



Fifth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

(Hansard)

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



Vol. XLIII No. 58 - 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 29, 1994

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Liberal
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCORMICK, Norma	Osborne	Liberal
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupertland	NDP
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 29, 1994

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

ACCESS Program Funding

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Lisa Jablonski, Helen Egyed, Ellen Olfert and others requesting the Legislative Assembly request the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Manness) to consider restoring funding to the ACCESS program.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of George Munroe, Laurie Wesley, Andrea Asham and others requesting the Legislative Assembly request the Minister of Education and Training to consider restoring funding to the ACCESS program.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Vincent Stamler, Loni Beck, Buffie Macklin and others requesting the Legislative Assembly request the Minister of Education and Training to consider restoring funding to the ACCESS program.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Economic Development

Mr. Jack Reimer (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Economic Development): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Economic Development.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

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

Your committee met on Tuesday, June 28, 1994, at 9 a.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 18, The Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances

Mr. William O'Brien - Insurance Brokers Association of Manitoba

Bill 28, The Off-Road Vehicles Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les véhicules à caractère non routier

Mr. William O'Brien - Insurance Brokers Association of Manitoba

Written Submissions Received:

Bill 10, The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune

Ms. M. Scott - Union of Manitoba Municipalities

Your committee has considered:

Bill 7, The Crown Lands Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales

Bill 8, The Fisheries Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la pêche

Bill 9, The Convention Centre Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Corporation du Centre des congrès

Bill 10, The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune

Bill 11, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Assemblée législative

Bill 12, The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le vérificateur provincial

Bill 13, The Condominium Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les condominiums

Bill 14, The Real Estate Brokers Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les courtiers en immeubles

Bill 18, The Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances

Bill 23, The Manitoba Historical Society Property Act; Loi sur les biens de la Société historique du Manitoba

Bill 28, The Off-Road Vehicles Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les véhicules à caractère non routier

has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 5, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route et apportant des modifications corrélatives

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

MOTION:

That clauses 171(2)(c) to (e) of the French version, as set out in section 7 of the Bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

c) d'enlever une plaque d'immatriculation ou une vignette de validation de la plaque d'immatriculation d'un véhicule automobile ou d'une remorque, sauf si le propriétaire y consent, que le registraire l'autorise ou que le présent code ou les règlements le prévoient;

d) d'apposer ou de permettre que soit apposée sur un véhicule automobile ou une remorque une plaque d'immatriculation qui ne peut être utilisée pour le véhicule en question, sauf si le présent code ou les règlements le prévoient;

e) d'utiliser ou de permettre que soit utilisé un véhicule automobile ou une remorque sur lequel est apposée une plaque d'immatriculation qui ne peut être utilisée pour le véhicule en question, sauf si le présent code ou les règlements le prévoient.

MOTION:

THAT clause 29(e) of the French version of the Bill be amended by striking out "eee.i)" and substituting "eee.l)".

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

Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee on Law Amendments

Mr. Gerry McAlpine (Acting Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as its First Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, June 28, 1994, at 9 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred. At that meeting your committee elected Mr. Penner as its Chairperson.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 19, The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale

Ms. Nancy Davids - Private Citizen

Mr. Bill Martin - Canadian Mental Health Association

Bill 21—The Manitoba Medical Association Dues Act; Loi sur la cotisation de l'Association médicale du Manitoba

Mr. John Laplume - Manitoba Medical Association

Bill 26—An Act to amend An Act to Protect the Health of Non-Smokers (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la protection de la santé des non-fumeurs

Ms. Jane Stewart - Council for Tobacco Free Manitoba

Written Submissions Received:

Bill 2—The Prescription Drugs Cost Assistance Amendment and Pharmaceutical Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide à l'achat de médicaments sur ordonnance et la Loi sur les pharmacies

Mr. Peter Sim - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Ms. Michelle Scott - Union of Manitoba Municipalities

Bill 4—The Energy and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'énergie et apportant des modifications corrélatives

Mr. Peter Sim - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Your committee has considered:

Bill 2, The Prescription Drugs Cost Assistance Amendment and Pharmaceutical Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide à l'achat de médicaments sur ordonnance et la Loi sur les pharmacies

Bill 3, The Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Fondation de traitement du cancer et de recherche en cancérologie

Bill 15, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau

Bill 19, The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale

Bill 21, The Manitoba Medical Association Dues Act; Loi sur la cotisation de l'Association médicale du Manitoba

Bill 26, An Act to amend An Act to Protect the Health of Non-Smokers (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la protection de la santé des non-fumeurs and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 4, The Energy and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'énergie et apportant des modifications corrélatives

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

MOTION:

THAT the English version of subsection 7(3) be amended in the part preceding clause (a) by striking out "a prescribed energy-using product is" and substituting "prescribed energy-using products are".

MOTION:

THAT the English version of clause 10(1)(b) be amended by striking out "that" and substituting "than".

MOTION:

THAT subsection 10(2) be amended by striking out ", employee".

Mr. McAlpine: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Negotiations on Internal Trade Barriers

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement for the House.

I am pleased to rise in the House today as co-chairman of the Committee of Ministers of Internal Trade to announce that the federal, provincial and territorial representatives have reached an agreement in principle on a comprehensive agreement to reduce and eliminate internal barriers to trade within Canada. I believe that this is a truly historic event for Manitoba and for Canada.

At the outset, I would like to acknowledge the negotiators for the Province of Manitoba, particularly my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), who was the co-chair of the negotiations prior to my taking on the responsibility. As well, I would like to acknowledge Paul Goyan and Allan Barber for their hard work and their commitment in the negotiations. I would like to also acknowledge and thank Mr. Arthur Mauro, who has done a tremendous job of chairman and chief negotiator, for his excellent work on behalf of the people of this country.

* (1335)

In 1992, First Ministers set a deadline of June of 1995 for dealing with internal trade barriers. Ministers for internal trade launched comprehensive negotiations in March of 1993 to conclude an agreement by June 30, 1994, and to be ratified and implemented by June of 1995. A comprehensive agreement to reduce and eliminate interprovincial trade barriers that have emerged over the past 127 years is vital to the economic well-being of Manitoba and of Canada.

Manitoba is a trading province and our continued prosperity is directly dependent upon an open and efficient internal market. Internal trade barriers are estimated to cost Canada almost \$7 billion annually. These costs are particularly important to Manitoba since we are one of the provinces which depend upon trading within Canada. Manitoba exports over 60 percent more within Canada than it does internationally. Removing barriers to this trade will enable Manitoba business to grow and prosper.

Internal trade barriers cost Manitobans an estimated \$300 million each year. Enormous progress has been made with the agreement reached yesterday in Ottawa. The agreement includes: a framework based upon general trade rules applicable to all governments; a dispute settlement mechanism for resolving issues on internal trade matters including access to this process for the private sector; the opening of a public sector procurement market of almost \$50 billion to all businesses in Canada and commitments to continue negotiations to open the procurement of Crown corporations; a code of conduct to prevent destructive competition for investment and put an end to the senseless bidding wars pitting province against province and wasting taxpayers' dollars; a framework and a commitment to deal with differences in occupational standards and qualification requirements that limit the mobility of workers and professionals within Canada; and an agreement not to create any new barriers to internal trade.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement represents an enormous breakthrough in an area that all governments have been wrestling with since 1985. There remain some matters which we will work to resolve in the near future. We have agreed to continue negotiations on internal trade barriers in the area of agriculture and food products, energy and alcohol beverages, to resolve outstanding issues in these areas in time for them to be part of our formal agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that this agreement represents a crucial step in restoring the faith of Canadians in the functioning of the Canadian

economic union. It demonstrates the commitment of all governments to work together to address the issues that have arisen over the past 127 years. The lowering of trade barriers within Canada will allow Manitobans to reap the benefits of a unified Canadian market. The opening of previously restricted markets in Canada will create new opportunities for Manitobans and the elimination of procurement barriers, and the establishment of a code of conduct and investment will directly benefit taxpayers. This agreement will reinforce Manitoba's efforts to make efficient use of every tax dollar.

It has been my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to represent Manitoba in these negotiations, and I am proud to announce to this House the conclusion of what I believe is a historic agreement. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Deputy Premier and the co-chair of the national committee for his statement today in the Chamber. I want to pass on our best regards to Mr. Mauro and members who represented Manitoba in these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I know that every agreement that is reached in Canada is called historic, and I know that I have perhaps used that term myself, but certainly this agreement does produce some results, and it does provide a number of exceptions, and it provides a number of challenges that are still unresolved in this trade agreement. So I think there is a lot of work ahead, if I must say so to the members opposite and to the trades ministers across the country.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have always been opposed to provinces bidding for jobs through taxpayers' money and taxpayers' grants. If you just look at the telemarketing situation in Canada today, we have a Liberal government in New Brunswick that put money into jobs for Federal Express. We have a Conservative government in Manitoba that put money into GWE, and we have an NDP government in Saskatchewan that put money into the Sears marketing operation, all of which is wrong because, ultimately, those are three different governments, three different political stripes with the same problem.

A code of conduct, Mr. Speaker, will not deal with that problem, and there is no real teeth in this measure that has been agreed to by provinces. As we have lost a number of jobs to Alberta through the former Conservative government putting in tremendous public support to the Cargill plant and we have lost jobs potentially with the Simplot plant in Brandon, I do not think this problem has been solved, quite frankly, in the communique issued today.

* (1340)

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there are exceptions for Crown corporations, but there are no exceptions for social priorities of provinces. The whole area of regional economic development which was put on the table by some provinces, the whole area of northern unemployment and northern aboriginal hiring was not dealt with, I think, adequately by the ministers. It has been an area which we believe should be part of a trade agreement, an affirmative action program, to hire and train northerners and northern aboriginal people, and we think that is missing.

Thirdly, there is no strategy to deal with making sure that the floor of trading for goods and services is equal, Mr. Speaker, that labour laws, workplace safety and health laws, minimum construction laws, have a national agreement to them, so that we are truly competing on an equal basis.

There are jobs now in Manitoba that are being filled by construction firms from Alberta. Even I believe the latest national disease headquarters has a number of jobs being fulfilled not by Manitobans but by companies from Alberta. It is important. I know when I was Minister of telephones, companies in Saskatchewan would bid into Manitoba and be part of the tendering process, yet we could not bid into Saskatchewan. I think progress in this area is really important.

I want to congratulate the minister in his work. As I say, I think we have a lot of challenges to meet still on this very, very important item of having fair treatment of goods and services, of fair trading practices between provinces and an aggressive approach to dealing with taxpayers' money going to, as David Lewis used to say, corporate welfare

bums who just up the ante in terms of grants from the public. Thank you.

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): We, too, would like to join with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Leader of the Opposition in thanking the participants, on behalf of the Province of Manitoba, who have been down at these negotiations most recently, but have been involved in a very real way and through some very difficult negotiations for a number of years. They have served us well and, I think, kept cool heads throughout.

I think we are all very pleased the parties—and we have all seen over the years the very different approaches that were taken and the very different philosophies that came into these negotiations. Really, to see progress like this is encouraging. Is it as much as was hoped for? Clearly not, Mr. Speaker, and I think we hope it will continue and set a precedent for further discussions.

It is indeed anomalous and I suggest quite damaging to our country that we are now and have been for some time making it more difficult to deal with each other than it is with the rest of the world. The way the world is evolving is clear and that is towards a freer trade between nations, between peoples of all continents, and it was becoming easier for us to trade with Mexico than Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, many have suggested and I think quite rightly that if we were going to tolerate that for the long term, we deserved our fate in this country. I am very pleased that the governments have worked together across this country from the various political perspectives to come up with an agreement which I hope sets a precedent for future agreements that have more teeth.

I do share the comments of the Leader of the Opposition that I think it is an agreement in principle. It is going to rely on good faith, a commitment from all the provinces, but ultimately, I think, we do want to see a more stringent agreement between the provinces in this country that will not be at the mercy of the particular ups and downs of the political situation in each

province but will serve us well into the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have seen the governments work together, obviously very much appreciate the efforts of the negotiators here in Manitoba and, as well, the efforts of Mr. Mauro and the efforts, I think, of the federal government as they brought this to a conclusion. Indeed, it was started under the prior administration but was continued and to a successful conclusion in a very, I think, co-operative fashion. Thank you.

* (1345)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 220—The Elections Amendment Act

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): I move, seconded by the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), that leave be given to introduce Bill 220, The Elections Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les élections, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion presented.

Mr. Mackintosh: This bill gets patronage out of the administration of elections insofar as it takes the power to appoint returning officers from the cabinet and gives that power to the Chief Electoral Officer to be exercised by considering merit.

I cannot imagine an area where patronage is more repugnant than election administration. The bill will ensure that returning officers are both seen to be, and are actually, impartial and makes a move to a timely appointment process and professionally trained administrators.

This measure is recommended by the Chief Electoral Officer and was most recently urged in regard to last year's by-election in St. Johns.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 31—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment and Income Tax Amendment Act

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have leave to introduce for first reading, Bill 31, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation

Amendment and Income Tax Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba et la Loi de L'impôt sur le revenu).

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to introduce Bill 31 for first reading at this time? [agreed]

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), that leave be given to introduce Bill 31, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment and Income Tax Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba et la Loi de L'impôt sur le revenu), and that the same be now received and read a first time.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of this bill, recommends it to the House. I would like to table the message as well.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon from the Winkler Elementary School seventy-five Grade 5 students under the direction of Mr. E. Claassen. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Pukatawagan, Manitoba Health Emergency

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) or Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae).

Last week, I had the opportunity to travel to the Mathias Colomb Band or the Pukatawagan community, along with the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson) and the member for The Pas (Mr.

Lathlin). I was quite astounded by the health conditions in the community and the situation with the sewage lagoon and the water situation. It was astonishing for me to find out that the water was being boiled for over six months and, of course, the member for Flin Flon raised this with the Minister of Health last week in the House and, before that, privately.

Today we have received a copy from the Minister of Health of the chief medical officer's report, Dr. John Guilfoyle, dealing with the Pukatawagan situation. He confirms our concerns last week, concerns raised by the member for Flin Flon, that 1,100 people had suffered from skin disease out of a community of 1,700.

This is an absolute national disgrace of major proportions in terms of that many people being affected.

* (1350)

Mr. Speaker, the chief medical officer of Manitoba concludes that a health emergency does exist in this community due to its lack of a safe supply of drinking water, a very, very serious situation for any Manitoba community.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health: Has he been in contact with the federal government, and what action is either he or the Minister responsible for Federal-Provincial Relations, the Premier (Mr. Filmon), taking with the federal government on this very, very important health emergency.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) appropriately raised this matter with me. Working together, we asked Dr. Guilfoyle to look further into this situation. The day before yesterday, Dr. Guilfoyle and two others travelled to Mathias Colomb and looked at the situation. Dr. Guilfoyle reported to me yesterday, and I shared the report with the honourable member for Flin Flon.

Dr. Guilfoyle does not have very nice things to say, Mr. Speaker, about the circumstances that have existed at Pukatawagan—very strong language to describe the way he feels about

whoever it was who designed the water system in that area, and very strong language also with respect to whose responsibility it is to do something about that and to do something about it immediately, so the situation can be remediated for the people who live in that area.

That system is serving supposedly 1,700 people, Mr. Speaker, and is designed to serve 250. It is just totally unsatisfactory. Dr. Guilfoyle has agreed to prepare a communication for me to send to the federal officials, the member of Parliament for that area and anybody else who needs to be alerted to the situation so that something can be done immediately.

Mr. Doer: If this situation existed in any southern community in Manitoba, any of our communities, Mr. Speaker, it would be an absolute emergency that would be dealt with immediately, and the fact that the people of this community have had to boil their water for over six months, and 1,100 cases have been reported by that community is, as I say, a national disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government designed a plant that according to Dr. Guilfoyle, the sewage treatment plant is designed to deal with the sewage from 70 homes, this peculiar design which seems to be uncommonly inefficient in dealing with sewage. Tests have revealed that the bacterial contamination of sewage after treatment is actually higher than before treatment. This plant currently discharges sewage approximately 20 metres off the shore into an area where children swim.

