



Second Session - Thirty-Seventh Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report
(Hansard)**

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



Vol. LI No. 58B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, July 5, 2001

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Seventh Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AGLUGUB, Cris	The Maples	N.D.P.
ALLAN, Nancy	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
ASPER, Linda	Riel	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky, Hon.	Inkster	N.D.P.
CALDWELL, Drew, Hon.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean, Hon.	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
LOEWEN, John	Fort Whyte	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
MURRAY, Stuart	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PENNER, Jim	Steinbach	P.C.
PITURA, Frank	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack	Southdale	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Carman	P.C.
RONDEAU, Jim	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
SALE, Tim, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Wellington	N.D.P.
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
SMITH, Joy	Fort Garry	P.C.
SMITH, Scott, Hon.	Brandon West	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
TWEED, Mervin	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, July 5, 2001

The House met at 1:30 p.m.**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS****PRESENTING PETITIONS****Kenaston Underpass**

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Steve Jones, Faraz Shere, Tracy King and others, praying that the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Doer) consider reversing his decision to not support construction of an underpass at Kenaston and Wilkes.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Joy Enright, Lisa Bernier, Karen Stonyk and others, praying that the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Doer) consider reversing his decision to not support construction of an underpass at Kenaston and Wilkes.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS**Kenaston Underpass**

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger), I have reviewed the petition and it complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? *[Agreed]*

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth:

THAT the intersection at Wilkes and Kenaston has grown to become the largest unseparated crossing in Canada; and

THAT the volume of traffic for this railroad crossing is twelve times the acceptable limit as set out by Transport Canada; and

THAT vehicles which have to wait for trains at this intersection burn up approximately \$1.4 million in fuel, pollute the environment with over 8 tons of emissions and cause approximately \$7.3 million in motorist delays every year.

WHEREFORE YOUR PETITIONERS HUMBLY PRAY THAT the Premier of Manitoba consider reversing his decision to not support construction of an underpass at Kenaston and Wilkes.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen), I have reviewed the petition and it complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? *[Agreed]*

Madam Clerk: The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth:

THAT the intersection at Wilkes and Kenaston has grown to become the largest unseparated crossing in Canada; and

THAT the volume of traffic for this railroad crossing is twelve times the acceptable limit as set out by Transport Canada; and

THAT vehicles which have to wait for trains at this intersection burn up approximately \$1.4 million in fuel, pollute the environment with over 8 tons of emissions and cause approximately \$7.3 million in motorist delays every year.

WHEREFORE YOUR PETITIONERS HUMBLY PRAY THAT the Premier of Manitoba consider reversing his decision to not support construction of an underpass at Kenaston and Wilkes.

* (13:35)

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL
COMMITTEES**

**Standing Committee on Law Amendments
Sixth Report**

Mr. Doug Martindale (Chairperson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

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

Meetings:

Your committee met on the following dates:

Thursday, June 28, 2001, at 10 a.m.

Tuesday, July 3, 2001, at 6:30 p.m.

All meetings took place in Room 255 of the Legislative Building.

Matters Under Consideration:

Bill 11—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives

Bill 23—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route

Bill 33—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2)/Loi n^o 2 modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives

Bill 35—The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act/Loi visant à faciliter la perception des paiements alimentaires (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)

Bill 36—The Enhanced Debt Collection (Various Acts Amended) Act/Loi visant à faciliter le recouvrement des créances (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)

Bill 37—The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act/Loi sur l'établissement et l'exécution réciproque des ordonnances alimentaires

Bill 46—The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale et la Loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine

Bill 49—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2001/Loi corrective de 2001

Membership Resignations/Elections:

Substitutions received prior to commencement of meeting on June 28, 2001, at 10 a.m.:

*Hon. Mr. Ashton for Hon. Ms. Barrett;
Mr. Reid for Hon. Mr. Chomiak;
Hon. Mr. Mackintosh for Hon. Mr. Selinger;
Ms. Allan for Mr. Aglugub;
Mr. Praznik for Mrs. Driedger;
Mr. Cummings for Mr. Gilleshammer;
Mr. Reimer for Mrs. Mitchelson.*

Substitutions received during meeting on June 28, 2001, at 10 a.m., by leave:

Ms. Korzeniowski for Hon. Mr. Lemieux.

Substitutions received prior to commencement of meeting on July 3, 2001, at 6:30 p.m.:

*Mr. Gilleshammer for Mr. Cummings;
Mr. Faurschou for Mr. Reimer.*

Public Presentations:

The following individuals and/or organizations made presentations on Bill 11—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives:

*Sharon Stewart, Private Citizen
Donald Dewar, Keystone Agricultural Producers Inc.*

Shawn Feely, IMPACT, The Injury Prevention Centre of Children's Hospital
Terry Johns, Coalition of Manitoba Motorcycle Groups

The following individuals and/or organizations made presentations on Bill 23—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route:

Donald Dewar, Keystone Agricultural Producers Inc.
Greg Riou, Heavy Equipment Rental Association of Manitoba

The following individuals and/or organizations made presentations on Bill 33—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2)/Loi n° 2 modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives:

Josh Weinstein, Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties

The following individuals and/or organizations made presentations on Bill 35—The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act/Loi visant à faciliter la perception des paiements alimentaires (modification de diverses dispositions législatives):

Paula Mallea, Private Citizen

The following individuals and/or organizations made presentations on Bill 37—The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act/Loi sur l'établissement et l'exécution réciproque des ordonnances alimentaires:

Paula Mallea, Private Citizen
John Stefaniuk, Canadian Bankers Association

The following individuals and/or organizations made presentations on Bill 46—The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale et la Loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine:

Robb Tonn and Linda Giesbrecht, Provincial Judges Association

Written Submissions:

The following individuals and/or organizations offered written submissions to the Committee on Bill 11—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives:

Tristan Goertzen, Private Citizen

The following individuals and/or organizations offered written submissions to the Committee on Bill 23—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route:

Chris Lorenc, Manitoba's Heavy Construction Association

Bills Considered and Reported:

Bill 11—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, with the following amendments:

THAT the following be added after section 4 of the Bill:

4.1 The centred heading before section 26 and section 26 are repealed.

THAT section 5 of the Bill be amended

(a) by striking out the part before the proposed centred heading "NOVICE DRIVERS" and substituting "The following is added after section 26:";

(b) by renumbering the proposed subsections 26(1) to (5) as subsections 26.1(1) to (5);

(c) in the proposed clause 26.1(1)(m), by striking out ", or blood alcohol concentration levels of zero, for novice or" and substituting "for";

(d) in the proposed clause 26.1(1)(n), by striking out "his or her blood alcohol concentration level exceeds the prescribed level" and substituting "he or she has any alcohol in his or her blood";

(e) in the proposed clause 26.1(1)(r), by striking out "driver's blood alcohol concentration level exceeds the prescribed level" and substituting "driver has any alcohol in his or her blood"; and

(f) by adding the following after the proposed clause 26.1(1)(r):

(r.1) respecting the removal and storage of a vehicle, and any towed equipment, being driven by a novice driver when he or she has been found to be driving with alcohol in his or her blood, and respecting the enforcement of the costs of removal and storage;

THAT the following be added after section 5 of the Bill:

5.1 The following is added after section 26.1:

Stages for novice drivers

26.2(1) A novice driver must hold a class or subclass of licence prescribed for novice drivers

(a) in the learner stage for at least nine months before being eligible to progress to the intermediate stage;

(b) in the intermediate stage for at least 15 months before being eligible to progress to the full stage; and

(c) in the full stage for at least 12 months before he or she is no longer a novice driver.

Exemption for existing licences

26.2(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to a licence that is issued before the day on which this section comes into force.

Zero BAC level: novice drivers

26.3 No novice driver shall, while he or she has any alcohol in his or her blood, operate or have care or control of

(a) a motor vehicle or off-road vehicle; or

(b) an implement of husbandry, special mobile machine or tractor.

Restrictions at learner stage for class 5 vehicles

26.4(1) A novice driver who holds a class or subclass of licence prescribed for novice drivers

in the learner stage entitling him or her to operate a class 5 vehicle shall not

(a) operate a class 5 vehicle unless a supervising driver is in it;

(b) operate the vehicle

(i) with anyone else in the front seat other than the supervising driver, or

(ii) with anyone in the part of the vehicle behind the front seat except in a seating position that is equipped with a seat belt;

(c) tow another vehicle; or

(d) operate an off-road vehicle on or across a highway.

Restrictions at intermediate stage for class 5 vehicles

26.4(2) A novice driver who holds a class or subclass of licence prescribed for novice drivers in the intermediate stage entitling him or her to operate a class 5 vehicle shall not,

(a) between 5:00 a.m. and midnight, operate a class 5 vehicle with more than one passenger in the front seat or with anyone in the part of the vehicle behind the front seat except in a seating position that is equipped with a seat belt; and

(b) between midnight and 5:00 a.m., operate a class 5 vehicle

(i) with more than one passenger in the vehicle, unless a supervising driver is in the vehicle, or

(ii) when a supervising driver is in the vehicle, with anyone else in the front seat other than the supervising driver, or with anyone in the part of the vehicle behind the front seat except in a seating position that is equipped with a seat belt.

THAT the following be added after section 22 of the Bill:

22.1 Clause 319(1)(vv) is replaced with the following:

(vv) prescribing classes and subclasses of licence required to operate or learn to operate a

specified class or type of vehicle or more than one class or type of vehicle, prescribing fees for examinations for various classes and subclasses of licences, governing drivers who hold particular classes or subclasses of licences, and prescribing conditions and restrictions that shall apply to any class or subclass of licence;

Bill 23—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act/Loi modifiant le Code de la route

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, with the following amendments:

THAT the proposed subsection 24(1.1), as set out in section 4 of the Bill, be replaced with the following:

Licence required to operate tractors, etc.

24(1.1) Every person shall, before operating an implement of husbandry, special mobile machine or tractor on a provincial highway, or a highway within the municipal boundaries of a city, town, village or urban municipality, obtain and have in his or her possession a valid and subsisting licence of a class that authorizes him or her to drive a class 5 vehicle, as defined in the regulations, without a full-time supervising driver.

THAT clause 21(2)(b) of the English version of the Bill be replaced with the following:

(b) in the subsection, by striking out "clauses (1)(a), (c) and (d) do" and substituting "clause (1)(d) does".

Bill 33—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2)/Loi n° 2 modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, with the following amendments:

THAT section 7 of the Bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed subsection 242.3(40):

Sending confirmation statement

242.3(40.1) Instead of sending a copy of a registered financing statement to a motor vehicle owner, secured party or insurance company

under subsection (9), (11) or (36), the designated person may send the owner, party or company a copy of a statement, issued by the Personal Property Registry, confirming registration of the financing statement.

THAT the proposed subsection 264(1), as set out in subsection 9(1) of the Bill, be amended in clause (d) of the definition "Category A offence" by striking out "or section 263.1 or 265".

THAT the proposed subsection 264(1.1), as set out in subsection 9(1) of the Bill, be amended by striking out "a series" and substituting "an unrelated series".

THAT subsection 12(2) be amended by striking out "subsection 6(1)" and substituting "subsection 9(1)".

Bill 35—The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act/Loi visant à faciliter la perception des paiements alimentaires (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, with the following amendments:

THAT subsection 59.4(3), as set out in section 13 of the Bill, be amended

(a) in clause (a), by striking out "on the personal property of the person in default" and substituting "on all personal property of the person in default, including proceeds and after-acquired personal property"; and

(b) by replacing clause (b) with the following:

(b) is deemed to have been perfected on the day

(i) the maintenance was due,

(ii) the enforcement provisions of this Part become applicable to the order, or

(iii) this section comes into force;

whichever occurs last.

THAT subsection 59.4(5), as set out in section 13 of the Bill, be amended in the part before clause (a) by striking out "before or after the

maintenance was due and payable" and substituting "after the lien and charge was perfected".

Bill 36—*The Enhanced Debt Collection (Various Acts Amended) Act/Loi visant à faciliter le recouvrement des créances (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)*

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, without amendment.

Bill 37—*The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act/Loi sur l'établissement et l'exécution réciproque des ordonnances alimentaires*

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, without amendment.

Bill 46—*The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale et la Loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine*

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, without amendment.

Bill 49—*The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2001/Loi corrective de 2001*

Your committee has agreed to report the bill, without amendment.

Mr. Martindale: I move, seconded by the honourable Member for St. James (Ms. Korzeniowski), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs Third Report

Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Chairperson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Committee on Municipal Affairs.

Madam Clerk: Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs presents the—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs presents the following as its Third Report.

Meetings:

Your committee met on Tuesday, July 3, 2001, at 6:30 p.m. in room 254 of the Legislative Building.

Matters Under Consideration:

Bill-25 *The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie et modifications corrélatives*

Bill-28 *The Labour-Sponsored Investment Funds (Various Acts Amended) Act/Loi sur les fonds de placement des travailleurs (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)*

Bill 50—*The Regional Health Authorities Amendment (Accountability) Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les offices régionaux de la santé (responsabilités)*

Membership Resignations/Elections:

Substitutions received prior to commencement of the meeting:

*Mr. Tweed for Mr. Maguire
Mrs. Driedger for Mr. Faurschou
Mr. Loewen for Mr. Laurendeau
Hon. Ms. Mihychuk for Mr. Martindale
Hon. Ms. Barrett for Hon. Ms. Friesen
Hon. Mr. Chomiak for Hon. Ms. McGifford
Mr. Struthers for Mr. Aglugub
Hon. Mr. Sale for Hon. Mr. Selinger*

Public Presentations:

Your committee heard seven presentations on Bill 25—The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie et modifications corrélatives, from the following individuals and/or organizations:

*Cory Sul, Private Citizen
Robert Chernomas, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
Albert Cerilli, President, Manitoba Federation of Union Retirees
Margot Lavoie & Brother Thomas Novak, Manitoba Oblate Justice & Peace Committee*

*Carolyn DeCoster, Private Citizen
Madeline Boscoe & Carol Scurfield, Women's
Health Clinic
Paul Moist & Lorraine Sigurdson, Canadian
Union of Public Employees*

*Your committee heard four presentations on Bill
50—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment
(Accountability) Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les
offices régionaux de la santé (responsabilités),
from the following individuals and/or
organizations:*

*Heather Temple, CEO, Middlechurch Home of
Winnipeg*

*Mr. Michael Doiron, The Interfaith Healthcare
Association of Manitoba*

*Raymond Lafond, Catholic Health Association
of Manitoba*

*Real Cloutier, Winnipeg Regional Health
Authority*

Written Submissions:

*The committee received one written submission
on Bill 25—The Health Services Insurance
Amendment and Consequential Amendments
Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie
et modifications corrélatives, from:*

Linda West, Private Citizen

Bills Considered and Reported:

*Bill 25—The Health Services Insurance
Amendment and Consequential Amendments
Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie
et modifications corrélatives*

*Your committee agreed to report this bill without
amendment, on division.*

*Bill 28—The Labour-Sponsored Investment
Funds (Various Acts Amended) Act/Loi sur les
fonds de placement des travailleurs
(modification de diverses dispositions
législatives)*

*Your committee agreed to report this bill with
the following amendments:*

*THAT the part of the proposed definition
"placement peu important admissible" before
clause (a), as set out in the French version of*

*clause 2(1)(a) of the Bill, be amended by striking
out "0000" and substituting "000".*

*THAT subsection 14(2) of the Bill be amended
by striking out "and" at the end of clause (a) and
by adding the following after clause (a):*

(a.1) by repealing clause (a); and

*THAT subsection 36(2) of the Bill be replaced
with the following:*

*36(2) Subsection 16(2), section 28 and
subsection 29(2) come into force on a day fixed
by proclamation.*

*36(2.1) Section 17 comes into force on January
1, 2002 or any later day fixed by proclamation
made before January 1, 2002.*

*Bill 50—The Regional Health Authorities
Amendment (Accountability) Act/Loi modifiant
la Loi sur les offices régionaux de la santé
(responsabilités)*

*Your committee agreed to report this bill without
amendment.*

Mr. Nevakshonoff: Mr. Speaker, I move,
seconded by the honourable Member for
Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg), that the report of
the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Oscar Lathlin (Minister of
Conservation):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to
table the 2000-2001 Annual Report of the
Manitoba Tire Stewardship Board.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, I would
like to draw the attention of all honourable
members to the public gallery where we have
with us today Nicholas and Mark Loewen who
are the sons of the honourable Member for Fort
Whyte (Mr. Loewen).

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

* (13:40)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Health Care System Election Promises

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, under this Premier's watch the nursing shortage has doubled, waiting lists have grown longer and in the last year and a half, three people have died waiting in rooms and waiting for care. He ought to be disgusted with his record in terms of failings and broken promises.

Why did this Premier mislead Manitobans day after day in the election campaign saying: Elect me and I will solve all your health care ills in six months with \$15 million?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): The number of graduates in nursing by the year 2002, our first full graduating year, will be triple that of 1999.

Secondly, the Chief Medical Examiner has reviewed the cases referenced by the member opposite, and the Chief Medical Examiner will review all the circumstances with the Rogalsky death. We respect the role of the Chief Medical Examiner, and I hope the member opposite does as well.

Mr. Murray: Manitobans, when it comes to health care, are tired of this Premier's excuses, and they are tired of him blaming everyone else for his failures. He did not promise to reduce the number of patients in hallways; he promised to eliminate them. He did not promise to just offer more training opportunities; he promised to immediately hire more nurses and immediately convert part-time nurses into full-time nurses.

I quote from what he said, Mr. Speaker—always go back to the source: Doer aims for more full-time nurses. NDP Leader Gary Doer said his party will attract more nurses to the province by converting part-time positions to full-time positions. That seems to be a logical step forward, Doer said.

