilitating disease.

Cholinesterase inhibitors are known to slow or even prevent the progression of Alzheimer's.

The provincial government asked for the development of an Alzheimer's strategy in 2000 and was presented with nine recommendations in 2002, none of which has yet been implemented.

In the absence of a provincial Alzheimer's strategy, the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority put in place a policy in November 2003 whereby Alzheimer's patients entering personal care homes are being weaned from certain Alzheimer medications in a move that the WRHA's vice-president of long-term care has referred to as a financial necessity.

The administrative costs of the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority have more than tripled since 1999, to a total of more than \$16 million a year.

In a move that amounts to two-tier medicine, the families of Alzheimer's sufferers in personal care homes may request that the drugs continue to be delivered at the family's expense.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) to ensure that his attempts to balance his department's finances are not at the expense of the health and well-being of seniors and other vulnerable Manitobans suffering from this debilitating disease.

To urge the Minister of Health to consider reversing his decision to deny Alzheimer's patients in personal care homes access to certain medications.

To request the Minister of Health to consider implementing a provincial Alzheimer's strategy.

Signed by L. Schmidt, E. Kantyluk, J. Hemmerling and others.

#### **Proposed PLA—Floodway**

**Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These are the reasons for this petition:

Under the \$660-million expansion of the Red River Floodway, the Premier of Manitoba plans to subject all work related to the project to a Project Labour Agreement (PLA) which will require all floodway workers to pay union dues and which may require all non-unionized companies and workers to join a union.

\* (13:35)

This Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton) has publicly stated a project labour agreement would automatically require all floodway workers to pay union dues, even if they are not part of a union.

Forcing all floodway workers to pay union dues may increase the costs of the project by \$65 million.

Organizations including the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Merit Contractors Association of Manitoba, the Winnipeg Construction Association, the Construction Association of Rural Manitoba and the Canadian Construction Association have publicly opposed the Premier's plan to turn the floodway expansion project into a union-only worksite.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Premier of Manitoba to consider ending his government's plan to force all workers involved in the floodway expansion to pay union dues even if they are not part of a union.

To request the Premier of Manitoba to consider ensuring any qualified company and worker, regardless of their union status, is afforded the opportunity to bid and work on the floodway expansion project.

Signed: Darlene Lewis, Valerie Robertson, Bernice Lewis and others.

#### **Pharmacare**

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

These are the reasons for the petition:

Pharmacare is a drug benefit program for any Manitoban, regardless of age, whose income is seriously affected by high prescription drug costs.

Under the Doer government, Pharmacare deductibles have been increased by 5 percent each year for the past three years. As a result of the 15% hike in Pharmacare deductibles, individuals are facing increased costs ranging from \$36 to \$660 a year. Seniors, fixed-and low-income-earning Manitobans are the most negatively impacted by these increases.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the Premier of Manitoba to consider reversing his decision to increase Pharmacare deductibles by 5 percent in Budget 2004.

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

To urge the Premier of Manitoba to consider re-evaluating his government's priorities and to consider suspending his government's plans to spend \$100 million on new VLTs at a time when seniors and fixed-income Manitobans cannot afford medication.

It is signed by Bruce Nohlgren, M. Nohlgren and Jim Varndell.

### Highway 227

**Mr. David Faurschou (Portage la Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These are the reasons for this petition:

It is unacceptable for the residents of Manitoba to travel the unsafe gravel roads of Highway 227 in the constituencies of Lakeside and Portage la Prairie.

Inclement weather can make Highway 227 treacherous to all drivers.

Allowing better access to Highway 227 would ease the flow of traffic on the Trans-Canada Highway.

Residences along Highway 227 are not as accessible to emergency services due to the nature of the current condition of the roadway.

The condition of these gravel roads can cause serious damage to all vehicles, which is unacceptable.

Residents of Manitoba deserve a better rural highway infrastructure.

We petition the Manitoba Legislative Assembly as follows:

To request that the Minister of Transportation and Government Services consider having Highway 227 paved from the junction of highways 248 and 227 all the way to Highway 16, the Yellowhead route.

To request the Premier of Manitoba to consider supporting said initiatives to ensure the safety of all Manitobans and all Canadians who travel along Manitoba's highways.

Respectfully submitted by Murray Simpson, Jackie Simpson and G. Suggett.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### Bill 214—The Health Services Amendment Act

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that Bill 214, The Health Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services de santé, be now read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Member for River Heights, seconded by the honourable Member for Inkster, that Bill 214, The Health Services Amendment Act, be now read a first time.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Mr. Speaker, accountability should be recognized as a fundamental principle in the delivery of health care. This bill recognizes that fact. Bill 214 emphasizes that health services delivered under The Health Services Act in Manitoba must comply with the program criteria set out in the Canada Health Act.

It also requires that services comply with the fundamental principle of accountability. Bill 214 would put in place for Manitoba one of the fundamental recommendations of Commissioner Roy Romanow in his report, *Building on Values: The Future of Health Care in Canada*, which was

delivered in late 2002, that health services be delivered using a sixth principle of accountability to reflect Canadians' desire for more accountability in the health care system.

Le présent projet de loi établit que les services de santé offerts en vertu de la Loi sur les services de santé doivent satisfaire aux conditions d'octroi énumérées dans la Loi canadienne sur la santé. Il exige également que ces services respectent le principe fondamental de l'obligation redditionnelle.

### **Translation**

*This bill emphasizes that health services delivered under The Health Services Act must comply with the program criteria set out in the Canada Health Act. It also requires that the services comply with the fundamental principal of accountability.*

\* (13:40)

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

### **Introduction of Guests**

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us today the legislative interns from the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. They are Michael Acedo, Sarah Baker, Holly Bondy, Melanie Francis, Amanda Mayer, Kate Mulligan, Dave Myles and Chris Shantz. They are under the direction of the academic director, Dr. Greg Inwood.

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

I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us Brian and Wendy Penney, Shirley Bernardin, Brenda Jones and Lorraine Friesen. These visitors are the guests of the honourable Member for Morris (Mrs. Taillieu).

Also in the public gallery we have from Red River College English for Professional Purposes 16 ESL students under the direction of Mrs. Alice Landry. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Energy, Science and Technology (Mr. Sale).

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

### **ORAL QUESTIONS**

#### **Rancher's Choice Beef Co-op Government Support**

**Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Manitoba's cattle producers are in an even more difficult situation today now that it appears their quest to establish a slaughterhouse will not come to fruition now that the federal Department of Western Economic Diversification and Farm Credit Canada Venture both denied a request from Rancher's Choice Beef Co-op to invest in a new abattoir. Since the provincial support will not kick in unless the co-op raises \$3.5 million and since it is unlikely that the co-op will raise the amount of money before the June 15 deadline, it is also unlikely that this slaughterhouse will be built.

Can the Premier tell us, Mr. Speaker, what action his government will take to help Manitoba cattle producers who cannot get their cattle to slaughter and who cannot send them south of the border?

**Hon. Gary Doer (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, we are indeed extremely disappointed with the decision of the federal government and its two agencies to deny this reasonable proposal. It has been our view that there should be a sharing of the risk with this crisis, a sharing of the risk between the provincial government, the producers and the federal government.

One very major part of that risk has now been taken from cattle producers here in Manitoba. I have asked our ministers on an urgent basis to revisit the risk we are able to take because the decision of the federal government is absolutely unacceptable. I think it makes more sense actually for the federal government in terms of their own risk to be investing in slaughter capacity particularly for the older cattle than it does for feed programs and other cull strategies, Mr. Speaker. It makes a lot more sense, and one wonders whether the federal government agencies are talking to the federal Department of Agriculture. I suggest nobody in Ottawa is taking a leadership view to make sure that the real crisis that people express in the farm communities is expressed to the agencies of the federal government.

\* (13:45)

Having said that, I have asked our ministers to evaluate whether we, the provincial government, can take on additional risk. It is my view that we have to find a way to meet the producers in a way that is more effective now that the federal government has abandoned the cattle producers in this quest. Our ministers are going to do that on an urgent basis.

**Mr. Murray:** Manitoba's cattle industry is worth half a billion dollars to the provincial economy and is at risk of collapsing. Everyone agrees that the border should be open, Mr. Speaker. We all understand that is the best thing, but it does not appear as if that is going to happen. Recognizing this and recognizing the slaughterhouse facility likely will not get off the ground, surely the Premier must acknowledge that his government must do something to ensure that our cattle producers have a chance to save that industry. We have said all along in this Chamber and to Manitobans that a solution is to provide a cash advance to these cattle producers.

Will the Premier now do the right thing, provide our cattle producers with much-needed support so they can weather this crisis?

We have heard the Premier is extremely disappointed in the federal government. We know cattle producers are extremely disappointed in this Premier.

**Mr. Doer:** I believe our commitment to the ranchers' co-op was a \$2.5-million risk investment and a \$6-million MIOP investment in the project. I think the call for a risk from the cattle producers is fair, Mr. Speaker, to share the risk. I am disappointed that the federal government has abandoned the cattle producers, but I will look with the ministers on the amount of risk that I have indicated. As I have said, 2.5 and 6 in terms of some of the opportunities. We are going to go back and work and see. There is a gap that is 3.5 in terms of what the ranchers' co-op producers were looking at. They have not yet met that, but we have to see what the gap is and what we can do.

There is no question that the federal agency's decision takes the rug from underneath the producers. We are not just going to sit back and blame the federal government. We are going to try to find a way to look at additional risk for us and how

we can bridge this gap. This gap is real but we want to move on an urgent basis. I have asked the Minister of Industry (Mr. Smith) to move very quickly in this regard.

**Mr. Murray:** Mr. Speaker, Manitoba cattle producers and businesses that are impacted by this BSE crisis need support from the Doer government and they need it today. In fact, they needed it yesterday and months ago. They need a cash advance program and they need some kind of a long-term strategy from this Doer government. The border is not opening in the near future. The slaughterhouse does not have the financial support to get off the ground, but our cattle producers in Manitoba still need a solution.

How can this Premier consider flowing millions and millions of tax dollars to his union-boss friends through forced union dues while an entire industry potentially will collapse and as thousands of farm families continued to suffer and struggle through this BSE crisis? How can he stand here and allow that to happen?

**Mr. Doer:** Well, I thought for a moment the member opposite was going to take the high road but he disappoints me again, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a very, very serious—

**An Honourable Member:** Standing up for farmers, Gary. I will stand up for farmers in this House every day.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Doer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I have indicated in my two previous answers, we have considerable risk on the table for this venture to proceed. We also know cattle producers have accumulated investments at risk to have this process proceed. The federal government's ultimate decision disallows the spreading of that risk from three partners down to two.

As one of the major partners, I have said in my previous answers that we will look at different ways of increasing our risk in investment and we will try to close the gap with more equity investment from potentially the producers who are raising money and from potentially the provincial government. We do believe that no matter what happens with the border,

Manitoba, regrettably, has developed an economic strategy for livestock and cattle production.

By 1999, we had gone in '88 from 250 000 cattle that were being slaughtered in Manitoba to when we came into office there were only 19 000 cattle being slaughtered in this province.

We do agree with members opposite that it is better to have investment in slaughter capacity than subsidizing feed and other short-term programs. We are committed to a slaughter capacity enhancement and we are committed to increasing our risk to try to get this project off the ground, Mr. Speaker.

\* (13:50)

### **Rancher's Choice Beef Co-op Government Support**

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** May 20, 2003, has changed the landscape forever. Rancher's Choice president, David Reykdal, and his group of ranchers have worked tirelessly toward setting up a slaughterhouse in St. Boniface, Best Brand Meats, but this Doer government has set them up for failure. Our farmers are cash strapped, barely able to make ends meet. Our farmers are unable to make the \$3.5-million request by this Doer government.

Will the Minister of Industry and Mines tell this House how Plan B, a slaughter facility, will assist our farm families to move it forward?

**Hon. Scott Smith (Minister of Industry, Economic Development and Mines):** Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned, certainly from the start this government has been very supportive of the BSE crisis here in Manitoba and of our producers. When the border closed slightly over a year ago, as the member mentions, the government was working very, very closely with the producers out there.

I must commend David Reykdal and the folks from Rancher's Choice for coming forward in a partnership with the government, obviously working together. I must say the members opposite are preempting this. Rancher's Choice is working with the producers right now for the next couple of weeks looking at raising the capital they need. The partnership we are looking at is something we all take the risk on.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Eichler:** Mr. Speaker, obviously the member has not talked to Mr. Reykdal. I talked to him this morning and the news is not very good.

This Doer government is quick to blame the federal government for not supporting our producers. They say, "Sign up for the CAIS program." They say, "Sign up for the loan program." These farmers have no money. They are maxed out and grabbing at straws that are not there. With no slaughterhouse to ship to, what will these farmers do?

Will the Minister of Industry guarantee the farmers of this province he will not abandon them in this time of crisis?

**Mr. Smith:** I can certainly assure this House that the government has not abandoned producers, and we will not abandon producers moving into the future. Certainly the federal government has refused to come on board in a partnership with the producers, with the government, and now not with the federal government, obviously they have chosen to identify the beef industry in Manitoba as not being a federal priority.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you the business plan that was generated working with Rancher's Choice and through our department putting the business plan together was a good one. The producers continue to work and continue to raise funds. Mr. Speaker, this side of the House will not let the producers down even if the federal government is not in.

**Mr. Eichler:** This Doer government has gone out and told the people of this province about the \$180 million in programs they have put forward to our families, spending another \$100,000 along with that. Furthermore, this Doer government has done nothing to assist farmers in culling their herds, complicating matters even worse, more cattle, no slaughter facility, more cost for farmers.

Will the Minister of Industry tell farmers of this province what the plan is for these struggling farmers?

**Mr. Smith:** Mr. Speaker, working pretty much daily with Rancher's Choice and going to many of the meetings across Manitoba, I can tell the member opposite we are working with producers for a solution. The considerable support that the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) has had over this



crisis to the producers has been quite commendable by many of the producers I have met and talked with. Working with Rancher's Choice, looking at a solution to increase the slaughter capacity here in Manitoba is certainly something that is a priority with us. We will continue to be at the table. We now are on the table and will continue to do that with producers, and we will come up with a solution together.

### **Red River Floodway Expansion Master Labour Agreement**

**Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition):** The Premier knows that the vast majority of Manitobans oppose his plans to force unionization and force union dues for the floodway expansion project. But his refusal to back off these plans so jeopardized the entire project that he had to bring in Mr. Wally Fox-Decent to try to salvage it. The Premier has had Mr. Fox-Decent's report for over a week now, but he has refused to say whether he is accepting the recommendations or not.

Will the Premier finally listen to Manitobans and say no to forced unionization, say no to diverting millions of taxpayers' dollars to his union-boss friends and say no to forcing non-unionized workers to pay union dues? Will he do the right thing?

\* (13:55)

**Hon. Gary Doer (Premier):** We are certainly, given the choice of taking the advice and wisdom and experience of Mr. Wally Fox-Decent or taking the advice of our extremist friends across the way, we are going to go with the wisdom of Mr. Fox-Decent over the extremism of members opposite. I think Mr. Fox-Decent as usual has done a commendable job in this report.

I would point out that the members opposite continually use the term "forced unionization." Page 2 of the report, and I do not know whether members opposite have had a chance to read the six-page report yet in the last week, there is no forced unionization. I repeat, no forced unionization. The member opposite's preamble falls like a house of cards, just like his rhetoric does for the last two months.

**Mr. Murray:** The Premier failed to tell Manitobans in the last election campaign last year that he had

plans for a forced unionization and forcing people to pay union dues. They cast their ballots a year ago without knowing the Doer government was going to be flowing millions of dollars to its union-boss friends. We were disappointed to learn this week that the federal Liberal government supports forcing non-unionized workers to pay union dues and excluding employers from the negotiating table. Manitobans will know when they speak their voice on June 28 in the federal election campaign.

This Premier has the opportunity now to do the right thing. Will he reject the federal Liberal's position on this and agree to not flowing taxpayers' dollars to his friends and saying no to forced unionization?

**Mr. Doer:** I am pleased the member opposite has reminded us of this wonderful opportunity to celebrate the anniversary of this great exercise in democracy a year ago. I thank him very much for that. I have to say he is much more generous than I was when I was in opposition because I tried not to remind the former Premier of the anniversary dates of his successes, but I thank him for that. I might point out the former premier would remind me anyway, if I did not mention it.