Now, when I visited that community, you could see it. I certainly did not know it was this bad. It is a health emergency for all citizens of Manitoba, and I thank the minister for getting involved in it.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health: What response has the minister received from the federal minister responsible and from the federal government of Canada?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, we know the response since last fall has been zero to a situation which leaves the people of Pukatawagan in a health emergency situation, according to Dr. Guilfoyle. As I say, Dr. Guilfoyle and I and no doubt the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) are making

every effort to ensure that we are not going to allow the federal government or the local government for that matter to allow this matter to persist. It is not appropriate for the people who live in that area.

This water, Mr. Speaker, is not even good enough to bathe in. The people there have to buy their water in bottles. That might be all right for consumption purposes, but when the water is so unsafe that you cannot even bathe in it without putting your health at risk, it seems to me the authority that has the responsibility for it ought to waste no further days in addressing the problem.

* (1355)

Mr. Doer: I thank the minister for that answer.

Capital Funding

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): In the last paragraph of Dr. Guilfoyle's report, he mentions very clearly that—prior to that, he mentions the whole fact that the capital design by the federal government was totally inadequate both in size and also in design. He goes on further to say that the band has no other capital to deal with this issue, and he states that they plan to access emergency funds under the transfer agreement with the federal government.

I would like to ask the Minister responsible for Federal-Provincial Relations (Mr. Filmon): Will he facilitate this transfer under this agreement with the federal government? The lead minister or the Premier has dealt with other transfer agreements before with the federal jurisdiction.

Would he also work with the Minister of Health to make sure that this health emergency gets the emergency funds that may be available from the federal government and must be available for the federal government to deal with this health problem?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): If in our inquiries today from the federal government there is not a willingness to move immediately, I will call on the services of the department of federal-provincial relations to assist me in getting that job done.

It is not appropriate or acceptable that the federal government allow this matter to drag any further. I do not really know whose fault this is, whether it is the band's fault or the federal government's fault, but the fact is, the federal government has a responsibility for First Nations in this province. If they can negotiate self-government agreements, that is fine and dandy, Mr. Speaker, but right now we have a problem that needs to be addressed immediately.

Goods and Services Tax Replacement

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I have a question for the Premier.

All major media reported today that the federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Martin, has floated the idea of a single, national harmonized sales tax pegged at 10 percent to replace the GST. You might want to call it son of GST, maybe, Mr. Speaker.

The provinces would get 60 percent of the revenue from such a tax. However, there could be a shortfall as a result of such a tax change. In return, the federal government apparently would give the provinces the right to impose a flat tax on income.

My question to the Premier is: Can he confirm that the federal government has indeed offered to create a single tax of 10 percent, and can the Premier indicate whether the 10 percent rate would be applied to food and other items not now covered by the provincial sales tax?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I just caution the member for Brandon East for putting on the record what might be considered a sexist remark. It could also be the daughter of GST. Having said that—[interjection] I will not engage in any discussions with the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) on that.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm the veracity of those newspaper reports with respect to the federal proposal, but I can confirm that a quick analysis of what that would produce would be a shortfall to the Treasury of Manitoba of I believe just under \$200 million annually.

Therefore, we would be put in a position of having to take the responsibility to raise the funds and, presumably, the federal government would give us some initiative or assistance in raising the funds by raising some other taxes to supplant the loss. It looks very, very much as though it is a proposal that is not in the best interests of Manitoba. That is all I can say.

I expect to get a full report from our Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), who is currently in the midst of meetings with his federal and provincial counterparts on the issue.

* (1400)

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the Premier and his answer in this case about the loss of sales tax revenue.

I appreciate this is very early, but I wonder if the Premier could indicate what impact this would have on income tax. If there was this loss of \$200 million, can he imagine to what degree individual income tax rates would have to be increased as a consequence of the federal proposal?

Mr. Filmon: I want to emphasize that we are talking in hypothetical terms. I am reluctant to do that other than to say, yes, the counter side of the proposal, as I understand it, would require us to make major increases in personal income tax rates in order to supplant the loss of revenue from that proposal. That simply is a very, very bad proposal, from our perspective.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, my final question then is: Will the Premier now reassure Manitobans that his government will not give in to pressure from the federal Minister of Finance and Mr. Chretien to broaden the base of our provincial sales taxes and indeed the national sales taxes so that food and medicine and other vital items would be included in the future?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, as I have said in this House earlier this week and late last week, we are adamantly opposed to the proposal that has been put forward by the federal Liberal committee that studied the replacement for the GST that would call for its application to be broadened onto groceries, medical supplies, all of those areas that

were rejected in the first round of discussions that led to the GST as we now know it.

All the most damaging and negative aspects of the original GST proposals now appear to have been reborn in this proposal along with the proposal to hide it and bury it within the prices so that people are not aware when taxes are increased, along with the other element of the proposal, which was to harmonize it, again with the negative impacts on our Treasury and on consumers in particular, as it implies a transference from businesses to consumers of the burden of the tax.

All of that is so negative that I find it difficult to believe that the new federal government would even consider that and is, in fact, realistically proposing it to Canadians.

Winnipeg Jets Government Position

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the last 48 hours, the Premier has been making comments about the status of negotiations that he is aware of that are going on between the majority shareholders of the Winnipeg Jets and others to find out whether or not some reconciliation can be made to keep the team in the city for a further year, as recommended by the Burns report.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the Premier: The assumption that I think all in this Chamber are functioning under and indeed I think has been the message that has been sent to the public is that the government will have nothing more to contribute to the Winnipeg Jets with respect to this deal that is ongoing. Yet the Premier, obviously, and the various levels of government have to be involved, as they have certain rights under that initial agreement, but it does not involve further money.

I would like the Premier just to, if he would, confirm that, that this is the approach he is taking in these negotiations and, if possible, identify for members of the Chamber what the status of those discussions are, to his knowledge.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I thank the Leader of the Liberal Party for the question, and I am happy to share all the information that I can. I will

say that I hope to have a letter in my hands—if it arrives before the end of Question Period, I will table it; if not, I will deliver it to the offices of both opposition caucuses—from the majority shareholders of the Winnipeg Jets confirming that they have, in effect, given an option to purchase all or part of their shares in the club to a private-sector-based group.

I met with three representatives of the private-sector-based group yesterday afternoon to confirm that they were making this offer on the condition that the clause that allows for the exercise of the option at an agreed-upon price is extended to May 1 of 1995, which time extension is intended to give the opportunity for the ability to prove whether or not the seats in the arena, the boxes and all of the premium seating that is contemplated in Burns can be achieved to allow for \$27 million of annual revenue to flow and for this private sector group to demonstrate whether or not they can also find private sector capital to contribute towards the construction and development of a new arena and to allow for the time that is necessary to prove whether or not a salary cap on players' salaries will come to the NHL during the immediate future.

Finally, I would say that this private sector group who are putting up their own capital towards this venture are also proposing to take the responsibility for the design and engineering developments that have to take place over the next year, concurrent with this, so that a year of construction is not lost if a go decision is to be made next spring.

The private sector group, I am satisfied, not only has the wherewithal, but I am satisfied that they have the motivation to make all of this work and to prove and demonstrate that private sector funding is available for the process.

I would just say to the Leader of the Liberal Party that, as I believe his party has gone on record, we have indicated that some limited support as was contemplated by the Mauro committee that contemplated up to, say, \$30 million of federal, provincial and municipal money, the provincial share of course would

probably include the value of the land, which I think is worth about \$5 million as part of the provincial contribution. That remains on the table as part of a potential mix of funding. It has not changed.

I might say as well to him that our hope of course is that all of the money necessary for the arena can be found through the private sector and creative financing sources.

Economic Viability

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, the position which has been articulated previously in this Chamber on behalf of our party has been that any contribution from the levels of government, from this level of government, the provincial level, must be cost neutral. We all know the construction itself produces revenues directly over the construction period. Cost-neutral contributions have been what have been talked about. Of course, I share with the Premier the—we have suggested the bond issue idea, that it be raised from the private sector.

My supplementary question for the Premier is: Underlying all of this, and he has indicated it is the ultimate economic viability of the Winnipeg Jets over the long term, in a year's time how does the Premier propose, or has he thought about it at this point, to assess, how will governments assess whether or not this team is economically viable for the medium to long term, which might warrant the construction of a facility?

That is the critical, underlying precondition of this whole debate.

* (1410)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, our assessment will be based on the achievement of three things.

One is a salary cap, because I think even the Burns proposal says this razor-thin marginal deal that they see coming together would not be doable without a salary cap.

The second thing we have to assess is whether or not this private sector group who are going to

attempt to go out and market boxes and luxury seats to raise the income from the team to \$27 million can achieve that target.

The third thing is the degree of private sector capital available for the construction and development of the new arena facility. All those three things will be the basis upon which we will make our evaluation.

The member is quite right when he says there are significant revenues that accrue, even aside from the construction of the arena, which will produce not only thousands of construction jobs but at the same time of course direct revenues to government. All of that is part and parcel of the equation.

The final parcel of the equation of course is that this team currently provides an average, over the last three or four years of the agreement, of \$14 million of annual direct revenues to government, which is expected to rise to \$20 million by 1996-97—direct tax revenues to government. The question is, what are we going to do to replace that to provide the funding that we need for government services—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Winnipeg Arena Design Costs

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): I have a final question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

There has been much discussion in the last 24 hours about the amount of money that is going to be required to satisfy the government's initial designing of a facility, should it go ahead, and the figure \$750,000 has been kicked around in the press.

My question for the Premier: What is his information as to the amount, and where is that money coming from? I think I heard him say it is coming from the private sector, but can he indicate where the money is coming from, and if he could also indicate what his information is as to the amount that has been committed of preliminary work?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Initially, the three levels of government were proposing that they would be responsible for the cost of design. In my discussions yesterday, the people whom I spoke to indicated they felt that the money could come from private sector sources.

Seven Oaks General Hospital Private Home Care Services

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, this government has said their bottom line in health is patient care. Yet, even the president of a major hospital has said the government is only interested in cutting costs. This year Seven Oaks has over a million-dollar cut from this government, has been forced to close the hospital on Filmon Fridays, yet the government has found money to pay for their friends at We Care private nursing services.

Since the Premier is so forthcoming about the Jets and all the financial information, can the Minister of Health tell us how much the government is paying to We Care Health Services for that contract at Seven Oaks?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): I agree, Mr. Speaker, that the bottom line is patient care. As a result of a question raised yesterday by the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), the issue became rather clear that patient care is the bottom line.

I would like to quote from a letter in relation to the issue raised by the honourable member with respect to patient care, and it is from Jack Litvack, the president of the—Oh, I am not going to have time for that, Mr. Speaker? It is very relevant. [interjection]

I think maybe I will deal with that in another way, Mr. Speaker. The issue that the honourable member asks about—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when a member references a letter, they must table it in the Chamber, please.

Mr. McCrae: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would love to table this letter. It is so positive. It is so positive, I am afraid honourable members in the New Democratic Party would refuse to read it.

Mr. Speaker: Are you going to table it? Do you want to table it? You do not have to, but I am asking.

Mr. McCrae: Yes, I will read it. I will just read the last—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable Minister of Health, carry on with your response, and you want to table the letter.

* * *

Mr. McCrae: Yes. In concluding my response, Mr. Speaker, I will read the last paragraph of the letter referred to. It says: The leadership which was shown by Manitoba Health staff and others was most gratifying. I wanted you to be aware of our appreciation for this constructive and collaborative assistance. Thank you. Sincerely, J.T. Litvack, President, St. Boniface Hospital.

I would table this letter for honourable members to read, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, they will give us the money on the Jets, and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) can go on for five minutes on the Jets, but the minister refuses to tell us.

Will the minister tell us how much his friends at We Care are getting for their private nursing contract?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, the people at We Care Health Services, which is carrying out this pilot with Seven Oaks Hospital, their friends seem to be the patients who are being served by them and who speak very highly of the work being done in this project. The people who are being served under this project have very, very high praise for the service. As one of the local broadcasters—I think it was CKY TV—said, the patients love this service; the NDP hates it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that says a lot to me about where the NDP is coming from in this whole discussion.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the minister: Will the Minister of Health tell this House how much this government is paying We Care Health Services to carry out the government's pilot project, which probably is in excess of \$100,000?

Mr. McCrae: It would probably be more accurate, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the savings and the relief to patients in the hundreds of thousands of dollars than it would be to the company that is involved.

It just goes to show you, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to patients and the bottom line, we know where the NDP is. They are not on the side of the patients, never have been. They have made their position very clear. They are on the side of their union boss friends.

Farm Safety Net Programs Manitoba Position

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, this coming week the Ministers of Agriculture are going to be meeting in Winnipeg. The minister has indicated that safety net programs will be on the agenda. Other provinces have put together proposals, have held public meetings for farmers to have input on how these programs should be designed, but we have not had that in Manitoba.

Can the minister indicate what position he is taking to these meetings? Has he given any consideration to base Manitoba's proposal on the cost of production or capping the amount of money that can go to each farm, thus targeting more family farms in this province?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, allow me simply to correct the honourable member's implication that meetings have not been held throughout Manitoba.

We have had a very well-comprised committee representing different commodity producer organizations assisting in the development of a Manitoba position. In addition, of course, we have ongoing meetings with the premier farm organization, namely, the Keystone Agricultural

Producers organization whose president, Mr. Ransome, serves on this committee.

So that kind of discussion has taken place. Of course, at the different farm meetings that I have attended throughout the province during the course of the last five or six months, this issue has always been on the agenda, so there has been lots of input from the various primary producers, agricultural producers as to the Manitoba position on these matters.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised. I have not heard of any public meetings being announced to discuss this issue. [interjection] The Minister of Highways (Mr. Findlay) had his chance at Agriculture.

Since it is a fact that a large percentage of the funds in safety net programs is benefiting a small number of farmers to a greater degree than the majority of farmers—large operations are getting more of the money—and since the federal budget will be cut by up to 40 percent, farm safety net programs will be greatly reduced.

Will the minister agree that it makes sense to cap the amount of public money, so that we can help more farmers, so more people can stay in the rural community, and this would tie into the sustainable development—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put her question.

* (1420)

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, I would just gently remind the honourable member to look at one of the major safety net programs involving most of the farmers, say, in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the GRIP program, and ask her colleagues in Saskatchewan how they fared and how the coverage fared under those two equal programs.

I have said before and I am pleased to say again, that is a single success story for us, although I would hope, quite frankly, that that kind of level of support harvest conditions would mitigate from happening again. The support was there, and that is what safety programs are for. That is why the GRIP program continues to be a major portion of

the programs that I am putting forward into next week's conference.

We are looking very seriously at the suggestions that are coming forward from other provinces, as well as from the federal government about what Mr. Goodale calls a whole-farm support program, support to replace the outgoing tripartite programs that were there certainly, for instance—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You will have another opportunity.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, the minister says he is looking for suggestions, and I am offering suggestions about capping—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a time for debate. Question.

Ms. Wowchuk: My final supplementary: In light of the fact that the pay-the-producer panel projects a minimum loss of \$43 million to Manitoba, and this will result in losses of \$1,700 to \$3,100 per farm and we cannot afford that loss in rural Manitoba, will the Minister of Agriculture be taking forward the position that change to pay-the-producer is not acceptable in Manitoba and it will destroy the economy in rural Manitoba?

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, I can only reply by saying that the very wide range of issues extremely important to agriculture in Manitoba and to Canada will be discussed next week. They include the transportation questions; they include the safety net programs. They include supply management programs ordering the marketing programs. They include our ongoing trade difficulties with our major trading partner, the United States.

I will undertake, Mr. Speaker, to provide, because I am just that kind of a guy, a summary of the deliberations of the conference to my critics, both of the New Democratic Party and of the Liberal Party, at the conclusion of the conference.

Rural Development Video Production Costs

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to questions from the member for Flin Flon (Mr.

Storie) on June 28, which was yesterday, to which I took notice.

First of all, I want to reject any and all of the statements that were made with respect to the video by the member for Flin Flon. It is obvious that this member and his party do not support entrepreneurship and small business in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and it was evident by the questions that were posed yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, the video produced by my department that the member refers to was entitled *Strong People Building a Stronger Tomorrow* and was designed to support rural Manitoba entrepreneurship and small business. It did feature a segment with the individual identified by the member as the owner of Kitemandu, a kite manufacturer from Neepawa.