Now that he is Premier, what we hear is: Well, you cannot just add water and stir and mix

to get a nurse. Why then did the Premier mislead Manitobans and say he could? It is another election broken promise.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Prior to recognizing the honourable First Minister, I would like to take this opportunity to remind all honourable members when referring to a member, by constituency or ministers by their portfolios. I would ask the co-operation of all honourable members.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, in the rhetoric of the member opposite, which is regrettable, the member made a number of statements. One is: blame someone else. We have said that we will accept and respect and deal with any recommendations that come from the Chief Medical Examiner. We had said that yesterday. We say that again today in the House. We say that dealing with other matters that have been raised before them.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the issue of hallway patients, there was an allegation made yesterday in the House that this contributed to the situation. There were no patients in the hallways at Seven Oaks on the day—[interjection] Well, if the members want to heckle about a very serious matter, I am very disappointed.

Mr. Murray: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said over and over and over that a promise made is a promise kept. In his own news release, he states: Today's NDP is not going to make promises galore and then break 40 percent of them. These are the Premier's election releases. A stack of broken promises.

Can the Premier tell the friends and the family of Herman Rogalsky and all Manitobans why he made numerous policies and numerous promises on health care and he knew he could not deliver on them? Manitobans have no reason to trust this Premier.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious number of questions that are being raised by Manitobans, by the public, by people in this

Chamber and by the Rogalsky family. Those questions deserve answers. They do not deserve to have a rerun of a political disagreement.

The issue of hallways and their contribution to the situation will be examined by the Chief Medical Examiner, the same process that was used, for example, when the Chief Medical Examiner determined that an inquest was necessary after the 12 baby deaths in 1995. The two cases the member referenced earlier and the case today have been reviewed by the Chief Medical Examiner. There was no recommendation for any inquest following those cases.

This case and the concerns and the questions raised, including hallway medicine, our information was that there were no patients in the hallways on the Saturday at Seven Oaks, where the patient was taken by his family—*[interjection]* I think that heckling is unbecoming of members opposite on such a serious matter, Mr. Speaker.

* (13:45)

Private Health Care Clinics Government Position

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): On a new question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, waiting lists are longer, the nursing shortage has doubled, patients are now having to go out of province for care, rural health care facilities are closed for weeks on end, and, hang onto your gurney, it is getting worse. It is not just the patients and the families who are in pain, but it is also the nurses, the doctors and the many other health care professionals who are feeling the pain of the Doer government's deteriorating health care system.

When will this Premier recognize that the status quo is not working? It is not keeping up to the growing demand. Will he open up his mind to a collaboration with publicly funded, privately run health care clinics?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, dealing with the answer to the last question, with the heckling, I was unable to complete my

answer. The question was asked about the Rogalsky family and Mr. Rogalsky. As I said before, the matter will be fully examined by the Chief Medical Examiner of Manitoba.

The issue of nurses, the issue of hallways, whether there were any patients in the hallways, we are led to believe there were none in both hospitals during that time. The issue of staffing—*[interjection]*

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, I think the issue is the deteriorating health care system under his watch. That is what the question is about.

The Premier should learn from his mistakes that he has made. Manitobans know full well what he promised during the election campaign, and now they know that he has broken his promises. They have had enough of his misleading and broken promises. The Premier's status quo health care system is failing Manitobans.

There are public-private health care systems around the world that are working better than Manitoba's. Why will this Premier not be open to reviewing them and, whatever is working there, bring it here and make it work in Manitoba?

Mr. Doer: To complete the question, before I was shouted down, from two questions ago, the assertions and allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition and all the other questions raised by the family and the public, every one of those questions and the issues will be independently evaluated by the person that has the qualifications, the credentials, the independence and responsibility to do so. That will not be the Leader of the Opposition, it will be the Chief Medical Examiner of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we will heed the advice and findings of the Chief Medical Examiner, as I would suggest is crucial.

On the second last question dealing with a mix of public and private, there already is a mix on the question last about innovations. We are continuing to innovate. We are continuing to look at more resources, particularly the resources that we are training. We believe that all of these decisions will have long-term benefit for innovation and health care services here in Manitoba.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, clearly in Manitoba there is growing dissatisfaction with the Doer government's health care system. Yet the Premier refuses to be open to new ideas that would lead to improvements. Change is needed. The status quo is just not acceptable.

Will the Premier commit today to looking at public-private successes in other countries? Will he open up the debate so Manitobans, all Manitobans can have input on what they think their health care system should look like? Because the health care system belongs to all Manitobans, not just him.

Mr. Doer: There are a number of bills before the House, including a bill that the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) worked considerably long hours on in co-operation with the front-line health care providers and the various boards of directors.

It implements a number of recommendations that flow from the Thomas report, where we have a quasi-regional health care system without the benefits of regional co-ordination for patient care. The Minister of Health has brought in a number of innovations, but he has done so in co-operation with the faith-based institutions and the other health care facilities to ensure that we can have greater innovation, greater co-operation, patient care that starts in the community.

That is the bill before the Legislature right now. It flows, as I say, from the inadequacies of health care that were identified in Justice Sinclair's report and articulated in the Thomas report. There is much work ahead of us, and we will continue to work for patient care every day we are in office.

* (13:50)

Antigang Strategy Government Commitment

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice on another raised, but not met, expectation. I am sure the tranquility of a beautiful Manitoba morning was broken this morning at the home of the Minister of Justice

when he got out of bed and saw today's headline in the Free Press that the Hells Angels were coming through town, because he sped to his office and he put out another press release that he has finally done what he committed to do 14 months ago, with his announcement that he made today.

I want to ask this Minister of Justice: Is the only way we get action out of this Government on justice issues if the Hells Angels are driving through our capital city?

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the question is just a silly one. The issue, as we announced to this House earlier this week—today we announced an initiative to deal with street gangs, not biker gangs.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this Attorney General: Does he think it is silly when, 14 months ago, on the 16th of May of the year 2000, he promised the people of Manitoba initiatives that he is only delivering today, 14 months later? Is it silly to expect action out of a minister of the Crown?

Mr. Mackintosh: I know this is a question that was raised by members opposite before. It was our hope and expectation that the part of what was announced today would be available in the fall. As a result of illness in part of the department and as well, Mr. Speaker, some extensive consultations, in fact, 40 organizations and individuals were asked for their input into the development of our announcement today, which is Project Gang Proof.

It is a three-part announcement. First of all, there is a Web site available for parents, youth and communities to help identify gang activity, gang behaviour and provide courses of action that can help reduce the level of street gang activity in Manitoba. As well, we coupled that with the announcement today that, as of today, there is in place for all Manitobans a resource help line to deal with street gangs.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this minister how Manitobans can have any faith in their justice initiatives. They are losing faith in their health care initiatives. How can they have

any faith when this minister announces 14 months ago, in May of last year, that his big initiative would be in place in the fall of the year 2000? Where is the competency of this minister? Why will he not accept responsibility for his lack of action?

Mr. Mackintosh: I thank the member for the question because it allows me to put in context what the initiative was today. He characterized it as some big initiative. We made it very clear that the initiative announced today is arguably a small but nonetheless important part of what is a comprehensive strategy, and last May we announced our road map for a strategy—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Mackintosh: Perhaps the member might want to reference back to the announcement of May, which included as part of our comprehensive approach the creation of a Criminal Organization Unit in the Department of Justice, including five prosecutors and support staff on top of that; five prosecutors designated to deal with organized crime, including biker gangs; the creation of an RCMP gang unit which is up and running; the creation of a program by the Winnipeg Police Service, which we are helping to fund, will take action in schools. These are parts of the initiative that was announced in May, and there is more to come.

Eaton's Building Heritage Status

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): Yesterday, the Minister of Heritage indicated that one way of showing respect for heritage buildings was to knock them down. This is the same minister that said, and I quote from Hansard on June 21: I have not received a report of any kind.

That was June 21. We have since learned that he received a recommendation from the Heritage Council on the 9th or 10th of June. I would like to ask this minister what his response was yesterday to Mr. Bill Neville, who resigned as chair of the Heritage Council as a result of this minister's inability to stand up for the Heritage Council and instead who chose to

deliberately mislead this House and to follow the Premier's (Mr. Doer) direction—

* (13:55)

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would ask the honourable Member for Fort Whyte to withdraw the words "deliberately mislead."

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would kindly ask the honourable Member for Fort Whyte to withdraw the words "deliberately mislead."

Mr. Loewen: I unconditionally withdraw those remarks.

Mr. Speaker: Unconditionally withdraw the remarks? I accept that from the honourable member.

The question has been put.

Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism): Regrettably, the chair of the board found it in his wisdom to step aside with regard to being the chair. He wanted to be a public citizen, as was quoted, and he wanted to be able to participate in the debate. He felt the honourable thing would be to step aside and to be able to participate in the debate. Certainly Mr. Neville is well respected in the community, and he will certainly be missed with all his advice and his counsel with regard to a lot of heritage issues, not just one narrow issue but a lot of issues that he has contributed to in the last couple of years.

Public Consultations

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): I would like to ask the Deputy Premier why she is not utilizing her knowledge of the historic significance of the Eaton's building to stand up and fight for public consultations on the options for re-adaptive re-use of an historic building as it was recommended by Plan Winnipeg. Has the Premier muzzled her, too?

Hon. Jean Friesen (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for that question, and I assume that a compliment was

meant by his reference to my historical knowledge. You know, one of the things about historical knowledge is that it is open and accessible to all, and I claim no special knowledge other than any member of this House and the information the member provided to all of them. History is a very democratic process.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sure we all want to hear the question.

Mr. Loewen: I would ask the Minister of Heritage why his NDP government chose to ignore the pleas of Bill Neville, who pleaded with his Government to prove through public consultations that the Eaton's site is the best site for a new arena. Why can we not have an Eaton's site and a new arena?

Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism): I am really pleased to see the Opposition and the Member for Fort Whyte are now supporting the True North Project, because for months now they have been speaking out of both sides of their mouths, saying, yes, they are, and, no, they are not. The business community is counting on us to proceed with that.

Now, with regard to Mr. Neville, once again I just want to reiterate he is a very highly respected individual in the community. We respect Mr. Neville. Mr. Neville was looking at one narrow component with regard to the Eaton's building and its heritage, and when I took a look at—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lemieux: I just want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Neville is certainly—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

* (14:00)

Point of Order

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, *Beauchesne's* 417:

Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and not provoke debate.

This minister should not be taking shots at a person who is not here, like Mr. Bill Neville, saying that he has a very narrow view. That is unspeakable for this minister.

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

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the point of order was merely an interruption, an unfortunate interruption. The member was concluding his remarks. I believe the remarks were that he was just concluding. Further, the minister spoke with the highest regard about Mr. Bill Neville.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Prior to ruling on the point of order raised by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader, I would just like to caution all honourable members that the phrase "speaking out of both sides of your mouth" has been ruled at times as unparliamentary. I would ask all honourable members to kindly use a different phrase.

On the point of order raised—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. On the point of order raised by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader, it is not a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The honourable minister, to conclude his comments.

Mr. Lemieux: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To conclude my remarks, I just want to say that I have the highest regard for Mr. Neville, and I continue to welcome Professor Neville's views on new directions on heritage and would encourage greater public support for the reuse and retention of heritage properties in the future. I know that—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Economic Crisis Rural Manitoba

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Just last week the Minister of Agriculture returned from a meeting of the ministers in the Yukon Territory with the federal counterpart. She is one of the signatories to "A Vision for Agriculture." Under the section entitled "Renewal," farmers are going to be offered choices, including, and I quote: Enhancing the capacity to earn off-farm income or choosing non-farm options.

Could the Minister of Agriculture explain to this House and this Legislature and to the farmers of Manitoba what would possess her to provide as a renewal option the choice to get out of farming totally? What farmers would make that choice?

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would, first of all, like to clarify for the member, indeed there was no agreement signed. It is a framework that has been developed to work on, to look at what the future opportunities are in agriculture.

The member has expressed concern that one of the points in the document talks about earning off-farm income and the fact that there is also the option of people to leave farming.

Well, the member should get into the real world. Farmers today, many farmers today are earning off-farm income to supplement their farm income. Many farmers today are making the choice as to whether or not they should stay in the business of farming. This is nothing new. It has been happening for decades, and it will continue to happen.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is we want to work with farmers and work on opportunities in rural communities so that people can indeed stay in farming. We are looking at prospects for transition to other generations.

Mr. Jack Penner: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister: Since when is the vision of any government for renewal to enhance the capacity to ensure that farmers in this province could make enough money outside of the farm to ensure that their families could actually go to

school, that their families could actually enjoy health care and food on the table?

What kind of a vision is that from a Minister of Agriculture for renewal and enhancement of the agricultural community?

Ms. Wowchuk: I would ask the member to look at the real world. In fact, he himself knows that in his family, farmers have off-farm income. That happens in our family. We were able to stay in farming by having off-farm income. It is a reality of this world.

I have to tell the member that this vision is supported by farm groups, by commodity groups, by farm organizations. So I would ask him to listen to his farmers and listen to what people are saying, that they do want to stay in agriculture. They want to build on the opportunities and the reputation of Canada of producing high-quality food and maintain a share of the marketplace, but not all of them want to expand their farm. Some of them want to stay on small farms and supplement their farm income with off-farm jobs, as they do today.

Agriculture Resolution Prime Minister Meeting Request

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): I want to ask the minister then whether she has had time to ask the Premier whether he could table the letter requesting a meeting with the Prime Minister. Remember, the Premier said in this House that he would lead a delegation of farmers, business leaders and agricultural people to meet with the Prime Minister anywhere, any time, any place that he chose.

Could the Premier table the letter or could the minister table the letter for the Premier indicating that that request had in fact been made?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we have the letter. I will make sure it is tabled. If the minister does not have it here, we will make sure it is tabled in the next few minutes.

The member has asked the question before. I said, if the Prime Minister will agree to meet, we will bring a delegation down to meet with him.

He tends not to meet when he is not prepared to change his mind. We have had success changing his mind in the 1999-2000 year. We have had no success beyond the \$500-million announcement federally in a very fair, undistributed way, in our view, in the year 2001-2002.

We recognize that some of the changes we have made, crop insurance and some of the interim financing measures have been positive, but we still agree with members opposite that the grain and oilseed sector is suffering and that the subsidies from the United States are not being reduced, they are being enhanced. That has put our grain and oilseed producers in a very serious situation.

We will table the letter, the third letter to the Prime Minister, on this matter shortly.

* (14:10)

Eaton's Building Heritage Status

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism. The report of the Manitoba Heritage Council and an evaluation by architect Terry Fuglem show clearly that the Eaton's building should have been designated a heritage building.

The Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism was appointed to defend, protect and improve Manitoba's heritage.

My question to the Minister of Heritage, the minister who should be protecting our heritage: Why is the minister acting as the chief of the wrecking crew to demolish the Eaton's building?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

An Honourable Member: Get control of your junkyard dogs.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

An Honourable Member: What arrogance.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Point of Order

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Again this Premier yells across this House in ways that are just unbecoming of a Premier. For him to refer to us as "junkyard dogs," he should be looking at his own rows.

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

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, clearly the Premier was responding to heckling, I would daresay some gleeful heckling from members opposite throughout the entire Question Period, heckling which has prevented the honourable minister from responding to important questions of public policy. The response was characterizing, in a tongue-in-cheek way, the Opposition today in this House, unfortunately heckling that was occurring during the questioning of a most serious matter of health policy earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for River East, on the same point of order.

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): We saw very clearly when the Premier was answering questions on health care that he did not have any answers for the promises that he made and the promises that he broke. That was why he sat down. It is unbecoming and unlike any—

Mr. Speaker: Order. On the point of order raised by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader, I will take the matter under advisement to peruse Hansard and consult the procedural authorities, and I will report back to the House.

* * *

Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism): I thank the Member for River Heights for the question.

As the phoenix rises from its ashes, the True North Centre shall rise from the former Eaton's

building, breathing new life and energy into the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba.

Not like the Opposition wanting to knock everything down, every effort that is put forward, this Government will make sure Winnipeg will be thriving long into the future.

Sustainable Development Strategy COSDI Report

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): My supplementary to the Minister of Conservation: When is the minister going to implement his sustainable development strategy, the COSDI report, and appoint the sustainable development auditor to keep an eye on the wrecking crew led by his Minister of Heritage?

Hon. Oscar Lathlin (Minister of Conservation): Mr. Speaker, I believe the member has asked a similar question before with respect to the True North arena complex. I can only indicate to him this afternoon, I think as has been pointed out to him earlier as well, that the True North arena complex is the type of development that does not fall under The Environment Act. Therefore, the provincial assessment is not required.

I will conclude my response this way. The fact that the project is receiving federal funding automatically triggers the federal environmental assessment process to come into place. Because we have harmonization agreements with the federal government, our responsibility will be to respond to the federal process by providing comments with respect to the project.

Eaton's Building Heritage Status

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): My supplementary to the Minister of Heritage: I ask the minister whether he is intent on destroying the Eaton's building because it has been described as a physical testament to great entrepreneurial, technological and social inventiveness, qualities which he does not seem to care for.

Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, all the

rantings and ravings of the member from River Heights are not going to change the minds of the people of Manitoba, who understand that the Minister of Heritage has to weigh a lot of issues with regard to a lot of recommendations and proposals. That is what I have done. It is a balance. It is very difficult sometimes. I am certainly prepared to do that. That is the challenge sometimes that we all face.

Just to conclude, we as a government will take a look at Princess Street, putting \$30 million into the downtown, the Big 4 building, the Ashdown building. There are 147 sites in Manitoba, either through the federal government, the provincial government and municipal governments, that have been designated.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing our work with regard to heritage and we will continue to do so into the future.