Having said that, I would repeat, "No forced unionization, page 2." It is on the bottom of the page. It is the third paragraph from the bottom and it says, "There is therefore no forced unionization."

**Some Honourable Members:** No forced unionization.

**Mr. Doer:** I would ask the member opposite to read it, and we will have a test on comprehension tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I would remind all honourable members, when the Speaker is standing, all members should be seated and the Speaker should be heard in silence. I ask the co-operation of all honourable members.

**Mr. Murray:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and it is always interesting, when the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the Premier, stands up and talks about unionization, how they all join in chorus over there.

**Some Honourable Members:** Solidarity. Solidarity.

**Mr. Murray:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

\* (14:00)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Murray:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Premier has said the Floodway Authority is the employer on this project and as such is the only one at the negotiating table with the unions, but the Floodway Authority has blatantly sided with the unions, has made secret deals with the unions and has repeatedly ignored requests from the heavy construction employers to meet.

These employers are only 95% non-unionized, Mr. Speaker. They make their decisions regarding pay, benefits and training of their employees and are being excluded from the negotiating table. I repeat that the employers are 95% non-unionized.

**Some Honourable Members:** Non-unionized.

**Mr. Murray:** Manitoba's heavy-construction employers should be at the negotiating table, not just this Premier's staff and his union bosses, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Premier today commit to ensuring that the Manitoba heavy construction employers have a seat at the bargaining table?

**Mr. Doer:** The report states, "Working in close association with relevant employers and employer associations." I would point out also on page 3, the top of page 3, it says, "No stoppage of work or work slowdown." Mr. Speaker, it is of course in the public interest to have a project, as Mr. Mulroney did with the Confederation Bridge, but Mr. Mulroney with the Confederation Bridge had much more stringent conditions dealing with the Rand Formula and the treatment of the employees on that project.

Having said that, of course Mr. Mulroney had experience in labour-management relations. He was a member of the Klies Commission, much more knowledgeable than the member opposite dealing with these kinds of issues.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out when the members opposite use their rhetoric about friends, it is this party that banned union and corporate donations. It is that party that wants to return the old days of corporate and union donations and that is why they will not win four years from now.

### **School Division Amalgamations Harmonization Costs**

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, for over 20 years English students have been bused from the former Red River School Division to Hanover School Division. Families want to continue their children going to Hanover, but because of the forced amalgamations, the bus had been taken away.

Not only has forced amalgamation resulted in horrific cost increases for school divisions, it has also resulted in social cost to families. A bus goes from Red River School Division to Hanover School Division to pick up French immersion students, yet students who want to go to Hanover are denied. The bus travels empty one way. How ridiculous is that?

Will the minister commit today in front of these families that all students grandfathered to Hanover School Division will have a seat on the bus to their school?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Before recognizing the honourable minister, I would just like to remind our guests in the public gallery there is to be no participation and that includes applauding.

**Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth):** I am certainly aware of the situation. We have received correspondence on the situation and there will be a response forwarded to the division in question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

### **Point of Order**

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Official Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

**Mr. Leonard Derkach (Official Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The minister has just acknowledged that he will be corresponding with the parents to give them the answer. This is Question Period. The question has

been put. The parents are in the gallery. Why is it the minister cannot respond to the question when it is posed by the member from Morris?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Before making a ruling, I would just like to remind all honourable members that points of order are to be used to point out to the Speaker a breach of a rule or a departure of practices of the House. It should not be used to ask a question. On the point of order raised by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader, he does not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Mrs. Taillieu:** Mr. Speaker, this government's decision to amalgamate school divisions should not result in the disruption of children's education. These families have not moved. Their taxes have not gone down, in fact they have gone up yet they now find themselves without the same services they previously had. Their children have been denied busing to their school.

Can the minister tell these people, can he look them in the eye and tell them why their children must suffer for this government's mistake of forcing school divisions to amalgamate?

**Mr. Bjornson:** I am concerned about the educational opportunities for all of our children. As the Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth, I take it very seriously. It is a big responsibility, and I will gladly meet with the parents who are in the gallery today, if they care to go to my office, Room 168. I will gladly meet with them this afternoon once Question Period is over.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Official Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Just previous to this answer and to the last question, you ruled on a point of order that a person should only rise on a matter where the rules are breached or where the practices of this House are not being followed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the practice in this House is that if a member from the opposition poses a question, then that question is either taken as notice or it is responded to. Refusing to answer the question posed by the member from Morris indicating that I will take the parents aside and give them answers privately is not a response.

This is a public forum. This is where the government is to be held accountable. If the minister does not have the answer, then let him say so. The member from Morris has just posed the question which she deserves an answer to, and I ask you to rule on this matter whereby the minister should answer the question or take it as notice.

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Government House Leader, on the same point of order.

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I understand from the answer that the minister said the matter was being looked into and a response would be coming.

I think it is always important that matters brought to the attention of ministers be considered in a considered way. I just remind members of *Beauchesne's* Citation 416: An answer to a question cannot be insisted upon, and that citation goes on to talk about what reasons may unfold. The questions and answers should stand and face the scrutiny of the public. It is not a point of order I would suggest.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader, he does not have a point of order. To me it is a dispute over the facts.

\* \* \*

**Mrs. Taillieu:** Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Education refuses to answer my question, I will get the answer after he graciously meets with the parents today which was our objective we wanted to achieve here today. We will get the answers from them because we cannot get them in the House. Thank you.

**Mr. Bjornson:** Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the opportunity to meet, as I said, and hear the concerns first hand. We take all concerns of all parents very seriously. I look forward to the opportunity to meet with them and hear those concerns first hand.

### Adolescent Parents Supports and Services

**Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa):** Mr. Speaker, the system failed a 16-month-old baby who was brutally beaten to death this past weekend. The programs the minister has been bragging about failed this child. This minister must take charge of her own department.

Can the Minister of Family Services outline what steps she has taken since she has heard of this horrible tragedy? What action has she taken? What has she asked to be done to ensure that resources are in place so no other child can experience the kind of tragedy that this family has?

\*(14:10)

**Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Family Services and Housing):** Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my deep concern over this event as the minister. We do have two investigations currently underway, one by the Winnipeg Police Services, the other by Winnipeg Child and Family Services. These investigations should be respected. We will respect these investigations.

**Mrs. Rowat:** Mr. Speaker, we are asking about what action this minister will take without waiting to hear what the outcomes will be. We need action now. The families in this province need action now.

Can she outline what this government has done to ensure that this tragedy will not be repeated? My question to the Minister of Family Services is this: Can she assure Manitobans today that there will be no other babies that will fall through the cracks like this one did? Action, please.

**Ms. Melnick:** Mr. Speaker, again, I will speak to the two investigations that are currently underway by the Winnipeg Police Services, Winnipeg Child and Family Services. This is a process that must be respected and I will ensure as minister that we will respect these processes.

### Baby's Death Request for Public Inquiry

**Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa):** Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough to wait. Manitobans must know what action this minister is taking to ensure that she

is protecting society's most vulnerable children and we need answers today. Child and Family Services employees need to know they can come forward with positive solutions to improve the system without fear of action being taken against them.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Family Services today call for a public inquiry so no other children, no other child, is failed so tragically?

**Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Family Services and Housing):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate, I am very concerned as Minister of Family Services and Housing. There are two investigations underway, Winnipeg Police Services and Winnipeg Child and Family Services. We must make sure that these investigations are allowed to be as thorough as they need to be. We must respect the process of these investigations, and this government will respect the process of these investigations.

### Adolescent Parents Support Services

**Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte):** Mr. Speaker, a baby has died. This minister refuses to tell us what action she is prepared to take or what action she has taken. This minister is directly responsible for this department. It is her responsibility to see the children and the infants that need her assistance are taken care of. Her department is in disarray. Staff morale is at an all-time low, the lowest it has ever been. Her department is paralyzed as a result of her lack of leadership. She needs to get on this issue. She needs to get in control. Contributing to the low morale in her department are the questionable policies that she has in place that endanger children.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister today if she will confirm that it is her department's policy not to replace social workers who are on sick leave and on holidays.

**Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Family Services and Housing):** Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate as I stated yesterday that we brought in, in 1999, a perinatal unit to deal specifically with young parents, both mothers and fathers. Every teen mother is to be assessed through a mandated agency, and they will be assessed on a one-on-one basis. This is available throughout the province of Manitoba.

The services that are available to these young people include community-based support programs

in nutrition, community-based support programs in child development, community-based programs in health and wellness. We also have services for home visits through which public health gets involved. We have services that include home visits until a child is three years of age. These services also help our young parents develop parenting skills that they will need. We also provide counselling in decision making both during the period of pregnancy and the period of parenthood. Our department is working very hard every day to provide these services throughout this province with our support-providers throughout the—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Loewen:** Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that people in her department are working hard. It is just unfortunate this minister continues to get in the way. She owes the people of Manitoba more than standing up in this House and reading from policy manuals which in fact that program does not even apply.

It applies to children that are less than one year old, and I would have thought she would have known that. Her department is in disarray. She cannot even answer questions on the policies that are in place in her department. She ought to be ashamed of that. A baby is dead. Others may be at risk. There are infants and children falling through the cracks.

I would ask the minister another question on her department and I would be very pleased if she would just give us the straightforward answer. I would like her to indicate how many children were lodged in hotels over the last two weekends. That is a fairly straightforward question. Let us have the number.

**Ms. Melnick:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that in contrast to pre-1999, where many children have been warehoused for long periods of time, the number has dropped drastically as we have increased foster homes, as we are working towards provision of another 50 foster homes for children.

The number of children in hotels at this time, Mr. Speaker, is primarily around keeping sibling groups together. We agree that, during a time of being brought into the shelter system, it is best siblings do stay together and that has greatly reduced. I do not have the exact numbers here, but I can tell you the numbers are vastly, vastly reduced and are based on keeping sibling groups together.

**Mr. Loewen:** Mr. Speaker, this minister does not have the numbers. The people of Manitoba need those numbers. We understand in the last two weekends over 80 children, 80 children were lodged in hotels. This Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, called it a scandal when 30 children were lodged in hotels. Under his watch, we now have 80, over 80 children. No wonder this department is in disarray.

We do not have time to wait and see if this minister will come back with answers. We do not have time to wait and see the results of the police report or an internal investigation. We need some competent, outside, independent advice as to how to turn this situation around, how to make things safe for infants and children in the province of Manitoba.

I would again implore this minister to advise us today that she will do the right thing, that she will not only look after the people in her department but she will set her mind to looking after infants and children and call today for a public inquiry so we can get to the bottom of this.

**Ms. Melnick:** I can assure the House that every day I am dedicated to doing the right thing by the children of Manitoba. I am dedicated as Minister of Family Services and Housing to make our children our No. 1 priority. We have since 1999 set up the perinatal unit to deal with teen parents, be they men, be they women. We have an array of services that have been much improved and much further developed since 1999. We are committed to delivering these services to all of the teen parents throughout our entire province.

#### **Conservation Staffing Natural Resources Offices**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** My question is for the Minister responsible for Conservation. The Canadian Nature Federation has given a report card on the provinces throughout Canada and Manitoba did not do well. We placed nine out of ten in Canada. The minister can take great pride in the fact that we got a D-minus and should be, quite frankly, a little bit ashamed of that fact.

What stands out in the report is laws and policies are not enough. There are a few specific quotes: "Enforcement of law is limited." "Vacancies in government, scientist positions are not being filled."

"Staff resources needed to deliver these programs are increasingly inadequate." Talking, Mr. Speaker, with endangered species.

My question for the minister is this: Can the minister tell this Chamber if in fact we have more or less conservation officers working in Manitoba today than we did in 1999?

**Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation):** I wonder why the Member for Inkster did not get up a couple of weeks ago when the same view was taken in terms of the same kind of study that was made by a different group, the Environmental Defence Canada, where we received the third-highest mark in Canada.

\* (14:20)

I wonder why the Member for Inkster did not stand up and say, "You got that good mark because you were so committed to protected areas in this province, because you as a provincial government have moved forward on new parks: the Criddle-Vane Homestead Park," the most recent that we have opened, "the Caribou Park, the park at Pembina Valley, the park at South Atikaki." Mr. Speaker, we are working hard to make sure that we do our best to protect endangered species in this province.

#### **Wildlife Unlicensed Hunting of Bears**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Today we got the report that says this government got a D-minus. We can go again on conservation in the issue in regard to bears. When it comes to bears, the reality is this government would get an absolute F. A colleague of this minister within his own NDP caucus has admitted to shooting and killing three bears without having a licence and saying it was in self-defence.

I have asked the minister the question: What is the proper process when a bear is shot in self-defence? Much like the question that he just answered, it is a bunch of baffle-gab that we get from the minister. There is some obligation. People do want to get some answers to questions.

The question is: Will the minister tell us what is the process when someone kills a bear in self-defence?

**Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation):** I welcome every opportunity to get into a discussion with the Member for Inkster when it comes to bears, because we can look at The Polar Bear Protection Act in this province. The Polar Bear Protection Act in this province, which is recognized across this globe as leading legislation to protect polar bears, to protect that polar bear that lives in Churchill, is affected by climate change, is such a tourist attraction to our area. We get top marks all over the world for The Polar Bear Protection Act, and the Member for Inkster ought to know that.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder why this minister gets a big F when it comes to protecting our bears? What this government is saying is if you want to go and shoot a bear in Manitoba, go out and shoot it and just say it was in self-defence, or be a New Democratic MLA, possibly. I find that it is unacceptable.

Why can the minister not answer a very simple question? What is the process if you shoot a bear in self-defence? What expectation? Has the minister actually talked to the member from Interlake in regard to this issue?

**Mr. Struthers:** I want—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I can barely hear the question.

**Mr. Struthers:** I am very pleased to talk about bears, but not only in terms of bears. This government has done the right thing in terms of other species in this province, including elk and others when we banned panned hunting in this province, I think a very disturbing practice we took the right decision on. I think the Member for Inkster deep down, really deep down supports us but just cannot bring himself to the point of giving us credit for doing those good things and all of the good things we do in terms of parks, protected areas, ecological reserves, protecting the polar bear and protecting all of our wildlife in this province.

#### **Point of Order**

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader):** I just wanted to point out to the visitors, the interns from Ontario, I hope they recognize that we indeed are moving toward a stable democracy here in Manitoba.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the honourable Government House Leader, he does not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** Time for Oral Questions has expired.

### Introduction of Guests

**Mr. Speaker:** I want to draw the attention of honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us from Pinkham School 19 Grades 4 and 5 students under the direction of Mr. Richard Scrapneck. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Member for Wellington (Mr. Santos).

Also in the public gallery, we have from Katimavik Program 11 visitors from right across Canada under the direction of Ms. Jane Conly. This group is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger).

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

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### Holy Trinity Orthodox Sobor

**Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of May, on the Feast of the Holy Pentecost, I had the spiritually uplifting occasion to attend the 100th anniversary of the Holy Trinity Orthodox Sobor, which is the parish of the Very Reverend Archpriest Anatoly Melnyk.

In 1905 the church was consecrated by Bishop Tikhon, who later became the Patriarch of Moscow. It was built on land gifted by Feodor Samborsky, who had come to Winnipeg from Byelorussia. This parish was the first orthodox church in Winnipeg and for over 40 years held the Bishop's Seat as the cathedral for all the orthodox people in Canada serving the needs of Christians from Russia, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Greece, Romania, Serbia,

Syria, Georgia, the Holy Land, folks from Western Europe and converts.

It received cathedral status in 1916 when the Russian Orthodox Mission in Canada was reorganized into the Diocese of Canada, the first ruling hierarch being Bishop Alexander Nemolovski.

Mr. Speaker, the liturgy on the day of celebration was presided over by His Grace Seraphim, Bishop of Ottawa and Canada. He was assisted by His Eminence Archbishop Lazar, retired bishop of Ottawa, and His Grace Bishop Varlaam, retired bishop of Vancouver, whose surname, I later learned, was Novakshonoff.

In attendance for the service was His Excellency Nikolai Dimitrovich Smirnov, the Consul General of the Russian Federation in Canada, and we were joined later at the banquet by the Honourable Mr. and Mrs. Peter Liba, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba.

In my service as a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I have never attended a more personally fulfilling occasion such as this as I felt the spirits of my forefathers with me. I want to wish upon the congregation love, peace and continued success in the days and years to come. Spasiba.