My department contacted Mr. Bell yesterday regarding the question from the member for Flin Flon. Mr. Bell confirmed that he is intending to move to Ontario. Mr. Bell confirmed that his move has nothing to do with his business. As a matter of fact, his move is regarding a family matter and a recent death in the family. Mr. Bell expressed his disappointment that anyone would depict his move as a negative commentary on the business climate in Manitoba. He said—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hold it for a minute.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable opposition House leader has the floor. Order, please, the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman). Order, please, the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay). Now we will hear your point of order, sir.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne Citation 417 is very clear, that answers to questions should be as brief as possible and deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate.

Mr. Speaker, this is particularly true of questions that are taken as notice, and we would appreciate if the minister would simply provide the information and perhaps also indicate in his answer, the member for Flin Flon was absolutely right in indicating that the video gave a false—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the latter part of the comments of the honourable member for Thompson, they are not relevant to the point of order. There is no point of order. I believe the honourable minister was dealing with the matter raised.

* * *

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bell expressed his disappointment that anyone would depict his move as a negative commentary on the business climate of Manitoba. He said the reasons he came here three years ago are still valid for the kite manufacturing business today in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, he came to Manitoba because of the environment, because of the good labour force and because of the Central Time Zone in Manitoba.

Mr. Bell is a native of Neepawa, and he was happy to come back to Manitoba three years ago to start his business.

Victims Assistance Fund Status Report

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, many nongovernmental agencies who provide much needed services to victims of crime have had grant applications into the Victims Assistance Fund, some of them for as long as two or more years.

Will the Minister of Justice tell the House today if there are external agencies who will be receiving funds from the Victims Assistance Fund?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I believe we covered this issue in the Estimates of the Department of Justice. At that time, I explained to the member that there had been some applications which were in and others which had been grandfathered in. I understand at this point all of those agencies have had some notice as to whether or not they would be receiving funds or not.

If the member has an indication of an agency where it is outstanding still, I would be very pleased to know about that, those applications which she is speaking about which have been of long standing.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, when will these external agencies that are going to have money granted by the Victims Assistance Fund be informed as to when the money will actually flow so that they can make plans for their programs that they would be undertaking with these funds? When will they know when the money is coming?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding for those agencies which are to be receiving money, of those outstanding applications—not the new applications, but outstanding applications—they have been contacted, and to the best of my knowledge, they were required to meet certain criteria.

Within their application, they were required to clarify or to make certain accommodations in order to actually receive their money, and that process, to the best of my knowledge, is ongoing. Until they have agreed to meet those conditions, I am not able to tell the member today exactly the date that the funds will flow to those agencies.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, when those funds finally flow, some that are over two years in the pipeline, how much money will the Victims Assistance Fund be granting to external agencies for services to victims of crime?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, when that money flows, I will be able to give the member an amount of money which has flowed to agencies.

The member speaks about applications which are outstanding, some of which because they are required to meet certain criteria or conditions to have the money flow, and then we will be looking at any new applications which come for further funding in a new fiscal year.

* (1430)

Social Assistance Welfare Abuse Reporting

Ms. Norma McCormick (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier.

For weeks now we have been asking for details of a number of Family Services announcements intending to remove barriers to employment. Few if any details were forthcoming. Today we have a completely mean-spirited announcement of a 945-STOP line to encourage the public to report on potential welfare abuse.

My question to the Premier is: How is this snitch line a priority for the expenditure of money in the Family Services department when a statistical analysis on founded cases of welfare fraud between 1991 and 1993 reveals that fraud is not an increasing or even significant problem?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to accept from the member for Osborne that she supports letting any fraud, any fraud whatsoever go on in the welfare system. In fact, even if it is \$1, it is taxpayers' money that is not well spent.

What we are attempting to do is ensure that the very scarce dollars we have are given to those who need it, not those who willingly abuse the system. I think she ought to be ashamed of herself.

Ms. McCormick: Mr. Speaker, the tone of the Premier's response and the tone of this press release is further—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a time for debate. We are out of time. The honourable member for Osborne, kindly put your question now, please.

Ms. McCormick: The tone of this press release is—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are out of time. The honourable member for Osborne, kindly put your question now, please.

Ms. McCormick: Given the tone of this press release, which is further indication that this department holds its citizens and its clients in contempt, what is the basis of this latest attack on the most vulnerable people in our community, when study after study, including one by this—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put her question now.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, we want those who legitimately are entitled to receive social

allowances to receive the most that they can receive of the scarce dollars we have. The people I hold in contempt are those who support fraud.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the Premier in his response was certainly unparliamentary in suggesting that anyone who raises a question about a matter—and the Premier may just disagree in terms of the question, but to cast aspersions and suggest that any member of this House would support fraud, as indeed the Premier did in his final comment, is unacceptable and I believe that the First Minister should withdraw those comments.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I clearly listened to the Premier's response, and I can tell you, he cast no aspersions on anyone in this House. He referred to people who are abusing the welfare system, which he finds and our party finds unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker: I do not believe there was a point of order, and I tell that to the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

I heard the remarks of the honourable First Minister and, clearly, I do not believe the honourable First Minister attributed them to anybody, but what I will do, sir, I will take this matter under advisement. I will peruse Hansard just for clarification. That will settle that one.

Point of Order

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, unfortunately, yesterday's Hansard is not available, at which time I directed questions to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach). Had they been available, the record would show that the minister did not answer the questions yesterday, and he did not answer the questions today.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. For sure, the honourable member for Flin Flon does not have a point of order. The reason that Hansard is not

available is because we have had so many committees sitting at this time.

NONPOLITICAL STATEMENTS

Portage Collegiate Institute— 100th Graduation Ceremony

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Portage la Prairie have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, last night I had the great privilege of attending the 100th graduation ceremonies—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Just hold it for a minute.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe in the confusion starting the points of order, the member for Osborne (Ms. McCormick) had only placed two questions. I would ask perhaps if there might be leave that she be allowed to place the final supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Well, I had clearly indicated at the time I had recognized the honourable member for Osborne that the time had actually expired at that time, and I was giving her that opportunity to ask that question. I did do that.

Now it appears that they are asking for leave to extend Question Period to allow the honourable member for Osborne to ask a question. Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No, leave is denied because Question Period is 40 minutes long.

Mr. Speaker: Now, we already have leave for the honourable member for Portage la Prairie, nonpolitical.

Mr. Pallister: Thanks again, Mr. Speaker.

Last evening, I had the privilege of attending the 100th graduation ceremony at the Portage Collegiate Institute, my old school. At this graduation ceremony, there were 118 graduates. I

will not share with the House all 56 award winners, but I would like to tell you that there were four principal award winners, some of whom who will be known to members of this House.

Certainly, Sean Rooke received a \$24,000 scholarship to attend the DeVry Institute. I believe Sean will be pursuing studies in Calgary. Bjorn Christianson whose mother Roberta is the chairman of the Manitoba Arts Council and whose father is Barney Christianson received nine awards including the Governor General's Medal for the highest overall standing at the Portage Collegiate and a \$22,000 scholarship for McMaster University. We are very proud of young Bjorn.

Two other young gentlemen who served here as Pages last year both received four awards. They were Jeff Peters, who received a University of Winnipeg entrance scholarship and, as well, Trevor Rudge, whom some of the members of this House will remember, who received a University of Manitoba entrance scholarship. We are very proud of these young people, and it is indeed a privilege to mention their names and put their names on the record.

As well, Portage Collegiate will be celebrating its centennial this coming week, July 7 to 9, and there are presently over 4,000 delegates registered. So we are quite excited in Portage la Prairie to be hosting the reunion of this fine school. Thank you.

Committee Changes

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, during the meeting of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments on June 28, 1994, at 7 p.m., the following substitution was moved, by leave, with the understanding that the same substitution would be moved in the House: the honourable member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg) for the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

In order to ensure that the substitution is entered into the official record of the House, I would like to move, seconded by the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, as of the 7 p.m. meeting on June 28, 1994, be amended as follows:

the member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg) for the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Motion agreed to.

Negev Dinner

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Kildonan have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave. [agreed]

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, together with the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), together with the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), together with the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) and with the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), I had the pleasure of attending the 42nd Annual Negev Dinner that honoured and congratulated Morley Blankstein.

I want to commend all of the organizers and participants from the Jewish National Fund and the organizers of this dinner, Mr. Speaker. The theme of the dinner was From Holocaust to Hope and it was a rousing success, raising money for the Jewish National Fund.

In addition, it was a very moving occasion because one of the speakers in attendance had been one of the individuals on Schindler's List, and the entire 1,300 individuals in attendance were moved by his eloquent statements and his experience.

The second speaker dealt with the hopes and the aspirations of the people of Israel and the Jewish population in general following the terrible tragedies of the late 1930s and 1940s.

I am sure all members of the House join in congratulating with me the Jewish National Fund of Winnipeg and the Negev organizers for a wonderful and very moving evening. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (1440)

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES (continued)

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is leave for reverting to the Presentation of Reports by Standing and Special Committees in order to allow the presentation of the reports of the Committee on

Law Amendments which met last evening at 7 p.m., and the Committee on Private Bills which also met last evening at 7 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to revert to Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees to deal with the two committees that were sitting last evening? Leave? [agreed]

Standing Committee on Law Amendments

Mr. Jack Penner (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments): I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as its Second Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, June 28, 1994, at 7 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 17—The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg et apportant des modifications corrélatives

Nick Ternette - Private Citizen

Jae Eadie - City of Winnipeg Councillor

George Fraser - City of Winnipeg Councillor

Shirley Lord - Choices

George Harris - Private Citizen

John Prystanski - City of Winnipeg Councillor

Written Submissions Received:

George Stewart - Winnipeg in the Nineties

Bill 20, The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités

Reeve Ron Renwick - Union of Manitoba Municipalities

Your committee has considered:

Bill 16, The Provincial Court Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale

Bill 20, The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 17—The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg et apportant des modifications corrélatives

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

MOTION:

THAT the following be added after Section 2 of the Bill:

2.1 The following is added after section 15

Quorum of committee

15(3) A by-law under subsection (2) may provide that an ex-officio member of a committee may be counted for the purpose of constituting a quorum.

2.2(1) Subsection 28(3) is amended by striking out "four".

2.2(2) Subsection 28(4) is amended by adding "including exercising the right of the mayor under subsection (2)" at the end.

2.2(3) Subsection 28(5) is amended by adding "including exercising the right of the mayor under subsection (2)" at the end.

2.3 Clause 29(1)(c) is amended by striking out "four".

2.4 Subsection 33(1) is amended by adding "not more than" after "establish".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 89.2(4), as set out in subsection 6(3) of the Bill, be amended by striking out clauses (a) and (b) and adding "made in writing and signed by not less than 250 electors" after "shall be".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 89.2(5), as set out in subsection 6(3) of the Bill, be struck out.

MOTION:

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal

references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

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

Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Mr. Jack Reimer (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Private Bills): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report on the Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the following as its First Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, June 28, 1994, at 7 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee has considered:

Bill 206, The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les armoiries, les emblèmes et le tartan du Manitoba

Bill 300, An Act to amend an Act to continue Brandon University Foundation; Loi modifiant la Loi prorogeant la Fondation de l'Université de Brandon

Bill 301, The Misericordia General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Misericordia General Hospital"

Bill 302, The Manitoba Historical Society Incorporation Act; Loi constituant la Société historique du Manitoba

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee recommends that the fees paid with respect to the following Private Bills be refunded, less the cost of printing:

Bill 300, An Act to amend an Act to continue Brandon University Foundation; Loi modifiant la Loi prorogeant la Fondation de l'Université de Brandon

Bill 301, The Misericordia General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le "Misericordia General Hospital"

Bill 302, The Manitoba Historical Society Incorporation Act; Loi constituant la Société historique du Manitoba.

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

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House Business

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, there is agreement, I believe, amongst all members of the House to convene the House tomorrow at 10 a.m. and sit until 1 p.m., rather than our normal sitting hours for a Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House to begin the sitting tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. and to conclude at 1 p.m.? [agreed]

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would seek unanimous consent for consideration of Estimates today as follows: in the House, Department of Justice and the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Estimates. In Committee Room 255, the Department of Urban Affairs, followed by the Sustainable Development Fund, followed by the Civil Service Commission, followed by the Department of Highways, and followed by the Department of Health.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to alter the sequence of the departments to be considered in the Chamber? I believe we are going to do Justice in the Chamber, followed by the AJI. Is there leave for that? [agreed]

In the Committee Room 255 to deal with Urban Affairs, Sustainable Development, I believe, Civil Service, Highways, Health, et cetera. Is there leave? [agreed]

Mr. Ernst: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a committee

to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) in the Chair for the Departments of Urban Affairs, Sustainable Development Innovations Fund, Civil Service Commission, Highways and Transportation; and the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair for the Department of Justice and Aboriginal Justice Initiatives.

* (1450)

**COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
(Concurrent Sections)**

URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

This afternoon this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 will resume consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Urban Affairs.

When the committee last sat, it had been considering item 1.(b)(1) on page 146 of the Estimates book.

Item 1. Administration (b) Executive Support (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$171,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$43,700—pass.

Item 2. Financial Assistance to the City of Winnipeg (a) Unconditional Current Programs Grant \$19,987,500.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I was going to ask the minister to give a detailed explanation on that item, but I will perhaps do it in writing.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: I thank the honourable member for that. Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

Item 2.(b) Unconditional Transit Operating Grant \$16,672,500—pass; (c) General Support Grant \$8,090,400—pass; (d) Dutch Elm Disease Control Program \$700,000—pass.

Resolution 20.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$45,450,400 for Urban Affairs, Financial Assistance to the City of Winnipeg, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Item 3. Urban Affairs Program Support (a) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$517,200—pass; (b) Other Expenditures \$222,200—pass; (c) Capital Region Sustainable Strategy \$75,000—pass.

Resolution 20.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$814,400 for Urban Affairs, Urban Affairs Program Support, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Item 4. Expenditures Related to Capital (a) Financial Assistance to the City of Winnipeg \$16,000,000—pass; (b) Urban Initiatives \$1,000,000—pass; (c) Canada-Manitoba Winnipeg Core Area Renewed Agreement zero.

Resolution 20.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$17,000,000 for Urban Affairs, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Item 5. Lotteries Funded Programs (a) Unconditional Grant to the City of Winnipeg \$4,000,000—pass.

Resolution 20.5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,000,000 for Urban Affairs, Lotteries Funded Programs, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

We will now move back to the Minister's Salary.

Item 1.(a) Minister's Salary \$10,300—pass.

Resolution 20.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$225,000 for Urban Affairs, Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

This concludes the Department of Urban Affairs.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT INNOVATIONS FUND

Mr. Deputy Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau): We will now move on to the department of Sustainable Development, page 144.

Item 1. Sustainable Development Innovations Fund.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Just on behalf of our critic, I want to indicate that some the issues that relate to this were raised in the Department of Environment, which had fairly extensive Estimates scrutiny. There may be further questions in other forms that will be asked in this session, in other ways, but we are prepared to pass this item due to time constraints to move on to the remaining departments.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

Resolution 32.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,911,500 for Sustainable Development Innovations Fund for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

This concludes the department of Sustainable Development.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. Deputy Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau): We will now move on to the department of Civil Service Commission on page 21 of the Estimates book.

Does the honourable minister have an opening statement?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, just by way of an explanation, this department was commenced the other night. The Liberal critic asked a number of questions and my intention was to make a short statement and ask a few brief questions. I believe the minister is en route. I would suggest we maybe recess until the minister gets here.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Why do we not just talk it through.

Mr. Ashton: I would suggest we recess for five minutes.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Recess for five minutes? [agreed]

The committee recessed at 2:57 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 2:59 p.m.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister charged with the administration of The Civil Service Act): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I believe we already are well advanced into the Estimates of the department, and my critic, Ms. Gray of the Liberal Party, had completed a number of questions, and we had adjourned in anticipation of the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), who joined our committee from other duties, giving him a chance to peruse Hansard and return to ask a number of questions that may not have been dealt with.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would just like to make a brief statement. I appreciate the co-operation of committee members in terms of this scheduling. I know we have had to do that quite a bit the last number of weeks for both ministers and opposition critics, and I certainly appreciate the fact that accommodation was made.