* * *

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Pursuant to the question from the member from Emerson, I would like to table three copies of the letter to the Prime Minister.

Manitoba Retired Teachers' Association Proposed Governance Plan

Mrs. Joy Smith (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, in June of 1999, before the last election, the First Minister promised the Retired Teachers' Association that if elected his Government would accept and implement the new governance plan proposed by the TRAF board and the Manitoba Teachers' Society.

I would like to ask the minister: Given that less than two years ago his party supported the new governance model proposal, why is this plan not implemented by now?

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Education, Training and Youth): Mr. Speaker, in the last 18 to 20 months, this Government has made more progress on pension issues than any preceding government indeed with regard to teachers. We have moved on maternity leave provisions that members opposite did not do in 11 years in office. We have a bill before the

House this afternoon, I believe, or this evening, Bill 18, to further enhance pension opportunities for teachers in this province.

We will continue to work with teachers and retired teachers to build a better province, as we work with all interested parties in this province.

* (14:20)

Mrs. Smith: Can the minister simply answer the question? Would he inform this House as to when he plans to live up to that promise of June 1999 and implement the new governance proposal?

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, we are working towards a solution in this matter right as we speak. I have been working for a number of months with teachers, with retired teachers, who, quite frankly, over the last 11 years have despaired of the relationship with government. We will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Order. Prior to members' statements, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us Messrs. Garth and Nolan Poulley who are the guests of the honourable Member for St. James (Ms. Korzeniowski).

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

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Mr. Dave Pomarenski

Mr. Harry Schellenberg (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise and recognize Dave Pomarenski, a teacher at Kildonan East Collegiate who is one of the 21 teachers awarded the Certificate of Teaching Excellence from the University of Manitoba at a reception held at the University Centre.

This event is annually hosted by the University of Manitoba Students' Union and

University Teaching Services to give students the opportunity to say thanks, to show appreciation to their favourite teachers.

Dave Pomarenski was chosen for the Teaching Excellence award by Marla Morawski, his former Grade 11 and Grade 12 chemistry student at River East Collegiate, who is now a graduate from the I. H. Asper School of Business.

Marla Morawski selected Dave Pomarenski because she remembered him for being a teacher who cared about the student as well as the subject and was always there to guide students in the right direction. As a teacher, he was approachable, had a great rapport with students, had a sense of humour and was ready to go the extra mile. As a result, students felt comfortable going to him for assistance during and after class time. It was his sensitivity to the needs of students and his people skills that made him a great teacher. Dave Pomarenski also taught students to think for themselves and to solve problems on their own. Students found these challenges rewarding.

Dave Pomarenski has taught school for a total of 29 years, 4 years at John Henderson Junior High, 21 years at River East Collegiate and 4 years at Kildonan East Collegiate.

He and his wife, Pat, have three children. Mandy is attending grad school at the University of Manitoba, Kurt has graduated from education, become a teacher, and Mark has completed Grade 11 at Garden City Collegiate.

Congratulations to my former colleague from River East Collegiate for his many years of outstanding work in the classroom. You will be remembered for your good work.

Ms. Dara McLean and Mr. Rick Scott

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize two outstanding people in the constituency of Turtle Mountain. The first person I would like to congratulate is Dara McLean. She was recently announced as the Manitoba High Schools Athletic Association Female Athlete of the Year. Dara was an all-star last November in the high

school association Provincial A Championship. She has also made the Manitoba Canada Games team that will compete in London, Ontario, and this summer is a member of Big West, a club team based out of Virden.

A highlight of her career was recently she has announced that she has accepted a scholarship to compete in the NCAA Division 1 Volleyball Group with the Middle Tennessee State Blue Raiders. She is identified as a graduating six-foot-two power hitter for the Glenboro Panthers Varsity Girls team. All the people of southwest Manitoba and Turtle Mountain are very proud of her.

The second person I would like to acknowledge is the coach of that team, Mr. Rick Scott, who recently was announced as the Manitoba High Schools Athletic Association Coach of the Year. He spoke very warmly of his years with Dara, and Rick has spent many years in the community promoting and developing young athletes in Turtle Mountain and in Manitoba.

On behalf of my colleagues, and I hope all members of the Chamber, we offer them both congratulations and continued success.

Mother Goose Nursery—25th Anniversary

Ms. Nancy Allan (St. Vital): In the mid-1970s there was a dream to create a children's day care inside a home where children could grow and learn, be nurtured and loved. That idea became a goal for a hardworking mother of three, Bernice Owens. Bernice's goal was accomplished in January 1976 when Mother Goose day care was incorporated. Since that day hundreds of happy children have grown up and passed through the doors of Mother Goose.

Recently, I was honoured to attend Mother Goose's 25th anniversary. Marilyn Bush, the director, did a wonderful job of making this 25th anniversary a special celebration. She paid recognition to the valuable staff, who are the heart and soul of Mother Goose. Tracy Stark began her 10-year career at Mother Goose after graduating from Red River and is invaluable to the child care team. Rose Sherwood has an incredible 20 years of working at Mother Goose.

The children called Rose the boss, and they let her think she is. She has many roles and responsibilities and accomplishes them all with integrity.

Bernice Owens, the founder of Mother Goose, who is still involved as the day care's landlord, was presented with a plaque recognizing her contribution to early childhood education in the community. The afternoon reunion was attended by former children and parents who had the good fortune to attend Mother Goose. They hugged old friends, looked at photos over the years, played games, shared food and refreshments, and celebrated the good memories from their association with a very unique place that provided support to their families.

Congratulations to the board of directors and a very dedicated director, Marilyn Bush, who organized a fabulous celebration in honour of early childhood education and Mother Goose's 25th anniversary.

Eaton's Building

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I am going to read several passages from a remarkable report by Terri Fuglem, assistant professor of architecture at the University of Manitoba, on the Eaton building: The T. Eaton building on Portage Avenue, designed by Canadian architect John Woodman, set the pace for Canadian architectural innovation. The Eaton building was an extremely progressive building, not only for Canada, but in terms of the whole world. The Eaton building was designed and built in such a way as to provide the utmost in structural integrity, while at the same time affording flexibility.

This report talks about the technical splendours in the Eaton's building. This report describes the Eaton building, which has defined and dignified Portage Avenue for 96 years. This report indicates that, contrary to popular belief, the building is in excellent condition. Canadians, including Manitobans, says the report, have a tendency to undervalue their own worth and their own history.

The Eaton building is a physical testament to the still great entrepreneurial, technological

and social inventiveness of our people. Once the Eaton building is torn down, it can never be retrieved or rebuilt. Manitobans will have lost an important monument, not only of value to western Canada but to all of Canada.

It is a real question today, as I posed it, whether the NDP so despise technological, entrepreneurial and social inventiveness that they want to destroy the very symbol of this social, technological and entrepreneurial inventiveness that we have in Manitoba, the Eaton's building.

Bishop Grandin Greenway

Ms. Linda Asper (Riel): Work on the Bishop Grandin Greenway project is well underway. This spring I joined 42 volunteers who participated in a cleanup, collecting 140 bags of garbage and a considerable amount of larger material.

This summer is an exciting time for residents involved in the project. The Eco Action 2000 grant of \$24,800 has set into motion a project team under the direction of Murray Gibson to begin the phase of tree planting; the establishment of a no-mow zone where existing vegetation can be encouraged to naturalize, particularly in those areas surrounding the river and ponds; the planting of a demo wild flower garden, supervised by Bud Ewacha; and work on a wood chip trail that would encourage healthy community activity. An Urban Green Team has also been hired with four students ready to work on the project in co-operation with Teen Stop Jeunesse.

* (14:30)

As with any major community initiative, the project's steering committee has been involved in providing the neighbourhood with ample information and also consulting with residents about the no-mow zone and work plans.

A newsletter is being prepared to help communicate changes with residents, particularly those on St. Michael Road. Other ideas for the project include a butterfly garden, a skateboard park, and planting of upland native shrubs and river bottom forest species.

The Bishop Grandin Greenway is a stretch of green space approximately five kilometres in length contained within the Manitoba Hydro right of way stretching from the Seine River to the Red River.

Congratulations to all those involved in the project. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, we will deal with bills for a while. Would you please call the following bills: 300, by leave—I will ask for leave—18, 11, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

Agricultural Crisis

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, just a short question. Did you call for grievances?

Mr. Speaker: Three times.

Mr. Jack Penner: I am sorry, Sir. I missed it. I wonder if there would be leave to revert to grievances.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a will of the House to revert to grievances? Is there? [*Agreed*]

The honourable Member for Emerson, on a grievance.

Mr. Jack Penner: Mr. Speaker, I stand today and grieve for the agricultural community. We have seen this Government take the Standing Committee on Agriculture, an all-party committee, on tour and lead the agricultural community to believe that there was sincerity in trying to get some additional funding for the agricultural community.

There was a commitment made by the Premier (Mr. Doer) that he would sincerely approach the Prime Minister. After the many hearings that were held across this province, there was a sincere commitment made by the Premier of this province that he would lead a delegation to any place anytime, anywhere in this province to meet with the Prime Minister.

Yet, when I read the letter that the Premier sent to the Prime Minister, it says this: The committee believes it is essential that there be an opportunity to discuss the report with you, along with both short-term and long-term solutions to the crisis facing agricultural producers and rural communities. I understand that you are scheduled to be in Winnipeg on May 31, 2001. If your schedule permits, I would suggest that we plan to meet at that time, although, he says, the western premiers will be holding their annual conference in Moose Jaw that day, and I can make arrangements to return to Winnipeg for a meeting with you.

I think that clearly indicates to the Prime Minister that it would be inconvenient for the Premier (Mr. Doer) to meet at that time. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been nothing short of courteous to the farm community, to municipal leaders, to chambers of commerce and whole farm families that appeared before committee to give them the courtesy of a direct request to the Prime Minister at a future date when it would suit the Prime Minister and when it would suit the Premier. Yet we have not seen that in this letter, nor have we seen any mention made by the Premier to try and attempt such a meeting.

I want to digress just briefly because I think this is where the difference is between our party and our policies in agriculture and rural development compared to what this Doer NDP government's policies are. I think they were this: It was our commitment to the rural communities that we would put a department of rural development in place that would be targeted specifically for development of initiatives in rural Manitoba that would provide jobs to those members of communities that derive a living from the fruits of the agricultural community's efforts; in other words, the retail sector, the manufacturing sector, the service sector and all those that provide services to the agricultural side of the provincial economy.

Yet the first initiative that Premier Doer took was to disband the Department of Rural Development, annihilate it, clearly indicating to the people of Manitoba that they had no interest in continuing the development that had been worked at so long and so hard by the Filmon Conservative administration. It was clearly that difference that is noticeable now in rural

Manitoba, when we see business after business after business closing, and many of our small communities.

I have one community, that, as I have indicated has seen 13 businesses close in one community alone. How many people employed in those businesses? We have no idea. We know that it is forcing school closures in many communities in rural Manitoba. It is forcing post office closures in many communities in rural Manitoba, and many others.

I think it is imperative that this minister give a better explanation of what her actions were, and what her directions were and what her requests were of the federal minister and the other ministers of agriculture in this country of Canada, at their meeting. I think it is absolutely astounding that a minister, in a renewal commitment to the farmers of this province, would agree to a renewal commitment that would say, and I quote: enhancing the capacity to earn enough off-farm income to support your farms. You would have thought that this minister would have argued for policies and directions and better trade deals to ensure that the agriculture community in this province could grow. Yet she does just exactly the opposite.

I find it absolutely deplorable that our Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) would agree to signing a visionary outline of what is to come, and that is choosing non-farm options for farmers. In other words, putting in place programs that will see the migration, to a much greater degree, of farm families off the farm. Can you imagine a Minister of Agriculture who is supposed to be the stalwart for the community, who is supposed to be the pillar of food production in this province, saying to farmers we have given up? This Doer administration has given up on them, and we will now ask the federal government to put in place programming to get you off the farm. She was the one, and our Premier Doer was the one, that said we will look after the family farm. What a way to look after the family farm.

* (14:40)

I saw a little girl appear before the standing committee in Brandon and make a compassionate plea to the all-party committee, a plea

that said we need help. We need this Government's help to ensure that my family and I can remain on our farm, that we may attend our rural school, yet that 12-year-old girl's pleas were totally ignored.

I think we need to reflect for a minute on what was said by a young 18-year-old farmer on the steps of this Legislature. It was widely quoted, and published in many of the farm newspapers, when he so eloquently enunciated what farming was all about. It was not just going out on a tractor and tilling the soil. It was not just going home at night and sitting down for supper with mom and dad. It was not just congregating at the local community centre and playing a game of hockey or curling at the local community rink. It was not just that at all. It was an emotional experience. It was something that was born into him, that he was a true farmer, that he wanted to be a farmer.

Yet he said: I need one thing. He said: I need an assurance from my governments in this province and in this country that will assure me at least a competitive equality in the world market. He said: How can I be encouraged to make an investment in the food industry if I already know I am going to get only half of what my American friends get for their commodities that they raise? How can I encourage a banker to loan the 18-year-old farmer money to invest in his family farm's operation when he knows the day he steps onto this farm his income will be virtually exactly half of what his American counterpart's income will be when they both come out of university?

What a dramatic speech that was. What a dramatic demonstration of the difficulties our young people are having today in maintaining a farm operation. That is why we saw last year alone better than 14 percent of our farm labour pool disappear out of Manitoba. One year of NDP socialist administration sees the elimination of 14 percent of the farm labour pool.

It is incredible. In two years more than 10 percent of our farmers have disappeared. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, they are the young entrepreneurs, the ones with the knowledge, the ones with the university education that are giving up and leaving because they cannot see enough

income off that farm to be able to support and raise a family. How sad that day is.

That, Sir, is why I am grieving today, because many of our farmers today are grieving quietly in their homes.

I want to mention just one other issue. That is the floods that we have seen over the last couple of years in Manitoba, first in western Manitoba, now this year in central Manitoba, in the Neepawa area, large rains and huge floods in eastern Manitoba, large rains last fall and again this spring and large floods, and yet what do we get from this Government? We do not even get a commitment that there will be a DFA program.

How can those young farmers, when they have to face the elements of the weather, and they are willing to do that, when they have to face the fact that they will have to sell for half the price of what the Americans are getting for their products and try and be competitive, and then when they are flooded out be told, sorry, we have not made up our minds yet, by this Government?

What a dramatic experience when you see grown men and women cry, because they know their whole livelihood and their whole life is disappearing before them. They are going to have to tell their young men and their young women growing up on their farms that, no, there is no future for you, because we have elected an NDP government, a government that is headed by a Premier (Mr. Doer) that is fast at the lip and frozen at the hip and does not know what action means.

That is why, Sir, those young farmers are going to be told they have no future. That is why the minister is proposing a program to get them off the farm, a program to see whether there are not enough jobs to get them jobs off the farm, and allow them some income that they can at least transit out of the farm.

I think it is high time we in this House grieve for all the young people who would have liked to have been food producers for our nation's interest, when they, in fact, today are dying.

Mr. Speaker: We will revert to Orders of the Day.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY
(Continued)**

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

**Bill 300—The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba
Incorporation Amendment Act**

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for concurrence and third reading of Bill 300? Is there leave?

[Agreed]

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Smith), that Bill 300, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Incorporation Amendment Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mackintosh: Would you see if there is leave, as well, to deal with the payment of fees motion regarding Bill 300?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to deal with the payment of fees motion? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Smith), that the fees paid with respect to Bill 300, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Incorporation Amendment Act, be refunded less the cost of printing.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Attorney General, seconded by the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that the fees paid with respect to Bill 300, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Incorporation Amendment Act, that the Jewish Foundation of Manitoba be refunded less the cost of printing. *[interjection]*

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

* (14:50)

REPORT STAGE—AMENDMENT

**Bill 18—The Teachers' Pensions
Amendment Act**

Mr. Speaker: An amendment to Bill 18, The Teachers' Pensions Amendment Act.

Mrs. Joy Smith (Fort Garry): I move, seconded by the Member for Steinbach (Mr. Jim Penner),

THAT Bill 18 be amended by renumbering section 9 as subsection 9(2) and by adding the following as subsection 9(1):

9(1) The following is added after subsection 49(6):

Transfer to pension adjustment account

49(6.1) If at any time the actuary on the basis of his or her evaluation of account A and the pension adjustment account reports a surplus in account A and determines that payment in any year of the total pension adjustments provided for under section 10 would result in an unfunded liability, the board may transfer all or any portion of the surplus to the pension adjustment account.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise the House that the amendment is out of order according to rule 62.(1) because it imposes a charge on the public revenue without being recommended by a message of the Lieutenant-Governor.

It is also out of order due to *Beauchesne's* citation 698.(7) which states: "An amendment is out of order if it imposes a charge upon the Public Treasury, if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the Royal Recommendation."

I am advised that the same amendment had been ruled out of order in committee for similar reasons.

Voice Vote

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, because this was one of

the NDP broken promises, we challenge your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. All those in support of the ruling, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Laurendeau: Mr. Speaker, on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I understand there have been some consultations. Is there leave of the House to consider an amendment about the effective date of an amendment proposed by the honourable Minister of Education?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for the honourable Minister of Education, Training and Youth to move the amendment? [*Agreed*]

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Education, Training and Youth): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture and Food (Ms. Wowchuk),

THAT Bill 18 be amended:

(a) in subsection (15)(1), by striking out "section 9" and substituting "sections 9 and 13"; and

(b) by adding the following after subsection 15(2):

Transitional and coming into force: section 13 (15)(3) Section 13 is retroactive and is deemed to have come into force on June 1, 2001. A teacher or former teacher who makes an application under section 63.(2) of The Teachers' Pensions Act, as enacted by section 13, within 90 days after this act receives royal assent is

deemed to have made the application on June 1, 2001.