#### Cindy Procter

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention and special recognition to an honour received by Cindy Procter, a member of my constituency. Cindy recently was awarded a Lieutenant-Governor's Volunteer Award for her service to the community of Woodlands.

The Make A Difference Community Award is an annual award presented to individuals who have personified the spirit of volunteerism, made lasting and meaningful contributions to their community. Nominated by the Royal Canadian Legion in Woodlands where she has volunteered for 28 years, she was presented with the distinction by the Lieutenant-Governor at the banquet held on April 21 in Winnipeg.

Cindy has exemplified all attributes of her volunteerism in her community. In addition to her time spent at the Legion, Cindy helps out at Woodlands Community Hall and the Oak Park

Lodge, and she used to donate her time as baseball coach with the Woodlands Recreation Club.

Mr. Speaker, the gift of time is something that volunteers give so much of generously in our province and I know that as a mother and grandmother, Cindy Procter has made substantial sacrifices over the years through voluntary service and a dedication to her community. She is well-deserving of this award and I offer her my congratulations. Thank you.

\* (14:30)

### Used-Oil Collection Depots

**Mr. Bidhu Jha (Radisson):** Mr. Speaker, protecting our environment remains an important task for all of us. Therefore, every drop counts in the effort to properly dispose of used-oil products. One litre of oil can contaminate 1 million litres of fresh water, so the correct handling of waste oil materials is very essential.

This week, I joined the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) at the official opening of seven more used-oil collection depots in Winnipeg, adding to the already existing network of 64 depots across the province. These depots provide a very important service, facilitating the reduction of waste oil flow into the sewers and landfills.

They provide the public with an access to depots collecting used oil, oil filters and containers. With more depots now open, the opportunities for Manitobans to join the recycling program have been greatly enhanced. Congratulations to Ron Benson and to the Manitoba Association for Resource Recovery Corporation who have been working hard to increase the rate of oil products recycling in Manitoba.

Used-oil collection has doubled since the depot program was created. In 2003, through the efforts of MARRC and its partners, 11 million of 15 million litres of used oil was properly disposed of. Also, 220 tonnes of oil containers were collected and recycled with the plastic reused to make plastic lumber and other products.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Mr. Joe Casciano, the General Manager of the Regent Avenue Canadian Tire for hosting the announcement

of this program expansion and for representing the Canadian Tire associates who have signed on to this program.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of this government that is a partner in this very effective recycling program and I commend the local businesses for joining with us to protect Manitoba's environment. Together we are creating a cleaner environment for our future generations. Thank you.

### National Transportation Week Awards

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden):** It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to rise in the House today to recognize celebrations occurring across Canada between June 3, today, and June 12, in commemoration of National Transportation Week.

On Tuesday, June 1, I had the pleasure of attending the 2004 National Transportation Week luncheon hosted by the Transport Institute during which Mr. John Marinucci, president of New Flyer Industries was honoured as the 2004 Manitoba Transportation Person of the Year in recognition of his significant contributions to the transportation industry.

Also recognized were the Certificate of Logistics Graduates for 2003 and 2004, Mark Ogg, Winston Yip, Paul Murphy, Beverly Saarela, Corey Cockriel and Mike Allaire. Also, Mr. Rob Ritchie, CEO of the Canada Pacific Railway, who was named 2004 National Transportation Person of the Year, was recognized as well.

Canada is a large and diverse nation with the combined challenges of an inclement climate, rugged terrain, sparse population and vast geographic expanse. An accessible and effective transportation system is vital to the every day health, mobility and economic opportunities of all Canadians. This is particularly true in Manitoba, where remote rural and northern communities are critically dependent on year-round access to essential transportation links, whether they are by air, rail, water or the trucking industry.

Ninety-five percent of the goods moved within Manitoba depend on trucks. The Manitoba-based trucking industry directly and indirectly employs 33 000 Manitobans, down to about 4 percent of the Manitoba labour force. It is a drop of about 20



percent since 1996. It also has more than 300 000 commercial trucks crossing the Manitoba-U.S. border each year. Whether they work in the trucking, air or rail segment of the transportation industry, employees provide transportation services to almost every community in Manitoba.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all recipients of National Transportation Week Awards and to recognize the men and women whose work make it possible to navigate the rugged Canadian landscape each year.

### **Women Entrepreneur of the Year Awards**

**Ms. Marilyn Brick (St. Norbert):** On May 20 I was pleased to attend the Annual Women Entrepreneur of the Year Awards and gala dinner. These awards honour those women who have made a significant and outstanding contribution to entrepreneurship in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this is an annual event, supported by the Women Business Owners of Manitoba. I would like to congratulate the eight hardworking and dedicated women who won in each category.

The Contributions Community award was given to Kimberley Dawn MacAuley for her dedication to the expansion and growth of the *Clipper Weekly* newspaper.

Ari Driver was given the Emerging Business award for Perfume Paradise.

The award which recognizes the role of women in International Trade went to Debra Belinsky and Cheryl Benson-Guanci, owners of the DCB Group.

The Building Business Award, which recognizes innovation and creativity, was awarded to Cathy Stewart and her business, World of Water.

Valerie Morrison, the proud owner of Mooswa Resort, was given the award for Impact on Local Economy.

Kim Penner and her business Kim Penner Equine Art was awarded the Home Enterprise award.

The Excellence in Service award was given to Mabel Wieler and her company Penner Wieler and Company.

And finally, the Lifetime Achievement Award, which recognizes pioneers in business, was awarded to Daphne Petrakos and her Giselle's Professional Skin Care. She was also awarded an Outstanding Overall Excellence award.

I would like to commend all the nominees, including Lila Larson of Coaching Links, for their hard work in building a strong Manitoba and for their contribution to the Manitoba economy.

I would like to thank the sponsors of this event. I would also like to thank the president of the Women Business Owners of Manitoba, Winnipeg Chapter, Heather Lamontagne and the committee members who have worked diligently and dedicated much of their time to make this event happen. This event helps us to appreciate and recognize the efforts and positive contributions that women make to the business and the economy of our province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY (Continued)**

#### **GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**

**Mr. Speaker:** To continue Orders of the Day.

#### **House Business**

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Private Bills will meet Monday, June 7, 2004, at 10 a.m., to consider 300 and 301.

Mr. Speaker, on a matter of House business again, I would like to advise the House that Bill 28, The Agrologists Amendment Act, is being withdrawn from the standing committee scheduled for Monday, June 7, at 6:30 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been announced. Order. I just have to read back the announcements.

It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Private Bills will meet on Monday, June 7, 2004, at 10 a.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 300 and Bill 301. Also, it has been advised to the House that Bill 28, The Agrologists Amendment Act, is being withdrawn from the meeting of the Standing Committee on Legislative

Affairs scheduled to meet on Monday, June 7, at 6:30 p.m.

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise and thank the government for withdrawing Bill 28, The Agrologists Amendment Act. It is important to note that the agrologists had approached us and asked us whether we could work with them to get government to recognize that this act was not in the best interests of the agrologists or what government was attempting to do. Therefore, we requested from the minister that this act be withdrawn in recognition of the importance of the professionalism of the agrologists in this province.

We want to thank the agrologists for bringing to our attention their needs in order to maintain that professional organization in this province and to serve the people of Manitoba. So, again, I want to express my appreciation to the government for having acted in the way they have done and also want to thank the agrologists for having brought this important issue to our attention that we could deal with it.

\* (14:40)

**Mr. Mackintosh:** In terms of today's business, Mr. Speaker, would you first canvass the House to see if there may be leave to deal with bills in the House and concurrence in one of the committee rooms, with no vote or quorum in the committee room?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House to deal with House business in the House and to deal with Supply in a committee room with no votes or quorum in the committee room? Is there agreement?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. There is no agreement.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Mr. Speaker, would you canvass the House to see if there is leave for concurrence to take place in one committee place tonight 6:30 until 9 to allow the independent members to question ministers, no vote, no quorum in that place?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House to have Committee of Supply in one of the committee rooms

from 6:30 to 9 to allow the independent members to pose their questions to the ministers? Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed. *[interjection]*

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave? I have to put the question.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. We are trying to deal with the House business.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. We are trying to deal with House business, and I need to be able to hear what is being put, so I can put it back to you, the members of the House.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Member for Inkster, on a point of order.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did deny leave. This is the first that I heard anything of it. If the Government House Leader wants to approach and possibly request a little bit later we might be able to accommodate that, but this is the first I heard anything of it. So that is the reason why, but I do appreciate the Government House Leader giving us some thought.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. On a point of order raised, I would like to advise all honourable members—*[interjection]*

Order. On the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Inkster, I would like to advise all honourable members when you are debating or discussing House business, please do it in private and not on the floor of the Chamber. House business should be done amongst the House leaders.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, we have more good news, Mr. Speaker. As discussed with the honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), I wonder if there is leave of the House for Supply to sit in concurrence tomorrow from 10 till 12:30 in order for the independent members to ask questions of ministers. We will discuss the ministers to be called. No vote or quorum in that committee, please.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to call Committee of Supply for tomorrow morning from 10 till 12:30 for the independent members to allow them to ask questions of the ministers with no votes or quorums to be called in the committee? Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that leave was denied by the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), just for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call business in the following order. First—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Before I entertain a whole bunch of points of order, I want to remind all honourable members, points of order—*[interjection]*

Order. Points of order are to be used to point out to the Speaker a breach of a rule or departure of Manitoba practices, not to use points of order for debate purposes.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Member for Inkster, on a point of order.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that, if we reflect on what has happened in the past, the biggest, the most clear example that I could show is to go back to the constitutional debate of Elijah Harper in which Elijah had said no. You did not have members standing up saying that so-and-so, that member said no, and if you get someone standing up indicating that, well, I

do not—*[interjection]* I would appreciate if the member from Interlake would be patient.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** This, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is a rule. Is it appropriate for a member then to stand up and say, "So-and-so has said no." If, in fact, that is, well then that same principle then should be able to apply for other members to be able to stand up and say, "Oh, I saw so-and-so say no," or "I saw so-and-so say no," on any other piece of legislation or any other resolution.

Why should the Government House Leader have the opportunity to be able to stand in his place and say, "Oh, the member from Inkster said no," Mr. Speaker? That is an unfair advantage to the Government House Leader.

The question is put by the Speaker and, yes, I did say no for a just reason, but the point is, "Do the rules of our Chamber allow for some members of this House to be able to stand up and identify other members who are saying no." If it does allow for that, I would like to know so that I would be able to use that same procedure in the future.

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Official Opposition House Leader, on the same point of order?

**Mr. Leonard Derkach (Official Opposition House Leader):** Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, on the same point of order.

The member from Inkster rose on a point of order with respect to the Government House Leader asking for leave to allow him and his buddy to ask questions, who are the independent members in this House. I will not even call them members of a party, because they are not. They are simply independent members.

Mr. Speaker, they wanted an opportunity to have ministers before them so that they could exclusively use time to ask ministers questions in concurrence.

This is important because we as the opposition do not have to agree to that because concurrence is called for all members in the House, but the Government House Leader advanced this issue on the request of the two independent members. We agreed to it and they agreed to it.

Between the time they agreed to it and this afternoon, they have changed their minds. Now, Mr. Speaker, what they are doing is stalling the business of the people of Manitoba. These two independent members now want to drag the feet of the House. You know something, I guess, I do not know whether it is the extra stipend they are going for or what it is, but they are now wanting to prolong the business of the House beyond the normal agreement that they signed.

We want to ask the question: What is the purpose, Mr. Speaker? We are prepared to do the business of the people and, yet, we have two independent members here that are holding another 55 members hostage because they do not want to work.

**Mr. Speaker:** Okay, on—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. On the point of order raised by the honourable member, when I ask if there is leave, and if I hear a no, that really should be the end of it. It should not be members getting up and pointing out who denied the leave or why did they deny the leave. It is the permission of all; it has to be unanimous consent of the House in order to change routine business. It takes one member to say no, and that is where it normally stays.

So I rule that the point of order was good advice. I would not say it was a point of order because it was not a breach of the rule, but it was very good advice and I am passing that on to all honourable members. So that should take care of that matter.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I do believe I do have a point of order, and, if not, maybe even a matter of privilege.

The Opposition House Leader made a very serious allegation, a serious allegation that I am after additional money. I am concerned because I have had other members of this Chamber raise that issue with me. I think that there is misinformation that is being provided to possibly others inside this Chamber.

\*(14:50)

At no point in time did I ever, ever indicate that the Liberal Party was looking for any additional resources or privileges. For the minister, the Government House Leader or the Opposition House Leader to try to say something any different than that is wrong.

*Beauchesne's* is very clear. *Beauchesne's* states that you cannot impute motives to others. I take offence. I believe if the Opposition House Leader had any integrity at all, he should stand up and apologize for implying that I am taking actions for the reason of money. I take great offence to that, great offence. He should apologize, because that is a bald-faced lie.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Before making a ruling, I want to advise all honourable members when using language in the House, all members are honourable members, and we should pick our words very carefully.

Many Speakers have ruled on the wording of bald-faced lies or liars. It has never been accepted by any Speaker, and I sure do not intend to start now, because, as I said, all members are honourable members. Maybe the honourable member would like to rephrase that a little bit.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I will do better than that and just apologize for using the word "liar."

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for that.

On the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Inkster, it is not a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Mr. Speaker, would you please call business in the following order today: first of all, second readings in the order they appear; debate on second readings in the order they appear, to be followed by concurrence.

#### SECOND READINGS

##### Bill 53—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2004

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I move, seconded by the

Minister of Culture (Mr. Robinson), that Bill 53, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2004, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Attorney General, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism, that Bill 53, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2004, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Part 1 of the bill is primarily concerned with correcting typographical numbering and other drafting errors. Part 2 updates references to the names of ministers and departments to reflect the reorganization of executive government. Part 3 addresses changes required by the repeal of the Young Offenders Act, Canada, and the introduction of the Youth Criminal Justice Act, Canada. Recent amendments to the rules of the Assembly resulted in a number of changes to the names of committees of the Assembly. Part 4 of this bill makes a series of amendments so that the statutes refer to these new names. Part 5 validates the regulation and everything done under that regulation.

There are, however, some substantive matters included in Part 1 of the bill that I bring to the attention of honourable members. The Court of Queen's Bench Act is being amended to allow rules to be made restricting access to documents filed in proceedings intended to achieve the settlement of the case at the request of the court. The Manitoba Evidence Act is being amended to allow affidavits sworn before a Commissioner of Oaths in another jurisdiction to be admitted in Manitoba courts.

The majority of provinces recognize affidavits sworn before Commissioners of Oaths. An amendment is being made to The Provincial Police Act to allow special constables to be appointed by the Minister of Justice rather than by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. An amendment is made to The Real Property Act to ensure that an agreement between a landowner and a utility to erect a wind turbine will bind subsequent owners of the property in the same way as agreements respect the location of transmission lines.

The City of Winnipeg Charter is being amended to address certain matters that were overlooked when the old City of Winnipeg Act was being redrafted.

An amendment is made respecting the hearing process on zoning by-laws. Another amendment clarifies the basis on which the annual rental value of premises for business assessment purposes is calculated.

I am looking forward to further discussions on this bill if there are any, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few words on Bill 53. Usually, toward the ending of a session, government will often take a look at a number of pieces of legislation or laws that are currently in place and then take a look at what sort of amendments, usually, generally speaking, they are minor amendments, and then bring them forward as one all-encompassing bill.

Just going through the index of this bill, you get a fairly good sense, Mr. Speaker, or going through the table of contents, you get a very good sense in terms of just how all-encompassing this bill really is in terms of dealing with other pieces of legislation and, in good part, because when we look at when the government brought this bill in for first reading, I believe, and if I take a look at the spreadsheet, was on May 31.

That is when the government would have brought in this bill. It really has not necessarily afforded us the opportunity to go through the details of the bill, but whenever you bring in a bill of this nature, one of the biggest concerns that one need or should have is that you want to ensure that the amendments that are being proposed to the many other bills by the passage of this bill are, in fact, best being done through this bill as opposed to being a separate bill in itself.

That is probably the biggest concern that we would have with Bill 53, because of the number of acts that it does have an impact on and not necessarily being provided any sort of a spreadsheet causes concern.

You know, I could read off the different bills. It is a significant number. Just at quick glance, we are probably talking maybe 40 or 50 bills or amendments to possible bills, and a concern, in good part, would be is that we would want to make sure that whatever legislation the government chooses to bring before us is, in fact, in the best interests of Manitobans.