I just want to briefly mention a number of issues that are of continuing concern to us in the New Democratic Party in terms of the Civil Service Commission. First of all is the ongoing situation with the affirmative action side of the department. We have had an affirmative action policy and program in this province since the mid-1980s certainly in the form of the agreement that was reached at that time with the MGEA. It was basically structured to over time bring greater equity into the hiring of the provincial government.

There has been some progress, and certainly I look forward to the continuing updates I have requested from the minister in terms of affirmative action and particularly following last year when concern was expressed, certainly by myself as critic and others, about the fact that given the downsizing, both the layoffs and the reduction in

the number of employees, that we have seen some slippage in terms of the representation of target groups in the civil service.

***** (1500)

We certainly would appreciate any information, not only of the current numbers, because I believe some of that may have been discussed the other night, but in terms of some of the concerns that were expressed about the process for hiring as well, because certainly we have done better, for example, in terms of aboriginal people than we have in terms of visible minorities traditionally the last number of years, and that is a concern that I want to place once again on the record.

I also want to express some concern too that with the general downsizing of departments that in the case of the Civil Service Commission there is a reduction in terms of the Civil Service staffing itself, and I am particularly concerned in terms of the provision of services to both departments and to employees. I think that the Civil Service has been under a great deal of pressure, quite frankly, generally—I am not talking about the Civil Service section of the department—the last number of years because of the reduction in numbers and in some cases through the direct layoffs that did take place, although by and large what we have seen has basically been the result of reduction in numbers of employees in either early retirements or other employee adjustment mechanisms. So I certainly want to place that concern on the record.

There is a significant amount of pressure being placed on many people, and it was interesting today, I thought, that the government has announced this 1-945-STOP number, targeting welfare fraud because, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think it should be placed clearly on the record that one of the worst, most horrendous situations of overload is in terms of Income Security, the government's Income Security department.

So I think it is absolutely bizarre that we now set up a phone line when the government has seen fit, through its reduction in the number of civil servants in this province, not to deal with the horrendous welfare load that exists. I have had

repeated constituency concerns involving Income Security, and I will publicly commend Bill Ghostkeeper, the director in Thompson, who has been of tremendous assistance in often straightening out situations of Income Security.

But I can tell you that staff are burdened to the degree that I think that the government, if it is serious about making sure there is no fraud, but also just as importantly, if not more importantly, to make sure there is fair treatment of people on Income Security generally, which includes providing the benefits that people are entitled to when they meet the criteria for welfare, that one place to start is by looking at the staffing side.

I, by the way, do not believe that the phone line is appropriate. I believe that, I mean, what are we going to have next, a 1-945-STOP number for people who are abusing the Workforce 2000 program? Are we going to do the same in terms of other government programs and initiatives? Are we going to have a fraud line set up for someone who might go and fraudulently claim money from the Home Renovation Program? I think there are some questions that could be asked.

But my concern, because this is the Civil Service side, is in terms of the pressure that is there. I want to also raise this concern and perhaps the minister can respond, as to whether the minister in being responsible for the Civil Service Commission has, whether it be through his position in cabinet as another minister, whether it is through any internal committees, but more specifically as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, I think looked at the fact that there are departments where clearly there are problems in terms of understaffing, and I use the department of Income Security because—and Family Services by the way is very much in the same category—there are situations where people are dealing with caseloads that are absolutely impossible for anyone to deal with on a fair basis.

I would suggest, when we are dealing here with the whole question of Income Security and the government which has raised the issue of fraud, one way to assure that there is not fraud, and one way to assure that there is fairness for all people is

to have proper resources put in place. So I want to raise that because I think that is important.

I want to deal also with the implications of Bill 22 and ask the minister in terms of the specific action he has taken as Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission with regard to Bill 22, because I have received numerous calls from civil servants over the past year in particular pointing to some of the difficulties it has provided in terms of service. There are clear examples on the Justice side. I have talked to people who have said that because of Bill 22 and the closure of courts on the Fridays, in some cases the RCMP have had to charter aircraft because of the closure. Also on the correction side, on the intake side, they have had to charter aircraft to move people from one community, move them down south just for questions of public safety. I am wondering if the minister has reviewed some of those concerns.

There have been concerns put in place in terms of other essential services, and a lot of them, by the way, are coming from the Justice system. There is a very real concern in terms of that.

I am wondering if the minister can update the whole question of Bill 22 in reviewing the initial year in which—regardless of our position on Bill 22 and our party opposed it, I think the minister obviously is quite aware of that—but regardless of that, in terms of the implementation of Bill 22 whether any changes were made, and whether the Civil Service Commission played any role, the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, in ensuring that there was some greater flexibility in terms of its implementation, because I know there have been some initiatives that have improved the situation somewhat but there were significant problems.

I want to indicate also, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that I would still appreciate information. I do not believe I did get it following the Estimates last year, perhaps through an oversight, in terms of the number of employees, the breakdown of employees in this province currently in comparison to the number over the past 10 years. One of the concerns we have expressed in terms of decentralization is the fact that while the

government has talked about decentralization, there have been some initiatives, and we have supported decentralization initiatives, in many communities there are actually fewer civil servants today than there were when the government announced this whole policy just prior to the 1990 election.

I know in my own community where there have been some departments moved up. CEDF is relocated to Thompson. It had a small office previously; now it has relocated all its staff there which is very positive. The Department of Energy and Mines has also done so with about eight or nine staff. The bottom line, Mr. Deputy Chairperson—and this is ironic, by the way. When the Department of Energy and Mines was originally coming to Thompson there was a discussion of the need for additional office space. By the time they came to Thompson there was no need because the provincial government had eliminated so many positions in the Provincial Building that there was empty space. So I am looking again for a breakdown in terms of the number of employees over the past 10 years in different regions of the province, more specifically between Winnipeg and rural and northern areas. I think that is important, because when we are assessing decentralization we have to have those figures available to us.

There are a number of other issues that I will raise at another time in other forums, and I know the Liberal critic raised a number of issues as well which I was going to raise questions on. I wanted to put these comments on the record. I would appreciate response on a couple of the items I mentioned either now, if the minister wishes to put some comments on the record, but I would certainly be willing, in terms of any detailed questions, if the minister could provide me with that information in writing whether it be in terms of Bill 22, whether it be in terms of affirmative action, which I know has been raised to a certain extent, or whether it be in terms of decentralization.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, first of all, with respect to the area of affirmative action, I can advise the member that we had a very long

discussion about many of the issues that he raised in the earlier part of the discussion, and many of the answers he is seeking I think he will find in Hansard if he has not had a chance to peruse it. But the one thrust or question that I just reiterate, because I know it is of interest to him on how affirmative action was affected by downsizing, I am advised that proportionately there was no effect on our numbers, and in fact in some areas they have gone up. What all that means I am not quite sure, but our declared numbers have not changed in terms of their proportions with the downsizing.

* (1510)

With respect to pressures on employees, and particularly Income Security, it may be interesting to note that my staff advised me that they are not aware of any overall reductions in Income Security offices. In fact, Income Security offices have been areas that have been one which have offered redeployment opportunities as people have left, bringing people from other areas that positions have been eliminated and moving them into Income Security offices. It has been one of the better areas for moving people.

Now, I recognize fully that caseloads have increased over the last number of years. Obviously, that does put some increased potential, but they have not been the subject of downsizing in terms of those offices.

One area in Income Security that the member raises that was brought to our attention last year was the closure on Fridays of Income Security offices, which tend to be their busiest days. In keeping with the flexibility that we wanted in those areas, that problem was taken back to the department, and we have given a great deal of flexibility in ensuring that we meet essential needs. I believe at Christmas that was changed last year for the three days, and there will be a variation in those days this year in the program for the summer and the Christmas periods so that we, again, provided the flexibility. The rules are not so rigid that they become silly.

Just on that point, the member raised some issues with Justice and RCMP, and I can tell him from my experience, I get those kinds of calls that

he does, that often there are some legitimate cases that come forward where Bill 22 has caused some difficulties. When those are brought to our attention, we raise them with departments because we have, from cabinet level, said very clearly that we want departments to develop plans for implementation of Bill 22 that make common sense, that are realistic, that minimize the impact on service delivery and provide employees with as most useful time as possible. So the departments themselves are the people that develop the plans to ensure that they make common sense. We found after last year's experience, particularly after last summer, that there were some problem areas, and we worked with departments to address them, and made improvements in the Christmas closure. We have made some more refinements for this coming summer that are in place.

I have to tell the member that from time to time Bill 22 becomes the excuse for issues that have nothing to do with Bill 22, and I say to him that I had a call last summer, after the second Friday, from a Workers Compensation claimant. He called my office, and he talked to one of my staff. He said: Please tell your minister, I am not stupid. I was not born yesterday. There has been a six-week or eight-week delay in my adjudication of my claim. The employee at the Comp Board who was dealing with him blamed it on the Filmon Fridays, and I think this was only into the second Friday. He said, they must sure do a lot of work on Fridays down there to be six or eight weeks behind, because they had lost two Fridays.

Ultimately, we know that there is some impact on service, but there always will be people in human relations who use something else as an excuse for other problems. So one has to sort those out. But the gist of the member's comments is certainly valid. We should provide flexibility to ensure that common sense prevails in the application of these days, and that is what we have tended to do.

I say to him that, as a northern MLA, where service in the North and service patterns may be somewhat different than other parts of the province, if there are particular areas of operation

that come to his attention, we would be prepared to look at them. In fact, some of the changes that were made were the result of my information that came to me as an MLA or came to me as a minister. In checking with departments, we were not comfortable with the plans that they met, and we asked them to review them again. They made changes, because they were not particularly interested in necessarily accommodating the best service.

One area that we have offered again that was a problem last year was in the area of licence renewal, and what we have done is, I believe, that the motor vehicle branch will be open at 1075 Portage on the Friday, the 29th of July, for renewals at the end of that particular month. We have also just, not as part of Bill 22, but in that particular area, gone to a Saturday opening, generally on the last Saturday of the month, I believe, at one of our other locations, which is now advertised in St. James, so that we better accommodate. We had some resistance within the department having a Saturday opening to accommodate customer service, but it has worked out very, very well and, you know, through the work of the minister and his staff, that is again another service improvement.

Just one comment I make to the member on affirmative action, and I know that he is probably aware of this and it does pose a problem, and I call upon him through his good offices and connections with the labour movement, but one of the ongoing thorns, I guess, in the side of affirmative action for the moment has been the official position of the Manitoba Government Employees' Union to only want affirmative action at entry-level positions. I know there is a rule or a theory or a principle there that they have embraced very strongly. What it has meant is that the central affirmative action committee, the union-management committee that we have had in government, that goes back I believe to the times his party was in power, has not been a really effective tool in affirmative action because of the position of the MGEU. I recognize there is a conflict of two principles, but at some point that has to be sorted out.

I think just touching the areas that the member has raised, I hope I have given him some sense of where we are in those areas that he has raised.

Mr. Ashton: I thank the minister for that response. I would appreciate once again a response on the decentralization, the breakdown of employees. I realize the minister said last year it would be very difficult, but an attempt would be made to provide that information. I will accept whatever response the minister can give me in writing on that.

In the interest once again in terms of time I am prepared to pass this part of the Estimates.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: 1.(a) Executive Office (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$264,100—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$57,600—pass.

1.(b) Administrative Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$619,800—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$397,500—pass.

1.(c) Human Resource Management Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,242,900—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$689,700—pass.

1.(d) Labour Relations Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$937,800—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$224,700—pass.

1.(e) French Language Services Secretariat (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$168,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$21,800—pass.

1.(f) Organization and Staff Development Agency (1) Salaries zero—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures zero—(pass); (3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations zero—(pass).

Resolution 17.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,623,900 for the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

This concludes the Estimates of the Civil Service Commission.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Deputy Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau): We will now move on to the Department of Highways and Transportation on page 95 of your Estimates book.

We are on Resolution 15.5, item 5. Transportation Policy and Research (a) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$766,600.

* (1520)

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, when we last met on the Estimates, I had asked the minister questions pertaining to local airport control towers in the province that were potentially under threat at that time, the issue that I raised with the Thompson tower.

I learned just today that the federal Minister of Transport is now talking about cutting funding to local airport operations throughout the country and, in particular, tower services. I am wondering if the minister has had any communication from the federal minister on this issue.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Deputy Chairperson, in the Chair)

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, at this time I would like to introduce Joan Sunderland, manager of Management Support, who has joined us here this afternoon.

The member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) is referring to what we have all seen in the press, which seems to be the way Mr. Young wants to communicate with ministers and the citizens across the country. He makes statements; we have no way of knowing whether they represent policy, decisions made or decisions intended, because at this point, as minister, I have received nothing in the way of a letter or anything official, nor has the department.

The department has been involved in discussions with Transport Canada staff around the issue. We have written a letter as of June 2, I believe; I wrote a letter raising concerns about the airport control tower at Thompson regarding, first, safety at the airport and, secondly, the potential of interfering with economic development opportunities for Thompson and the North.

There are three towers currently in operation in Manitoba. Those are Winnipeg, St. Andrews and Thompson. Again, referring to the media commentary or report, it looks like they are

looking at towers with less than 60,000 airplane movements per year, and it looks like Thompson's record is in the range of 34,000 to 37,000 movements per year.

So if you are looking at the criteria he has set, and again I want to remind the member it is simply media comments that he has made, which he has consistently done, we have no verification that it is policy at this current time, that there was a decision by the federal cabinet or it is one that is imminent. It does raise concern to us, and we have certainly raised those concerns with the federal minister.

I know the mayor of Thompson has raised those concerns, and the MLA for Thompson has written me, and I have expressed precisely to him what we have just talked about.

Mr. Reid: I thank the minister for that. We are still concerned that the federal minister is continuing to make those comments as recently as today, and it causes us concern that he has not had the decency to even contact the provincial ministers of transport to make them aware of any items that he is contemplating at this time. It would seem only fair that he would that.

I want to switch for a minute and go to a consultant firm that was hired by the western provincial governments to look at the pending merger between CN and CP Rail. There was a meeting that was held in the province here, and the minister—I know we have raised this point in Question Period—through this firm has only included the shippers in the process of consultation. We had asked that the rail employees and members of the public at large be included.

Can the minister tell me how many people attended the meetings? What was the cost of the contract for this company? Is it shared equally amongst the provinces? When will they be reporting back to the minister?

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, the member asked quite a few questions with regard to the consultant that has been hired by the three prairie provinces to prepare some understanding of the implications of the CN-CP merger.

The total contract is \$65,000, which is being shared 50 percent by Alberta, 25 percent by Saskatchewan and 25 percent for the Province of Manitoba. That consultant will be consulting all groups which have interest in the topic, and we are expecting him to report at the Council of Ministers meeting next week in Calgary.

The meeting that the member refers to here in Winnipeg, 37 people attended the meeting.

Mr. Reid: Other than what this firm is undertaking, have any studies been done in the past to look at any impact that the change in the method of payment is going to have on transportation jobs, and in particular, rail transportation jobs in the province?

Mr. Findlay: With regard to the merger, if that is what the member is talking about, the MOP, we had what was called, when I was Minister of Agriculture, a ministerial advisory committee, which held meetings across the province of Manitoba over a course of probably at least four years. It had civil servant membership from both Agriculture and Transportation.

I think there were three or maybe four studies—I think it was four studies were done, commissioned by the advisory council, which throughout its course was chaired by the dean of the Faculty of Agriculture in Manitoba. First it was Mr. McGinnis, and then when he retired as dean, Mr. Elliot was the chair.

There was broad membership on that committee, from agribusiness and farmers. I think there were four farmer representatives and four agribusiness representatives, and they held a large number of meetings across the province to get input on the various proposals that were coming from the federal government on the method of payment.

At no time during the course of that discussion was there ever any reference to or analysis of the impact of the MOP being eliminated, which seems to be the mission that the federal government is on. If you can believe the comments of Mr. Young over the past, oh, going back to the 3rd of June when he started in Thunder Bay, and we had the emergency debate here on the 9th, and there was

some concern whether he really meant what he said. But Mr. Young has consistently made the same comments at speeches in Toronto, that as far as he is concerned, it can be eliminated. It shows very, very clearly his lack of understanding of the importance of that particular federal government program on the economy of western Canada.

* (1530)

Mr. Reid: The question was more targeted to not the elimination of the method of payment, because we know what that impact is going to have, not only on the railways but the producers, as well. At least, we can assume there is going to be a significant impact.