Thank you.

Motion presented.

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question is before the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 18—The Teachers' Pensions Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Bill 18 as amended.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I understand I have to ask for leave for concurrence and third reading on Bill 18.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Government House Leader have leave for concurrence and third reading on Bill 18? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell), that Bill 18, The Teachers' Pensions Amendment Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development and subsequently amended, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 11—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you canvass the House to determine if there is leave to deal with Bill 11?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to deal with Bill 11? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 11, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* (15:00)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a few words on the record on Bill 11, a bill which deals with graduated licences. I support the general principle of graduated licences and will vote for this piece of legislation, but I believe that the legislation is considerably short of what we should have had from the NDP government.

This legislation is perhaps typical of the NDP in that it provides fixed times for everybody. It is a one-size-fits-all approach. Everybody must go slow in getting their licence rather than recognizing that individuals develop competence and skills at different speeds.

Indeed, we can see the model that is used in training and licensing pilots to fly, that they are licensed based on experience, competence and the number of hours flown. One of the problems of this bill is that, indeed, it would be possible and will be possible for young people to pass through the time periods without hardly even driving a car at all. I believe it is important in this day and age that we have some demonstration of competence, that we have some evidence that young people are learning and gaining skills and practising driving and that we should, in fact, have an approach which is modified from what is described by the NDP government in this act.

I think that those young people who are able to demonstrate competence to build up a strong driving record in a shorter period of time should be able to be licensed in a shorter period of time. I think that this philosophy which is to be able to show performance and competence is important and that this should have been incorporated as part of this legislation.

The second major point I would like to make is that although this bill has gone through some

changes from the original conception to allow it to adapt to people in rural Manitoba, and particularly to young people in the farm community or new licensees in the farm community, I am skeptical in a number of areas that this bill really has been adapted sufficiently to be appropriate, as it should be, for rural people as it is for urban people.

So I give this bill support, but I give it a little reluctantly, realizing that we should have seen much more than we did see in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): It is my pleasure to rise to speak to Bill 11 which is related to the graduated drivers' licensing program for our provincial government. I want to preface my remarks and to indicate to members opposite that I will be talking strictly about the program and some of the comments that I heard and, of course, relating to members opposite why the task force has made certain recommendations with respect to graduated drivers' licensing.

I want to also say that, in prefacing my next comments, any comments I make while we may be occasionally talking about youth, that this graduated drivers' licensing program is not aimed specifically at youth or young drivers but is aimed at novice drivers of all ages.

First, I want to thank the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Ashton) for recognizing a need to take action. When first our Government was elected in the fall of 1999, the first thing that the Minister of Transportation and Government Services undertook was a review of the crash statistics for the Province of Manitoba. He looked at the number of lives that had been lost over the last decade or so and recognized that there was a significant impact upon the people of Manitoba as a result of those crashes and those fatalities.

The minister also recognized that there was a significant impact upon the family members themselves, and I reference the fact that there was a Donna and Ken Malley who lost their 14-year-old son. This particular family resides in the constituency of Thompson and, of course, are well known to the Minister of Transportation and Government Services. We also heard in

committee just recently and have had much contact with Sharon Stewart, whose daughter, Haley, unfortunately, was killed in a motor vehicle accident just before Christmas in 1997.

Coupled with the information that the task force has heard—and, unfortunately, all too many families in the province are impacted by the loss of loved ones as a result of automobile accidents that are involving novice drivers—now the medical system also is impacted by that, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, the Minister of Transportation and Government Services has shown significant confidence.

I must say I have been very honoured and privileged to have been asked by our Minister of Transportation and Government Services to represent our Government in a task force. I was joined by the Member for St. Vital (Ms. Allan) and the Member for Brandon West (Mr. Smith), the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Rondeau) and the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Jennissen) who were also members and significant contributors to the task force process.

I want to thank them for their tireless efforts, the travel that they were involved with, the long hours that they spent away from their family members themselves and the many, many months, over eight months, in the work that that task force undertook in developing our graduated drivers' licensing task force report that forms the basis for this legislation that we are debating here today.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that every waking moment during those eight months that the task force worked on this project was spent researching and debating, and I can say we were quite proud of the work that the task force undertook in developing the model for this particular legislation. I think this is a significant step forward.

I know members opposite have said that they are thankful that the task force took the time to travel the province, and I can say honestly that, as a part of a new government at that time and after appointment as a task force, we wanted to consult quite broadly with Manitobans. We recognized right at the beginning that this was a non-political issue, and we wanted to go out and

we wanted to talk with Manitobans, very openly and very earnestly, Mr. Speaker, about their thoughts about whether or not there was a need to have a graduated drivers' licensing task force in Manitoba.

I want to also comment, and I do not think I am telling any secrets here that perhaps have not been shared with members of the public before. I remember very early when the Minister of Transportation and Government Services (Mr. Ashton) brought this particular issue to our caucus and raised this as an issue before our task force was struck. I remember quite clearly the comments of our Premier (Mr. Doer), and the vision he had upon hearing of these statistics, and the information the minister had brought forward. I will quote for the House, and I hope I quote accurately: If it saves lives, we are going to do it.

That was a statement that I will always remember that our Premier took as a vision for our Government. If we are going to do the right thing here, if it saves lives, then we are going to strike a task force, and we are going to have that task force consult broadly and widely with Manitobans, and have them bring back a report and a recommendation to the people of Manitoba and to this Legislature, and that we would debate it.

I thank our Premier, too, for having that vision and that courage. We know that this, perhaps, can be, as the previous government found, in some cases, a particularly sensitive political issue. But we thought if it was handled in a non-political fashion, and we consulted broadly with Manitobans, there would be an opportunity for Manitobans to provide us with the direction; and that we hope we would have the courage to bring forward a report that would reflect all of the issues, and we think we have done that.

I also want to thank members of the Opposition, and I know the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Faurichou) has played a significant role in this process. Our public hearings started in the community of Portage la Prairie. That particular meeting was very well attended, and I thank the Member for Portage la Prairie for his comments in that process and his comments

and his work and his advice all along the way, since the late fall of 1999.

*(15:10)

I know I had talked with the Member for Portage la Prairie and, because I believed that this was a non-political issue, I talked openly and shared information with the Member for Portage la Prairie as a result of our research. So, when we came across new and interesting information, or we heard something that was perhaps different and unique from the different communities we were travelling to as a task force, I would share that information with the Member for Portage la Prairie. Because I wanted him to be apprised of what the public was saying around the province, and what our research was showing as well. So I want to thank the Member for Portage la Prairie for his involvement in this process.

I know that members opposite had dealt with this, I believe, on two occasions during their government throughout the '90s, and for some reason, which I am not quite clear on, it was decided at that time they would not proceed. I do not know if there was not enough evidence to support, or perhaps some other reasons. But I do know that I want to thank members of the Opposition as well, and while they have added their comments to Bill 11 throughout the debate on second reading, there is a risk that you take when you sense that the public might not have their head or their heart wrapped around a particular issue. You run risks by being leaders. But I want to thank all members of this Legislative Assembly for being leaders in having Bill 11 come forward, and for the support that the members of the Legislature, and, in particular, members of the Opposition, have shown towards this particular piece of legislation. So I thank you for being leaders in this process as well.

Mr. Harry Schellenberg, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

This process would not be complete, of course, and would not have occurred without the support of the public. The public played a significant role in this particular process and on this issue. Without their support, progress would

not likely have been possible. If it had not been for organizations such as Keystone Agricultural Producers and the president, Don Dewar, and the guidance and advice that he provided along the way throughout the hearings process—the advice that he provided to our Minister of Transportation and Government Services after the report had been released added greatly to the process and the legislation that we have before us here today.

I want to also thank the Coalition of Manitoba motorcycle councils and Terry Johns and Mr. Houghton and others who were involved in the process, and the advice and guidance and many, many meetings that we had with the motorcycle councils with respect to graduated drivers' licensing and the input that they had in the process. We had, of course, in addition to the public and the community groups around the province, we also had the various Manitoba media, whether it be TV, radio, community newspapers. They all played a significant role in advising the public of the hearings process and at the same time reporting upon the public's comments at those particular meetings.

So we would like to thank the TV, radio and community newspapers throughout the province of Manitoba for the role that they played in keeping the public advised of the task force hearings and, of course, as a result of the report that came about at the end of the task force hearings.

We had input from the Manitoba Trucking Association; we had input from MAST, Manitoba firefighters, Manitoba doctors. There are many, many other Manitobans that contributed their comments and advice with respect to this legislation and this issue on graduated licensing.

I also want to thank the many members of the department of Driver and Vehicle Licencing. I will name them because they played a very significant role. We would not have been able to undertake this work as a task force without the role that Driver and Vehicle Licencing played in this process. Starting with Registrar Marlene Zyluk; Brock MacMartin, the Director of Highway Safety; Rick Ledieu, who many

members of the Chamber will recognize for the role that he played. He travelled with the task force all over the province of Manitoba to every single community that we visited and, in fact, travelled with the task force to the different Canadian provinces and was the technical expertise behind and the technical knowledge behind the task force and made the job look so simple. It was as a result of Mr. Ledieu's efforts and knowledge that the task force was able to complete its work.

We also had the assistance of Fred Mann, the Chief Driver Examiner; Rick Orloff, the Senior Systems Analyst; Brian Gray, the Review Officer; Doug Scott, Driver Licencing; Carolyn Halbert, DVL Records Manager; Bob Chapman, DVL Policy; Roland Patenaude, DVL Systems Analyst. We also met with the Winnipeg, Brandon and RCMP police forces and the municipal police forces as well at special meetings that we called to allow them the opportunity to have input into the development of our task force report.

We also met with the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation so that they would have some input and they would provide their knowledge with respect to insurance matters relating to crash statistics and other matters relating to crashes.

There was a significant role that was played by IMPACT. I want to recognize very specifically one Shawn Feely, who came to our committee here on public hearings on Bill 11 and doggedly pursued the task force around the province of Manitoba and was able to listen to the comments and to provide advice and guidance along the way. I can say that Shawn Feely played an admirable role in that process. We thank him for his efforts.

We also had input from MADD and TADD, the CAA, Manitoba Safety Council. The list goes on and on. We could thank so many Manitobans and organizations in Manitoba for their role. This task force effort was an exhaustive effort, hopefully leaving no stone unturned in our consultation process. So it was not only the Manitobans we consulted with, we consulted with every other person we thought might conceivably have a role to play or knowledge with respect to the development of the task force report.

Those were the Manitobans that we consulted broadly and widely with. At the same time, our task force also wants to thank the governments of Manitoba that we travelled and consulted with. There were five provinces that we went with. I first want to thank and start with the Minister of Transportation in the Province of Ontario.

I know that the Province of Ontario at first was somewhat reluctant, not knowing that Manitoba was proceeding down the road of graduated drivers' licensing, but after we explained to them that we were interested in the development of their program and any advice or guidance they might provide, the Minister of Transportation in Ontario arranged for meetings. I want to thank David Ward, the Senior Policy Advisory for road safety programs in Ontario, who gathered the staff from his department. Mr. Acting Speaker, we had very, very long, intense meetings with those, with the Department of Transportation in Ontario. They provided guidance. Ontario, of course, as most members will know, was one of the first two provinces in Canada to bring forward the graduated drivers' licensing program.

Nova Scotia was another province. Ken Cogan, the Deputy Registrar of Motor Vehicle Safety in Nova Scotia, we want to thank him; Jamie Morrison, the registrar of driver and vehicle licencing in New Brunswick; Jay Carson, the registrar of DMV in Prince Edward Island. We want to thank our Atlantic Canada provinces, our sister provinces for their advice and guidance in the development of our legislation.

Our task force very much wanted to adopt and find the best practices that we possibly could and to incorporate them in our report. Last but not least, I want to recognize the former minister responsible for the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia for establishing the opportunity for us to have very extensive meetings and probably the most extensive that we have had in Canada.

As I said before, this is a non-political approach and I am not going to comment on the events that have transpired in the past, but I want to thank Mark Medgyesi, and I will give the

spelling of this later to Hansard, who is the supervisor of driver vehicle licencing and is part of ICBC. They established two full days of meetings for our task force and provided us with a significant review of their process. They are the most recent graduated drivers' licensing program in all of Canada.

So we very much wanted to draw on their experience and knowledge, and I can say, Mr. Acting Speaker, that as a result of our consultations with our Canadian sister provinces, we were able to gather much more knowledge and to incorporate many more good ideas into our task force. We thank our Canadian provincial counterparts for allowing us the opportunity to sit down with them and to ask all the many questions that we had and to receive very open and straightforward information which assisted us greatly.

* (15:20)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I now want to talk a bit about the process that the task force went through. Of course, in February of 2000, the task force commenced its hearings over the course of 28 days. We had the opportunity to have 14 public meetings in 13 different communities. As I said before, we started this process with no preconceived plan, and we wanted Manitobans to be the judge on whether or not there was a need to have a graduated drivers' licensing system in Manitoba.

We had sent out media invitations, and I know members opposite have said that perhaps we did not consult broadly or widely enough, but we advertised and I can provide information that members opposite want of all the communities that we advertised in the papers, the local media. We sent letters to all of the school division superintendents in the province of Manitoba, inviting them to make their constituencies, their student bodies, their teachers aware that the task force would be coming to their area and to invite them to participate in the process. We sent letters out to First Nations councils in Manitoba inviting them to participate in the process as well. So we made it as broadly based as we possibly could, Mr. Acting Speaker.

At the end of our consultation process in the meetings we held, we had the opportunity for

questions and answers and full open dialogue with the public and allowed the public to ask any question that might be on their mind. The public, of course, was also given an opportunity to make formal verbal and written presentations which were incorporated into the research findings of our task force and, of course, formed the basis for our task force report.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

Now, the community notification, of course, first went to the press, and I said there were interviews with local media and all of the people that were consulted, but we also gave the opportunity for members of the public, any member of the public to consult with our task force. They could send e-mails, they could send faxes or letters, they called us, of course, in addition to all of the meetings that were held. So there was as wide an opportunity for consultation as we thought we could possibly have.

Now, of course, as I have indicated, there was one main question that was asked as a result of our starting the process, and we told the public there was no preconceived plan, that we were not targeting one age group, but we were looking at the effect of inexperience on novice drivers of all ages, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we would let Manitobans be the judge on whether or not there would be a need for a graduated licensing system in our province.

We asked, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a series of questions, main questions. Of course, there were supplementaries that would follow out of that and I will list them: Should Manitoba introduce some form of graduated drivers' licensing program? Should there be a no-alcohol-tolerance component to a Manitoba GDL program? Should there be passenger restrictions? What would be a suitable length of time for a learner's stage? What criteria should be used for determining an eligible supervising driver? Should there be a nighttime driving curfew? If so, should there be exemptions to the curfew? What would be a suitable length of time for an intermediate stage?

Those are the main questions that were asked, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but there were a

number of other questions that I am sure that members know, are quite aware of, that were asked by members of the public. We provided, hopefully, the answers the public were seeking. We have heard many comments back from Manitobans, and we have heard them perhaps raised by members of this Legislative Assembly, as their constituents would have consulted with them. We hope that the legislation itself has dealt with those comments that were made.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

I know, Mr. Speaker, that members of the public have had the opportunity to now see and read the report, but I think it is important perhaps for members of the public and perhaps for the Archives for the history of our province if I was to table copies of the Graduated Licensing Task Force Report dated June of 2000, so it might become a part of the history of the province of Manitoba, because the task force itself went to great lengths in gathering the information and putting this report together. So I would like to table copies for members of the public with respect to our work and our efforts in that regard.

There are, of course, a number of notable quotes that came about as a result of the task force hearings, and I think it is important when we put into context what we heard and how we tried to incorporate the public's comments. I want to read into the record some of the notable quotes. It starts off with one that I think members opposite will recognize, and I quote: There is one drive that you never want to have to take with your child, and that is in the funeral procession. Another quote is: I do not know how graduated licences will work, or whether it might have helped prevent the accident that took the life of our bright, loving son. I just know that our lives have been changed irreparably and anything that might have helped prevent our loss would be a good thing.

Another quote: The current Manitoba licensing system does not measure competency except by the passage of time. Another quote: People, no matter how young or old, need a learning period. You cannot learn to be a safe driver in two weeks. Another quote: We need a made-in-Manitoba GDL program and should be

leaders, not followers, in setting the standard. Another quote: Any decisions or recommendations that you make should be evidence-based and not on public opinion. The final quote: I know some people have concerns about graduated licensing as being more legislation, and Big Brother, but speaking as a police officer, I would rather write a traffic ticket than do a death notification.

Those are some of the notable quotes that came about as a result of the public hearings. I know it was very difficult for members of the public to come forward and share their experiences with the task force. We thank them for their courage and their conviction in coming forward and sharing those stories, their very personal and tragic stories with the task force.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of the task force, as I have indicated, reflect the best advice and information available to minimize fatalities and injuries occurring through motor vehicle accidents. The task force is very aware of the competing interests of various parts of our province and the multitude of viewpoints Manitobans shared. Manitobans want our GDL program to be evidence-based. Some of the advice was contrary to all evidence, or was unenforceable as we subsequently found out as a result of our broader consultations.

Now, we are giving our driving regulators, as a result of this legislation, a potentially effective new influence tool that is called graduated licensing. It is how skilful that we use the tools that are given here in and through this legislation that will determine its ultimate effectiveness. No system, no tool, no matter how well crafted will replace an active role that experienced driver parents, or other adults, will play in training our new inexperienced novice drivers. Driver education is an additional training tool to that provided by our family members and other adults that will help train the novice and inexperienced drivers in our province.