I do believe that the Government House Leader should have ensured that there was some discussions in advance to debating Bill 53 for the simple reason that we would want to get some sort of assurances from the Government House Leader as to what the actual intent of the bills are.

I appreciate the fact that the Government House Leader has stood up and briefly addressed some of the general outlines of the bill, but, in terms of specific questions that we might have had, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I really have not had the chance to go over the bill in detail, so I have to go with the principle, the principle being that when you bring in legislation, generally speaking, it is for one act, of course. It allows you then the opportunity to consult with other individuals that could have a vested interest in that particular piece of legislation or that law, because it is actually law. And it is an amendment that we would be bringing forward, but at least it affords us to go to that stakeholder.

So, if I were to give a specific example, one could say that if we were to take any bill that is on the Order Paper, you know yesterday I had spoken about the Red River, the floodway, or we are going to be talking about the floodway act, Mr. Speaker.

\*(15:00)

Well, on that particular bill, we can go to who we believe are the stakeholders, share the bill with those individuals or allow for people to be able to provide input for us. Then it allows us to, in essence, critique the bill, have some sort of a determination, weigh the pros and cons, see if it is a bill which we could actually get behind and support. Well, what makes Bill 53, as I say, unique, is because in Bill 53 it has so many laws that it actually is going to implement somewhat of a change.

I know this issue has been raised before. The government today, while in opposition, I know has addressed bills of this nature before and has expressed the same sort of concerns that I am expressing now. I think that they are legitimate concerns, Mr. Speaker. It would have been, I believe, more appropriate for the Government House Leader to be able to share with us in a little bit more detail as to what is in this bill in terms of its impact, and give some sort of justification that all the amendments that are here are minor enough to be incorporated

into this bill, that they did not require, it is their own separate legislation.

But we did not get that sort of a detailed explanation. I do not think that is appropriate, but given that we have it before us and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very good chance that this bill will in fact pass and then go into some form of committee stage. That might provide us another opportunity to ask some specific questions, but it is one of those bills in which ultimately I would think the government should not be in any hurry in terms of passing or if there are certain aspects of it that really dictate its urgency, I would suggest to you that it is a bill that should be, possibly even, say, in second reading or if it is going to committee, hopefully, we will get from the minister a more detailed explanation as to the purpose and the different types of minor amendments or so-called minor amendments that are being proposed in Bill 53.

It is not my intention to speak long on this particular bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a bill, as I say, with the reservation of how it has been brought in and then expected to go into committee. With that one reservation the amount of time that we have had to even look at the bill does concern me a great deal, quite frankly. But we do recognize that ultimately it will go to committee.

It concerns me because, as I had stated, the bill actually came, or it was given that first reading on May 31. I am not sure in terms of the actual day that it was circulated inside the Chamber. That, I would argue, is the reason why I think that it was important for me to be able to stand up, express the concern that I have with regard to it, because I am not happy with the way in which the process is working on Bill 53. Quite frankly, I do truly believe that if the shoes were on the other foot, if the government was still in opposition, they, too, would have some concerns and possibly even some questions as to why this bill happens to be as thick as it is. They would want to feel comfortable in knowing that none of the amendments that we are going to be passing by passing this particular bill should have been incorporated in its stand-alone bill. It does, as I say, raise concerns.

With those few words, ultimately I trust it will likely end up going to committee, and, hopefully, we will get some better opportunity or better explanation

from the minister responsible as to why it is that all these amendments are in fact being made and try to give us the assurance that these amendments are of such a minor consequence that it would be okay to put into Bill 53. With those few words I am prepared to leave it at that. Thank you.

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance):** Can I stand to move my bill now?

**Mr. Speaker:** We have not dealt with this one yet. We are still on Bill 53, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2004. We have had one speaker.

**Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson (Mr. Penner), that debate be adjourned.

*Motion agreed to.*

#### **Bill 54—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2004**

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Healthy Living (Mr. Rondeau), that Bill 54, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2004; Loi d'exécution du budget de 2004 et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

I am tabling the message as well.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Finance, seconded by the honourable Minister of Healthy Living, that Bill 54, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2004, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been advised of this bill, and the message has been tabled.

**Mr. Selinger:** It is moved that Bill 54, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2004, be read a second time and then be referred to a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for second reading Bill 54. Bill 54 introduces tax changes announced in the '04 budget, which I had the

pleasure of delivering to the Assembly on April 19. The 2004 budget reflects both the views expressed by Manitobans in our pre-budget consultations and the challenges of this very difficult past year.

This budget continues to invest in the priority areas of health and education and provides support for farmers, families and communities, while maintaining the province's finances on a sound footing. I would direct the members' attention first to part 4 of Bill 54, which amends The Income Tax Act. Part 4 introduces a three-year extension of the Manitoba Film and Video Production Tax Credit and the addition of a 5% frequent filming incentive and a 5% rural and northern filming incentive.

An amendment will also permit producers who hold a broadcaster's licence to qualify for the film tax credit. These measures will help to ensure that the film industry in Manitoba continues to grow and prosper in the coming years. This bill also introduces the new Odour Control Tax Credit. This corporate income tax credit will encourage businesses to implement measures to control nuisance odours from organic waste. Taxpayers will benefit from greater flexibility as the carry-forward period of the Manufacturing Investment Tax Credit, the Research and Development Tax Credit, and the Community Enterprise Development Tax Credit is increased from seven to ten years. In addition, a ten-year carry-forward and a three-year carry-back is now available to the Co-operative Education Tax Credit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to draw the attention of members to the other parts of Bill 54. Part 1 of Bill 54 amends The Corporate Capital Tax Act to include subordinated debt in the calculation of taxable paid-up capital applicable to banks, loan and trust companies. Part 2 moves the taxation of propane and natural gas to The Gasoline Tax Act from The Motive Fuel Tax Act, as these products are derivatives of gasoline.

Part 3 amends The Health and Post-Secondary Education Tax Levy Act to clarify the payroll exemption applicable for remuneration paid to transport drivers on trips outside of Manitoba.

Part 5 of Bill 54 amends The Mining Tax Act to provide greater clarity on the recovery of debts owing to the province and the imposition of penalties for late filing and for failure to provide information required under the act.

Part 6 amends The Motive Fuel Tax Act to allow for the equalization of the diesel fuel tax rate with the gasoline tax rate. This part also moves jet fuel to this act from The Gasoline Tax Act, as jet fuel is a derivative of motive fuel.

\* (15:10)

Part 7 amends The Retail Sales Tax Act to expand the taxable base to include certain legal, accounting, architectural, engineering, security and private investigation services.

My department has held numerous discussions with professional organizations whose members and clients are affected by this change. My officials will continue to provide assistance to ensure that implementation on July 1 can proceed in a fair and effective manner.

Also, in Part 7 of this bill, retail sales tax, buy/sell refunds available to vehicles and aircraft will be extended to include certain off-road vehicles such as dirt bikes. It will also include a provision that clip-on sunglasses purchased with prescription eyewear are not taxable, and a provision that modernizes the exemption on sales of used footwear by increasing the exempt amount from \$20 to \$100. It also clarifies collection/demand provisions and estimating the fair value of taxable property and services.

In Part 8 it amends The Revenue Act to implement a 2% land transfer tax on transfers of land with a value greater than \$200,000.

Part 9 amends The Tobacco Tax Act to change the rates levied on tobacco products in accordance with those announced in the budget.

Bill 54 also repeals The Manitoba Foundation Act, which is no longer required because of changes to federal income taxation respecting creditable limits on donations and makes minor wording changes to The Financial Administration Act with respect to the provincial authority to borrow and lend.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the members to carefully consider this bill. While the principles of this bill have been discussed during Budget Debate

and in Estimates, Bill 54 provides a greater detail on a number of provisions.

**Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte):** I move, seconded by the Member for Charleswood, that debate be adjourned.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Member for Fort Whyte, seconded by the honourable Member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger), that debate be adjourned. Agreed?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. It has not been agreed to? All those in support, say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** Just for clarification purposes, the honourable Member for River Heights, were you rising to speak to Bill 54? Okay. Once I move to adjourn the bill, or before I do, is there leave to revert back to allow the member to speak? Is there a will of the House to allow the member to speak? *[Agreed]*

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Thank you, and I thank the members. I just want to put a few words on the record with respect to Bill 54. I want to discuss in particular the increases in the retail sales tax that are a central part of this bill.

I would like to point out that in the election campaign, which was a year ago, this government did not campaign to increase the retail sales tax, and that is what they are doing. Why were they not campaigning last year telling us about their plan to increase the retail sales tax on lawyers, on engineers, on architects, on accountants, on people in the security industry, private investigators?

For all these individuals, the retail sales tax increases from zero on their services to 7 percent. But the problem is that it is a tax on their services and that it, therefore, is a tax on single mothers needing legal services in order to get maintenance payments.

It is a tax on those who need legal services in order to seek fundamental justice. It is a tax on those who seek legal services in order to correct wrongs, to seek justice.



With regard to engineers, this is a tax on the people who are the innovators in our society. Not very long ago, there was a report comparing the productivity in Canada and the United States and the productivity increases.

We have had comparisons of the productivity improvements or lack of it in Manitoba compared to the other provinces. Certainly, if we want to increase productivity, the last thing we want to do is put a tax on innovation, new ideas and increased productivity.

We have a tax being imposed on architectural services. We have beautiful buildings that we would like to see in Winnipeg and in Manitoba. Yet this government is putting additional 7% costs on the architectural services. It is a tax on building beautiful buildings.

One of the problems in the way that this is being imposed relates to the fact that it will be difficult to do this without creating incentives for people to work and live in other jurisdictions. It will make it more difficult to attract architects and engineers, innovators, here to Manitoba when they know that everything they do is going to have this extra tax on them. It will be easier for people to be innovators and do the research somewhere else, where it is not taxed.

So there is a problem here. There is a problem that we had a government who is introducing all these new taxes but never campaigned to do that, never told the people of Manitoba that that is what their intention was, to raise taxes. Not one just on lawyers, not one just on engineers, not one just on architects, not one just on accountants but on all of them.

Part of the problem is that when a lawyer needs to use an accountant, the accountant's service is taxed and the lawyer's service is taxed so that the single mother who has to get maintenance payments and needs legal services now has to pay the tax on the accountant's services for the lawyer as well as the tax on the lawyer's services. It is not a good bill. Clearly, there are problems with this.

One of the other measures that the government has introduced is the increase in deductibles for Pharmacare. Did this government campaign on a policy, on a plan, to increase deductibles to Pharmacare? I never heard that. Certainly, a lot of people that I have talked to never heard that either. A year ago, this government was campaigning on, oh

no, we are not going to increase taxes. Well, this is a user fee and it is like a tax. Here they are increasing new charges and new taxes with this bill.

So I rise to speak today, Mr. Speaker, because I think that there is a problem with this government. There is a problem because, when they campaigned last year, they said one thing and now they have done something else. What they are doing is not good policy. They are trying to implement by July 1 this new tax on lawyers and on lawyer services, and on engineers, and on architects.

I understand in discussions with a number of people who work as lawyers, architects and engineers that there are sufficient problems that this is going to be a difficult tax to implement by the July 1 target date.

We will see whether the government will actually make it and whether they will, in fact, force people to have to spend a lot of extra time just pushing in order to get ready with this quick date for major changes in the taxes.

The way that this tax is being applied to legal services with all the exceptions is going to create significant problems in terms of how it is administered. It is not going to be an easy thing. It will require some separate financial package. The financial package, for example, for the GST, clearly, there would have been simpler ways to do this if that was their intention.

\* (15:20)

But, as I said, they certainly did not campaign last year on increasing the retail sales tax in this way. We have even raised the issue of whether this should have been the subject of a referendum. We do not have as good an estimate of the revenue to be generated as we should have had. We do not know for sure, although the government claims that their package is tax neutral. I think we will only wait and see whether, in fact, it is or not.

I rise to speak today just to make these points because I think that they must be made. When a government campaigns one year and says one thing, and then comes back the next year and does something quite different, it is time to start holding that government to account. Clearly, this government needs to be held to account because of what they are doing, and the way that they are raising retail sales

tax on mothers seeking child support and needing legal services. A lot of family law and mothers seeking child support does not fall under legal aid. The minister should talk to some of the lawyers who have been involved in places like The Pas where, from time to time, this sort of issue comes up.

Clearly, there are some issues here. There are some fundamental problems with the approach that this government is taking. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to stand up and talk to this bill at this point. Thank you.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to be able to address this bill. This bill, actually, is, in essence, needed in order to be able to implement the budget. So what I like about this bill is it affords all of us the opportunity to be able to address the issues that most, one could say, might concern us in regard to the budget.

I think the Leader of the Liberal Party is right on when he indicates the issue of the sales tax. I do want to spend a bit of time in regard to the sales tax because, you know what I believe, Mr. Speaker? I believe the government should have had a referendum. We did have balanced budget legislation that was introduced with the former administration. The NDP over the years have talked in support of that balanced budget legislation. A part of that, there is a tax referendum clause. What does it actually say in terms of a referendum that is required for tax changes?

If you go to 10.2(b), a bill to increase the rate of tax if, in the opinion of the minister, the proposed change is designed to restructure the tax burden and does not result in an increase in revenue, that one could ultimately be used as an exemption, Mr. Speaker.

But what we do know is that for many people, as the Leader of the Liberal Party has pointed out, this is an absolute brand new tax. If you go and talk to the people that are paying for the law fees, or accountants and architects and so forth, they will tell you that this is, indeed, a new tax.

We know that this tax is not a neutral tax. It is going to generate tens of millions of dollars for the government. In fact, it is listed in the budget papers. It gives some more-specific dollar amounts as to how

much money is going to be raised. For 2004-2005, the revenue impact is going to be \$17.2 million, yet, if you go to page B9 you will see that retail sales tax is going to be increasing up to, for 2004-2005, in total, \$1.154 billion. There is absolutely no doubt that this tax for many is an absolute new tax and it is increasing taxes.

In the balanced budget legislation, there is a requirement that Manitobans are entitled to be able to have a referendum. I believe they might want to dance on the law of the balanced budget legislation and say, well, this and this and this and try to justify it, but the reality is quite different. If you ask Manitobans, they will very clearly tell you that there is a new retail sales tax that is being applied and it is going to generate a considerable amount of revenue for the government and, as such, they should have been entitled to a referendum.

But you know what, I do not blame the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) for not calling for a referendum on this issue because I suspect that the Minister of Finance is likely going to be right in anticipating that it would be denied, that he would not have been able to sell this to Manitobans. I get the feeling that that is the primary reason why we do not have a referendum on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

So there was an expectation. The government did not meet that expectation and I find that that is most unfortunate. If you look at it, Mr. Speaker, there are referendum requirements. The government has chosen to avoid that issue, but another part of the legislation is also that you have to have balanced budgets and the government is saying that it has a balanced budget. I believe there is like a \$4-million variance that could ultimately turn it into a budget that is not balanced, that we could have a deficit. In fact, we have the provincial auditor who is telling us that we actually have a deficit in the province of Manitoba.

Imagine all the New Democrats across Canada, let alone Manitoba, when the national auditor said, "Here is a situation that happened in Ottawa" and they were all saying, "Oh, listen to the Auditor-General of Canada, the Auditor-General is correct" and all this kind of stuff, but what about if we were to apply that same principle of listening to the provincial auditor, Mr. Speaker? If we did that what you would find is that we had a deficit in the province of Manitoba and what happens under this

legislation if there is a deficit? Well, it gives a fairly clear indication on what should have happened. What should have happened is the Cabinet ministers, each and every one of them, should have taken a significant decrease in their salaries.

I think that the ministers need to reflect on the claim and determine whether or not it is a valid claim because it is based on the third quarter report from 2003-2004 and you will see, I believe, that there is a valid argument to be made that there is, indeed, a deficit and as such the balanced budget legislation dictates that each and every minister should have taken that decrease in pay.

That is why when I think of the taxation policy and this budget that there has been a disservice done to Manitobans. They talk about the importance of balanced budget legislation but they have been able to kind of dance around in order to avoid or to try to give the perception that they support it on one hand, but in reality I do not truly believe that they do support it.

The New Democrats have been in government since 1999 and they have had opportunity to be able to address inequities in our taxation policies, but they have been disappointing. They have been very disappointing in the area of education.