My concern here is if we change the method of payment from pay-the-railways position to pay-the-producers position, the railways are now saying that there is going to be a significant impact on the employment levels within the railways. I want to know what studies have been done within the province of Manitoba to determine what the impact is going to be on rail employment within this province if we move from an MOP of pay-the-railways to MOP of pay-the-producer.

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I have already given the member an indication of a fair number of studies that were done, and as a follow-up to those studies we did in this province and what other provinces did and what the federal government did, the federal government appointed the producer-payment panel, which has gone through the analysis of the question the member is referring to. To my knowledge, at this point in time, the federal Minister of Agriculture or the federal Minister of Transport has not released the final outcome of that producer-payment panel study, whose job it was to make a recommendation on what would happen with MOP changes.

The member says, what would happen to railway jobs? Well, I think the member is fairly well aware that a change in MOP will not change the amount of grain grown, and if grain continues to be hauled by railroad, there should be little or no impact on railroad jobs, because the MOP is in place to support the transportation costs of moving grain from the Prairies either to Thunder Bay or to

Vancouver for export. If the same amount of grain is grown, the volume on the railroads to be hauled will not change.

The issue is not so much what will impact on the method of payment change. The issue is, if the payment is removed entirely, what will the impact be, not only on the rail industry, but on the farm economy and the impact on rural communities across western Canada? I mean, it is a massive impact, and the federal Liberal government has taken a stance that is totally contrary to anything that had been discussed or analyzed in the past.

(Mr. Deputy Chairperson in the Chair)

There is no question that, if they follow through, there will be a drastic change in what we do, and there will be a very heavy call to change the way in which we handle grain and export it from this part of the Prairies, because if we are not nonviable today, we are very much nonviable after that happens.

Mr. Reid: The minister, then, should maybe look at the comments that have been made by the CEO of CP Rail and the CEO of CN Rail, wherein they talked about the impact of changes in the method of payment, which is pending. I mean, these people are obviously knowledgeable about the railway industry and, I would expect, would have a significant number of people who could study this issue and who have determined that there is going to be some effect on railway jobs, and they think it is going to be some significant effect. That is why I wanted to know about Manitoba, but I will not belabour that point.

Can the minister tell me what assurances he has had from the federal minister for the volumes of grain to flow through Churchill for this year? Has he received any correspondence, any indication, from the federal minister?

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the federal minister, neither of Agriculture nor of Transport, has given us any confirmation at this time of any volume moving through. There has been speculation of certain volumes to certain locations, but not confirmed by either federal minister or the Wheat Board at this time.

I might say that the speculated amount is at least equal to last year's amount, but I cannot comment on it, because it is not official. It is just a speculated amount, and there is no confirmation of the sale or where it will be shipped through. We are hopeful that the speculation is true, but, at this stage, no confirmation.

Mr. Reid: I have many more questions dealing with Transportation Policy and Research, but they are going to have to wait until we move through to concurrence, which, I believe, will give us another opportunity to ask some of those questions. It will be dealing with the merger, the CN-CP merger, when I will be asking those questions.

I will have some questions regarding the VIA Rail operations, whether or not there has been any other meetings that the minister has had with his federal counterparts or VIA Rail to determine what changes are anticipated, since there were some documents that were leaked or released earlier this year, indicating that Manitoba is going to potentially lose some of its service.

We will be asking again at that time to see if there are any changes with respect to Churchill grain volumes for this year. I think it was 288,000 tonnes last year; that is not an adequate amount and will leave the port in a deficit position for the second successive year and will only be a further nail in its coffin, which is something I am sure, hopefully, no member of this House would like to see.

With that I am prepared to pass Transportation Policy.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Item 5. Transportation Policy and Research (a) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$766,600—pass; (b) Other Expenditures \$336,800—pass.

Resolution 15.5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,103,400 for Highways and Transportation, Transportation Policy and Research, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Now I move on to Resolution 15.6, item 6. Driver and Vehicle Licensing (a) Management

Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$2,860,800.

The honourable minister, did you want to introduce your staff present?

Mr. Findlay: At this time, Mr. Dan Coyle has joined us. I am sure that both our critics know Mr. Coyle.

Mr. Reid: I have no questions under Management Services, Mr. Deputy Chair.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

6.(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$2,546,100—pass.

6.(b) Licensing (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,676,200.

Mr. Reid: I am going to put some questions on the record, and once again I will attempt to raise these during the concurrence motion which hopefully the minister will have some answers for me at that time.

The Photo Licensing Project, I would like to know, and it is my understanding that that has been completed in '92 and it is now a fait accompli. I want to know the revenue that is being generated from that program over and above the costs. I would like to know the costs of the program for sustaining it in its ongoing basis; the number of vehicles that are registered in the categories; questions regarding the staggered vehicle registration program that we are about to enter and any impacts that it may see on the staff; whether or not the minister has any anticipation or any policy intention of moving towards a graduated licensing program or system that has been developed in other provinces. With that I am prepared to pass that section.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: 6.(b) Licensing (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,676,200—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$1,367,200—pass.

6.(c) Safety (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$4,876,200—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$1,253,800—pass.

6.(d) Manitoba Public Insurance Cost-Sharing Agreement \$3,521,400—pass.

6.(e) Transport, Safety and Regulation (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,041,800.

* (1540)

Mr. Reid: Again, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I will raise these questions in concurrence. I will just put them on the record now for the minister's information.

I would like to know, since the province is now moving to the private vehicle inspection program, does the minister or the department keep any number of vehicles or have any estimation of the number of vehicles that will not be changing hands, that will not fall under the criteria established for the private vehicle inspection program?

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

6.(e)(2) Other Expenditures \$457,700—pass.

Resolution 15.6: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$19,601,200 for Highways and Transportation, Driver and Vehicle Licensing, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

We thank Mr. Coyle for taking the time to come and join us today.

We will now move on to Resolution 15.7. Boards and Committees (a) Motor Transport Board (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$321,500—pass.

7.(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$148,500.

Mr. Reid: Again, I will put questions on the record for the minister's information. I am looking for, as I had last Estimates, information relating to the Motor Transport Board's cost recovery. The Taxicab Board is moving towards a position of full cost recovery, and I want to know if the Motor Transport Board is taking similar steps. I see the monies that were allotted, but I want to know what their other operations entail, regarding their costs and whether or not they have achieved full cost recovery.

There was supposed to have been an interprovincial report on Motor Transport Boards,

and I can raise that issue with the minister in concurrence, and I am prepared to pass this.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

7.(b) Highway Traffic Board (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$207,500—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$67,700—pass.

7.(c) Licence Suspension Appeal Board and Medical Review Committee (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$210,600—pass.

7.(c)(2) Other Expenditures \$88,300.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I have a couple of questions that might not necessarily be related to this line, but it is an important issue for me. If the minister is prepared to entertain the questions—he indicates yes.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Order, please. Is there leave of the committee to allow the honourable member for Inkster to ask a question that is not relevant to this? Leave? No? Leave is not granted.

Leave is necessary for you to ask any questions that are not falling within the Licensing Board.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, can I ask then which line we are currently on?

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: We are currently dealing with Licence Suspension Appeal Board and Medical Review Committee.

Mr. Lamoureux: I will wait until we get to the Minister's Salary. I could not deal with the taxicab industry at this point in time?

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

We are now dealing with 7.(d) Taxicab Board (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$231,000.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I wanted to ask the minister, last year we had a piece of legislation that passed. There were some negotiations between myself, the minister, and the New Democratic critic was brought in towards the tail end, and the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), where we came up with what was believed a compromise in which we saw a commitment from the former minister to set into

process a structure that would allow for input from drivers, driver owners, other stakeholders within the industry before that particular bill would in fact be proclaimed. Given the importance of that particular bill and the need for some changes, I am wondering if the minister can give some sort of indication what the current status is. In particular, is the government still considering the proclamation of that bill? Maybe he can comment in terms of some sort of an update.

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I happened to sit in on some of the committee stage of the bill last year he is referring to and saw some of the input and the comments of people in the industry, so I can appreciate the circumstances that existed at that time. Since the compromise that the member refers to where all three parties were involved along with the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), there was a committee struck of four people from the industry to be able to communicate directly with the Taxicab Board.

Mr. Orle is now the chairman of the board, has been for some time now, and my understanding or my office's understanding is that there is, dare I say, much better harmony in the industry. Things seem to be going respectably well, considerably better than they were at the time that bill was being discussed, and I guess I am quite pleased personally that there is some harmony in the industry, some better understanding.

The Taxicab Board, I would like to commend them for the way they are conducting business. It seems to be creating that sense of understanding maybe that is out there in the industry, and until there is a recommendation from the board that it is time to proclaim that bill, we are not proceeding to that proclamation at this time. It is step by step, see if we can continue to have the success on an ongoing basis that we appear to have out there right now. I have to commend all the participants in the industry and the role that the board is playing to achieve that calm that we now have, or relative calm.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there was indication that this ad hoc committee that was being put together from the former minister would

also have some responsibility in terms of looking at other aspects of the legislation that could have an impact. I am wondering if the minister can indicate whether, in terms of both the short term or long term, what the government's intentions are. Are we going to see some additional changes to the legislation in which there were, as I say, specific concerns brought up? Is this group going to be able to develop, for lack of a better word, a blueprint or a white paper on what they believe is necessary in legislation?

Mr. Findlay: At this point we have not received anything, or there has not been any desire expressed to us to do anything in the way of legislative change. I prefer to allow the relationship between the board and the industry to evolve and develop, and if they come forward with some recommendations that I have comfort with that they are broadly supported, we would be prepared to act upon them. Nothing has come forward yet, and we will await recommendations from any component of the industry through the board to determine if there is any need in the near future or distant future for any changes.

* (1550)

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Order, please. I am interrupting the proceedings of this section of the Committee of Supply, because the total time allowed for Estimates consideration has now expired. Our Rule 64.1 (1) provides in part that not more than 240 hours shall be allowed for the considerations in Committee of the Whole of Ways and Means, and supply resolutions respecting all types of Estimates and of relevant Supply bills. Our Rule 64.1(3) provides that where the time limit has expired the Chairperson shall forthwith put all remaining questions necessary to dispose of the matter and such questions shall not be subject to debate, amendments or adjournment.

I am therefore going to call in sequence the questions on the following matters: Highways and Transportation, Resolutions 15.1, 15.7, 15.8; Health, Resolutions 21.1 and 21.9.

I would like to remind members that these questions may not be debated, amended or adjourned according to the Rules of the House.

Resolution 15.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,024,600 for Highways and Transportation, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Resolution 15.7: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,353,900 for Highways and Transportation, Boards and Committees, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Resolution 15.8: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$117,032,100 for Highways and Transportation, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Resolution 21.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$14,361,700 for Health, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Resolution 21.9: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$65,552,000 for Health, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1995.

This concludes our consideration of the Estimates in this section of the Committee of Supply. I would like to thank the ministers and the critics for their co-operation during this committee process.

Thank you very much. Committee rise.

JUSTICE

Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

This section of the Committee of Supply will continue to deal with the Estimates for the Department of Justice.

We are on item 5.(d) Judicial Services. Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber.

5.(d) Judicial Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits.

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): I am wondering if the minister could tell us if on May 24, the day before Judge Meyers was reassigned, the deputy minister met with Chief Judge Judith Webster.

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The answer is no.

Mr. Kowalski: I am wondering if the minister could tell me if she has seen a report of the Provincial Judges Association of Manitoba to the Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges, St. John's, Newfoundland, September 21, 1993? Has the minister seen this report?

Mrs. Vodrey: Yes, I have seen the report.

Mr. Kowalski: I have a question about the hearing officers. I understand they are now at the St. Boniface District 5 area. In regard to a report done by Greg Yost, I am wondering if the minister could share any of the information or findings that came from that report that was done, I think, in the latter part of last year.

Mrs. Vodrey: I am told that this is a discussion document, one which is being continually worked on to reach an end, that we have not yet shared an updated report with the police and Corrections and believe that that is a place where we need to start in order to keep the process one in which we had agreed to in the working relationship.

Mr. Kowalski: I just had some other questions in regard to the reassignment of Judge Meyers. Did the chief judge inform the minister or anybody in the minister's department of the reassignment prior to May 25?

* (1450)

Mrs. Vodrey: A day ago, the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and now today the member for The Maples have asked questions, and yesterday the member for St. James, I believe, attempted to accuse this government of interfering with the work of the Provincial Court of Manitoba.

He said that the Deputy Minister of Justice had met with the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court near the end of May. He said further that as a result of the meeting a judge of the Provincial Court was

reassigned from the area of domestic violence to another area of the court's work.

Madam Chair, this allegation is not only untrue, I think it borders on the scandalous, that a suggestion of this sort is made against public officials who at the time were not even in this House and that it could be made without a shred of evidence to support it.

I would like to be absolutely clear and unequivocal in my report to this House on this issue. As Minister of Justice, I had absolutely nothing to do with the decision that was taken by the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court, nor did the Deputy Minister of Justice, nor did anyone in the Department of Justice or, for that matter, the government of Manitoba. The decision was taken by the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court and was taken by her alone.

Madam Chair, when an outrageous suggestion of this nature is made, it is tempting to simply be dismissive of the allegation. I must say that I am sorely tempted to say to the honourable member that he is simply wrong in his allegation and get on with the business of this House.

The allegation, however, is now a public one. It is on the record. It has been made against senior officials responsible for the administration of justice throughout the province of Manitoba. It is important that I set the record straight and be perfectly clear on the circumstances here, and that is precisely what I intend to do now.

Madam Chair, I first intend to comment on the applicable law on this issue. Under The Provincial Court Act, this Legislature has entrusted the chief judge with full and exclusive responsibility for the supervision over judges and the assignment of their work.

Section 8.1(1) of The Provincial Court Act reads as follows and I quote: "The Chief Judge (a) has general supervisory powers in respect of judges, magistrates, justices of the peace and other staff in matters that are assigned by law to the court; and

(b) is responsible for the judicial functions of the court, including direction over sittings of the court and the assignment of judicial duties."

The law, therefore, is quite clear. The chief judge has full and exclusive responsibility for the assignment of judicial duties to the judges. That is something that I as Minister of Justice scrupulously respected since my appointment, and I certainly intend to follow that principle for as long as I am a law officer of the Crown.

Madam Chair, I would now like to outline to this House the sequence of events surrounding the reassignment of the chief judge of the judicial duties to be performed by the judge in question.

On the 22nd of May, 1994, articles appeared in the local newspapers concerning Judge Meyers. They are a matter of public record. In part they concern his early life. They also detailed an interview with a journalist, one that that journalist had with Judge Meyers.

On the 23rd of May, 1994, after reading these articles, the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court, Judith Webster, took a decision to reassign Judge Meyers to other judicial duties. That decision was taken by her alone. She did not consult me before taking that decision, nor would I expect her to. She did not consult or even discuss the issue with the Deputy Minister of Justice or anyone else in the government of Manitoba. I cannot put it more simply than that. She was dealing with an issue that fell exclusively within her assigned area of responsibility. It was a decision for her to make, and she made it in accordance with the facts before her.

On the 24th of May, 1994, after she had decided to reassign Judge Meyers, the chief judge telephoned the Deputy Minister of Justice. She informed him that she had taken the decision. This information was provided as a matter of courtesy, as the Department of Justice is responsible for court administration. No comment or advice was sought by the chief judge and none was provided by the deputy minister.

On the 25th of May, 1994, the Manitoba Court Executive Board met to discuss a series of issues concerning the administration of justice in the province. This board meets every six weeks or so and is composed of the Chief Justice of Manitoba, the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench,

the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court, the assistant deputy minister in charge of Court Administration and the Deputy Minister of Justice. Its mandate is to consider broad issues affecting the administration of justice with a view to streamlining the court system.

Madam Chair, this may well be the meeting to which the honourable member referred. He is very much mistaken, however, when he suggests that the issue concerning Judge Meyers was discussed. It was not on the agenda, nor was it discussed by anyone at the meeting. It was quite simply not discussed by the participants at this meeting before, during or after the meeting. The honourable member's information on this point is erroneous.

Later on the same day, at approximately 3 p.m., the chief judge held a meeting with Judge Meyers. At that time Judge Meyers was informed of the reassignment by the Provincial Court Chief Judge.