I listened to the comments that were made by members opposite, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the driver education program. I can say as a task force, as a result of our research, we, too, thought, like many members of this Legislative Assembly, that driver education was a key and

critical component of training our novice drivers, and it would actually produce safer drivers as a result of that education and training.

We subsequently found out, Mr. Speaker, through our broader research, and it came as quite a surprise to members of the task force, that as a result of the research, we could not find any conclusive evidence to indicate that driver education actually contributed to a reduction in accidents and crashes and in fatalities. I am quite willing to share all of the research material with any member of this Legislative Assembly who might want that information. It is broadly available on the Internet through the Traffic Injury Research Foundation.

I do know that in consultation with, particularly, the province of Ontario, they said quite clearly to us: Before you make the decision with respect to time credits and buydowns with respect to the stages of graduated licensing, you have to determine whether or not the buydown that you are going to give is as a result of some benefit that will be accrued as a result of that buydown in time. If the criteria that you establish is a reduction in accidents or fatalities or injuries, then do not measure that. Do not use that as your criteria to buy down the program, because we cannot substantiate and we do not have the evidence to show that there is a reduction in the fatalities or accidents.

So, Mr. Speaker, we were quite surprised to hear that from the Government of Ontario through their department, the Traffic Injury Research Foundation, and I have the studies here I can provide to members opposite if they want to see the information. That is why we did not make a recommendation to give a staged buy-down. I do know that there are many states in the United States of America that are, perhaps, moving away from time credits as a result of their drivers' licensing program.

*(15:30)

Now, I am not saying that there is not some merit in driver-training programs, because I think there is significant merit, that any training, any education that we can gather is of some benefit and will, hopefully, help to make us more experienced drivers. But whether or not it reduces accidents, a significant number of

researchers have undertaken that, and it is not just the traffic injury research. We are basing this on research that we have done. I do not know how else we can make a determination on this. These are trained and skilled people that involve doctors, medical researchers, traffic-injury research experts from various jurisdictions around the world, who have brought this information forward. In fact, I think there was one or two studies even done in Canada that showed the same results as a result of their research, as well, on this issue.

Everyone knows that formal education is accepted like motherhood and apple pie. Most logical and reasoned people expect that individuals involved with a formal education retain knowledge and skills acquired through that formal education. Most would think that the same logic would apply to the High School Driver Education Program and the advanced driver training.

The Dekalb study that has been referenced many, many times was undertaken in the 1970s, in the 1980s, was again researched through the 1990s, and compared its findings over those three decades and was found to be the most comprehensive review to assess the impact of formal driver instruction through the driver education programs. The studies have been repeated many times in the U.S., Sweden, Norway, Finland, Australia and Canada, all with similar results. The overwhelming preponderance of evidence fails to show that formally trained students have a lower frequency of crashes than those who do not receive such training. That is not to say that there is not some benefit accrued through that training because we think all training is useful, all education is useful, but the findings show it does not reduce crashes.

Now, as I have said, there is some evidence that at least some driver education programs can successfully teach driving skills and impart knowledge, but skills and knowledge acquired in training do not necessarily produce driving behaviour, and that is crucial, that leads to reduced crash involvement.

Now, the members opposite have indicated that we need to expand the High School Driver

Education Program in this province and, Mr. Speaker, good advice. I do know that members opposite are probably aware—I did a member's statement on this yesterday—Manitoba has gone from very humble beginnings of the driver education and training program in 1966 up to the point now where they are training, we anticipate, some 14 500 students this year. There are, I think, 17 000 high school students in the province of Manitoba every year that we are moving very close to 100 percent. That is the goal. The long-term goal is to get to that point, so that everybody would perhaps receive some form of formal training.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of instructors. We have First Nations communities that are involved in the program as well. We have women's abuse shelters that have had driver education programs funded by MPI through that process. We have many, many hundreds of driver instructors in the province. We are training more, and, as my member statement yesterday will stand, that information is available for the members opposite.

Now, the fees vary. In Manitoba, the students pay only \$50. In other provinces of Canada, they can pay upwards of \$850 for one of those training programs through private facilities. The range varied across Canada from \$250 to \$850, but we say the range is in the higher end of that scale from the provinces that we consulted with.

Now, Québec, my understanding is, withdrew from the mandatory driver education and training program, of course some time ago, but Manitoba continues because we see that there is a benefit that will accrue to our novice drivers, our inexperienced drivers in Manitoba.

I know there were also comments made by members opposite, and I want to thank the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Rondeau) for his comments as a part of our task force, because he recommended to us that, perhaps, we might want to consider bringing forward simulators to allow our novice, our inexperienced drivers the opportunity to drive off-road prior to having them take part in what we would call more high-risk conditions on our highways and our roads. So I thank the Member for Assiniboia for his

comments in that regard as well. That, I am sure, will be investigated in the coming days and weeks ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the Traffic Injury Research Foundation indicates that they would not recommend introducing driver training and education into the graduated licensing system. We accepted that advice and our report as a task force indicates that. If the objective is to produce drivers faster, then give time credits to buy down the graduated drivers licensing stage. But if the objective is to produce safer drivers, then they recommend that the process that we have incorporated into our report is the way to go. We have accepted that advice.

The objective, we think, is to reduce accidents, to prevent injuries and to provide hazard detection and collision avoidance. We think that is the objective of training, and the motivation of new drivers, of course, is crucial to that particular process. We hope that the legislation and the report that we have brought forward reflect that.

Now, the members of the Legislative Assembly have made suggestions, and I say reasoned arguments, for some further dilution of this legislation, and, in some cases, for further enhancements to this legislation and the GDL program itself. Some have openly accepted the premise for this legislation itself. I only wish that each and every member of this Legislature would have had the opportunity and the time to see and hear the families that came before our task force committee hearings.

Mr. Speaker, no program is perfect and addresses all of the concerns, unfortunately. As with most things involving safety, there will be some inconvenience. In my humble view, it is measured and warranted when it comes to reducing injury and saving lives when compared to inconvenience. The difficult thing to measure for most families is who will be saved as a result of this graduated drivers' licensing program. Which member of this Legislature will be able to say this law saved my life or the life of a family member or a member of a family in my constituency? Which Manitoba family will be able to point to themselves or to a family member and say this program saved us? We will

never know. Statistically, we hope and we pray that there will be a significant reduction in the loss of lives in our province and in the number of accidents that occur. Statistically, we will measure annually the progress that we have made, but individually each of us will not know if we, ourselves, survived.

The task force went to considerable lengths in consultation, not only with Manitobans but in seeking out the best practices among our Canadian provincial partners with a GDL program. After many, many months of researching, listening and talking to ordinary Manitobans and questioning experts, then measuring and weighing the evidence and comments before us, the task force made recommendations based on all of the advice and based on the best practices at the time.

We knew that some of the recommendations, if adopted, could and would likely be debated further. We wanted to remain true to our findings, knowing that our task force recommendations, if adopted in their entirety, would, in some respects, make Manitoba a GDL leader in North America. We also know that many of the recommendations are essential to an effective GDL program and that many are interlinked. We also know that our findings and recommendations would become the measure against which any Manitoba GDL program and future changes would be measured. We also know with the coming summer and graduation time, which is upon us now, if history is a teacher, that there could be accidents involving novice, inexperienced drivers. We know that there was an accident just recently involving the family of a member of this Legislative Assembly.

I pray, Mr. Speaker, that there will never be another fatality or a serious motor vehicle accident. Sadly, in reality, that may not happen immediately. But that does not mean that we, collectively, as a society, should stop trying to make positive changes to reach for our goal. To influence the safe driving attitudes and behaviours is perhaps the fundamental objective of any GDL. To teach safe driving skills, then to ingrain these behaviour skills and attitudes until they become good and safe driving habits. We must not lose sight of the objective to make our roads and our highways safer; for all to reduce motor vehicle crash injuries, fatalities and the

subsequent human and financial cost. Let us all make sure that every evening when our families gather around the dinner table, that everyone is present and that there will not be one place setting unused due to an avoidable motor vehicle accident involving a novice, inexperienced driver.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let us all do our part to make that a reality. I want to thank members of the task force for the significant effort that they made on behalf of the people of Manitoba, for the members of the Legislative Assembly for their support in this legislation, and for the members of the Manitoba public and all of the organizations that were involved in this process—for the many, many hours that they put in, in the consultation process, and for the significant role that they made in the development of Bill 11. I am proud to say that we are a part of this process, and we hope that this will significantly reduce the fatalities and the injuries to our novice, inexperienced drivers in Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (15:40)

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) for his 40-minute presentation, and certainly compliment fellow members of his task force who, he said, every waking moment for eight months, thought about this, and I say that is dedication. I am not sure about the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Jennissen). I think maybe he thought about some other things there, but, seriously, this started out as a good way to make legislation. You put in place a task force, and you talk to Manitobans, and you receive third-party information from those people who will be affected by it.

Then they brought forth a report on the subject, and this Graduated Driver Licence Task Force Report is quite comprehensive and does reflect a lot of work that was put into it. So the process started out as being a good way to make legislation, and from there the process sort of unravelled a bit and I would say that I am supportive of the legislation but it has gone through a rather strange path in getting to where we are today.

The minister's first reaction to this was to put out a press release indicating that they would be going forward by regulation to put forth the Graduated Driver Licensing Program. Then after some reaction from the public, he put out a second press release, again going forward in this legislation through the means of taking it to Cabinet, and passing regulations, and, certainly, I was critical of that. But he also watered down the program considerably in his second press release.

Then, almost at the last minute, Mr. Speaker, he announced that the motorcyclists were going to be included in this and that they would be part of the Graduated Driver Licensing Program, and I think there are lots of questions surrounding how that is going to take place. Then at committee the other night, at the eleventh hour, he brought in a tremendous number of amendments to the legislation, and this is my main criticism. Those amendments were not shared with the Opposition. Those amendments were not shared with the third parties involved, and it does leave, not only members of the Legislature but third-party groups who were interested in this legislation, who have been following this legislation, no opportunity to have the time to look at these amendments and to digest them and to understand them.

So, as I say, this started as a model in terms of making legislation, but it unravelled through the process, and I think that is unfortunate.

I do again commend the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Faurschou) who has worked very tirelessly on this subject, as well as the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid). I had the opportunity to work with the Member for Transcona on issues to do with the Department of Labour and the Workers Compensation Board. While we did not agree 100 percent of the time, we were able to talk about those things and work together on it. Even though the Premier (Mr. Doer) is not here, I would certainly think that he would not be making a bad choice when he does bring the Member for Transcona into the Cabinet because this work, I think, shows a lot of research and a lot of thought. It is the type of qualities that he would be looking for in a member to advance him into Cabinet. I think that this will look good on his resumé.

Now, I do have a criticism of the legislation in that I do not think it went far enough, and the missing piece is on the education side. I raised this in the form of an amendment the other night at Committee, and it was rejected by the Government. I think it is unfortunate that that companion piece that offers driver ed programs readily available across this province is really necessary.

Now, I do not fully understand something that the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) indicated in his remarks when he said that driver education is not effective. I would think, even though he has looked at research on that, that he is absolutely wrong in making that statement. If we do not believe that people can be trained to drive and educated through a driver education program, why do we have them? I can tell you, from my own personal experience as the principal of a high school that had driver education, my own family members, many people have taken driver education, and I think it is very, very effective in training drivers.

The reason that the amendment was rejected was that it called on the Government to spend some money. I would say to government members this should be seen as an investment. I am surprised, while they were ready to spend \$30 million of money from MPIC at one point on bricks and mortar, that they would not spend one pittance of that on driver education so that it could be a universal program throughout Manitoba. I say to you it is going to be rural Manitobans who are affected by this.

Those schools that are small and remote, where they cannot get a class of 12 at the first of September to take driver education or even the ability to offer it a second time, and this is the missing piece in this legislation. I would hope the Member for Transcona would talk to Cabinet members over there and say, listen, we have passed legislation which we think is good. Let us put in place the education component. Let us be sure that driver education is universal so that all Manitobans can access it because without that you are going to have people who are really delayed in getting their driver's licence, and I am surprised that the Government has missed this point.

Driver education is not universally available because you need a certain number to have a class start at a certain time of the year. You need the availability of automobiles for driver education training. You need instructors who are able to put forth that driver education program. This, to me, has to be fundamental to the graduated drivers' licence program. I think it is the missing piece, and it is not too late that members in Cabinet can make that decision, can see that the program is expanded and to see that that is available to all young Manitobans.

Members of this House will know that it is a very important right of passage for a young person to take a program, succeed at that program and get a driver's licence. There is not going to be that programming in a number of areas in Manitoba. Somebody mentioned at committee the other night that perhaps 40 percent of the schools do not have driver education on a regular basis, and that is wrong. I think steps should be taken by Government to ensure that this is available, that young Manitobans will have the ability to take the program and to succeed in getting a driver's licence as quickly as possible once this legislation is put into place.

So, having said those few words, I would ask the Government to look at the process. Certainly they went, at the last minute, from doing this by regulation to putting it into the legislation. That process is the right one except doing it at the last minute and not giving people a chance to study the legislation and understand it is wrong. I would also urge them, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at a more universal program for drivers education.

If you were prepared to spend \$30 million on bricks and mortar, surely you can add a little from MPIC, which has that surplus that Treasury Board members covet. Surely, you can spend a little bit of that on a universal driver education program. It is not too late to do that. It is the companion piece that should happen, and I would urge the Government to seriously look at that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 11, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

* (15:50)

Bill 33—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2)

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, is there leave to deal with Bill 33?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to deal with Bill 33? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services and Housing (Mr. Sale), that Bill 33, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 34—The Municipal Amendment Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 34, The Municipal Amendment Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 35—The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services and Housing (Mr.

Sale), that Bill 35, The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed, by leave.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave? [*Agreed*]

Motion presented.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise just to put a few words on the record on Bill 35. While I support this bill to have better enforcement of support payments, I note and have raised with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) previously some concerns about the implementation process. As we all know, there is in putting any legislation through some important implementation steps which are just as important, sometimes even more important than the legislation itself.

Clearly, some of the changes which the minister has already started to make in The Pas have caused many mothers in that area some significant problems in the delays in getting their support payments, in transferring the delivery of services to Thompson and Winnipeg outside of The Pas.

I think that in putting these comments on the record, I would highlight to the fact that in the implementation of some aspects of his management of support payments, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) has been quite misguided and poorly advised and has done a poor job of implementing things. So, as this bill moves forward, I would hope that the minister will listen to some of the concerns from around the province and do a better job heretofore than he has done in the past.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is third reading of Bill 35, The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 36—The Enhanced Debt Collection (Various Acts Amended) Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, is there leave to deal with Bill 36?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to deal with Bill 36? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services and Housing (Mr. Sale), that Bill 36, The Enhanced Debt Collection (Various Acts Amended) Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 37—The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, is there leave to deal with Bill 37?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to deal with Bill 37? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services and Housing (Mr. Sale), that Bill 37, The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the following bills: 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 17.

Bill 43—The Auditor General Act

Mr. Speaker: Concurrence and third reading, Bill 43, The Auditor General Act.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 43, The Auditor General Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 46—The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, is there leave to deal with Bill 46?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to deal with Bill 46? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Smith), that Bill 46, The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 48—The City of Winnipeg Amendment (Pensions) Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 48, The City of Winnipeg Amendment (Pensions) Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, is there leave of the House to deal with bills 49 and 50? [*Agreed*]

Bill 49—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendment Act, 2001

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs

(Mr. Smith), that Bill 49, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendment Act, 2001, as reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 50—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment (Accountability) Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 50, The Regional Health Authorities Amendment (Accountability) Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

* (16:00)

DEBATE ON CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS**Bill 17—The Student Aid Act**

Mr. Speaker: To resume debate on concurrence and third reading of Bill 17, The Student Aid Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach). Is there a will of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Russell?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been denied.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 17, The Student Aid Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

**Bill 23—The Highway Traffic
Amendment Act**

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Is there leave to deal with Bill 23, Mr. Speaker? *[Agreed]*

I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 23, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa): Just a few words I would like to say on Bill 23. The minister has introduced this as legislation that is going to protect the public from drunk drivers who drive combines and road packers and backhoes. In fact, he talked about a certain number of statistics where he rhymed off that farm machinery had been in some accidents. When he was asked whether any of them were unlicensed drivers, he did not know. The fact is that they were not. This bill is put forward as feel-good legislation, I think, to remedy a problem which does not exist.

We just heard the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) go on for 40 minutes on how the graduated drivers' licence procedure went with all kinds of consultation, yet at committee we had members on Bill 23 from Keystone Agricultural Producers, from the heavy construction industry and the heavy construction rental industry. This bill was a total and complete surprise to them. There had been no consultation. They knew nothing of this legislation. It flies in the face of what the Premier has often said about consulting with Manitobans.

I can tell you that this was a real disappointment to them. A disappointment to members on this side that they would bring forward under the guise of housekeeping in getting the drunk combine drivers off the road, legislation without any consultation whatsoever with the key stakeholders in this province. The other unintended collateral damage of this legislation is they indicated that upwards of 20 percent to 25 percent of people who work in heavy construction

and work in seasonal agricultural industry-related jobs do not have a driver's licence. They have never had one; they have no intention of getting one. These people will not be allowed to do this work.