You know, what happens is that we have seen in the province of Manitoba a growing reliance of financing public education on property tax owners. The greatest inequity that is there, because we have two different levies on education taxes dealing with property, and in the consultation that I have done, especially when I was Education critic, people are saying the one that is the most difficult, the one that is most inequitable is the local school division tax. You will see huge variances, depending on the school division that you happen to live in.

Then you have the provincial levy that is also put on to the property tax. Then you have the money that comes from general revenues. Out of those three, one would argue the most progressive way of financing the public education system is through general revenues, much like in terms of health care. Both education and health care are social services. We all have a certain reliance on public education and public health care. We all feel very good and comfortable with the fact that they are there.

\*(15:30)

When it comes to education, we are not saying that you can convert it all overnight, but, again, I would suggest to you that actions speak louder than words. If, in fact, the government was wanting to be more progressive or ensure more equity amongst the way in which taxes are being collected, what we would see is there should have been a drift of the reliance of financing education towards general revenues, as opposed to continuing to rely, and in many areas rely heavier, on financing of public education through property tax.

As a result of that, municipal governments throughout the province, whether it is Winnipeg or rural municipalities, have really felt the pinch on this issue, Mr. Speaker. What they have seen is that the amount of school tax that is being levied at the local level is in some cases almost doubling the total property tax bill. You had councillors, mayors, I truly believe throughout the province that are finding it very difficult on the revenue side because they recognize that people do not want to have to pay more in property tax.

Relatively speaking, in terms of the balance of Canada, we are likely one of the highest, if not possibly even the highest, but we are definitely one of the highest in terms of the amount of money that we pay on property tax. So we would look towards the government, Mr. Speaker, in terms of being able to give and demonstrate leadership on the whole issue of tax reform. That has been lacking.

The NDP leadership on tax reform to date has only been in the area of our consumption tax and increasing different fees, then telling the public, "You know, we are not increasing taxes," but they do have a huge, huge increase in revenue, and I will get to that shortly. But they look at other ways in which they can generate money.

I have a constituent who came to me, and he had driven an Impala, and he said, "Well, you know, here is how much it is costing me in order to get my plates." You look at the registration and, I believe, I might have referred to this earlier, so one could always go back in Hansard, but I believe he was somewhere around \$45 in terms of registration. In order to register his vehicle while he is purchasing insurance, he had to pay \$45. Well, that would have been in, I guess, three, possibly four years ago. Well,

every year that registration fee has been going up. Now he is paying just under \$100. Well, when you look at it, the number of vehicles that are registered in the province, and you get that type of an increase, how can you really legitimately say that we are not increasing taxes, when you have virtually doubled the registration fee?

How many Manitobans have a vehicle? How many Manitobans register a vehicle? To say that, "No, no, we are not increasing taxes," well, people do not necessarily buy that. I do not buy that. What was interesting is the government was saying, "Well, you know what we are going to do," because sometimes you try to designate things, you know, "How do we justify this \$23 increase?"

The idea that they had was, "What we'll do is we will increase it by \$23 and we will allocate that increase towards the twinning of the Perimeter." Now, there is the section of the Perimeter that has and needs to be twinned.

Very few people would argue that that is not necessary, but, from my perspective, to justify this particular increase by saying the money that is going to be generated from this is going to go towards paying for that, does that mean once it is done that the registration fees are going to be dropped \$23?

Well, we know that that is not going to be the case. You know, I have had discussions with others in regard to this. All political parties at different levels of government have done things of that nature. This government here had an option. They did not have to do it that way. They could have been a little bit more transparent, but they choose to hide and try to mislead and misguide Manitobans as to what they are actually doing.

So I talk about three points there. You have a government that we know should have had a referendum on the retail sales tax because of the legislation. We know this government does have a deficit. They should have taken a cut in their ministerial salaries. Then we cite the example of a government that hides an increase and tries to say, "Well, it is for this, and this is the reason why we are giving that increase," three totally separate issues in which this particular Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) has done his best, and he has done a very good job, I must say. I will applaud him on that, in

terms of getting that spin out there that, "We're not increasing taxes."

Well, you know, I can recall the debate in here back in October or September or whenever it was when Glen Murray talked about the need for getting more taxes, and the Premier stood on his feet and he said, you know, the essence of, "I want to be perfectly clear. There will be no tax increases. I was not elected to increase taxes." That is what the Premier had said.

It would be interesting to see the Premier face the same people that the then-mayor had went around the city through those town halls and say to those people that he has not increased taxes. I suspect that there would be very, very little will on behalf of the Premier to do something of that nature, because if he did have to do something like that, he would not be able to convince, I do not believe, any Manitobans, any Manitobans beyond the NDP caucus anyway, that in fact these budgets have not contained increases in taxes.

That is why I think that in one sense the Minister of Finance has done well in terms of his spins related to his budgets, but overall when you go into the details, I find that it is fairly significant. You know, when I had left this Chamber, the expenses, or the total revenue of government, was somewhere around that \$6 billion. Today it is over \$7 billion in terms of revenue.

I had some of the breakdowns in terms of the taxes. Individual income tax in the '98-'99 budget was \$1.48 billion, and I must say that was a budget that was introduced by Gary Filmon, and the New Democrats in opposition did support that budget too. But the revenue there was \$1.48 billion. In the '02-'03 budget, it was \$1.68 billion. That is like a \$200-million increase. That does not include the increases in revenue that we would have achieved here. Now, I can appreciate the revenue came because of the economy expanding, so that is why we have the additional revenue there.

The gasoline tax has been fairly stagnant, somewhere around that \$155 million to 157 million. Retail sales tax back then was \$846 million. If I pull the numbers from the recent budget, the government now is indicating for 2004-2005 that that number has now grown to \$1.154 billion. That is \$1.154 billion. What we are talking about is a huge, close to what, \$300 million more in retail sales tax. Now, a lot of

that gain could be attributed to additional purchasing, the growing power or more Manitobans buying things, and so forth, but one of the most significant aspects of that growth is because of the new taxes that are being implemented by this particular Minister of Finance or, I should say, this government. Tobacco tax, you know, it is interesting, was at 110 back in 1998-1999, and now it is at something like \$178 million.

\* (15:40)

The revenues have been coming in. Revenues have been increasing. It was not until, I believe, November when I really had a good chance to get a good understanding of some of those numbers. Once I felt somewhat comfortable with it, I had done up one of my mailers and informed my constituents as to the degree in which the revenue, the amount of money this government is collecting today, is significantly more four years after it had been first elected.

Well, you know, here is a bit of a catch. In the past I have indicated that I personally, if you were to ask me what sort of an economic model or theory do I somewhat adhere to, is, I believe, to a certain degree in Keynesian theory, in which economies have highs and lows, and when the economy relatively does well, there is a need for government to ensure that you are balancing the economy. In other words, you are not trying to add to a boom, per se.

What the government really can do, the best service it can do for the province is to ensure that when you are going in the downward direction of a business cycle that the government is there to support its citizens. My concern is what will happen and what sort of direction are we going to see from this government in the future if, in fact, the economy does not perform as well as it does today.

At some point in time some might argue that the economy will not perform as well, and when that happens there might be some sort of a need for cutbacks. When you have government growing as quickly as it is, it is, what, 20 percent over a few years, you have got to be very careful in terms of how that money is actually being spent. Are there better ways in which you could in fact be spending that money? If you identify a problem and just throw the money at it, ultimately you are going to create

some inefficiencies. When crunch time comes, you might then be put into a position in which you are forced to take some actions that are going to be very hurtful for the province. That is why, when you have revenues coming in to the degree in which this Province has had revenues coming in, there is an extra onus on the government of the day to be ever so diligent in terms of how it is allocating the money out and ensuring that it is not just blindly throwing money, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I do not want to be completely and absolutely critical of the government. There are some areas in this budget in which there was a positive, when they had taken some of those revenue increases and put it in terms of beefing up the resources in the immigration area, Mr. Speaker. Well, that is something which ultimately will ensure that we have more resources; ultimately, more immigrants coming to our province.

That is what has been allowing our province to grow. That is what allows us to be able to generate the types of taxes that we are talking about inside this particular bill, because this bill is about taxes and the tax revenues that are being generated. So here is an example where I would suggest to you that there has been a good allocation, because it will enable us to get, I believe, more immigration coming to our province.

The province has grown primarily in many sectors as a direct result of immigration. So this is something that will ultimately allow the economy to continue to grow.

Why that is important, Mr. Speaker, is because, if the economy continues to grow, that means a good portion of every section of this legislation will then have an increase, not because the government is giving it an increase in terms of a percentage increase, rather it is growing because the economy itself is growing.

That is the best way to generate additional revenues, based on the performance of the economy as opposed to the government just determining that it needs more money and we are going to raise taxes in order to achieve that.

That is the ultimate reward when government, at times, can take relatively positive initiatives and turn those initiatives into ultimate economic growth. That is where the benefit really is.

You know, the legislation that we have before us, I am glad that it was called today, because I know that it will go to committee and it will provide us the opportunity to be able to ask more direct questions for those that do have questions in regard to taxation policies, and so forth, of this government. I would like a more detailed answer from the minister, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the expected amount of retail tax that is going to be coming from our lawyers, that new tax. The reason why I say that is because I do not believe the amount that is being projected in the book is actually correct.

You know they were expecting, I believe it is, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$20 million from all those new groups: the architects, the lawyers, the engineers and security firms through that new 7% tax. I had the opportunity to talk to one of those groups, the Manitoba Law Society, and had asked them what they anticipated their contribution is going to be to this new tax. The number that was indicated to me was somewhere around \$20 million.

Well, that causes some concern because of the amount of money that this minister is actually stating. It seems to me that he might be, in fact, underestimating. That is an important issue which I would be very much interested in getting some clarification on. So, whether I get the clarification in committee or the Minister of Finance has his staff that is possibly listening, I would not mind getting some more details on that particular point. Having said that, I just want to thank you for the opportunity to be able to say a few words on this. We do look forward to it going to committee. Thank you.

**Mr. Loewen:** While I appreciate the member from Inkster re-reading his budget speech, I would move, seconded by the Member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger), that debate be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### Bill 10—The Gaming Control Amendment Act

**Mr. Speaker:** Resumed debate on second readings, Bill 10, The Gaming Control Amendment Act,

standing in the name of the honourable Member for Carman (Mr. Rocan).

What is the will of the House? Is the will of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Carman?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** No? Okay. It will not remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Carman.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** I want to say a few words with respect to Bill 10, The Gaming Control Amendment Act. The first thing that I want to say is to say some positive things about the government with trying to move forward on addressing some loopholes that were there and some shortcomings in the way the Gaming Control Commission was originally set up. Clearly, as the minister has pointed out, it was set up as a relatively weak body. It has needed to have some better powers and better ability to ensure that gaming as it occurs in this province is done with more responsibility and is done with more accountability and with more transparency.

\* (15:50)

*Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

We note in a positive sense that the bill will allow the review of gaming commissions, not only those in Winnipeg or in First Nations communities, but the activities of the commissions, the gaming activities that take place, the source and application of the funds raised and disbursed in the communities, and that the commission will continue to have a clear role in the approval of licensing of personnel and the integrity of gaming in Manitoba.

We note also that the report of the Auditor General which came forward in the spring of 2003 was helpful in looking at some of the recommendations which came forward to be included in The Gaming Control Amendment Act. I would like to show thanks to the Auditor General for his efforts with respect and compliment him on the recommendations that he made that there needs to be some changes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like, however, to point out that there are some real deficiencies. First

of all, we actually agree with the critic from the Conservative Party who pointed out that there does need to be a review with respect to the costs and benefits of gaming in Manitoba. This should be a thorough review, not a cursory review.

We would certainly support an amendment which we hope the members of the Conservative Party will put forward to include a public study to evaluate and to ensure that the true costs and benefits of gaming as it occurs in Manitoba are noted. Clearly, it is in the public interest to have these costs and benefits clarified. There are some alarming studies which suggest that there are real problems with addictions, with suicides, and with all sorts of other areas in terms of the gaming that is happening here, and we should know what the situation is.

We should have, as the Conservative Party has requested, a public study that will look at this very carefully and report back to the Legislature. So we are certainly in support of that evaluation and hope that it will be done, and this act can be amended to ensure that such a study will occur.

We note under the act, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the powers of the executive director are considerably expanded. This is good in that it will provide for better authority and accountability in terms of gaming and gaming commissions and gaming establishments in Manitoba. But it also raised some interesting issues in terms of the executive director.

For example, the executive director may authorize another employee of the commission to perform any of the duties or exercise any of the powers of the executive director under this act and the regulations. Now, such a provision may be customary under certain circumstances, but we have to be very careful when we are looking at a regulatory body with respect to gaming, because the last thing we want is circumstances where either the executive director or his delegate, which is perhaps the more concerning, that the delegate might have conflicts of interest, friends or family who are involved in delivery of gaming programs, who are involved in the Manitoba lotteries commission.

One of the things that has to be very clear is a clear separation of what is the regulatory body, the gaming commission, and bodies like the Manitoba Lotteries Corporation or other bodies who are involved in gaming and promoting gaming and

advancing gaming and advertising gaming and trying to make money from gaming and trying to do all sorts of other things from gaming.

So we see a concern here that although the powers of the executive director are expanded that we do not have adequate checks and balances here in the sense that the transparency certainly with respect to conflicts is not perhaps adequate and needs to be addressed. I hope that this is something that the minister responsible for this will have a look at.

The second general point that I want to make deals with the responsible gaming policy. We in the Liberal Party are certainly in support of responsible gaming policies and making sure that gaming as it occurs is done in a responsible way and that we do everything we can to avoid problems of addiction, that we have in place the mechanisms for prevention and intervention where there could be possibilities of suicides and so on. These are matters which I think greatly concern us.

As the MLA for Inkster pointed out in his remarks on this bill, there are instances of which he has heard where there are real family problems as a result of one family member going out and gambling and spending a lot of money and causing a lot of hardship. These are the sorts of things that we have to be very, very careful of, because there needs to be an effective responsible gaming policy.

It is this point that I want to specifically spend a little bit of time on. One of the things which is lacking in this legislation is an initiative to look at the outcomes, the adverse outcomes. Now, that would be part of what would be this public review, but there needs to be an ongoing evaluation of whether there are more or fewer problems related to gaming as is occurring in Manitoba. Has the incidence of addiction gone down or up as a result of the responsible gaming policy?

Clearly, if the incidence of addiction is going up, the responsible gaming policies as they are being implemented are not working. So fundamental to be able to implement this act, fundamental to be able to deliver what we all want, which is fewer problems associated with gaming, is an ongoing measure of the number of people who are addicted, careful tracking of the problems associated with gaming in their breadth and variety, but, perhaps, we can settle for certain key indicators. What are those key indicators

which will allow us to evaluate whether there are more or fewer problems related with gaming?

The point that I want to make here is that the act should have provided for a mechanism to track key indicators of the problems of addiction, abusive gaming, suicides, if you like. We hope there are not any, but we know that there have been some in the past.

Clearly, what is fundamental to knowing whether this policy is going to be effective is whether you have an increase or a decrease in the adverse outcomes. Clearly, what we want is that the problems with gaming are going to decrease. That is the rationale for having responsible gaming. As the MLA for Fort Whyte has said, "Get rid of it." Well, that may be what one has to do if you cannot bring in a responsible gaming policy that is effective.

\*(16:00)

What I would say to the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen), who belongs to the party that so expanded gaming in this province, is that there does need to be some caution. One of the former Liberal leaders, Paul Edwards, campaigned very hard to decrease the incidence of gaming and the problems associated with it. One of the things that has to be done if we are going to continue to have gaming in this province is to have a responsible gaming policy and to know whether or not it is effective.

We have had, as we have seen in the last week, some real problems in ministers giving clear answers to very simple questions. What is the process for reporting a bear when you shoot it without a licence? Well, they cannot even answer that. The problem is that the legislation here needs to have a framework for measuring outcomes and looking at accountability and providing those reports.

I will move on to talk about certain other aspects of this legislation, the certain aspects which should have some attention as we go into committee and into third reading. The implementation of the responsible gaming policy, the operator must adopt its responsible gaming policy as soon as practicable. Well, is that a week, a month, a year, five years, ten years? I think that it would be reasonable to have some clearer phrase than as soon as practicable. The reason is that as soon as practicable in a sense gives the impression that you are trying to do this fast but

may have the reality that it is loose enough that it could be put off and put off and put off.