It has often been said in this House, Madam Chair, that honourable members of the Assembly bear a heavy responsibility to ensure that suggestions or allegations made by them are accurate and based on fact. The honourable members have come very close to breaching this principle. I believe the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) have cast a pall over the integrity of my office and that of senior public officials charged with the responsibility of administration of justice in this province. This is a serious state of affairs.

I have taken some time this afternoon to deal in detail with the real facts in a way that some may say are unnecessary. I think that a detailed account is necessary. I think it is important to set the record straight when the integrity of public officials is impugned. The true circumstances, as I have related them, are sufficient to dispel any concern of impropriety. There was none here at all. In reality there was never an issue to begin with. I call on the honourable members to reconsider their allegations to retract and to, at the very least, indicate to you, Madam Chair, that they are now

satisfied with the facts that have been detailed to this House.

Mr. Kowalski: I am also offended by the questioning of my privilege as a member of the opposition whose duty it is to monitor the different government departments, my right as a member to ask a question and give the government an opportunity to put on record the facts, as I have done today, knowing that the government official about whom we were questioning their conduct would be here to answer the question, just as a police officer. Anyone who is not guilty when a police officer investigates and asks questions should not be offended. Just as the old common law principle of the judge's rule is that a police officer has a right to ask any person a question to investigate a case, so has a member of this House.

As a critic, I feel I have the right when information comes forward, such as the fact that on September 21, 1993, Judge Meyers released a report to the Provincial Judges Association, the Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges, that was highly critical of the government and received other information. I had the right and the duty to ask those questions as a member of the opposition, as a critic, giving the minister and her staff an opportunity to put information on the record. I think that is my duty to do, and I do not feel ashamed in any way to ask a question, for those without guilt do not have to feel any guilt whatsoever.

So with those comments I will end the questioning on this matter.

Madam Chairperson: Item 5.(d) Judicial Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$7,427,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$609,400—pass.

Resolution 4.5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$26,642,800 for Justice, Courts, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

* (1500)

Item 6. Protection of Individual and Property Rights (a) Manitoba Human Rights Commission (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,104,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$357,800—pass.

6.(b) Legal Aid Manitoba (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$4,961,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$8,325,600—pass.

6.(c) Public Trustee (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$2,756,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$787,700—pass.

6.(d) Land Titles Offices (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$5,521,500—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$1,642,200—pass; (3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations (\$90,000)—pass.

6.(e) Personal Property Registry (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$660,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$485,600—pass.

Resolution 4.6: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$26,512,300 for Justice, Protection of Individual and Property Rights, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995. Shall the resolution pass?

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): Just a quick question for the minister on this line. Would the minister advise if she can right now, if not by taking it as notice, how much less Legal Aid Manitoba will receive in this fiscal year?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Chair, there is an increase to Legal Aid of \$337,300.

Mr. Mackintosh: No, I admit I was a bit sloppy in my question. I understand that there will be about a quarter of a million dollars less from the Law Foundation to Legal Aid Manitoba this year, and I am just wondering what the net difference will be to Legal Aid Manitoba as a result.

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Chair, I am informed that there may be a decrease from the Law Foundation to Legal Aid but there will be no net difference because the government has made that up. Is the member referring to the direct grant to the Public Interest Law Centre? [interjection] You are?

Madam Chair, I am informed that the funds to the Public Interest Law Centre are still under discussion at the moment, and so I do not have a definitive answer for him today.

Madam Chairperson: Shall the resolution pass? The resolution is accordingly passed.

At this time I would ask that the minister's staff please leave the Chamber so we can deal with item 1.(a).

1.(a) Minister's Salary \$20,600.

Mr. Mackintosh: We are nearing the end of a very interesting road, and I wanted to comment on the responses both in Estimates and in Question Period and what our understanding is of the minister's performance, particularly with regard to areas that I set out when I began remarks on the Estimates, and that is with regard to family or women's issues, in particular, and with regard to youth crime.

Before we get into that, I want to comment on the response of the minister today to remarks made by the members for Maples (Mr. Kowalski) and St. James (Mr. Edwards), and I think as well she made reference to remarks or a particular question raised by myself with regard to the government's role in Judge Meyers' effective disciplining.

I want to reiterate what I said in response to the matter of privilege that the minister raised in the House. The context of the questioning of the government is very important to this issue, and I reference the First Minister's (Mr. Filmon) response to my question on April 26 in this House when I asked the First Minister to table any legal opinion the government had advising it that it can conclude the retirement package without approval and knowledge of the Assembly. In response the First Minister said: the member opposite should know that matters of employment between employees of the government of Manitoba and the government of Manitoba are matters that can be dealt with by any administration in power.

Madam Chair, that is an absolutely astounding, astounding remark by a First Minister in this country, to think that judges are employees of the government. If the First Minister and this government is of the opinion that judges are employees of the government for the purposes of a benefits package, one must ask and be vigilant as to whether it also thinks judges are employees for the purpose of discipline. So with that context in mind, opposition members have every obligation

to ask the questions that were asked. It is their obligation on behalf of Manitobans.

Having made that remark, I want to go back and talk about the minister's responsibilities and duties and her record, particularly with regard to family issues and to youth crime issues.

We have brought in evidence before this House about the backlog in the Domestic Violence Court. This government on its own initiative set certain objectives when it established that court for a three-month backlog. That was one of the reasons why the court was established. It was to fast-track the serious, serious charges which, by the way, have ramifications for youth crime, ramifications for family unity in this province. Indeed, it is said that a young boy who witnesses his mother being struck by his father is a thousand times more likely than one who has not witnessed that to be a violent young offender. Indeed, the people that are involved in the youth justice system say that virtually all young violent offenders come from backgrounds of abuse.

* (1510)

We know from the anecdotal evidence that the backlog in the Domestic Violence Court is up to one year, and it can be more in certain circumstances, but there are a great number of cases that are waiting one year. I am certainly aware of one incident from New Year's Eve and the hearing will not be until late December. The minister has in Question Period in response to questions said that, oh, the backlog was only four and a half months. I cannot tell the minister the reaction that got from people who are in the justice system. Then the next day, on the Monday night in Estimates, she admitted that it was actually about seven months' backlog with six weeks of waiting time from the time of the offence to the time that the trial date is given. So she admitted only one day later that the backlog was in fact about eight and a half months. We know it is longer in fact.

We also are aware, both from the Jane Ursel report and from anecdotal evidence, that there is an 18-month wait for child abuse cases in Manitoba in that Domestic Violence Court, in some cases, and I am certainly aware of one that went longer.

We have become aware that the government has apparently made a decision, and I hope it will change its mind, not to continue to support the victim services units projects in seven Manitoba communities. This will have a direct impact, particularly on women and children in domestic violence cases, but indeed on all victims.

As I said at the outset, it is time for a new role for victims in the justice system. They have been left out, and the victim services units are just one step toward a greater role, one step toward greater justice for the party that is most affected by crime.

I know the minister's response, that these victim services units were part of a pilot project. Well, the pilot project has exceeded anyone's expectations. There are, I understand, up to 800 hours of volunteer work being put in in some of these units, just with the spurring from one staff member. These communities have given it their all through their volunteer efforts, and they cannot find the kind of resources necessary to ensure that these programs continue.

These victim services units and the mayors of the towns and villages have pleaded with the minister, and they will continue to plead with the minister, that she not offload this essential component of the justice system onto the community or simply abandon it. There must be a commitment of this essential service. There is a commitment through the Women's Advocacy Program in the city of Winnipeg and there will be in three other communities. Let us not have this hodgepodge attempt to deal with victims' issues. We have to have a comprehensive province-wide approach.

We have seen a pilot project commence in the Domestic Violence Court regarding zero tolerance whereby the victims of domestic violence can have the charges dropped if they advise they will not be testifying. We have said that this is not zero tolerance in that case, it is the new tolerance policy, it is the get-soft approach to domestic violence.

We have talked in Question Period and in this committee about the Maintenance Enforcement office. As I have said, they are shovelling water

over there. People are going without return phone calls for months.

A young brave woman came into this Chamber, she was so distraught, and talked about her experience about 20 messages left over the course of three weeks, and then she got a return call. That is a modest example of what is happening at that office.

The minister said in the throne speech that she would be bringing in new measures to ensure that the financial responsibilities of families are met. My understanding of throne speeches is that that announces the government's program for the pending session. Yet the minister has since confirmed that in fact she is not bringing in any measures but she is engaging in some consultation process. This is an urgent matter. There are innovations to maintenance enforcement in other jurisdictions which provide great examples for Manitoba.

We talked in Question Period about Wisconsin and Australia and Ontario's deduction-at-source programs. There are many other examples of ways to prioritize enforcement. It bothers me when I hear about the First Ministers or the Ministers of Trade and they make it a priority to get together and discuss how they can break down the trade barriers in Canada. Why can that not be done by the Ministers of Justice to break down the maintenance barriers in Canada so that maintenance enforcement can occur across this province without some artificial barriers?

In youth crime, the minister has failed to heed, virtually, every recommendation made by her own summit on youth crime and violence, and she has failed to implement even most of the programs set out in her nine-point plan. There was a one-day workshop on violence in schools, which had been planned in advance. It was piggybacked onto that nine-point plan. Finally, yesterday, the minister announced the gang phone line. That is like raindrops on the fire, Madam Chair. Some bells and whistles here and there.

At the same time, there are backlogs of up to 11 months in the youth court, so that consequences are not following the offence in the mind of youth.

The minister has failed to work with the government, push the government and take whatever action she can to reverse the cuts that this province has seen over the last six years to family and youth supports. There has been no enhancement of preventative and rehabilitation programs for young offenders. We have seen severe overcrowding at the Youth Centre, which will take away from the rehabilitative and counselling efforts provided by staff, which will threaten security.

The minister has failed to bring in the report on the War on Drugs so that we can test any government policies against what Manitobans have advised. We have seen the failure to fully implement the recommendations in the Pedlar report, and we note, in particular, the need for a long-term program for spousal abusers. We have seen the government pay about \$1 million to eight judges so they will retire and, as the minister says, refresh the bench. As I said in Question Period a few days ago, when a government refreshes the bench nearing the end of its mandate, Manitobans have a word for that.

But these judges are bought out at a time when there are terrible backlogs in the courts, at a time when we are facing summer, at a time when we are facing increased numbers of charges, at a time when there are 10 days for which the courts are shut down. We have seen the response to auto theft and vandalism with a bill, again a bell and whistle. We support that bill, but no comprehensive approach, no approach to encourage people to take preventative measures under The MPIC Act or otherwise to deal with what is a very, very serious problem out in the neighbourhoods. We have seen applications for Victims Assistance funding go on for years without a response. We have seen the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council fold without an active role by this minister, immediately, to ensure that service continued and was revitalized, and let alone the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, which, I think, is one of the darkest clouds over this government. This afternoon my colleague the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson) will be commenting on that or asking questions—but the virtual abdication by this government of the

opportunity and promise that is contained in that report.

Therefore, Madam Chair, I move that the Minister's Salary at line 1.(a), under the Department of Justice Estimates, be reduced to \$1.

* (1520)

Madam Chairperson: It has been moved by the honourable member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) that the Minister's Salary, line 1.(a) under the Department of Justice Estimates, be reduced to \$1. All those in favour—

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Chair, may I speak to the motion?

I am happy to take a little time to speak to the motion to correct on the record some of the information that the member has put. As people read Hansard, they are amazed to see how many times the member has to be told and how many times the member has just completely failed to understand the answers that have been given.

Madam Chair, let me start with some of the issues that were raised in the member's speech. The member speaks about the Family Violence Court. The Family Violence Court, which, I am more than happy to remind members opposite, was started by this government, the Family Violence Court which was developed by this government and implemented by this government.

Madam Chair, let me remind the member that under the previous administration, there was no Family Violence Court. Under the previous administration, there was no special attention to spousal violence and partner violence, there was no special court to deal with children who were victims, there was no special court to deal with elders who were victims. The other side, the previous administration, the party to which that member belongs, did nothing, absolutely nothing, and when this government came into power, this government moved, this government acted. This government set up the Family Violence Court. This government made efforts to deal with this most serious situation. It was an area which sorely needed assistance; it was completely neglected by members opposite when they were in government,

and this party and this government did not neglect it.

The member speaks about the Family Violence Court with what he calls anecdotal evidence, no hard evidence, no facts. Madam Chair, in this House, during the course of Estimates, I presented for the member facts which came from the Courts Division of the Department of Justice, which provided a very clear update as to the progress of cases through the courts, with the due process of justice, what exactly the time frame was, and I provided that on a regular basis.

Madam Chair, the member opposite did not even raise it in the discussion of Courts, but I put that information on the record when we discussed Prosecutions.

Madam Chair, the member relies on anecdotal evidence. He does not put forward any details of a single case he knows in which he claims took a particularly long time, and as the member knows—he has a legal background, he should know unless he has forgotten everything—reasons for delay are many. They are not just a result of the court system or the court's operation, but they also are a result of requests by the defence, agreement by the defence as to when they will bring a case forward. He knows that there are a great many reasons, a long list of reasons why a case may take such a long time, but as I raised in the course of Estimates, there were court dates available within that five- to seven-month period, and that it is our goal.

The three-month period was one which this government set for itself. That three-month period was not set by any other body. It was not set by the Supreme Court; it was not set by any other group. That three-month time period in which this government would like to deal with cases and which we aim to have court dates available was set by this government. Now, when defence lawyers or for other reasons of examination cases are outside of that three-month period, it does not mean that the court has been ineffective.

As the member knows, the Supreme Court ruled that it is in the range of 11 months that we would expect cases through the due process and that,

outside of 11 months, yes, questions might be raised if all cases and first-court-date opportunities were set after 11 months. But, Madam Chairperson, that is absolutely not the case here, and the people of Manitoba should understand the facts that court dates are available within the five- to seven-month window and some court dates before that time.

Now the member speaks about the pilot project that has been set up. I have explained to him that, because this government is so concerned about the Domestic Violence Court and the progress of cases, but with respect to due process we have looked at several points in which to attempt to make improvements so that cases can be seen in its most expedient way, one was to look at the prosecutions area.

There is a pilot project, but it is not operating as the member characterizes it. A stay within the pilot project may occur if the individual—with the full assistance of Women's Advocacy and supports available, the woman then says that she simply is not going to testify and that there is not other evidence which is available which will allow the case to proceed. So that case is then dealt with within the three-month window which the member has felt was so important. Also, cases in which the accused pleads guilty are dealt with within this pilot project. It is required co-operation between our Crown attorneys and some private law firms to look at how this pilot project will operate, but where an individual says that she has every intention of testifying and that she wants the case to proceed and that the accused has not pled guilty, in that case the case will proceed, and it will proceed through the court system.

The effort of the pilot project was to look at one point within the system and attempt to look at efficiencies which might be drawn, but never to overlook the rights and the needs of the individuals, the complainant or the accused.

So the pilot project has begun, and we will be looking to evaluate the pilot project to look at its success, but we have not stopped there. The Domestic Violence Court which was developed by this government will continue to look for every

way possible to deal with these cases in the most efficient way.

The member speaks also about victims services. We did spend quite a long time in the process of Estimates looking at victims services and what is able to be funded under the criteria. As the member knows, the program which he has spoken about is, to the best of my knowledge, a contract agreement between communities and the RCMP. It was entered into with the full understanding that, should communities find this particularly helpful, should it actually work in these areas, then other funding would be sought which would be ongoing funding. And that is, to the best of my knowledge again, exactly what the communities are in the process of doing.

The member attempts to characterize this. He is wrong. People know he is wrong. And I am happy to put on the record again what the terms are so that there is not any question about government making a decision or changing its mind in this area to the detriment of communities. That is not the case, and the member knows that to be true also.

* (1530)

The member knows that we do continue to offer a great deal of support to those people who are victims across the province. He has overlooked, or forgotten to say, or perhaps he did not think it was important to mention, that our Women's Advocacy Program has expanded across the province, that there are three new positions in the Women's Advocacy, that it has expanded outside the city of Winnipeg, and that the Women's Advocacy Program is now available in Brandon and Thompson and The Pas. That probably was not important to the member.

The whole area of the needs of the family violence court and the supports necessary to operate the family violence court have been considered by this government very closely, and that is what led to the enhancement of that program.

The member also knows that there will be an enhancement to child witness and child victim programs so that the counselling and the support will be available to those young people, that that is

now going to be available outside of the city of Winnipeg.