I am glad the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Sale) is here because these are people that he has never met. They want to work and have worked for many, many years driving farm machinery, driving that packer alongside the road, never been in an accident, never had a licence, but he is now going to become one of your clients because he is going to be ineligible to do this work. I am pleased the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) is here because she knows that there are people, it is the only work they do, to work on seasonal farm operations. They do not have licences to drive that combine or to work with a backhoe. They now will no longer be able to do this. They will be in violation of the law, and I say I think it is an unintended piece of damage to do with this legislation. *[interjection]*

Well, the Minister of Family Services says they are not driving on the roads, they are going to be driving on the fields. The fact is they have to go from one field to another and what they are going to have to do is to have somebody bring another driver out. Keystone Agricultural Producers pointed this out the other night, and I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture did not hear that. It is going to tie up three people when they move a combine. *[interjection]* Well, I am disappointed that she would let this get by caucus and Cabinet without fighting for him, because I can tell you that the Keystone Ag Producers were very upset with this and they wondered where the Minister of Agriculture stood on this issue. So, again, this is legislation that is going to have an unintended effect because they think they are going to take these so-called drunk drivers off the packers on the highway and out of the combines and off the tractors. That is a problem that does not exist, and you are going to put these people out of work. So I would ask, before you proclaim this, you give this some real thought because it is going to have damage.

I would also say on winter roads in northern Manitoba that many of those people that work

on those winter roads do not have a driver's licence. Who is going to do that work? Who is going to be affected by this legislation? Who is going to be put out of work because of this legislation? The very people that this Government sometimes pretends that they are there to protect, and I say this is something you should think about, those winter roads are very, very important and these people will not be able to work in that particular industry because they do not have a licence, and they have been doing really, really important significant work. I would say to members opposite, give this some serious thought before you proclaim this legislation.

Thank you very much.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): My honourable colleague from Minnedosa has touched on the important points about which we have severe reservations in this particular bill. We asked the minister at committee in regard to the statistics of accidents that have occurred over the past five years as to whether or not these particular accidents involved persons that did not have drivers' licences. Were they individuals who, in fact, were in the wrong when these particular accidents occurred? There were no statistics, no data. There is nothing here; there is no information to back up what you are requesting and putting in legislation.

So you wonder why you are putting legislation down when you have absolutely no information on which to substantiate the need for this legislation. None whatsoever. When you have such a dramatic impact, as you are calling upon the heavy construction industry who are saying that between 20 percent and 30 percent of their workforce is going to be ineligible to continue their livelihood, their work, this is almost unconscionable that a government that prides itself on public consultation and listening to people, in this particular case is not listening to people.

They have not held any public consultation whatsoever and, as my honourable colleague for Minnedosa stated, the particular parties which this legislation is going to impact did not even know this legislation existed. There was no prior consultation at all before this legislation came forward. I raise this specific issue of when those persons are on the construction piece of equip-

ment and in a construction area—and I know the honourable Member for Dauphin-Roblin (Mr. Struthers) is calling across the way that persons should, in fact, have a driver's licence when on a roadway.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when you are operating an earthmover in a ditch on a roadway, I do not suggest at all that that particular piece of equipment should be considered being on a roadway. However, within this legislation you are considered of the right of way, not just the roadway, the right of way. So, when you are in the ditch with that earthmover, I would like to ask the Member for Dauphin-Roblin as to whether he would consider an earthmover as being on the roadway when it is gathering soil and digging the ditch deeper or constructing a crossing? Yet this legislation includes that particular area.

*(16:10)

In consultation with the minister, the minister was, I would say, taken aback by the questioning that we put forward at the table during the committee the other evening. There were no responses to our concerns. I know my colleague from Emerson is going to speak, and perhaps my colleague from Lakeside on the impact on persons engaged in agriculture. So I will leave that topic to them.

However, I want to leave on the basis of winter road construction. I am certain that you, Mr. Speaker, are familiar with the amount of economic activity and the importance of that economic activity that is derived from the construction and maintenance of winter roads into the North. Persons are engaged in the maintenance and construction of those winter roads, and yet when we ask the question as to whether winter roads are included or excluded from this particular piece of legislation, the minister did not know. Legislative Counsel was not able to answer the question, and yet the Government is pressing ahead with this bill and is unable to answer some of the most fundamental questions. That is why I believe that this is wrong-headed to proceed with this particular piece of legislation without being able to answer these questions.

In any event, I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are so many elements within this bill because it is an omnibus type of bill, and does direct and correct certain situations that we all acknowledge within this Chamber that need to be addressed. However, I suggest that the honourable members of the Government side of the House here are being led down the path to passing this legislation without they, themselves, asking very, very important questions. I look to members from the North, that represent individuals from the North, that I am certain have constituents of theirs who work on winter roads. Do they all have drivers' licences, and I know the answer is that, no, they do not. They are putting these individuals out of work, and I believe they know not what they do.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though this particular piece of legislation will pass today, I have no doubt of that, I do ask and reiterate the comments made by my honourable colleague from Minnedosa that the Government re-examine this legislation prior to proclamation, and amend to correct these oversights as I see them and have described and addressed this afternoon. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about this bill and the reasons for being very apprehensive about passing a bill such as this. I mean, this bill was portrayed by the minister as wanting to ensure that members, or people who have been caught for drinking and driving and had their licence suspended, would not be able to drive on a provincial highway.

Well, this goes way, way beyond that, and the implications of this bill are far, far more reaching than implied by the minister in his attempt to sort of put it under a drinking driver classification, or a cloud of a drinking driver classification.

That is what is unfortunate about this bill, because this bill really imposes hardships on many sectors that are involved in large employment of individuals, and the employment of those individuals is largely done on vehicles that are very slow moving. A farm tractor, in most cases, travels at a maximum speed at roughly about 18 miles an hour, which would be considered on highways a very slow moving

vehicle. Most farm machinery now under actions of the previous administration, the previous Conservative government, ensured that all farm machinery would be properly lit. I mean, it is enforced. So the safety of the actual equipment operating on a road—that has been put in question by this bill, is simply not verified and valid.

Many of the construction industry that testified before the committee the other day, Chris Lorenc, the president of Heavy Equipment Operators in this province, indicated clearly his displeasure and support for the points that the Keystone Agricultural Producers had made in opposition to this bill.

There is another clause in this bill that is sort of hidden. I mean, the minister said the other day it was just provincial highways. It is not so at all. Look at clause 225(1.2), and then tell me if it is just provincial highways. Not so at all. Look at clauses, oh, this is such a long one. You have to go back 10 pages. Clauses 300(1)(mm.4), and then talk about (hhh) under 300.1, and it talks about the empowerment of the registrar. This gives the registrar huge powers that registrars never had before.

Why would you want to do that? Why give the registrar more power than the courts have? Unilaterally imposing her or his will on the drivers of this province. I fail to understand the logic and the thinking of this bill. I think, quite frankly, the minister has not even read his own bill, because no normal minister of highways would ever support this.

I want to leave one issue that I think is far more relevant to the dangers of this bill than anything else. If, for instance, an equipment contractor hiring a person that has a valid driver's licence to operate a Caterpillar, or a road maintainer or any one of those vehicles in the construction industry, Mr. Speaker, hires that person tomorrow, and the day after, for one reason or another, that person's licence is suspended, does not tell the employer that his licence is suspended and consequently has an accident or somebody runs into his vehicle, his Cat, do you know that the contractor is liable and could be sued for every last cent that he or she owes?

Do you know that a farmer hiring a temporary truck driver during harvest season hires somebody who has a valid driver's licence to operate a truck, and for one reason or another over the weekend has his or her licence suspended, comes back to the farm, gets into the truck and pulls out onto the highway, and somebody not paying attention runs into the back of that truck, that farmer, not the truck driver, but that farmer, is liable and could be sued for every acre of land and everything the farmer owns.

Do you know that that is implicit in this legislation? Why would you, as honourable members of Government, want to impose those kinds of dangers and write it into a bill? I mean, have you not questioned your minister? Have you and your caucus not debated and discussed this legislation? Do you not have a legislative review committee? I mean, how ignorant can a group of backbenchers be in allowing the minister to impose his unilateral will on a province?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the members in Government would allow such a thing to happen. So, I say to you I would strongly recommend to the minister that he should put this bill on ice. There are some good aspects to this bill. But he should put this bill on ice for a while, and have at least the discussion with his colleagues in his caucus, and get some legal advice as to what is implied in this bill and how it will affect the innocent contractor, or the innocent farm operator, and, indeed, any one of you guys hiring somebody to operate your car, and, having an accident, need not know that that person might be suspended the day after and you might be totally liable for his or her damages.

* (16:20)

So this is a dangerous bill the way it is drafted. I think the government of the day the minister, really needs to give some second thought as to whether he, in fact, wants to put this bill before this Assembly in final reading before reconsidering whether the draft currently in place here today and all the implications of the drafting the way it is done should be allowed to happen. Because it really puts many innocent people in very significant financial peril. I would

strongly suggest to the House Leader that he have this discussion with his minister before he brings this bill back for final consideration in this Chamber.

Mr. Harry Enns (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I want to send a specific message to two particular ministers; those are the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) and the Minister of Transportation and Government Services (Mr. Ashton). I ask them to take seriously the good advice that my colleague the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) gave them in his closing comments about this bill. Yes, we will pass this piece of legislation.

Obviously there are some reservations. I mean, you have heard great speeches of support for this bill in the last few moments. Can you imagine what it would be like if we really opposed this bill? That is a fairly regular technique that is used by governments when they bring kind of omnibus legislation before us, which has many good parts, and, in principle, is supportable, as this bill is being supported by us.

But having heard from representations from the heavy construction industry, having heard from our farm organizations about its particular impact on what I genuinely believe were unmeant targets, that I really would like the Minister of Agriculture to demonstrate a little bit of muscle in her Cabinet on behalf of farmers and to simply, when this bill is being proclaimed, hold back some of these sections that obviously we have pointed out. The industry, the farm organizations that I pointed out could prove very troublesome for unintended targets of this legislation.

I would say the same thing for the Minister of Transportation and Government Services (Mr. Ashton). Having listened to the representations of the construction industry, having listened to some of our arguments here on third reading, that there would be nothing wrong to prevail upon Cabinet to withhold certain sections of this piece of legislation, while they may wish to proclaim the rest of the legislation.

I remind honourable members we had fun with them. This was an NDP government with

great skill at doing the warm and fuzzy thing and the good public relations thing, who passed freedom of information legislation in this Chamber, great fanfare: the public had a right; the government was supposed to be transparent; civil service, bureaucrats, you know how they come to decisions, should be freely available to the citizens of Manitoba. Then they sat on it for how long? Years, years they sat on it until finally from the prodding of those of us in opposition, they finally proclaimed the bill. *[interjection]* We proclaimed it. Pardon me. Yes, we proclaimed it after a change of government. That is absolutely right.

So, Mr. Speaker, the concept that the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) recommends to members opposite when proclamation of this bill is being dealt with, to hold back those sections that we have pointed out with the industry, the affected, impacted representatives of the industry, both the heavy construction and farmers have pointed out, that deserves some rethinking before being passed into law. Thank you very much.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my concerns in regard to this bill and just reiterate some of the concerns that were raised by the farm groups, the heavy equipment rental people the other night in the committee as well. There is great concern I think amongst the persons who are involved in this particular situation.

A number of these people, the point that I would like to work on a seasonal basis. If they cannot work in the climate that they are very much trained for and very much the experienced people to operate some of these particular implements, it means that they do not get even seasonal work, which also means that the Government is basically forcing them onto welfare roles because they cannot, obviously, then become eligible for employment insurance benefits throughout the rest of the seasonal time of year as well.

This is a very irresponsible action on behalf of the Government, we believe, I believe at least, to be able to force people out of work in this particular situation. As has been said by many of my colleagues, you know, the situation of

driving a vehicle at four or five miles an hour on a highway that is under construction, where either half of it is closed off to access by automobile or completely closed off in the case of construction around buildings, elevator sites, some of the industries that we have developing in this province, is very untimely I think.

It appears as if the minister did not really take a very serious look at the type of legislation that he was putting forward, certainly, as has been pointed out, did not talk to anyone in regard to the people who would be impacted by this kind of a bill. I think it is depicting of the kind of vision that this Government has in regard to how we should develop the province of Manitoba in regard to construction and new enterprises coming into the province. In fact, they did not look at several sectors that will be impacted by this bill that work in that heavy construction field. Never mind the farming communities and the individual farm operators and their families who are having a difficult enough time in some areas to make ends meet.

I understand, even though I was not in the House earlier today, that now many farmers in Manitoba have been told that the only way that they should farm a viable farming unit is to go and get some off-farm employment. Of course, here is another situation where the Government is inhibiting those same people from getting off-farm employment. It is pretty devastating to be in opposition and watch this kind of legislation coming forward in the province of Manitoba.

So with that I will end my comments. I just wanted to add those to the record. Thank you.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I too want to put a few comments on the record regarding this bill. I believe it is an ill-conceived bill. I think it is indicative of what we see across the way where there is little reasoning specifically to agriculture and to rural Manitoba.

Again, it is going to put extra stresses on the agriculture community, the heavy construction industry. Rural Manitoba is being hit. I think it is indicative of the government of the day, where they are making laws which are very specific to some of the feelings that they have within the city of Winnipeg. I do not think in any way that

it is looking at it in a realistic way as to the things that are happening in rural Manitoba.

Maybe this is as a result of the fact that they have dropped the old department of rural development and no one is speaking for the agricultural community. I see some rural members across the way sitting and smiling and thinking this is a joke. Obviously none of them have ever, ever been in business and had to hire people who are working either in the construction industry or in agriculture.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is an ill-conceived piece of legislation. I wish that they would take time and look at it; see how it impacts people in rural Manitoba.

The other irony of it is that somehow we are wanting to put more restrictions on rural Manitoba, but when we look at some of the real problems that are created in Winnipeg, when we look at some of the crime that is taking place there, there is all kinds of legislation coming out but nothing happens. So I just find it a real irony that we would put this kind of legislation forward. I trust and I hope that they will listen to rural Manitoba, which they did not.

* (16:30)

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) is feeling that this is a rather—a piece of joke, I guess, whatever, but I just wish that he would seriously look at it, and listen to what those people who we are talking about, when they were in committee, the comments that they made. I think they were heartfelt comments, and, before they proclaim this, please take another look at it and use common sense. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 23, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Mackintosh: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, we need some guidance perhaps from you, but we will return to concurrence. We moved the motion earlier in the day. If you need me to move the motion again, I will do so. Otherwise, we will just go back into Supply. I do not know.

Mr. Speaker: Resuming concurrence.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Concurrence Motion

Mr. Chairperson (Conrad Santos): The Committee of Supply has before it for our consideration the motion concurring in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2002. The floor is now open to questions.

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River): Yes, Mr. Chair, I am just wondering if we could wait two or three minutes, however long it takes to get the minister responsible. I was questioning the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) who deferred the question to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Ashton) for response to my question when it was called 12 o'clock.

My question, prior to the recess, was to the Minister of Education, who then deferred the question to the Minister of Transportation. I

understand there is a demonstration or a trial project regarding the placement of strobe lights on school buses, and my question was when does the program start? What is the duration of that program? My first question.

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Education, Training and Youth): The minister responsible for this is, fundamentally, the Minister of Transportation and Government Services, because the installation of such material has implications for legislation under his purview. But I can answer the questions because we have been working fairly closely because it is a school-bus issue. The minister is not here to be able to provide more detailed information, but I will do what I can do in the time that we are here.

In terms of the pilot project, there was a two-year pilot project implemented a year ago in four school divisions in the province to allow school divisions to install strobe lights on buses to ascertain their relevance in terms of safety, visibility and so forth for transporting students; so that motorists and so forth could see school buses in conditions of snow or fog or what have you. Mr. Chair, that pilot project is a two-year pilot project. One year has passed.

We have had requests from school divisions to expand the pilot project, which the minister responsible and myself have agreed to, so the pilot now is available to all school divisions in the province of Manitoba, an expansion from the original four. It is a two-year pilot project. The pilot ends next year. So we are midway through this pilot to ascertain, as I said, the safety of strobe lights on school buses.

Mrs. Dacquay: I thank the minister for that response. If I understand correctly, all divisions will now be able to have the strobe lights affixed to four buses.

Mr. Caldwell: There were four school divisions that were taking part in the original pilot. We have expanded it to include all divisions, yes.

Mrs. Dacquay: Are there costs attached to this program for the individual school divisions or are the costs being incurred by the Government?

Mr. Caldwell: The costs for the installation of strobe lights are borne by the individual school divisions. They are very, very modest costs. Of course, you know, by saying that they are borne by the individual school divisions, the majority of those funds that school divisions use still are provincial dollars, so school divisions make their own determination on how they want to expend them. But I think the cost of installing a strobe light on a bus is between \$100 and \$200, so it is a pretty minor cost.

Mrs. Dacquay: Upon completion of the trial project, is the minister willing to, dependent on the outcomes, the results, consider giving the divisions the authority to install these strobe lights on the required number of buses they feel would be appropriate?

Mr. Caldwell: I appreciate the question. Yes, the purpose of the pilot was to ascertain the advisability of doing exactly what the Member for Seine River suggests.

* (16:40)

Mrs. Dacquay: I thank the honourable minister. As I understand it, there is a desire in the school division, the schools in my areas, that particularly bringing in rural students from south St. Vital into the northern part of St. Vital, it is very much deemed to be a safety factor, and they would like the flexibility to be able to continue the program.

Mr. Caldwell: I thank the member for her comments. I know we share a concern for safety of school children in terms of their transportation to and from school. I know that many, many police forces now utilize strobe lights in terms of their vehicles. I think they are becoming more accepted nationally and internationally, although there are still jurisdictions that prohibit strobe lights in Canada. But I do thank the member for her comments, and I know that we do share the same concern about child safety.

Mrs. Dacquay: Mr. Chair, I believe we have finished questioning the Minister of Education at this moment, but my colleague wants to pose questions to the Minister of Transportation and Government Services (Mr. Ashton).