So we would hope that the minister looks again at this act and instead of providing a mechanism to put it off and put it off and put it off that in fact what he does is provide policy which we know that there is a clear time frame within which it needs to be implemented.

I would say that the problems which I have outlined relate to the measurement of outcomes to the deliverables. Now, the deliverable here is a responsible gaming policy. The deliverable is not a reduction in the incidence of addiction. Surely, that is what the deliverable should be. That is that we have a lower level of addiction and fewer problems from gaming. We should measure that and we should have that as our accountable deliverable, not just the introduction of a policy without any end point.

One of the other points in this legislation which I think is important to look at deals with essentially the powers of the executive director and of the gaming commission, and the mechanism for dispute resolution and appeals. I think what is the goal here of this legislation is to ensure that things are done in an accountable way, that gaming processes and practices have, as it were, technical integrity, as the law puts it, that the procedures and the personnel are licensed, and that we can track what is happening with gaming in Manitoba.

In this context, we are providing powers to the executive director or, as I have mentioned, to somebody that he delegates those powers to, but one of the problems with this legislation is with the process of ensuring that the powers of the executive director are not used in some arbitrary way to the disadvantage of somebody who is just trying to do the best they can in terms of running a gaming establishment.

Whether it is the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, whether it is a First Nations community, whether it is somebody who has a VLT in their hotel or a keno in their Laundromat, we have some concerns about that, but the point here is there needs to be, I would suggest, better protection of individuals from the arbitrary powers of the executive director and his designate. I think, clearly, one needs the ability for the executive director to act. There is the ability for the executive director and his



designates, perhaps under some circumstances, to seize equipment, to shut down facilities, et cetera, but the process here of appeal where somebody feels they have been wrongfully accused is the one that I am concerned about.

If you are going to have growth of all sorts of businesses in this province, and gaming is an example of that, then, not that we want that growth of gaming, we want growth of other businesses, but you need to provide some basis for consistency, for assurance that the arbitrary powers of the government or its designate, in this case the gaming commission, are not abused, that the person who is trying to do the right thing and to follow the procedures is not caught up in problems and suffering a severe financial burden because of an act which was taken maliciously, for example, or in other ways. We tend to think that an executive director or his designate would never act in a way that was partisan or malicious, or accidentally bad, but we know that occasionally these things can happen and there needs to be some level of protection. I express some concern that the process here may not really be as adequate as it should be in that respect.

As we look at this legislation, what I want to put on the table is that, yes, we support responsible gaming. We might want to get rid of gaming entirely in Manitoba but, to the extent that it is here, we should proceed to manage things in a more responsible, accountable and transparent way.

I do want to speak for a few minutes about some of the initiatives that the government has been involved with. We certainly are in favour of better regulation of gaming where it exists here. But we do have concerns about a government, which on the one hand is regulating but on the other hand is moving quite aggressively to bring in keno, to bring in major new, I think it is \$75 million, investments in gaming facilities and options for people to draw people in to, it would be likely that we have more addictions. That is one of the things that we are concerned about.

This expansion of gaming that this government is involved with is somewhat counter to what we had thought was the direction of the government and that was, we had thought, that the government was, in appointing a Minister of Healthy Living (Mr. Rondeau), of pointing in the direction of preventing

problems and improving health and improving lifestyle.

\* (16:10)

We are quite concerned that by making all these new investments the government is committing itself to an expansion of gaming, a potential for an increase in addictions and, we hope not, but the problem of suicides and family break-ups and all these sorts of things. These are real things and we have concerns about the way that the government is proceeding. We would certainly welcome the comments from the Minister of Healthy Living on this legislation because one would hope that his knowledge and input, and his push to prevent health problems might be brought to the Chamber, and that his advice could be considered because we believe that we should prevent problems of addiction and that this effort should have, as we have said, measurable outcomes.

My colleague from Inkster has already talked about the situation in Gilbert Park. It is one more example of the promotion of gaming activities in a way that many in the community of Gilbert Park are concerned about. Certainly, it is one of the things that we as Liberals are concerned about, a government which is on the one hand talking about promoting health and on the other hand it is expanding its gaming activities quite substantially.

So what we would raise as this bill will shortly go to committee, we raise concerns that will be, hopefully, discussed and considered carefully at the committee stage with regard to various aspects of this bill and, hopefully, in raising them, they can be addressed at committee stage. We look forward to the presenters, who will present at committee stage, in providing their advice in order to have a piece of legislation which is improved from the present version of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question before the House is the second reading of Bill 10, The Gaming Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de régie du jeu.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

### **Bill 31—The Floodway Authority Act**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Resume debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton), Bill 31, The Floodway Authority Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for River Heights, who has 28 minutes remaining.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to continue my comments on Bill 31, The Floodway Authority Act. As I had started to say before the bell rang yesterday, we on the Liberal side are certainly very supportive of the thrust of this legislation to establish a Red River Floodway Authority. We are very supportive of the effort to expand the floodway to protect the people within the city of Winnipeg as the best and most responsible option based on what we know at this point.

But, as I have indicated and want to make clear, we do believe that this process needs to be based on a very sound environmental review done under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and the relevant provincial acts, and in this context we see that Bill 31 provides for the Floodway Authority to obtain all the approvals required for the floodway expansion. We are certainly looking forward and are following the environmental review and the environmental process quite carefully.

We have, as I have indicated in my remarks on Bill 23, some concerns about the approach being taken by the NDP government. We have called for a co-operative federal-provincial panel as the most efficient and effective way to deal with this, but instead we have a Clean Environment Commission review process which has been chosen by the NDP provincial government.

We have particular concerns at the moment with this process given the politicization of the Clean Environment Commission by the appointment of political people who have been involved at a political level within the NDP who do not have the background in terms of the environment that one might have expected. Certainly, we would have seen that it would have been smart to have appointments to the Clean Environment Commission go through a legislative committee review process, in order to

ensure that people had good qualifications for the positions that they were about to take, and that the people within the Legislature had an opportunity to understand not only those qualifications but their point of view with respect to a number of matters on environmental reviews.

Second, we see it as vital that there is an adequate and appropriate compensation plan for the floodway. I have already spoken on Bill 23 and commented on the deficiencies of the government's approach, and the need to withdraw Bill 23 and come back with a better approach. We have, as I have said before, opposed the forced unionization, and we are pleased that there has been some movement on the government side in that respect.

Fourth, we want to make sure that there is a clear plan for the operation of the floodway and that, you know to the extent that one does not always know what may happen in the event of a flood, that where the operating protocols are deviated from, there really is a better approach to making sure that those who feel they have been affected by the changes in the operating procedure, their considerations can be taken into account.

Now I speak, for example, with regard to the concerns of people living north of the city of Winnipeg, that this last year the timing of the opening of the floodway coincided very precisely with the buildup of the ice, and that this may have resulted in an increase in flooding. *[interjection]* The MLA for Selkirk is speaking to be very dismissive of this point of view. The MLA from Selkirk, certainly, is of one opinion, that is, that the timing of the floodway had nothing to do at all with the level of water that was achieved downstream. But what we see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that there needs to a more independent approach to establishing this.

Let me give you one of the problems that we have in this respect. Most of the major engineering firms, I understand, are involved in the construction of the floodway, those who are in Manitoba. So, clearly, we need an independent review of not including somebody who has a conflict of interest because they are on the side of constructing or building the floodway. We need an important and independent assessment.

\* (16:20)

So, without drawing conclusions about whether or not the flooding north of the floodway was due to the operation of the floodway, clearly, what we are saying is that there needs to be a process to ensure that an assessment is made in a way that has some level of independence, and that there is an ability of government to listen and to understand, rather than to jump to conclusions, as the MLA from Selkirk does without having the full basis of knowledge and the full basis of investigation and research in relationship to this.

I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are two items with regard to Bill 31 which should be considered with some particular care at the committee stage. First of all, one of the concerns that has been raised and needs to be looked at is the scope of the Floodway Authority mandate. Let me give you an example. I was down south of the floodway and looking at an area where, when the Seine River Diversion drop structure was put in—and this was, I think, about two years ago—it was put in without a one-way valve, so there is a potential for water in the floodway to flow out of the floodway south and to flood people.

The concern I have is that, if the mandate is too restrictive, people who are affected by flows going out of the floodway rather than down the floodway may not be fully protected, and may not be fully considered. Certainly, from the feedback that I have had from some of the meetings, when certain aspects of other communities south of the floodway are considered—Rosenort, Ste. Agathe, St. Adolphe, Niverville, Grand Point, and so on—they are being told that the Floodway Authority is not sure whether it really has any mandate, which is important in a sense to them, or can assure them that in a 1-in-700-year flood they would really be protected.

The interesting thing about the profile of the level of the flood that would be present in a 1-in-700-year, is that the profile for the region from Aubigny south to the U.S. border is such that it is only a short level above the profile of a '97 flood, the flood of the century but, as one gets closer and closer to Winnipeg, the flood profile deviates further and further from a '97-year flood. So we get the potential for communities like Ste. Agathe, St. Adolphe, Niverville, Grand Point to not be protected in a way that communities further south like Emerson and St. Jean Baptiste are protected.

The result then is that when you look at this profile one has a concern that, in fact, part of what is happening by building up the dikes and the structures and the protection of Winnipeg is that one is artificially, as it were, holding back water and that people in Ste. Agathe and St. Adolphe and so on may be affected largely because of the fact that the water is held back rather than being able to flow through as fast as it might.

This is a situation which would occur in a 1-in-700-year flood. Certainly we are in favour of making sure that there is appropriate compensation but we also feel that there should be a guarantee for people in these communities which are in the flood plain where they have dikes now which were built up to a '97 plus two year level that they will, in fact, be protected in a 1-in-700-year flood.

We are concerned that the plans, at the moment, do not seem to provide that sort of guarantee for these communities with respect to a 1-in-700-year flood. This of course creates inequities. It creates circumstances where businesses might be concerned about investing, as the member from Emerson well knows, in communities like Ste. Agathe or Rosenort or St. Adolphe. Over the long run we need to have a careful look at this situation and make sure that communities are not disadvantaged by being partly protected, as it were, in the case of a 1-in-700-year flood whereas other communities are protected.

There needs to be a vision for ensuring that there is the protection and that that protection occurs for communities like Rosenort, Ste. Agathe, St. Adolphe, Niverville, Grand Point, where right now there are concerns, as indeed was pointed out not all that long ago in a very good article in the *Steinbach Carillon*.

So I think that it is very important that we look carefully at the mandate of the Floodway Authority as this goes to committee and look at these questions carefully because I think that all of us, when it really came down to it, would want to make sure that communities were treated fairly and that certain communities were not disadvantaged with respect to others just because of the nature of the design of what is being planned.

The second area that I would look for some input and some comment has to do with provisions in this act which deal with protection from liability of

members of the board of directors and the officers and employees of the Floodway Authority. Now, I understand that there needs to be some level of protection, whether it is insurance or what have you, for people who are employed by the Floodway Authority. Normally, a board of directors might have insurance for their directors or something like that in case something untoward happened. But to have a legislated approach which says that there is no responsibility or no liability for members who are on the board of directors raises some real issues in terms of accountability.

I think that, although the members who serve may do it in the best interests of people and trying to do the very best they can, that the experience with corporations and, as I have had, with boards is that you need to have some processes that ensure a level of accountability. So I would hope that these clauses would be looked carefully and I am sure the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) is well versed in corporate accountability and board accountability and may have some productive suggestions in this area. I will look forward to those when he speaks to this bill at some point.

What I would say here is that there needs to be a level of personal responsibility and accountability, and it needs to be very clear what the mechanism is for that and to ensure that when we are looking at this legislation and the operation of the Floodway Authority that these matters are taken into account carefully.

The last point that I would like to make is this: We are now four and a half years after the NDP government, our present government, was first elected. We are now only just setting up a floodway authority. This is something clearly which is of urgent importance. We hope that the 1-in-700-year flood does not happen for a long, long, long time, many hundreds of years, but we have to be cognizant that the risks are there and that the sooner this is accomplished in terms of protecting Winnipeg, the better.

Certainly, as we have seen this process unveiled by the government over the last four and a half years, there are many areas where this process could have gone more quickly, could have proceeded in a way that would have us further advanced than we are now. I say this, that it is important even as we push to do this in an urgent way that all matters are looked at very carefully.

\* (16:30)

I would repeat what I had said earlier, just for emphasis, on Bill 23. There are many people whom I have talked to who have been involved in floods, with a lot of experience. Their experience should be taken into account to ensure that what we build here protects not only the city of Winnipeg, but treats people north and south of Winnipeg fairly and looks after and ensures that environmental problems, where they occur, are mitigated or compensated.

We are quite concerned about issues of ground water, knowing that there were major problems with the initial building of the floodway and clearly with the fact that the depth of the floodway is not to be enlarged all that much more than at present. Hopefully, these will not occur, but, nevertheless, even two feet could have effects on ground water. We want to make sure that these matters are looked at very carefully and considered and that people who may be affected are not hurt, or, if they are, that there is an appropriate place of compensation. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** I, too, would like to be able to stand up and put a number of words on the record on The Floodway Authority Act, Bill 31. It is, as the Leader of the Liberal Party has said, a bill which we support. It is a positive piece of legislation.

It is acknowledging a change from the past to what is the future as opposed to having an authority where we will have a Crown corporation with a much clearer, I believe, mandate, a mandate that is different from before and in most part a very positive mandate, the primary reason why it is that we feel very comfortable in supporting this.

It is important that we be very clear in terms of our positions in regard to the floodway, because sometimes governments or others will try to distort them, but, as it has been pointed out, the floodway, the corporation in this particular bill, but most importantly the floodway expansion itself is something in which the Manitoba Liberal Party is very much in favour of. We recognize the value. The value cannot be underestimated.

As I had a chance to speak on Bill 23 yesterday, I talked about the ramifications of government not taking action to be able to prevent possible floods in the future. We made mention of the original flood-

way being built, best known as Duff's Ditch, and how Winnipeggers have benefited tremendously over the years as we have had a series of floods since the original floodway was constructed. As a result of that floodway being there, literally hundreds, probably millions of dollars, I suspect, would go into the billions that have actually been saved as a direct result of the floodway that we have today.

We can talk in terms of the future. By having this floodway expand that extra two feet, as has been pointed out in the media and inside the Chamber and outside the Chamber, what we are talking about is an additional two feet that will, in essence, protect Winnipeg, they say, in the 1-in-700-year flood. I am not a statistician myself, but I suspect that that should provide a great deal of comfort to a lot of Winnipeggers, if not all Manitobans, because as I pointed out yesterday, the floods, water will come and then it will go, and the individuals most directly impacted are the ones where the water has done some damage. Where it has done that damage, that flood remains on. Not only does it have that social impact, it ruins summers for people, the financial costs and so forth.

So I think that it is most appropriate that, given the very nature and the very size of the floodway and its increased responsibility for protection over the next number of years, that, indeed, it is appropriate that we move towards a Crown. What I really like about the legislation, other than the fact that it is moving towards a Crown corporation, is that it ensures that the expansion is carried out in a manner that provides increased benefits to the community.

I think that we do under-utilize the current floodway. I think there are a great number of ideas that are out there that we should be attempting to tap into. The type of ideas that I am referring to are specifically, I guess, would be recreational types of activities, other activities or other things that the floodway might be able to provide for Manitobans. It can do more than just divert water, I believe, at the time of floods. It is such a huge project. The amount of land is significant.

I am not too sure to what degree the floodway is used today outside of just diversion of water. I really have not had people, at least inside the Chamber heard that sort of a debate in terms of that alternative usage. I would welcome it. In fact, I would suggest to you that we should not only have the debate here, and I suspect that the Floodway Authority, soon to

be a Crown, will in fact try to consult the public. I am recall seeing a press release that I believe went out, I think it was by the Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton), talking about other possible activities. I think those are really encouraging to see.

I think that there is merit for us to have some public, more formal public discussions quite possibly on things that could be brought into it. In the wintertime, to what degree do we allow for snowboarding or skiing, or just walkways or ice rinks, or whatever it might be? A lot of people want to see the city of Winnipeg become more of a winter type of city so that we have lots of activities for people.

Well, in the wintertime, I think that we should be looking at the floodway and how we could best use the floodway. There are so many activities that could be generated, you know, Ski-Doos; I make mention to other, whether it is skiing, skating, snowboarding, whatever it might be. I think that we need to hear from the public as to what sorts of things they would like to see in the floodway.