The member had this explained to him fully, but he seems to have forgotten to mention that as an important initiative on behalf of victims. The numbers of victims who have been served, if I remember correctly—I do not have the exact figure in front of me, but I believe that I remember—it was over 50,000 individuals who had been assisted through the Victims Assistance program. This government continues in its commitment; in fact, it has enhanced its commitment. Let there be no mistake about that enhancement, because that is exactly what has occurred.

Madam Chair, the member then speaks about Maintenance Enforcement and a commitment to provide measures to improve the Maintenance Enforcement Program. Somehow, to that member, measure has a very narrow meaning and includes only legislation. Yet, when we spoke about Maintenance Enforcement in this House and when I have answered in Question Period, I have very thoroughly explained to the member the measures which have been taken, which include enhancing the staff of the Maintenance Enforcement area. We enhanced it by two this year, by three last year. That is five additional staff.

We have added, over the past two years, \$50,000 for computer enhancement. That is important. That allows us then to make sure that the information is readily available, that it does not require a hand search, that it can be pulled up electronically and more quickly.

The member seems to have forgotten the \$70,000 advanced to the Maintenance Enforcement area for the automated-voice system so that people, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, can make phone calls to the Maintenance Enforcement office and get information, information about the status of their particular account. By and large, the biggest number of phone calls which we receive in the Maintenance Enforcement office are phone calls about the status of a particular account. This new voice-automated system will now allow for the Maintenance

Enforcement officers to be available to do casework which is more complex than simply the checking of the balance of an account.

We recognize that people in Manitoba who depend upon the Maintenance Enforcement system have sometimes some very significant needs. When they can be met, that allows families to go on with their lives. That is why this government has brought in measures to enhance the Maintenance Enforcement area.

In the area of legislation, I explained to the member that, yes, through Family Law and Maintenance Enforcement, we are meeting with the community. We are asking the community, what kinds of changes might be useful and helpful for Maintenance Enforcement; how can we improve the act.

Madam Chairperson: The honourable minister has 30 minutes.

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Chair, 30 minutes remaining?

Madam Chairperson: Thirty minutes in total.

Mrs. Vodrey: And the amount of time remaining, Madam Chair?

Madam Chairperson: I believe the honourable minister has been speaking for approximately 10 minutes, but we will be checking the time and I will give you adequate notice.

Mrs. Vodrey: Thank you, Madam Chair. It is important that I know that because the member made a number of very spurious allegations, and I would like to make sure that I have the opportunity to answer each and every one of them fully.

In the Maintenance Enforcement area, the member speaks about measures, and I am very happy to describe to him the kinds of measures that this government has taken. Now, if we could look back, what was it like when the previous administration was in government? How much money did they advance? How many staff were available to them? What kind of enhancements did they put into the Maintenance Enforcement? It was left to this government to provide the enhancements for Maintenance Enforcement, to

increase the staff and to put forward the measures which were spoken about in the throne speech.

The member also has spoken about some measures which are being taken in Ontario, a garnishment process in Ontario, and I have answered that at the time. They have a different system in Ontario. They do not have the same system that we have here at all, and because of that different system, they have brought in a different measure. We still have the opportunity to garnish, but we also have other systems in place in this province which we believe are more effective, and I believe other provinces look to and would like to have the opportunity to put in place where their system is more like ours.

The member speaks about policing, and he references in particular the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council police service which collapsed itself towards the end of 1993. I would like to put on the record again, because the member has not taken this in, that the DOTC police service was a 100 percent federally funded police service, federally funded now by the new federal Liberal government.

The federal Liberal government did not agree to come forward with any enhancements for the approximately \$500,000 shortfall for the DOTC police service. So the member also should really be looking to ask these questions of the federal Liberal government, the Solicitor General of Canada, and ask why did they not agree to continue the DOTC police service.

The government of Manitoba was not the funder of this police service, but Manitoba, this government, did take the issue very seriously, in fact, the issue of policing in aboriginal communities across the province very seriously. What we did was meet with the Solicitor General and advise the Solicitor General that this government was prepared to move ahead into the First Nations policing policy.

The First Nations policing policy, Madam Chair, is a tripartite agreement. It requires agreement from the federal government, the provincial government and also the aboriginal community involved. It requires a consultation through the

aboriginal community to determine what type of police service that community would like to have, whether they would like a stand-alone, whether they would like a mixed police service or whether they would like to have a policing by the RCMP. It also allows for long-range planning in the community so that officers can be trained, if they choose a mixed police service, with the end goal of having a stand-alone police service.

This government supported a movement towards the First Nations policing policy. We worked very hard and very carefully with the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council to come to a signing agreement, an interim agreement for policing on the DOTC reserves, but at the same time we are working with other aboriginal communities across this province to look with them at what kind of policing they would like to have and move into other First Nations policing agreements across the province.

* (1540)

I would remind the member that this requires agreement by three parties. It requires the communities to determine what they would like. It also requires that police services be set up which will be effective, which will protect the people of that community and which will also allow for fiscal responsibility. So we are working closely with the other two parties involved to move ahead in the policing agreement. But make no mistake, Madam Chairperson, the DOTC police service was a 100 percent federally funded police service and the federal government decided that it was not prepared to move ahead into providing the approximately—and again I believe I am accurate, but this is to the best of my memory—\$500,000 shortfall that the DOTC communities had.

Madam Chairperson, I would like to spend a little bit of time now speaking about youth crime, because the member has spoken about his concerns about youth crime. I can tell him I am concerned, too, and I am concerned about a lack of support that has come from members opposite in dealing with this very serious nonpartisan concern of Manitobans.

They are looking for members who are elected to help them come to some ways of dealing with youth crime and violence. Well, this government has taken an extremely active and vigorous role in dealing with youth crime and violence and we have heard nothing from the other side—both parties. Both parties have failed to either be supportive of the ideas put forward by this government or to come up with any of their own.

We know that the foundation of dealing with youth crime and violence is the law that covers it, and the law that deals with and covers youth crime and violence is the Young Offenders Act. The Young Offenders Act, Madam Chairperson, was brought in when the previous federal Liberal government was in power. It was brought in by the federal Liberals, and now we have the federal Liberal government again, and it is amazing that I have had petitions brought forward from across Manitoba. I have over 8,000 names. Members in Manitoba know how important the issue of youth crime and violence is, and I have not had one approach or any support from members in this House or from the federal Liberal members who represent us to Canada.

I have not had the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy or the member for Winnipeg South come forward and say that they will take the names and the concerns of Manitobans to Ottawa and encourage changes to the Young Offenders Act—not once. Not once. The Liberal opposition, the NDP opposition simply do not care.

So the underpinning to managing youth crime and violence being the act, the law, this government has taken a very strong position across Canada in asking for that to be changed, because we want to have respect for the law, and because we want to have changes to the law, which, we believe, will make it the most effective law that it can be at this time.

I was very pleased that the federal Liberal Minister of Justice has agreed to put forward some changes. I am very pleased that they reflect closely what Manitoba has proposed. However, it will be now up to the political will of the federal Liberal government to actually put those changes through,

and we will be watching, because we do not know if they, in fact, do have the will to put those through.

Madam Chair, this government held the first-ever summit on youth crime and violence. We brought forward Manitobans from across this province to deal with this most serious issue, because we recognize that this requires many minds around the problem, that this requires community members, parents, young people, educators, all community members, business people, to come together and to look to find solutions. They worked in small groups, and they brought forward 700 recommendations to be used across this province.

Those recommendations were in categories for use by families, by the media, by schools, by community groups and also by government, and governments paid attention to those recommendations which are directed to them, and we look for other members, other participants, to also look at what is directed to them and to act on it. We look for the media's support in being positive in terms of highlighting very positive actions of young people.

From those recommendations, Madam Chair, this government came forward with a nine-point plan. A nine-point plan is a starting point. It was never meant to be the total plan. It was a good start. It is a good start, and we continue to add to it. We have added to it already. We have added to it with our amendments to The Highway Traffic Act, which deal with public safety, and the nine-point plan deals with the prevention, the intervention and the consequences of youth crime.

We are very interested in the prevention side, and in dealing with prevention, I was very pleased yesterday to make the announcement on behalf of this government of the youth contact line. That youth gang contact line will be able to be used by young people, young people who feel they are concerned about gang activity, they are concerned for themselves and they want assistance in being able to withdraw, or they want to have assistance and give information about activities they are concerned about, or parents can call the line.

Parents can get information or referrals which will help them with a young person known to them who may be involved in youth crime and violence. This has been a very successful initiative in British Columbia, and we are looking for it to provide assistance in Manitoba.

Before I go on to describe the other parts of the nine-point plan, I think it is important that I am able to say: Each initiative on its own may look like a small initiative; each initiative on its own looks like perhaps a part of a puzzle; and it is when you put all of those pieces together that you have the real force of the effort that this government has put behind combatting youth crime and violence; each part on its own is important and forms a part of the whole, but it is all of those initiatives that are put together that will make a difference in the area of youth crime and violence.

We were very pleased with the youth gang line, Madam Chair, that it also met the requirements that had been put forward in the summit. The summit said: In any initiatives put forward, involve youth; in any initiatives put forward, look at creating perhaps a new type of activity; involve the police; involve the business community; involve citizens. The youth gang line which was announced yesterday meets those criteria. Young people came forward to workshops. They became very involved and concerned about the issues of youth crime and violence. Some of those young people had first-hand experience with gang activity. They worked through possible scenarios so that they had had experience. Then they sat down, and they did the graphics work. They created the posters, and they looked at what would be an effective name for the youth gang line.

Madam Chair, I am very pleased to say again today that the young people of Winnipeg have named this Street Peace. The line will operate first in the city of Winnipeg, and then we will look at its success—it is a pilot project—and then we will look at moving—

Madam Chairperson: Order, please. I am interrupting the proceedings of this section of the Committee of Supply because the total time

allowed for Estimates consideration has now expired.

Our Rule 64.1(1) provides, in part, that not more than 240 hours shall be allowed for the consideration of Ways and Means and Supply resolutions respecting all types of Estimates and of Supply bills. Our Rule 64.1(3) provides that where the time limit has expired, the Chairperson shall forthwith put all remaining questions necessary to dispose of the matter.

I am, therefore, now going to call, in sequence, the remaining questions. I should point out at this time that these questions may not be debated or amended.

* (1550)

Resolution 4.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty—

Point of Order

Mr. Mackintosh: There is a motion before the committee. Surely the motion has to be dealt with and dispensed with.

Madam Chairperson: The interpretation of the rule regarding the disposition of remaining questions has always been interpreted that the remaining resolutions only will be dealt with.

* * *

Madam Chairperson: Resolution 4.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,145,100 for Justice, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995. Shall the resolution pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

An Honourable Member: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Chairperson: No? All those in favour of the resolution, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it. On division?

Formal Vote

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): I request a recorded vote.

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

Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

The question before the Committee of Supply is Resolution 4.1. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,145,100 for Justice, Administration and Finance for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas 24, Nays 25.

Madam Chairperson: The resolution is accordingly defeated.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I was paired with the Minister of Housing (Mrs. McIntosh). Had I not been paired, I would have voted no.

ABORIGINAL JUSTICE INITIATIVES

Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay): Resolution 27.1. RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 for Other Appropriations, Aboriginal Justice Initiatives, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

This concludes Committee of Supply. Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinsson), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

House Business

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wish to seek leave of the House in order to have Bill 31 read for a second time.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to allow the honourable government House leader to bring forward Bill 31 at this time? Leave? [agreed]

SECOND READINGS

Bill 31—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment and Income Tax Amendment Act

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I thank honourable members for providing me leave to introduce the bill.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Manness), that Bill 31, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment and Income Tax Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba et la Loi de L'impôt sur le revenu), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments to The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Act and The Income Tax Act respond to a range of issues that have emerged in the administration of the fund. Essentially, they allow the administration of the fund to flow more effectively to the benefit of the people of Manitoba who invest in the fund, the fund itself and other Crocus shareholders. The proposed amendments to The Income Tax Act respond to changes in federal legislation whereby money invested in a registered retirement savings plan will now be able to be used to purchase shares in Crocus directly rather than through a multistep process.

The proposed amendments to The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Act will limit the requirement for a re-evaluation of an asset to circumstances where the change in the asset will have a material effect on its value; ensure that unnecessary administration costs are avoided while still preserving the purposes for which the fund was created; and ensure that the value of Crocus shares are not falsely represented by allowing the fund to segregate fixed income securities purchased to hold until maturity from the short-term market fluctuations. As well, the amendments to this act ensure that the estate of any deceased shareholder will be able to redeem Crocus shares without waiting the minimum seven-year waiting period and eliminate confusion about the minimum waiting period before which a person who is retired or deemed to be retired must hold his or her share.

I commend these amendments to the honourable members of the House for speedy approval so that the administration of the Crocus Investment Fund may flow as smoothly as possible for the benefit of both investors and our province as a whole through the investment objectives of the fund. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate on Bill 31 be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call Bills 22, 25 and 27.

Bill 22—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Attorney General, Bill 22, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994; Loi de 1994 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives, standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to allow this piece of legislation to

pass through to committee to give members of the public the opportunity to come out so that we might hear their concerns. We look forward to those committee hearings and meeting members of the public who may wish to do so. Thank you.

* (1640)

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, this type of bill, I have been told, appears at every session. It is supposed to correct minor errors and omissions and clarify previously unclear provisions. This bill corrects a mistake with respect to residency requirements for Brandon city councillors. It amends The Civil Service Superannuation Act to require that fund monies be invested only in investments authorized under The Pension Benefits Act. It changed the name of the Credit Union Stabilization Fund to the Credit Union Deposit Guarantee Corporation. The balance of the bill is housekeeping.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome passing this bill on to committee where we can hear public submissions and further debate. Thank you.

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

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 22, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994; Loi de 1994 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives.

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

**Bill 25—The Statute Law Amendment
(Taxation) Act, 1994**

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), Bill 25, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1994; Loi de 1994 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité, standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

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

Bill 27—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Attorney General (Mrs. Vodrey), Bill

27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

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

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I believe if you check the clock, it is five o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it five o'clock, or is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? [interjection]

Order, please. Let us get this clarified here. Is it the will of the House to call it five o'clock?

An Honourable Member: Five.

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 25—Aboriginal Veterans Day

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson):

WHEREAS aboriginal veterans have served in the defence of Canada since the Battle of the Plains of Abraham; and

WHEREAS aboriginal service in the Canadian Forces was on a volunteer basis; and

WHEREAS aboriginals' service in the Canadian Forces resulted in the loss of their aboriginal rights and their acceptance in the aboriginal community; and

WHEREAS these aboriginal veterans had for many years failed to receive recognition of their service in the Canadian Forces and to the country of Canada; and

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has declared November 8 as an official day of recognition and remembrance for aboriginal veterans; and

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has also recognized the significance of November 8 for aboriginal veterans.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba support the designation of November 8 as Aboriginal Veterans Day.

Motion presented.

Mr. Hickes: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to stand up today and speak to this resolution, a resolution which seeks to formally recognize the sacrifice and contribution of aboriginal veterans who have served this country.

The formal recognition and remembrance of the commitment and courage of aboriginal veterans is long overdue here in Manitoba. Most Manitobans are familiar with the vast sacrifices made by war veterans in both world wars and the Korean War, the many lives which were lost to the ravages of the war, the loss of years with friends and family and often the loss of health and sense of security. These are losses which all soldiers experienced during the wars and losses which we as Canadians have all been made aware of.

During this year in particular, Mr. Speaker, 50 years after the date of the D-Day invasion, the media coverage of D-Day memorials has heightened the public awareness of the horrors of war and the stories and experiences of Manitoba's war veterans. Yet few Manitobans are aware of the full extent of the losses which were endured by aboriginal veterans and the difficult situations which many aboriginal veterans faced when they returned home to Canada.

Unlike many of the soldiers they fought alongside, aboriginal soldiers were not always treated as heroes upon their return to Canada. After sacrificing years of their lives to fight for this country, aboriginal soldiers returned to Canada with nothing. Stripped of their aboriginal status after volunteering for the forces, many aboriginal veterans were unable to even return to their own communities following the war. Without a chance to return to the life they had lived before going off to war, these same veterans remained

unrecognized and unaccepted by the nonaboriginal community.