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): I want to thank the Minister of Transportation and Government Services for allowing some questions on various matters that are before us.

I think one of the key concerns that I constantly hear in my travels around this province, as the member critic for agriculture, is the deterioration of our roads in this province, specifically in the grain and oilseed growing areas and in many other parts of the province where livestock production has been enhanced very dramatically, which, of course, means that vehicles must travel whether they want to or not virtually on a daily basis, either delivering feedstuffs or delivering any variety of materials that are necessary to raise livestock, and, of course, delivering the livestock itself to market or bringing new stock in in regard to, for instance, the hog industry.

It is almost a requirement now that the stock in the various barns, in the feeder barns, is changed every four months, and so that means every third quarter, the whole stock within a given operation changes. I think the minister needs to explain to Manitobans how he intends to provide an infrastructure that will actually encourage the maintenance, not the enhancement, but only the maintenance of the current agricultural industry by virtue of supplying a transportation routing to the community.

We know that the current capital budget is down by \$10 million, and that is absolutely astounding when one considers the increased revenues of \$800 million or better that this Government is generating annually now, over what they did two years ago. I would suspect that the minister would have at least lobbied very long and very hard to ensure that there was at least the nominal percentage that should have accrued to highways that normally would have accrued to highways if those kinds of increased revenues had been incurred by another party in power.

I want to ask the minister whether he can give us an indication as to which roads in Manitoba and southern Manitoba, in the industrialized and the agriculturally developed areas he wants to target as key routes and improve load carrying capacity to the point

where it becomes economical for farmers to be able to haul full loads on.

Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister of Transportation and Government Services): I think this is a continuation of discussion we had in the latter stage of Estimates. The member, I think, has to recognize that we as a government, in fact, in a year and a half, started to address some of the real challenges we inherited, in terms of highways.

I would like to, first of all, correct the member when he said there was a \$10-million reduction. What is interesting is that the current base budget this year is higher than the base budget in any of the years the Tories were in government. What the member refers to is the fact that they had a one-time only expenditure in the election year, a \$10-million capital figure. It is interesting because this is not a long-term commitment by the members when they were in government. As recently as 1997, the previous government spent barely \$90 million on our highway system—barely \$90 million. I compare that to the close to \$100 million last year, and, in fact, the \$103.9 million that will be spent this year. That is the capital side.

If the member opposite would be objective about this, and I do not expect that, he also would have to recognize that we have also moved on the maintenance side. Since we came into government, we have increased expenditure on maintenance by 8 percent. The main reason for that is the previous government repeatedly under-budgeted for maintenance in this province. We have done that. I think that is fairly important.

We have also dealt with the huge deficit that the previous government left in terms of our equipment. We were spending barely \$1.5 million a year in terms of renewing our construction equipment. That is a 1-in-97 year replacement cycle. I do not know how members opposite expect it to do that.

I will give the member another statistic as well, that we estimated our average equipment in the fleet was spending an hour in the shops for every four hours it is on the road—not adequate. Our Government has addressed that. In fact, we

have put in our first two years, including this year, more than \$8 million to renew the equipment fleet—a start. We have a long way to go, but I can say to the member opposite, he should look at that. To give you an idea of where it will make an impact, it will make an impact in the member's own constituency.

I will tell you how bad our equipment fleet was. The previous government decided they had to lease equipment rather than purchase equipment in northern Manitoba, because our own equipment would not survive the northern roads. The older equipment was being used in the member's constituency, so we are renewing the equipment fleet. I think that is fairly significant.

The member did ask about the impact, in terms of the agriculture community. One I will take real issue with, if the member is suggesting that somehow, magically, in 1999, 11 years after members opposite were in government, that somehow our roads started to deteriorate, I will tell you nobody in rural Manitoba will buy that. The previous government spent basically what it raised in terms of gas taxes. There were significant revenue increases in other areas, particularly on the income tax side. They did not put that money into the highway system, but I have always given them credit for spending what they took in. I think that is an important principle when you are dealing with the federal government that has not spent a cent on the Manitoba road system since 1997, until this year.

I want to focus in on that because we have signed an agreement with the federal government and we have worked in partnership with the AMM, with the municipalities of Manitoba, that is going to put in place funding cost-shared by the federal government. We put our share in the capital budget this year to flow that through. Also with the municipalities, which is going to invest money for the first time really on our grain roads, the first federal money.

* (16:50)

I want to stress, by the way, that I do not actually believe that this money really should be considered coming from the gas tax. I consider this being a small part of the Crow rate, which was one of the historic sell-outs, I believe, of

western Canada, when we lost the Crow rate in western Canada and where there was a payout of barely two years' worth of the Crow rate with very little, if any, consideration given to the fact that a lot of the shift in agriculture that has taken place, let alone the shift specifically in grain farming, is a direct result of the elimination of the Crow rate. So the one move, whether it was good or bad and we can debate that at another time, has had a real impact.

So we have moved. We signed an agreement, and not only that—and I realize this does not address the agricultural roads, but we are also in a position of getting the first federal money on our highway system starting potentially even this year. I want to put that on the record because we are also making sure we have the projects for that. Mr. Chair, I was rather disappointed when the Member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire) put out a statement in a local newspaper saying that we had stopped a program on Highway No. 1.

What we have done is we have submitted it under the Strategic Highway Initiative Program to make sure we get federal money in our national highway system. In fact, a number of other projects we are looking at right now, both on No. 1 and on No. 16, rather than put it in our existing highway program this year, which would not be constructed until next year anyway, we are making sure that we are going to take advantage of the federal money that is going to come on to our system. Now that makes a difference to farmers as well, and the agricultural community, because the national highway system in this province is an important part of that service.

So in a year and a half we have increased maintenance by 8 percent. We have virtually tripled the acquisition budget for capital equipment. We have taken the capital budget, and we have increased it to 103.9 to make sure we can have the money put forward on that. I say to the member opposite, we inherited a real challenge in terms of the road system.

I acknowledge that, but rather than get into what happened when they were in government or what has happened now, I think we all need to work in partnership to go to the federal

government and start getting them to reinvest the money they take out, whether it is the Crow rate equivalent money or the gas tax. That is going to be the long-term solution, because we are not going to take money from health care and education to put into our highway system. Traditionally we have taken it from highway related taxes, and that is what we are doing right now.

But, you know, we are paying 10 cents a litre every time we fill up with gas, and it goes to the federal government. We do not get more than 3 or 4 cents back on the litre, even in a year like this where we are getting some money. So I hope the member opposite will recognize that what we need to do is address that and address it collectively. I can spend a lot of time talking about the previous government and this Government, but we need to look forward and our vision is very much to work with the federal government and try and get them to have a national vision that is going to reinvest in transportation.

Mr. Jack Penner: You know, I am utterly astounded at the minister's response, coming from the minister whose Premier (Mr. Doer) announced that they would have a great relationship with the federal government. He is now saying that it is impossible to work with the federal government, that the federal government is not coming forth with their amount of funding, and he is blaming the federal government for all the ills that befall the highways department in the province of Manitoba.

I find it very amazing that the conversion on "the road to Damascus" has taken such a short while of this minister, and now he is condemning the very administration that his Premier said they would be so tightly in love with and be able to work so closely with. Yet he is now demonstrating to us his frustration of the federal government not picking up its share of the national highways system.

I concur with the minister. I concur with the minister that the federal government should, as the Americans do, kick in significantly more money into our national highways system. You just look at the national routing systems in the United States and the Army Corps of Engineers takes care of all those transportation routing

without any state involvement. In Manitoba, the minister of highways reduces his capital budget by \$12 million over last year.

Well, he says no. Anybody can look at the budget and the figures do not lie. If the minister wants to couch it one way or the other, he can, but in reality the minister has dropped the capital budget in his department very dramatically, and he is now feathering the budgetary side of the steel industry. I think it is unfortunate that he would take money out of construction to buy equipment, when he, in fact, could lease it or contract it, as the previous administration did. He will find that if he does the real numbers, from an economic standpoint, it is probably cheaper to contract than to buy the equipment himself and try and maintain it. Because that is very costly. That is a very costly proposition, and people in Manitoba are begging for roads.

The provincial highways department had scheduled a new bridge at Letellier, Manitoba. That bridge will fall into the river one of these days, and the minister knows it. The minister has been advised by his department on what kind of serious condition that bridge is in. It has become even more imperative that that bridge and the St. Jean bridge be replaced because there are no elevators left to haul grain to. There are no grain-delivery systems in all of eastern Manitoba now, east of the Red River. There are a few feed mills that you can deliver to, which is a great support base for those that raise feed grain. But any oilseeds or wheat that have to be hauled west of the Red River need to cross the river.

Highway 201 is not a heavy load-bearing roadway. Yet, it is the main route out of eastern Manitoba, for all the cattle, all the hogs, all the grain, all the oilseeds have to come down either 201 or down 59 Highway because those are the main grain routes. The other one is Highway 200, which is straight into Winnipeg, and that is the delivery system that the farmers or the live-stock industry have to use. There are No. 200, No. 12 and No. 59.

The former government had budgeted significant amounts of money to increase the load-bearing capacity of Highway 59 and of 201. Yet all of that has been cancelled and taken away, Mr. Chair. The municipalities are begging

the minister to reconsider the designation of some main routing so you can at least get to the large terminals that the grain companies have built, but the minister refuses to acknowledge their existence and the requirement of proper load-bearing capacity roads to be built at least into close proximity of those systems. Yet, he does not hesitate at all to put forward a bill like Bill 23.

I had a chat with two RCMP officers yesterday about Bill 23. You should have heard their comments. They said: How many more RCMP staff does the minister want to hire in order to ensure that all members, all farmers driving vehicles, all road construction vehicles will have drivers with licences on it? That is going to be their chore. If they do not, and if somebody is liable by somebody hitting an unlicensed driver, it is actually the RCMP responsibility under the terms of this act. What is the minister thinking?

So I would strongly urge the minister to go back to his Treasury Board and say to his Treasury Board: look, gentlemen, look, Mr. Finance Minister, you have seen an increase of \$800 million in revenues. Surely an extra 10 percent or 12 percent of that should have gone to roadways into the area that generates all the economic activity in this province.

So surely the minister could, as he says the federal government ought to, in his own province make his own case with his own Treasury Board and his own minister about increasing his budget by a mere 10 percent of the increased value of their revenue, instead of spending it all frivolously buying mortar and bricks and concrete, and call them healthcare facilities when they were already there. That \$7 million would have built quite a stretch of 59 highway that you frivolously spent on acquiring a health care facility that was serving the people well. That is the silliness about this Government.

I think if the finance minister might care to answer whether he is willing to consider taking at least 10 percent of his increased revenue and designating it toward highways, we would all, the people in rural Manitoba, and I think, even in the city of Winnipeg, would applaud that. So I ask the minister, has he approached his Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) on this?

* (17:00)

Mr. Ashton: I will not get into Bill 23, other than to say that I am shocked that the member opposite sees no problem with people who have had their licences suspended for drunk driving for medical reasons, or for poor driving records with allowing them to have a carte blanche ability to drive on our road system. I just say to the member opposite I think he does a disservice to rural Manitoba because it is rural Manitobans, northern Manitobans, as well as people who are in the city of Winnipeg, who drive on the highways as well. I do not know if the member spoke on the bill in third reading, but I thought we were dealing with concurrence.

Quite frankly, the words of the member opposite, in regard to highway funding, ring extremely hollow because the previous government spent basically what it raised in gas taxes. Mr. Chair, we have not changed that. The member is wrong. The previous government put in an additional \$10 million going into an election as a one time only capital initiative. It was not built into the base budget. I say to the member opposite, he mentioned about our relationship with the federal government for the first time since 1996 we are going to have federal money spent on the Manitoba system. They could not do it as a government. We have done it. We have signed a grain-roads agreement, and we have signed the Strategic Highway Initiative Program.

I will continue my discussion with my colleagues, but I can tell you for all we saw from the Minister of Finance and what not, this Minister of Finance has brought in budgets that have increased our maintenance budget by 8 percent, have increased our acquisition of capital equipment, that have increased our winter roads budget. I realize the member opposite has difficulty with some of the re-investment, particularly the fact that, outside of the capital budget, we are also living up to an obligation they signed in 1992 to provide an all-weather road to South Indian Lake.

Quite frankly, we have done more in the last year and a half to improve transportation in this province, recognizing a very difficult situation, than the previous government did in 11 years. So

I do not know if the member raised these arguments when he was in government, but the previous government certainly did not act on them. I will leave my comments at that.

I appreciate if he is lobbying for better roads. I agree with him on that. To point fingers here, and try and pretend that somehow, in the fall of 1999, magically, the road system suddenly got worse. I say to the member opposite that the previous government had 11 years. They managed the highway system. Some of the issues he raised about lack of RTAC access and upgrading the highways—he had 11 years in which he sat in a government that did nothing to address those concerns.

We moved, for example on 59—he mentioned 59. It took an NDP government to four-lane 59, something the previous government could not do in four or five years. I could do a lot more to respond. If we want political debate back and forth, I am ready for it. I thought the intent was to ask some specific questions on specific projects. I am open either way.

Mr. Glen Cummings (Ste. Rose): My question to the Minister responsible for Government Services in his capacity responsible for disaster assistance. I would like to give the minister an opportunity to, other than the length of time they took in Question Period, to explain the process that he is undertaking to be able to respond to the request for disaster assistance, so that the municipalities that have suffered significant infrastructure damage during the spring flood. I will give him this opportunity to explain, on the record, so that I can explain what is happening.

Mr. Ashton: The process we are following is the same process that is followed with all disasters. We have had our people out from EMO. The municipalities are the front line in terms of dealing with the emergency situations, and, also, the initial applications for DFFA are certainly aware. They have put in applications both for municipal claims, and there have been many private claims.

I think what the member is talking about really refers to his question asking about the announcement on the DFFA program. I can indicate that the announcement, I anticipate, will be made within a matter of days. I can give him

some more information since we last spoke in Question Period. I think we are looking now at upwards of \$8 million in damages this spring, with a further \$400, 000 last fall in the heavy moisture that took place. I think if the member is looking for a message to communicate back, it is that the announcement is imminent, and we just have to finalize a few details.

I hope he will communicate back, but we recognize the degree of the damage this spring. It was a very difficult spring and the municipalities, in particular, dealt with it, not only on the frontline of providing emergency measures, but also there was some significant damage to municipal roads. That announcement is going to be made—I will go a little bit further then within a matter of days. I would anticipate probably early to middle of next week. We just have to finalize a couple of the details, and we will get that information out. So I thank the member for the question.

Mr. Cummings: He can take the Fifth on this, to use the American term, if he wants, but has he had a positive relationship with the federal government in discussing their participation and cost-sharing, or have those negotiations started?

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Chairperson, I did flag, when I met with the minister responsible, Art Eggleton, the Minister responsible for Disaster Assistance, that we were anticipating a difficult spring. I met with him earlier this year, met on a number of other issues as well. I would anticipate that we follow a normal course here. We do have a federal-provincial agreement. The member is aware of the cost-sharing formulas. We would anticipate that there would be a significant financial contribution, because essentially the damage we are looking at this year falls within the accepted guidelines.

So we do anticipate a co-operative relationship, and we have also had some significantly high-level staff contact with the federal government, as the spring progressed, to make sure that they were fully aware of it. Now we are in a position of being able to announce a program very shortly. We do want to make sure that we can flow the process out to the claimants, and also make sure that the federal government is aware in advance of their obligation.

To make a somewhat longer answer short, we are not anticipating any problems with the federal government, at least in the sense of recognizing that there is a disaster. I think it is fairly clear. The bottom line is that it has been a very difficult year. The member and I had the opportunity to look at the situation at Westbourne. If you look at the Interlake, you look at southeast Manitoba, it has been a difficult year, and it has been a challenging year because it has been overland flooding, generally, rather than strictly riverbank flooding, which creates a whole new set of challenges for areas where you still have significant problems for moisture, even as we speak.

* (17:10)

Mr. Cummings: My problem with the position that the minister finds himself in is that the sooner that he can convey the essence of whether it is going to be 50-50 or 90-10 to the municipalities, the sooner they are going to decide whether they can afford to do the repairs on all of the sites that may be damaged.

Some of the repairs, as I recall the system, if you have a crossing that is 75 percent worn out, you are only going to get a percentage of the value of the replacement cost. That sometimes impedes the municipalities' ability to replace infrastructure.

The minister has a secondary problem on his hands now, because, in some cases, fully repaired, and in many cases only temporarily repaired, crossings are now blown out again where we recently had the flash flood in my area from Neepawa down through to Westbourne again. It did not cover the entire area that was flooded in the spring, but it hit a big part of it. Now, those municipalities and the minister's adjusters will be faced with the question: was this partially repaired?

I am asking, in general terms, if the minister has had any discussion with his adjusters in how some of these double damaged areas may be handled, because I suspect that this is going to be a second flood event. He is not going to be able to include it as part of the first claim, unless there is something better going on than what I anticipate. I certainly hope there is. The fact is the municipality may have spent a fair bit of

money on the anticipation there would be assistance, and now have to go back to that very same crossing and not receive as much assistance even as they were hoping to get the first time. They are very much up in the air.

The minister, and I know his staff and I myself, the minister should know, have been saying to the municipalities, well, I am sure that this will be part of a program. I am certainly not in any position to provide much level of comfort when they are spending—well, let us just pull a figure—if you are spending \$50,000 on a crossing that you are not sure whether you are going to get \$10, \$12 or \$25 per \$100 assistance on it, you maybe simply wait until you get some clear direction.

So can the minister enlighten me at all on what process is likely to be followed out there?