You know, I do not think that we should be limited to the ideas, that there might be even potential for some private-sector involvement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of assisting in those different types of activities. We could take other times of the year that, when we do have floods and there is a need to divert that water, it does put some limitations, I would obviously, and we all would, recognize; but, in years in which there is no water diversion, are there other things that we can be doing in the floodway?

\* (16:40)

I met with a group of young people, and I have one youth in particular, Jenny, who is a very outspoken young adult. She says, "You know, what the young people want to see is they want to see more skate parks." Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suspect that if the opportunity was there to make use of our floodway—again we have to look at the financial costs of doing something of this nature—maybe you can have some sort of a youth theme on skateboarding during the summertime.

We want to be able to create activities. Well, this might be the type of activity that would go a long way in helping our youth do things that they really

want to be able to do, to be able to hang out with their skateboards and do whatever else they might want to be able to do. So one of the biggest and the strongest pluses, I truly believe, to Bill 31—and it states right in the Mandate section—is that it does have a role in terms of looking at and providing increased benefits to the community. I interpret that mandate as what I have just finished commenting on, that increased mandate includes that recreational type of facility.

Obviously, we are concerned and we do not have the monopoly on the concern. We can appreciate that Manitobans as a whole are concerned about the impact of the environment. Whenever you move or re-allocate the type of dirt and the amount that we are doing, it has a fairly profound impact on the environment.

For many people, they might look at it from its simplest form, that it is just kind of pushing a little bit of dirt here, a little bit of dirt there, but what the reality is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that it has a huge impact on the environment. I think that what we need to see is very much a high sense of co-operation. Just because we are reforming the corporation does not necessarily mean that the role of the Province is done with and that the role of the federal government and, in fact, the municipal government is done with. There are still other responsibilities, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have dealing with the environment.

We have to be very concerned about our environment, and if we can get the different parties onside as much as possible, working together, we might be able to ensure that this project gets done in such a fashion in which people will feel very comfortable that the environment is indeed being protected.

I know, as the Leader of the Liberal Party has emphasized, it is critically important that we respect the process and the different environmental laws that are there and that we do not necessarily attempt in any fashion to cross any of those laws, that we follow the process, give due diligence, and where it is possible, that the different levels of government should, in fact, be working especially in that whole environmental realm, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I think that that is something in which we hope to see, very much so. It is interesting, as much as we support the floodway corporation or the creation of

it, there has been a great deal of concern, I believe, not only in the opposition benches, because I suspect out of the 20 members or 19 members of the opposition that you will find that everyone is virtually in sync.

I would suggest to you that you might have even had some members of the New Democratic caucus that were very much concerned about one aspect that I would like to spend a bit of time on. That is the whole idea of how the government was trying to institute a union-only policy on the floodway. It kind of puts a bit of a black mark on this whole process. It is interesting if you look at it. The Premier today tried to say, "Well, now it is only the forced union dues." He tries to give the impression that this has had nothing to do with the government of the day, that the government of the day just kind of stepped back and allowed this whole process to work its way through.

But Wally Fox-Decent has done great service to this Chamber, whether it is today or in the past, and he has bailed governments out of problematic situations in the past. I suspect, knowing the tendency of this government, that Mr. Fox-Decent will have more work in the future, because this government tends to mess up probably more than we would like to see.

Having said that, what we are really talking about is the way in which the initial reports came out about how the floodway was going to be expanded. The government was very clear in its position. It was very clear. The position of the government was that if you wanted to assist in any fashion as a worker on the expansion of the floodway you had to be a member of a union.

That was the origin of it. Let there be no doubt that the government supported that. When I say the government, I am really talking about the Cabinet. The Cabinet supported that because I do not believe that the backbenchers were made aware of it. I think they were even kind of caught offside. I remember the discussions inside the Chamber as at times you get some heckling inside the Chamber, and sometimes there is a little bit of chastising. I at times even participate in some of the chastising that takes place. I can recall vividly saying to others, you watch, it is not going to be forced unionization, that the government has made a mistake, to some of the NDP backbenchers. I had indicated to those

members, but it is okay, Wally will fix things for you. It will not be unionized workers, because the government has made a mistake. It was that clear in my eyes.

Well, why it was so clear that it would not happen is because the government recognized, and I do not know how they got themselves into that corner, but the government itself recognized that it made a huge, huge mistake when it made or it clearly implied that it wanted to see mandatory union people only digging in the expansion of the floodway. That was the position.

They knew shortly after it came out that Manitobans would turn on them. I knew that because it was shortly after, we are talking about within days, when we first heard about it. I was at an event. I was sitting at a table, and I had one individual that came up to me after I was introduced and said, "You know something," and he indicated that he was a member of a union. He has been a member of a union for many years, and he says that the NDP have gone too far, that they should not have said this, that it is not fair to non-union workers. You know what? I had taken that over that weekend, and I do not know if it was a few days or whatever was, then I raised the question to the Minister of Labour (Ms. Allan). I asked the Minister of Labour, how is it that she could actually claim to represent the non-union members of Manitoba's society or of Manitoba's workforce when her government is saying that if you are not a union member you cannot work on the floodway itself.

I do not know how she could actually be a Minister of Labour when that sort of government policy that states so clearly that if you are not a union member you cannot work on the floodway. So that was the policy of the government. Then what did they do?

They recognized, shortly thereafter, that oops we have hit a landmine or something of a very similar nature on this issue. So, what did they do? They called the 1-800-Wally-Fox-Decent line and Wally came to the rescue. We, as many expected, knew that the government would have their hand slapped on this one and they did. Mr. Fox-Decent was very clear that the government was, in fact, wrong, that you should not be forcing people to be members of the union.

\* (16:50)

Well, you know what, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was not a shocker. I suspect there were over one million people in this province that were quite pleased to hear that. The only ones that might have been a little bit concerned would have been the Cabinet of this government. They are the only ones, I believe, that were a little bit disappointed with Wally because maybe if Wally would have said yes, then they might have been able to sell it and they would have been able to appeal maybe to a few of those. I just underline the words "a few" of the union elite in which this particular Premier is so close.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know that is why when we take a look at the corporation or this bill, we can support the bill, but we want this government to realize that it is this government that had already, in its infancy, put such a large black mark already. That is why I am, for one, grateful that Mr. Fox-Decent did take it on and was able to come forward with a recommendation that, ultimately, Manitobans, I believe, will support, at least in good part. There still are some concerns about the union dues or fees or however it is that you might want to call it. We hope that the right thing is done on that issue.

I recall standing up and asking the question in terms of ensuring that no union dues actually leave the province in regard to the floodway. There is a huge cost. We are talking hundreds of millions of dollars of expenditure. This is what that corporation is going to be responsible for, hundreds of millions of dollars. That is why it is important that there be good processes put into place. There is the board that is being appointed. My understanding is that it is going to be a five, I believe it is a five-person board. It would be good to get a better sense in terms of how the makeup of that board is going to be. I believe it is appointed through the L-G. The L-G appoints the Chair and quite possibly, as I say, we would like to be able to hear a little bit more from the government in terms of that.

It is important that there are some checks put in place as the Leader of the Liberal Party has talked about, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We look forward to the government possibly adding some more comments in regards to that. So all in all, when I see Bill 31, I see a very positive bill. As many bills could possibly be made a little bit better, it would be nice to actually see this bill go into committee at some point. I look forward to hearing other comments from other members on this bill. In particular, I really hope that

we will get comments in regard to the usage of the floodway. I think we are ready to take it to the next step. I think we owe a great deal of gratitude for the vision that former Premier Roblin had in terms of creating the original ditch, or floodway—it is a lot larger than a ditch—the original floodway. Now, with us expanding it, I really do think there is a great deal of benefit.

I think the real next step here is to not only think about the diversion of water but to take that landmark—

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** You have to watch in terms of quickly trying to pass this bill, you know that. I think you might even have other speakers that want to speak to it and I would defend their ability to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do think there is a need for us to be able to take it to the next step. That next step, I would suggest to you, is finding alternative usages when we are not using the floodway for water diversion. I commented on some. There are so many other things that it can be used for. That is why I would appeal to others to talk about that, because I made reference to some; I think there are others. I really, truly think that you could, for example, have everything from gardens to different types of farming, and so forth.

With those few words, because I know the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) is hopeful that he would also be able to speak to the bill possibly today, or possibly others, we are prepared to allow the bill to go to committee, or if other members want to be able to speak on it.

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise and put a few comments on the record for the floodway amendment act.

I congratulate the government for taking the initiative to try and ensure that the city of Winnipeg will not be flooded in the future. I think that is a commendable action and I think it behooves all of us to ensure that 600 000 or better people in the province of Manitoba would be protected from flooding.

However, I want to say this. If we as a province would take that 700 or probably even a billion

dollars that will be spent on building a larger floodway around the city to try and dump water into northern Manitoba, whether it is used for hydro development or whatever, is in my view the wrong approach to flood protection.

I think we have an absolutely great opportunity in this province to make use of that water in a meaningful way. If we would spend half a billion dollars, spend this on water storage, this province would take on a different mosaic in total. Not only would our population patterns change but our employment patterns would change. Our social structures would change in this province.

I think the Shellmouth Dam is such a perfect example of how water can be controlled, regulated and used downstream for industrial development, for social activities, for recreational activities and many other things. Yet there seems to be a stigma in government. I am not pointing any fingers at any given parties that have governed. We, as the Conservative Party, were as guilty as anybody for refusing to spend money on storing water. Look at the high Souris. If you built the high Souris dam, look at what could happen on the Souris River. Look at the huge recreational opportunities there, if you did it there.

Secondly, if you built a dam on some of the tributaries running into the Souris River. You know, there are tremendous opportunities there. Look at the potato industry that could be developed there, because it has the kind of soil that lends itself well to potato production. But there is not enough water currently as we speak to allow for that industry to be developed. Look at the vegetable production opportunities, if you had the irrigation water on that sandy soil, immense opportunity. Look at the population switches and changes and additions that you would create if you created the employment opportunities through those kinds of processes by storing water.

\* (17:00)

I will give you another example. No matter who governs, in the very near future there will have to be attention paid to building two dams on the Pembina River: one in North Dakota and one in Manitoba. The reason that it will have to be done is not so much for flood protection, although it would be a tremendous benefit to the city of Winnipeg for flood protection to control those flows of water all down



that Pembina, because you get a rush of water almost every spring, which lends to very high water levels on the Red, and then, during flood events such as '97, it adds substantially to the level of water in the Red River Valley.

That has been proven by engineers' studies that the Red River Valley Water Commission did. That engineering study demonstrates that you would have lowered the water level on the dike in Winnipeg, in 1997, by a foot to a foot and a half. Do you know what that would have prevented? We would not have had to build the Z-dike if that would have happened.

Look at the immense saving that would have occurred right there in that one event. I see the most important one, the most important issue is the storage of water to supply the growing towns of Altona, Winkler, Morden. There is some better than 20 000 people living in that area, probably 30 000 people living in that area, and growing immensely every year. It is the largest growth area in all of Manitoba over the last decade.

Look at the huge number of houses that are being built in Winkler as we speak. It is the fastest growing community. Altona and Morden are second and third in respect to that growth. What will happen in that area, very shortly? Should we have a drought here, no water. No water to service those communities. What will we do then? Then we will take emergency actions, spend huge amounts of money to see that we get water to that area when you could, in fact, build two dams at roughly about \$200 million. I have spoken to the governor about that of North Dakota and he agrees that we should do that.

He said, "Will Manitoba participate if we move in that direction?" I said, "I think we have no choice but to."

So it behooves all of us to do some proper planning. As North Dakota is doing now, as Minnesota is doing now, I believe they have built some 13 structures already and there are some 8 to 12 new structures being built and planned as we currently speak to conserve and hold back water. Once all of those are in place, if we in Manitoba would do the same thing, the other great potential we have is on the Roseau River. The upper Roseau River, the start of the Roseau River, has a fairly large plateau that was drained a number of years ago for agricultural purposes. Minnesota is now talking

about putting dams in there and storing a large amount of water at the headwaters of the Roseau.

We have a perfect opportunity on the border of Minnesota, in the Gardenton area where the Gardenton dikes are right now, to build a huge storage area out of that which could store large amounts of water. Then let that water flow on a regular basis during the summer and winter months to supply water to communities downstream. For what? That area, again, is so suited for specialty crop production, for all kinds of industrial development, if we would only have the water resources on a continuing basis to be able to do it.

We could go to a number of other areas in the community. I look at the Assiniboine River at Holland. If you built that Holland dam, look at the resources you would have, look at the tremendous opportunity that you would have for flowing water on a continual basis downstream. You would have the Shellmouth, you would have the Souris and there are a number of other smaller dams that could be built. Look at the control you could have. You would virtually have no floods at all on the Assiniboine anymore. It would have to be a rare event to cause flooding if it was managed properly. I say the same thing could be done on the Red River with dams on the Pembina on the U.S. side and in Manitoba on the Roseau side. You could virtually control or cause the virtual elimination of the major floods.

Yet we are willing to spend \$700 million to just dump it downstream. Look at the potential for Hydro. If they could use all that storage basin that we can develop on those rivers to flow water on a much more regular basis into their Hydro system, look at the huge advantage instead of just using Lake Winnipeg, Lake Manitoba, the Winnipeg River system out of the Lake of the Woods and the northern flows that we get out of the Saskatchewan River and a number of the other rivers, the Burntwood River system. If we would only allow ourselves to think properly, if we would only allow ourselves to plan properly instead of wasting this money on building another huge ditch to see that we get the water into that lake at a much higher speed than we do today.

I think all of us owe it to our future generations that we start planning in that direction. I blame myself. I have been here 16 years now. I should have been far more ardent in my approach to this kind of

development because all of us would see the benefits of that in the very, very near future. I mean 10 years is such a small time to do it, but if we would amortize this over a 40- or 50-year period and not allow our minds to say, "Oh, we have got to do this all in one year, we have to spend all this money, or raise all this \$300 million that we are going to spend on the Pembina in one year." It precludes us from doing anything. So let us look in an organized manner, let us develop a mechanism that would allow us to charge this off in the future, on the future benefits, on the growth potential that we would develop out of this. That would only make sense.

So I needed to get this off my chest. I have been meaning to say this for a long, long time. I think it is time that all of us started a new-think when it comes to water resources and dealing with excess water and dealing with droughts because you would accomplish both of them. You would get rid of the high water levels in high-flow times and you conserve the water to protect yourself in drought areas. Secondly, you would have a major impact, and I do not care what the engineers say, the engineers are engineers, they will try and direct us as politicians to what they do best and that is build stuff. I would say let us redirect them to build what we see as societal needs in the future. I think then we will start developing the real Manitoba and the real potential that this province has. Thank you.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question before the House is the second reading of Bill 31, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton), The Floodway Authority Act; Loi sur la Commission du canal de dérivation.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

### **Bill 33—The Public Servants Insurance Amendment Act**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), Bill 33, The Public Servants Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur

l'assurance des employés du gouvernement, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

Is there unanimous consent that the bill remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** No. Denied.

**Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to say that this is a relatively innocuous act in terms of what is written in it. The issue with this piece of legislation will be how it is applied. It gives some powers to the Minister of Finance to expand the scope in terms of who belongs to the government benefit package. While, in principle, we are not opposed to that, we will be interested in listening to the minister explain at committee just whom he intends to have this legislation apply to. So, based on that, we are prepared to see this bill passed through to committee, so we can get our questions answered by the minister at that time.

\* (17:10)

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

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I, too, want to put a few words on the record before we pass it into committee.

As the member from Fort Whyte has accurately pointed out, it is not a complicated bill per se, but I do think that there would have been an opportunity for the government to provide some sort of a cost analysis or a spreadsheet of sorts with this particular bill so that it would better enable members of opposition, in fact, all members, the opportunity to have a better sense of what the costs really are.

So having that kind of information would definitely be beneficial in hopes that government would recognize that. The civil service is absolutely essential, as we all know. I do not know what the actual numbers are. There is some concern that, as government revenues have grown, we suspect that

the civil service in itself has grown. Expanding the classes of employees that can participate in an insurance plan is a positive thing. For that reason, we do not have a problem with this bill going into committee.