Clearly, for aboriginal veterans, their sacrifices did not end once they had returned to Canadian soil. Mr. Speaker, while nonaboriginal veterans were eligible for a land grant provided by the Government of Canada after returning from the war, aboriginal veterans were never offered these same land grants and often lost their previous land rights along with their treaty status.

Even today, with the renewed focus on veterans and the anniversary of the D-Day invasion, many people are still unaware that in order to serve in the Canadian Forces to serve their country, aboriginal soldiers were forced to give up their treaty status and their rights which went along with this status. I believe many Manitobans are unaware of this fact, because our province has never had specific recognition of aboriginal veterans and of the great sacrifices which they made in their service to Canada.

In going off to war, aboriginal soldiers put more than their lives on the line. By giving up their status as aboriginals they put their own cultural identity in jeopardy in order to serve their country. When people think of aboriginal veterans, often the only person they can name is Tommy Prince. They cannot name George Myron, George Mann, John Charles Spence, Bill Daniels, Walter Daniels, Bill Sinclair or the countless other Manitoba aboriginals who bravely served their country during each of the world wars.

Mr. Speaker, 125 Manitoba aboriginals lost their lives in the service of their country during World War II. It is time that the Province of Manitoba formally recognize these veterans and the great losses which they endured in order to serve their country.

In order to better explain the extent of the sacrifices which were made by aboriginal veterans, I would like to read to this Legislature an excerpt from a presentation made by the National Aboriginal Veterans to the standing Senate committee on aboriginal peoples earlier this year.

In his presentation to the Senate committee, Sam Sinclair, the president of the National Aboriginal Veterans, stated: I remember while in the service we were treated as equals, because one bullet can kill you as well as another person. Once we returned home, we were treated as nobodies again. People were denied jobs. We thought that some of us were qualified for these jobs. We were denied at other levels involving land, education, health and responsibilities all the way down the line, because people were not told exactly what their rights were as aboriginal veterans. They did not know what was available to them.

Another presenter explained how many aboriginal veterans did not even get compensation money, explaining monies that were due to veterans on reserves, if they were overseas or had an allotment coming to them, were generally sent to a person in authority, not to the spouse, not to the veteran, but to a person of authority. This usually meant the Indian agent or the Bay store or whoever happened to speak English, French or German.

Since the earliest battles on the Plains of Abraham, aboriginal people have served in defence of our country, and I believe it is time that these veterans were afforded the recognition and respect which they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg has proclaimed November 8 as an official day of recognition and remembrance for aboriginal veterans, and I would hope that this government would follow the city's lead by passing the resolution put forward today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table for the House the mayor's proclamation, which reads:

WHEREAS aboriginal veterans have served in the defence of what is known as Canada since the Battle of the Plains of Abraham;

AND WHEREAS service in the Canadian Forces was on a voluntary basis;

AND WHEREAS serving in the Canadian Forces meant the loss of aboriginal rights;

AND WHEREAS upon discharge the volunteers were not accepted back into the aboriginal

community or recognized by the nonaboriginal community;

AND WHEREAS the aboriginal men and women who have served have not received the recognition due them;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has declared the 8th day of November, 1993, as an official day of recognition and remembrance for aboriginal veterans;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, SUSAN THOMPSON, Mayor of the City of Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba, do hereby proclaim Monday, November 8, 1993, as Recognition and Remembrance Day for Aboriginal Veterans.

It is dated in Winnipeg the 8th of November, 1993, and signed by the mayor of our city.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a resolution that all parties could support. There is no politics in this. It is just to honour a lot of the aboriginal veterans who stood up and fought for our country in order to give them recognition, as the Government of Canada and the mayor of Winnipeg has done. I think it would be righting an undue wrong that has been created from the past.

So I would encourage all members of this House to support this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (1650)

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister responsible for Native Affairs): I am very pleased to rise to speak on this resolution today. I think its aims are indeed very noble and worthy of support by all members of this House.

I do wish, though, the member for Point Douglas, in his discussion of this resolution, would have spoken in a little bit greater detail about the loss of status, because I must admit I fall into the particular category that he spoke of, of many who are not aware of that.

Many of the aboriginal veterans that I remember as a child, particularly from the First World War, it never appeared to me that they had lost status, and I look forward—perhaps the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson), who, I understand,

will be speaking on this resolution, will be able to provide some more information.

One thing I am aware of that the member did not mention in his remarks, and I think it is important to be on the record in terms of context, is, I understand, that aboriginal Canadians who served in our Canadian Forces during the war were granted the right to vote in federal elections, which status aboriginal people did not have at that time. This may be part of the explanation on the status, but that right was granted to aboriginal people who served in the Canadian Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity for me for a few moments to recollect about an individual I knew as a very young child. The member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) made reference to a number of aboriginal veterans. When I was a young person growing up, a very good friend of our family was a Mr. George Williams from Peguis. Mr. Williams was a very old man, when I remember him, in the 1960s. I believe he passed away in the early 1970s, but Mr. Williams had served in the Canadian Army during the First World War in France. My grandfather, my mother's father, an Albert Hargreaves, had also served in the Canadian Army. Whenever Mr. Williams was at our home and my grandfather was there, the two of them would reminisce considerably about their common service in the defence of Canada and Canadian interests in the first great war.

The fact, of course, is that there were many aboriginal Canadians who have served Canada. As the member references the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, I am sure there were aboriginal Canadians on both sides in that particular battle for Canada. I think, if one goes into history, one will find that the service of aboriginal Canadians fighting along either French or English armies prior to the Plains of Abraham is also evident. So the tradition of aboriginals fighting with European armies in the interests of one side or another in those early battles in Canada goes back beyond the Plains of Abraham.

Certainly, in the Canada that we know today, aboriginal Canadians have always played a part in the defence of an independent Canada. Certainly,

when one looks at the War of 1812—and it is obviously not recent history, but in that very important war in the history of this country, when British and Canadian forces repelled invasion by American troops, the role of aboriginal units fighting with the British Army was one of the key successes in the ability of a very small British Army to repel much larger American forces in the Niagara Peninsula.

Obviously, aboriginal Canadians of that time made a choice as to whom they wished to fight and defend and chose the British, at that time, made the choice of whom they would support and chose the British who ultimately maintained control of Canada so that inevitably, in the march of history, we were able to have the country that we have today.

I think, when one looks at aboriginal servicemen who fought in both world wars, the name of Tommy Prince, who comes from my constituency, certainly stands out. I know the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) made reference to Mr. Prince. Mr. Prince also has the distinction, of course, of being the most decorated Canadian servicemen, I believe, in the history of our armed forces, having served in both the Second World War and Korea.

There are others, as the member for Point Douglas has mentioned, who certainly have done service for Canada and served very nobly, honourably and bravely in the defence of our country and the principles for which it stands.

I say to the House, as well, I had the opportunity last year of attending the first annual inspection of the Hollow Water corps in the constituency of the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson). I remember, during the course of that very proud event, a group of a dozen or so veterans from the community who had seen service in the Second World War and Korea. I could see the pride on their faces as they assembled to watch the young people in that community serve their country in the army cadet corps that is resident in that community. It reminded me again of the common bonds that we all share as Canadians, whether we be of aboriginal or nonaboriginal descent.

There are many things that divide us in this country, but there are certainly many things that unite us, and the common service to our nation in times of war is one of the bonds that certainly ties Canadians together very strongly.

It is with great regret, quite frankly, that many members of our aboriginal community paid a fairly hefty price in loss of status, as the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) has pointed out, by serving our country in our armed forces. Through this special recognition for aboriginal veterans, it provides an opportunity somewhat to recognize their contribution. But as many in this House, I am sure, would want me to point out—certainly on this side—we as Canadians owe a great debt of gratitude to all our veterans of whatever background who have served the interests of this country under arms.

Today as we speak, we read in the newspaper of the funeral of one of our brave armed services personnel who lost their life in the cause of peacekeeping in Croatia. We should not forget the sacrifices and the risk taken by those who serve our country in our armed forces. Although none of us in this House, I am sure, like war, like fighting and violence, we recognize there are times when one must take a stand, when one must be prepared to put one's life, health at risk for the betterment and protection of society.

The fact that so many aboriginal Canadians took it upon themselves in the most difficult of circumstances to offer themselves, offer their services to the monarch and to the country certainly must be recognized, and I am pleased to offer the support of this side of the House to this resolution. I look forward to the comments of the member for Rupertsland who will shed some more light on this particular area of history that is not well known. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eric Robinson (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to the resolution sponsored by the honourable member for Point Douglas.

Allow me to begin by expressing my gratitude for the kind words that have been spoken by the

Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Praznik), responsible for Native Affairs as well.

This resolution, I believe, is long overdue. Many of our veterans were willing to give the ultimate sacrifice in defence of this country and the freedom that all Canadians now enjoy. Even though as treaty Indians and based on our treaties it was not necessary for us to go to war, our forebears nevertheless felt it was a responsibility on their part based on a treaty relationship that does exist between the British Crown. Of course, I have mentioned it in this House before and elsewhere that the responsibility of the relationship was later transferred to the Canadian government in later years.

* (1700)

Our treaties, beginning with treaty No. 1 in Manitoba, signed in 1871 at Lower Fort Garry, based on that treaty relationship and the recognition by the aboriginal veterans or forebears as Britain being a treaty partner, the First Nations people particularly felt it was an obligation to defend the British Crown. Many of our men and women came to the defence of Canada in the time that Canada needed men and women to enlist in the armed forces during the First, Second, Korean Wars. Of course, that tradition continues, and many of our people have enlisted in the armed forces. Most recently, some of our people have seen service in the Gulf crisis in recent history.

The enfranchisement of treaty Indian people, particularly who served in the armed forces—many things were promised to First Nations people upon entering the service that they would be given land, they would be given certain things in return for their service in the Canadian Armed Forces. Unfortunately, when they came home they found themselves in greater despair and the respect that was due to them was never fully rendered by the Canadian government. The consequence of their service in the war was that treaty Indians serving side by side with nonaboriginal people, to enter bars and establishments like that in Europe and elsewhere in Canada during training camps, made it necessary for a lot of our forebears to forsake their treaty status and enfranchise in that

fashion in order for them to be with their comrades at these places. That is how the enfranchisement came about, Mr. Speaker. These people who did enfranchise were then considered blue-card Indians because they carried blue cards as identification, identifying them as Indian people but non-Status Indians.

The other thing, up until early 1960, it was necessary, particularly for First Nations people, to get a permit signed by the Indian agent in order for us to leave our reserves. I did not personally experience that, but certainly my parents and grandparents and my great uncles, my great aunts experienced that.

It has only been in recent years—in 1960, as I said before in this House, Mr. Speaker, was the year that we were given the recognition and the ability to vote in Canadian politics. We have only realized this in the last 34 years. There was a lot of discrimination that was faced by our forebears, even though they had laid their lives on the line for the freedom that everybody enjoys in Canada. We should all be proud of that fact that we are a free country and maybe many people do not realize that, but First Nations people, aboriginal people certainly had a role to play in this.

The Union Jack—I would like to talk about that—is still held in high regard and in high reverence by First Nations people particularly. It is only fitting that we in Manitoba should remember that the Union Jack is part of the provincial flag. We should never forget that, and, again, it goes back to that relationship with Great Britain. Many of our First Nations veterans tell us never to forget who we are and never to forget about our veterans. So whenever we gather at celebrations and at gatherings of First Nations people, a song similar to Canada's national anthem is sung to remember the veterans who laid down their lives for the freedom of this country.

The opportunity is here for me, Mr. Speaker, to put on the record some of the veterans who were willing to give the ultimate sacrifice from the community I was born in and the First Nation that I am a member of.

In World War I—and all these veterans are deceased now that I would like to read into the record: Matthew Neckaway; John James Menow; Thomas Charles Evans; Sandy Laughler; Alex Saunders; Charles Whiskeyjack; Henry Swanson; Jude Swanson; Walter Keeper; Joe Keeper, my great uncle, a recipient of the military medal and, after the First World War, an Olympian in the long distance, I should add; George Cromarty; George Brown; Willie Crate; Andrew Crate; John Robertson; Alec Whiteway; Alfrød Settee, another great uncle; Charles Wesley; Willie Robinson, a great uncle; Donald Robinson, my great grandfather; and, while fighting for the freedom of this country, some of the warriors who did not come home: George Campbell, Murdock Cromarty, Eric Olson, Elijah Tait.

World War II: Thomas Duncan; Jack Thomas Osborne; John James Quaskekapow; Andrew Robertson; Stanley Settee; Murdo Scribe; Alpheus Wilson; Charles Wesley; Paul Daoust; Robert Robertson; John James Menow; John Robertson; Thomas McLeod; Frankie Paupanekis, my great uncle; Willie Paynter; Donald Paynter; Stanley McLeod, my great uncle; Thomas Muskego; John Muswagon; Alfred Quaskekapow; Charles Quaskekapow; Sandy Gunn; Denny Allan; John Lowe; George Lowe, killed in action; Charlie Mowatt, killed in action; John Angus Muswagon, killed in action; Kenneth Scribe, killed in action; Phillip Jones, killed in action; Joe W. McKay; Joe McKay.

All these men that I mentioned from Norway House are all deceased with the exception of Sandy Gunn, John Lowe and Denny Allan.

In the Korean War as well, many of our men got up and were prepared to again defend this country: Kenneth Budd; James Robert Hart; Joseph Irvine Keeper, my uncle; Skeegix Darcy, who is now deceased.

From Cross Lake, all these World War I veterans are now gone on to the spirit world: Archie Halcrow, James McLeod, Stanley McLeod, Happy Jack Ross, St. James Whiskey, Edward Thomas.

In World War II from Cross Lake: Rose Beardy was killed in action; Sandy Beardy; William Cook; Ruebin McKay, an elder that I still visit periodically and I consider an uncle is still with us; Ernest McLeod, another uncle is still alive, but nevertheless talks about the significance of the aboriginal veterans and the role they played in the defence of this country; Stanley Mercer, killed in action; Peter Halcrow, now deceased; George McIvor, now deceased.

In the Korean War: Ernest McLeod, Donald McKay, Thomas Albert Ross.

In Nelson House, Mr. Speaker, in World War I we had Edwin Swanson; World War II, a great uncle of mine, William Thomas, Tommy Linklater, both deceased, George Spence, John Charles Spence, Alex Flett; in Korea, Russel Gossfeld. These warriors are still alive and still provide a lot of guidance and direction for our young leaders in the Nelson House community.

In Grand Rapids we have Alex Mercredi, who was a World War II veteran. In Gillam, a man who was also willing to give the ultimate sacrifice, George Dion, whom I have periodic contact with, served during the Korean conflict.

This is also a list of the veterans who served in the First World War. These veterans are from Sioux Valley: Samuel Dowan, Manus Merrick, George Blackface, John Taylor, Tom Kasto, Rufus Williams, Fredrick Essie, Herbert Happa, Norman Chaske, Zeph Sioux, Charles Happa, Johnny Noel, John Doota, Gilbert Moore.

In World War II, and also Korea: John Sioux, a good friend of mine was a Hong Kong veteran and a prisoner of war; Lawrence Antoine; Alfred Antoine; Herman Essie; Frank Happa; Henry McKay; Ralph Merrick; Abe Mini; Willim Mini; Stanley McKay; Alfred Tacan; Morris Tacan;

Allan Pratt; Peter Whitecloud; Albert Elk; Joseph Runearth; Solomon Hall. This is just a partial list of the men and women who served in the great wars in years gone by.

* (1710)

I would like to ask for the support of all members of this House, so finally this province, which should be very proud of its aboriginal veterans, recognizes November 8 as Aboriginal Veterans Day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in support of the resolution. It is always difficult following the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson) because of his oratory skills. In the brief time he has been in this House, I am impressed by his oratory skills, and it is difficult to follow someone like that.

I just want to add our words of support for this resolution. By the fact that the Government of Canada has already declared November 8 as official day of recognition and remembrance for aboriginal veterans and that the City of Winnipeg has likewise done, it is only befitting that members of this Assembly declare this day, November 8, Aboriginal Veterans Day. I support the resolution, as do the other members of our caucus. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the resolution of the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), Resolution 25, Aboriginal Veterans Day. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [agreed]

Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?

Some Honourable Members: Six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