With the civil service and the size of the civil service, you know, it has always got to be a concern when you have a government of this nature in charge as to the direction it is taking the civil service, and where the civil service specifically has experienced growth in other areas where maybe the civil service should have been growing a little bit more, or vacancies within the civil service that have gone without being filled.

You know, I could go to the question that I had posed earlier today where the government was given that D minus from a national group. In comparison to the other provinces, we ranked No. 9 out of 10. One of the reasons for that was the fact that they were concerned about vacancies not being filled, that are in fact there, vacancies in the civil service which are quite relevant, I would suggest to you.

One has to be very cognizant of the fact that at times government does expand in certain areas of the civil service. One could talk about other departments, or we could focus on, as I say, the question that I had posed and ask for the government to really re-assess its civil service in that area. I know I had one call in regard to the bear question that I had asked. People might be surprised that there are a number of people that do actually watch the proceedings of this Legislature during Question Period, and he had given me a call and indicated that he had had some discussions with conservation officers and that there have been some cutbacks in the civil service on conservation officers.

Well, those cutbacks in the civil service, and again I cannot say for sure because this is just something which this particular individual had expressed to me, indicating that he had talked to a conservation officer where there were some cutbacks in the civil service in that area.

One has to be very much concerned in terms of the civil service and the general direction that we are moving in because tax dollars are scarce. We have to be responsible. There are areas where we need to ensure that we invest more into civil service, i.e.,

registered nurses or health care professionals. There are other areas in which maybe we can have somewhat of a shifting.

I think we have to be open to it, even though the bill itself is actually fairly straightforward. We do not have a problem in terms of it going to committee at this stage, but I just wanted to highlight those concerns that I have.

With that, we are prepared to see the bill go to committee.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 33, The Public Servants Insurance Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion? *[Agreed]*

#### **Bill 34—The University of Winnipeg Amendment Act**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Advanced Education and Training (Ms. McGifford), Bill 34, The University of Winnipeg Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Université de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

Is there unanimous consent that this bill remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Unanimous consent has not been given. Denied.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** I was also wanting to put a few words on the record in regard to Bill 31.

The University of Winnipeg has played a critical role, as all universities have, in our province. What was really recent with the University of Winnipeg was that there was an appointment of a very high-

profile Manitoban in the name of Lloyd Axworthy. I think Lloyd Axworthy brings a lot to the University of Winnipeg. There is no reason why we should not be thinking of the grander scheme in terms of how the University of Winnipeg's role can be further enhanced.

I realize this particular bill deals with the disciplinary matters of an academic nature. Having said that, the University of Winnipeg, I, for one, did have the opportunity to take classes at the University of Winnipeg. It is a great university. I highly recommend it to all.

**An Honourable Member:** Did you graduate?

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Actually, I did not quite finish graduation. I got elected and, I guess, once I got elected—it was in '88. Oh, no. I am sounding like the Member for Interlake (Mr. Nevakshonoff). I guess it is a confession of sorts.

**An Honourable Member:** What is the process for that?

**Mr. Lamoureux:** You know, I do not want to get too much off topic here.

All in all, it is a positive bill. There is no reason why we cannot see the bill go to committee. Members, I know, want me to keep my comments brief. I will keep my comments brief because I understand that people want to get on to other pieces of legislation. I just wanted to be able to highlight the fact that we have a really good opportunity here with the University of Winnipeg.

I hope and trust that government will not only work with the University of Winnipeg, but other universities, show as much interest in the University of Winnipeg as it has in regard to the university they are proposing for Thompson, to demonstrate that, when we have some positive things happening, we do what we can to promote it. This particular bill, as I say, deals with disciplinary matters. It is something that is important at our universities. We look forward to this bill actually going into committee, and if there is other feedback, for it to be heard at that time.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

\* (17:20)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question before the House is the second reading of Bill 34, The University of Winnipeg Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Université de Winnipeg.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered. The Chair declares the motion carried.

### Bill 35—The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), Bill 35, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les caisses populaires et les credit unions.

Is there unanimous consent for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck)?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Consent denied.

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to put a few words on the record in regard to Bill 35, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act. This act is basically a review of the industry's ongoing review of their own act; as well, it is supported by the industry, industry-driven.

There have been numerous consultations throughout the province with the credit unions and caisses populaires. They are in support of this bill. It allows them to conduct their affairs in a more appropriate and timely manner.

There is unanimous agreement on our side to pass this bill to committee.

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

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, actually I have a few words that I would like to be able to put on Bill 35, because I truly believe that credit unions are very important to Manitobans. We need to talk about the benefits of our credit unions. Over the last number of years our major banks have been closing down all over the place.

I think there has been a lack of confidence from many Manitobans. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there have been many branches, I should say, that have closed down in north Winnipeg and, I would suggest, in other areas of the city. The local residents, I have seen rallies. I have even seen New Democrats kind of get charged up in trying to make sure that those banks stay alive in the communities.

I applaud that action, but do you know what the reality is, Mr. Deputy Speaker? All the action from politicians and local residents where those banks have closed down has really, for all intents and purposes, gone for naught in the sense that the banks did close down. *[interjection]* As someone has pointed out, they are gone.

But you know what Mr. Deputy Speaker? Our credit unions have really come to bat for us, or stepped up to the plate, and they have hit a home run, quite frankly. And you know what? I suspect that what we are going to see is that the growth in our credit unions will continue, because I think Manitobans recognize how the banks have not done the job that our credit unions have done because, as the banks have been shutting down branches, the credit unions have been opening up.

You know what? The Steinbach Credit Union, I think, has moved into Winnipeg. That is a clear demonstration of how Steinbach adds not only to Steinbach's economic development, but to the Capital Region.

That is why this bill provides us with the opportunity to speak out and pat them on the back, absolutely. The credit unions have done so much for our province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we need to acknowledge that. You know, I have had the opportunity for the first time out of a bit of frustration—

**An Honourable Member:** You robbed a bank?

**Mr. Lamoureux:** No confession on robbing banks. Banks might have robbed me, I must say, but I did not rob the banks, in terms of service fees, I am referring to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the first time in the last election, I instructed that we want to use our campaign fund coming from a local credit union, as opposed to a bank because you know what—*[interjection]* No. No. It is the principle we are talking about. It is the principle—

**An Honourable Member:** It is the interest, not the principal.

*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*

**Mr. Lamoureux:** And I have been paying interest, I must say, too. The credit union has really come to bat for us and, Mr. Speaker, the credit unions have very much so filled in in many areas in which the banks have let us down. You know something? I think that, in fact, one could come up—and I throw this as a suggestion—that maybe we should be coming up with some sort of a resolution, a resolution that commends the efforts of our credit unions in the province.

Whether it is Cambrian, whether it is Astra, whether it is Steinbach, you know, the Holy Ghost, there are a number of credit unions—*[interjection]* Someone has challenged me to name all the credit unions. Well, to be honest, I could not name all the credit unions, but you know what? That is a positive thing. There are so many credit unions in Manitoba and, as I say, they are growing. I do not know them all by heart. But you know what? We do have an umbrella group and that umbrella group of the credit unions has done a fabulous job.

One of the issues that the credit unions have brought to the table and, in fact, just recently, Mr. Speaker, is the whole pension issue. The credit unions have taken issue with what this government is doing in regard to the pension issue and how the pension issue is being dealt in Saskatchewan. So I would suggest to you that maybe the government needs to do a little bit more work with the credit unions.

I do not believe I am going to be able to conclude my remarks this afternoon, but if there is other House business that has to be dealt with, I am

prepared to—[interjection] Well, if there is other House business, I do not mind being interrupted to get the House business dealt with, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to be able to continue with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, when we see some of the direct involvement of our credit unions that go even beyond just providing banking services, it provides policy initiatives and ideas for government to consider. One of those issues of consideration was, in fact, the pension issue.

I suspect that there are a number of the government NDP members that have actually received correspondence from local credit union people dealing with issues; in particular, the issue of pensions. If there are members that have responded to those credit unions, I would applaud that, but I know that there is a great deal of concern that they are not addressing that unit or that issue.

As I say, I somewhat digress. The emphasis, I believe, is more so in terms of how important it is that we promote and do what we can to ensure that our credit unions continue to grow in the province of Manitoba.

When I see Bill 35, even though there might be some concerns, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that it is a bill which we could see go to committee. Whether it goes to committee today or it goes to committee on Monday, it really does not matter, but I think what is important is that we make sure the credit unions are aware of this particular piece of legislation—I suspect they likely are—so that they can possibly make presentation.

\* (17:30)

In that sense, we do look forward to hearing any presentation on this particular bill inside committee. You will find that, as in the past, we are probably more open to government in terms of being able to—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order, or House business?

### House Business

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader):** On a matter of House business, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** On a matter of House business. Okay.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** I just have to announce a committee change. I am just wondering if there is leave not to see the clock in order to deal with the report to the Assembly concerning MLA pay, allowances and retirement benefits.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to not see the clock to deal with Legislative Assembly Management Commission pay, allowances and retirement benefits? [Agreed]

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Mr. Speaker, is there leave to revert back to tabling of reports?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to revert back to tabling of reports, so I can table a report? [Agreed]

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Mr. Speaker:** I am tabling the report: Recommendations to the Legislative Assembly concerning the Report for MLA Pay, Allowances and Retirement Benefits 2004, the recommendations to the Commissioner.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Speaker:** Okay. Before we go too far, I just want to remind the House that we are already past 5:30, so the honourable member who was speaking to the bill, when that matter is again before the House the honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) will have 22 minutes remaining on that bill when it comes back before the House.

\*\*\*

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach),

WHEREAS the members of the Legislative Assembly assert that salary increases are not appropriate at this time, recognizing the difficulties that are being faced by Manitobans as a result of economic conditions including the BSE issue, the Assembly recommends that the Commissioner on MLA Allowances review the section regarding recommendations for salary increases with a view of deferring them at this time. We therefore respectfully reject the report to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Mackintosh), seconded by the honourable Member for Russell,

WHEREAS the members of the Legislative Assembly assert that salary increases are not appropriate—

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Mr. Speaker:** Dispense.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

**Mr. Mackintosh:** On the motion, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Oh, on the motion. I am sorry. You want to speak to the motion?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Okay. We will speak to it and then I will move the motion after.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Mr. Speaker, I will not speak on the substance of the report. The motion succinctly puts forward the views of LAMC to the House as required by the act, but I think it is very important at this time that we just take a moment to reflect on the tremendous effort and work, the insights, the research, the difficult options that the Commissioner had to deal with and how he put so much work into this report.

I think it speaks very, very highly of the skills of Mr. Backman and his dedication to his appointment as Commissioner. Obviously, these are very difficult issues to be dealt with. Indeed, I would suggest that the issue of salaries is one that will be of continuing difficulty, I suspect, but he did put forward, in his view, after considering the evidence and views of others, what he thought was appropriate, and I think that he has to be commended. I think the rejection of the report and the basis on which it is rejected should in no way reflect on the effort, the integrity and the skills and insights that Mr. Backman brought to his job.

So I say congratulations to Mr. Backman. I think we have to say job well done, and thank you very much on behalf of the public of Manitoba and the MLAs.

**Mr. Leonard Derkach (Opposition House Leader):** I join with the Minister of Justice, the Government House Leader, in extending our congratulations and our appreciation of the hard work that was done in compiling this report by the Commissioner, Mr. Earl Backman.

I know this is no easy task. This is one of those difficult tasks that we have to go through from time to time. Not only is it an uneasy issue for us as MLAs to deal with, but I am sure that for Mr. Backman, in doing the research and the work, and the comparisons that he has had to do in examining what the compensation issues should consist of, it, indeed, must have been an arduous and a difficult time. So, on behalf of our party, and I think on behalf of members of this Legislature and on behalf of people in Manitoba, I would have to say that Mr. Backman did an admirable job.

Our rejection of the report is no reflection of the valued recommendations that he has put forward, but rather it is an issue that we have to consider as legislators in Manitoba at this time.

When many of our farmers in this province are facing the prospect of not being able to continue their livelihoods, and when the economic situation in Manitoba is as it is, when we have the challenges in health care that we do, it is only important for us to be mindful of those things and to consider that against the recommendations that were presented to us.

So I think that this is not meant to be any kind of a slight on the work that Mr. Backman did. As a matter of fact, if you read the articles in the newspapers, I think there was some recognition that this was a respected report and one that was balanced.

To that extent, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to extend my sincere congratulations and thanks to the Commissioner for the work that he did, and I just want to reiterate that, in our rejecting of this report, it is based on the issue of salaries and the fact that we must, as responsible legislators, defer that part of the report at this time because of its inappropriateness to be able to accept those kinds of remuneration increases, given the circumstances of our province.

So, with that, I conclude my remarks simply to reiterate our extreme gratitude to Mr. Backman.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before I recognize the honourable Member for River Heights, I just want to make it clear to the House that this motion, when it was moved, it was moved by leave of the House, unanimous consent of the House.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** I would just ask that, when you convey the motion to Mr. Backman, you convey it together with the thanks from all the members of this Chamber for the effort that he has undertaken and the work that he has done in bringing forward the report.

I think that we all appreciate the time that he has taken and the effort that he has made, and I would just request that when you send him the resolution you express that sincerely from all of us.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, the resolution, consent to the Commissioner.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution? *[Agreed]*

#### House Business

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Government House Leader had one more piece of business?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet on Monday, June 7, 6:30 p.m., Room 254, to consider the following bills: 10, 31, 33, 34.

I would like to announce that, in addition to the bills listed above, Bill 23, that was The Red River Floodway Act, which was referred to the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs for that same night, will be transferred to the Social and Economic Development Committee being held that night at 6:30.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is announced that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet on Monday, June 7, 2004 at 6:30 p.m. in Room 254 to consider the following bills: 10, 31, 33 and 34.

It is also announced that in addition to the bills listed above, Bill 23, The Red River Floodway Act, which was referred to the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs for Monday, June 7, at 6:30 p.m. will be transferred to the Social and Economic Development Committee meeting being held on Monday, June 7, at 6:30 p.m.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being past 5:30, this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Monday.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 3, 2004

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>		Conservation Staffing Lamoureux; Struthers	2935
<b>Petitions</b>		Wildlife Lamoureux; Struthers	2936
Highway 227 Eichler	2925		
Faurschou	2927	<b>Members' Statements</b>	
Minimum Sitting Days for Legislative Assembly Lamoureux	2925	Holy Trinity Orthodox Sobor Nevakshonoff	2937
Alzheimer's Disease Driedger	2925	Cindy Procter Eichler	2937
Proposed PLA–Floodway Murray	2926	Used Oil Collection Depots Jha	2938
Pharmacare Taillieu	2926	National Transportation Week Awards Maguire	2938
		Women Entrepreneur of the Year Awards Brick	2939
<b>Introduction of Bills</b>			
Bill 214–The Health Services Amendment Act Gerrard	2927		
<b>Oral Questions</b>			
Rancher's Choice Beef Co-op Murray; Doer	2928		
Eichler; Smith	2930		
Red River Floodway Expansion Murray; Doer	2931		
School Division Amalgamations Taillieu; Bjornson	2932		
Adolescent Parents Rowat; Melnick	2934		
Loewen; Melnick	2934		
Baby's Death Rowat; Melnick	2934		
		<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY (Continued)</b>	
		<b>GOVERNMENT BUSINESS</b>	
		<b>Second Readings</b>	
		Bill 53–The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2004	
		Mackintosh	2942
		Lamoureux	2943
		Bill 54–The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2004	
		Selinger	2945
		Gerrard	2946
		Lamoureux	2948
		<b>Debate on Second Readings</b>	
		Bill 10–The Gaming Control Amendment Act	
		Gerrard	2952

Bill 31–The Floodway Authority Act		Lamoureux	2967
Gerrard	2956		
Lamoureux	2958		
Penner	2962		
Bill 33–The Public Servants Insurance Amendment Act			
Loewen	2964		
Lamoureux	2964		
Bill 34–The University of Winnipeg Amendment Act			
Lamoureux	2965		
Bill 35–The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act			
Taillieu	2966		
		<b>Tabling of Reports</b>	
		Recommendations to the Legislative Assembly concerning the Report for MLA Pay, Allowances and Retirement Benefits	
		Hickes	2968
		Recommendations to the Legislative Assembly concerning the Report for MLA Pay, Allowances and Retirement Benefits	
		Mackintosh	2968
		Derkach	2969
		Gerrard	2970