Mr. Ashton: I appreciate the concern the member is raising. Obviously, the degree to which events are treated as one event is advantageous to everyone in the process, because it essentially means that people pay only one deductible rather than several deductibles. The member knows the system quite well, I know from his question and from my previous discussions with him.

My sense is, for example, comparing last fall and this spring. Indications are that they will be treated as two separate events. We may run into some difficulty this spring as well. Some of the events may be treated as separate events, but that will come out with details of the announcement. Sometimes these are matters of discussion back and forth of federal and provincial governments. You know we still have ongoing issues even going back to 1997, some minor issues, but also 1999.

So, I cannot really give a clear answer until we have those final discussions, but I appreciate what the member is saying, and I do hope that we will be able to give him the information. I think he realizes, too, that most of the claims will be fairly routine. Municipalities are very well versed on what is happening. I have had the opportunity to meet directly with a lot of the municipal leaders in the affected areas both last fall and also this spring.

So I think they are aware of it and I would appreciate if the member could keep me posted on any specific concerns that do develop, Mr. Chair, because, as time progresses, when you are dealing with a significant program, and assuming it is up in that range, \$8 million, that there will always be, dare I say, grey areas, you know, issues that could go one way or the other and maybe some policy interpretation issues. So, if the member becomes aware of any of those, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Cummings: I appreciate the minister's position. I know that there have historically been some issues where the federal authority likes to hang their hat on details that can sometimes make what we believe eligible expenditures ineligible, and I would encourage the minister to negotiate hard on behalf of the Province. Because that ultimately comes back to rest with the local ratepayer where these disaster programs need to be applied. The sooner he can give them some direction, and I guess that my bottom line is, please give them that direction as quickly as you can. My colleague from Portage la Prairie would like to ask some questions.

Mr. Ashton: I appreciate what the member is raising as an issue and he raised a good point.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I would like to ask the minister responsible for EMO in regard to an area north of the city of Portage la Prairie commonly known as the Peony Farm. It is an area of densely settled residences that have experienced significant water damage to basements because of high water table. It is not overland flooding in relationship to what the definition is.

What I want to leave with the minister is that particular soil texture in that area of settlement is extremely porous. If a wave of water was to come over that area, it would disappear, because the porous nature of the soil allows for the water to percolate very, very quickly into the ground and ultimately ends up in basements. So, when you are looking at a soil condition such as that, it is a grave concern. I know the definition of overland flooding has precluded the residents of the Peony Farm from receiving any monies to assist with the damages.

I know that his department personnel have been there. His department is familiar with it. I

am asking at this point in time for the minister to request that his personnel, that have first-hand knowledge of the damage that has occurred to the residents of the Peony Farm—that they consult with the Department of Conservation and the water management area of that department and to relate the information that they have compiled so that there could potentially be information, planning conveyed from his department to the Department of Conservation, and ultimately to work with co-operation with the local government, the rural municipality of Portage la Prairie, to address these very, very serious concerns and problems that Peony Farm residents have north of the city of Portage la Prairie.

This is not a first-time occurrence. Because of the tremendous amount of moisture, we have really in the wet cycle, as Environment Canada has depicted our weather pattern, these residents now have had to contend with water in their basements out of three of the last five years. This year more extensively than any other year. There are only less than a dozen homes out of 140-plus homes that did not sustain damage in their basements.

I hope the minister can relate to me now that he will communicate the information that his department has compiled, and work with the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Lathlin), along with perhaps the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen), to address this very, very serious concern that we have. Ultimately there will be further problems, as we all know about what happens when you have flooded basements and an inordinate amount of water in wells, and the high water table as it affects the septic fields that each and every resident in that particular small community has on their property.

* (17:20)

Mr. Ashton: The member has raised this concern with me directly and I will undertake to pass it on. I appreciate by his question he recognizes a lot of the issues do relate more to the Department of Conservation. But I appreciate him raising, and I can certainly empathize with people in that situation. It must be very difficult for them to deal with it. So, I thank you for raising the question. I think by raising it in

the House today he has effectively put it on the record on behalf of his constituents. I certainly will undertake to get the department and my EMO staff to pass on their observations to Conservation, Mr. Chair. I thank the member for the question.

Mr. Faurshou: I also would like the minister to consider visiting the definition of overland flooding when you look at soil conditions. Overland flooding in a very, very porous texture of soil is a real concern. For the most part, soils do not allow quick absorption throughout the province, but, in this particular area, absorption does occur extremely quickly, and the definition precludes any of these individuals from any support or alleviation of their damages.

I would like to move on, Mr. Chair, to another concern of my constituency which I have raised with the minister previously, and that is the intersection of the Trans-Canada Highway and the Yellowhead Route, designated No. 1 and No. 16 highways, which intersect west of Portage la Prairie. That particular intersection was extensively studied by his department last year. A great deal of consultation took place, and a plan of action was determined to significantly enhance the signage. *[interjection]*

I appreciate being able to see the minister when I am addressing a question. This intersection, as I say, was designated to receive significant enhancements in signage, and the highway signs were to be installed prior to July 1 long weekend. It was noted in the press that the highways department, when responding to this concern as to why the signage had not been changed at the junction of 1 and 16 highways, is that this was due to, and I quote: problems with the awarding of the signage contract.

I would like first off to ask the minister as to the consideration that has been alluded to here. What are the problems that his department personnel referred to here in the signage contract?

Mr. Ashton: I want to get a response to the matter on that. I am not quite sure what the reference would be to, whether it is just a reference to some kind of signage that was not available to be produced. I am not quite sure

what the reference is, but I will get back to the member on that.

Mr. Faurshou: I believe that the department was referring to the tendered signage contract. I believe that the extensive amount of time that was involved and absorbed within the evaluation of the tenders that were received by the department, that essentially the contract for signage for the provincial Department of Transportation was awarded far later than was anticipated, so therefore the signs were not available. Am I correct in this understanding?

Mr. Ashton: When the previous government privatized the sign contract a number of years ago, there was a successful operation set up, private operation in Dauphin with single industries. The previous government, at the termination of that contract, extended the contract. We also extended it.

So there has been no closure of that kind of service. We have awarded a new tender, based on the tendering process, after a thorough review of various options. There has been a continued supply of signs throughout this process, both when the previous government and our Government extended the contract for the existing sign company while we reviewed various options.

Mr. Faurshou: My understanding, then, is the Department of Transportation was never without the services for signage then because the contract continued with the Signal Industries of Dauphin, Mr. Chair, until the tendering and contract award. In fact, when was the new contract awarded to Signal Industries, as I believe the minister indicated?

Mr. Ashton: I can get the member some more detailed information on that. I do not know if he is referring to the original contract or the latest contract. If he wants detailed information, what I will do is I will undertake to write back to the member on this specific issue related to Portage and I will try to give him some more detailed explanation as well. I appreciate the question.

Mr. Faurshou: My understanding, then, is the new contract for five years has been awarded to Signal Industries of Dauphin, which I understand is a subsidiary, Mr. Chair, not wholly owned by

Manitobans, but a subsidiary of Alberta Traffic, which is a signage corporation that supplies signs to Saskatchewan and Alberta as well. That particular contract is for five years. I do also understand that that contract does allow for an annual review of pricing.

I would like to ask the minister very, very specifically the prices that were quoted within the tendering process. How did they relate to the prices that the department was receiving on the extension of the contract with Signal Industries? How does the new contract pricing relate to the prices that were being charged by Signal Industries prior to the awarding of the new contract?

Mr. Ashton: The main focus in our decision-making process was the lowest qualified bidder, when I say "qualified," qualified in the sense of providing the specific specifications that we put in place. We awarded on that basis. My recollection is that there has been a reduction.

I could probably have more detailed information if the member wants on any of these items, but generally the decision was made to continue with going through the tender process, in this case because of agreements on internal trade that the previous government signed that we are honouring. It is then opened up to the markets.

In this particular case, obviously we went with the bid that provided the kind of specifications that we required in the tendered documents and the appropriate price as well.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I wonder if there is unanimous consent of the Committee of Supply to recess briefly to allow the Speaker to resume the Chair. The purpose is to seek the consent of the House not to see the clock until 9 p.m.

Mr. Chairperson: Is there unanimous consent for the Committee of Supply to recess to allow the Speaker to resume the Chair? *[Agreed]*

Call in the Speaker.

* (17:30)

IN SESSION

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you canvass the House to determine if there is leave not to see the clock until 9 p.m. this evening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker (Conrad Santos): Is there unanimous consent for the House to continue to sit until 9 p.m.? *[Agreed]*

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Concurrence Motion (Continued)

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I do have two further questions just in regard to the process and the tendering for the signage contract of five years with the Department of Transportation. In regard to the tendering process, was there a public opening of the tenders in this regard, and what is the criteria not to have a public opening of the tenders?

Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister of Transportation and Government Services): Once again, I can probably, in the interest of time, provide a written response to the question.

Mr. Faurshou: Just one last question to make it very clear for the record, the minister referred to that the lowest tender was awarded the contract that adhered to the specifications, as prescribed by the Department of Transportation. Is the minister aware of a lower contract, lower tender that came to the Department of Transportation and that was not successful due to specification deficiencies, if I might ask the minister to acknowledge?

Mr. Ashton: I will address the question in a detailed written response, but I can indicate that we always look at both dimensions. One is the cost; the second is whether it is a bid that meets our specifications and requirements. This bid, in a manner of specifications and requirements of the bids that did, it provided the best price. I will get more detailed information. Not having the file here, I prefer to respond in writing. I realize there may be a lot of other questions for other ministers in concurrence. So I will get more

detailed information. I thank the member for the question.

Mr. Faurshou: I just want to thank the minister. I very much look forward to his detailed response. It is something of concern when the lowest tender is not selected due to specifications that are laid out most certainly by the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Stan Struthers, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair

I believe in consultation because, at certain periods in time, one has to clarify the particular points within the tender. That is, without question, a very, very important process, to have complete clarity in all areas before award of tender takes place.

Just a quick question for the minister, if I might just ask of the work that is taking place above our heads in the dome of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly building, is the work on schedule and on budget? Are we going to be looking at a building that is going to restore the lustre of a gem in the province when the scaffolding comes down, and when, just a quick response?

Mr. Ashton: I want to indicate, first of all, just briefly in the contract that the practice of the department and practice of the Government, which has not changed, is that we set the specifications in the best interest of the people of Manitoba. The bidders do not. Certainly bidders have, and suppliers have, provided that information in the past, but they think it is the specifications to change. We review that. When we go to tender, we set the specifications, not the bidders.

In terms of the project, right now it is going fairly well. Whether or not there may be some additional work is an issue we are looking at. We are finding a number of items as we are proceeding that were unanticipated, some greater damage than was the case. So there may be some additional work we may be looking at. It is too early to say right now. Generally it is on schedule. I am very pleased we are being able to do it.

If you go back to the '92-93 report, I think it is important to recognize that the Golden Boy is getting a lot of attention, and so should the Golden Boy get the attention. It is a wonderful statue. It stands 16 feet from head to tip of torch. What we are starting to find is by actually doing the work, we are able to deal with some of the structural problems, the stone problems that we faced going back to the '92-93 report, including up to 60- to 70-pound chunks of the building that have fallen off. So we are dealing with some critical repairs. This is not just strictly regarding the Golden Boy.

We have also been able to deal with some of the issues related to the Golden Boy itself. The Golden Boy, for example, the torch, we found now that that torch was put up in the centennial year of '67 by drilling holes into the Golden Boy statue and then putting a clamp in place, with a lamp that needed to be replaced every 10 years and was replaced last back in 1992 by one very brave person and a series of ladders. I hope the Minister of Labour (Ms. Barrett) will hear me saying that I do not think that would withstand the scrutiny of Workplace Safety and Health today. The minister can see right out her window. I am glad to see the Minister of Labour is watching this on a daily basis.

So I want to stress one of the advantages by doing this project. It is a once-in-50-year opportunity to make urgent and emergent repairs. It is also an opportunity to ensure the long-term structural safety and the overall structural integrity of the building, including the Golden Boy.

Generally, we are in good shape. I can tell the member we are doing a lot better on this budget than the original building budget, which was subject to much controversy, led to the resignation of the Premier, various ministers, and ended up with one of the contractors in court. I can assure the member that that is not going to happen this time around.

* (17:40)

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Just two brief questions. Can you give me an update on the highway south of La Broquerie, I think it is

Highway 302 or 305. I am not quite sure. Can you give me a brief update on where that is at?

Mr. Ashton: I am not sure what the member is referring to, but I can undertake to get a written response on that and forward it to the Member for Portage. I know we are a bit pressed for time, so I will get back to the member on that.

Mr. Jack Penner: The second question is: Can the minister give us an idea of what the floor covering cost in front of the front steps, and the new floor covering?

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I can. I can give the member a brief background too. I was actually anticipating that this House Leader might ask a question on this, given some of the comments in Question Period. The rug was put in place after identification by Risk Management that it was necessary to have carpeting there due to risk of people slipping because of the condition of the floor. The cost was approximately \$3,800 done by a Winnipeg company. It was put in place a number of days ago.

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa): I have some questions for the Minister responsible for Heritage (Mr. Lemieux). I would like to ask the Minister of Heritage some questions about the Manitoba Heritage Council, their work, their recommendations, some of the dates that have been put forward, and see if we can perhaps look at unravelling some of the contradictory information the member has put on the record.

The Director of Heritage for the Province of Manitoba, Donna Dul, indicated that she gave the minister a heads-up on the report from the Heritage Council on the 10th of June. I am wondering if the minister could confirm that.

Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism): Mr. Chairperson, I just want to comment briefly on the question for the member. I thank the member for the question.

One thing I would like to say is with regard to a lot of the terminology that has been used with regard to recommendation and report, and often it has been used intermittently. I mean, one time we would use a report, the next time we

would use recommendation, and those are the comments that were being made. Certainly, as I mentioned not only to the press but I believe I mentioned in the House, my office was notified informally, certainly not of any kind of a written document or recommendation. What I wanted to do was I wanted to make sure that I heard and gave the opportunity for my department to have a chance to analyze the recommendation that was going to be sent to them, which is part of the process, first. I wanted to be able to see what they had seen, and I wanted it in writing in order to be able to obtain that and then to be able to have something to look at in order to make a decision.

Then, formally, we knew that the Heritage Council, chaired by Mr. Neville, recommended that it should be a heritage site, no reasons, what was based behind the recommendation to the department. So just wanted to mention this to the member opposite, that receiving something informally like that as opposed to getting something in writing, which I wanted to obtain and give the department, the Historic Resources Branch, an opportunity to look at the recommendation. I would hope that would have been included in the report to me in showing the recommendation from Mr. Neville and the advisory council, as well as what the department has to say.

Now, Mr. Chair, the process was sent to the advisory council. The advisory council then sends it to the Historic Resources Branch. The Historic Resources Branch sends it to the assistant deputy minister. The assistant deputy minister sends it to Mr. Tom Carson, and then he sends a report to me by memo. That is the process, and that is what was followed. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Chairman, so is the minister acknowledging today that he became aware of the recommendations from the Heritage Council following Donna Dul's call to his office on the 10th, that the information she provided to his office was relayed to him and he was aware of those recommendations that were coming forward, he was aware of those on June 10?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, the advisory council, I believe, met on June 9, going by

memory, which was a Saturday. June 10 would have been a Sunday. I cannot recall the date that staff made me aware of the informal decision, but I do not believe it was June 10. I cannot recall the exact date, but it was certainly shortly after. June 10 was the Sunday. Saturday was the 9th. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: So the minister is acknowledging today, then, that the next working day or two after the meeting of the Manitoba Heritage Council he became aware, through the director of Heritage in his department, of what the content of the report was and what the recommendations were?

Mr. Lemieux: As I mentioned previously, staff informally mentioned that the recommendation of the advisory council was to look at Eaton's and that Eaton's be a potential historic or heritage site. The dates, I cannot recall exactly, but I know that they had mentioned this informally. I want to repeat again that I did not see any recommendation from the advisory council at all. Again, it was informal.

So I had wanted to make sure that what I was going to see was a written report, which is part of the process, from the Historic Resources Branch, which then would be passed on to the ADM and then through my deputy and then to me.

The reason for not wanting to take a look at the recommendation, and so on, I wanted to give the branch, the Historic Resources Branch, an opportunity to take a look at the recommendation and to weigh it and to view it and apply their criteria to that recommendation without my participating in it in any way, shape or form.

I wanted them to take a look at the recommendation that Mr. Neville and the advisory council passed on, and then they would be able to weigh the criteria that they look at. Ownership, is the owner supportive of such a project and naming it an historical site or heritage site? What was the re-use? What does the municipal government think, or in this particular case the City of Winnipeg think, and apply those kinds of measures, which they do, to a particular site?

The process was followed. After that recommendation came to them from the advisory council to the branch, the branch had an

opportunity then to look at it and weigh it with all the criteria that they apply to it and then pass it on through the system to me.

Mr. Gilleshammer: I appreciate the minister talking about his department and their recommendations. What I am trying to get at is that the minister actually was aware of the recommendations soon after the meeting of the Heritage Council. I think that is what he is saying, that the staff passed on to him what the content of the report would be and what the recommendations would be, and he knew that the week following their meeting on June 9. Can he confirm that?

Mr. Lemieux: I appreciate the question from the member, but with regard to the content and all the details and so on and the discussion that transpired at the advisory council, all those particulars, I certainly was not aware of any of that. With regard to the recommendation being that they would look at designating a heritage site at the Eaton's building, yes, I can say that I believe I used that terminology in the House. I was awaiting a report coming from the branch with regard to the recommendation from the advisory council.

* (17:50)

There is the recommendation from the advisory council to the branch, and then the branch report to me. That is what certainly I was awaiting. But, informally, I cannot remember the exact language, but it looks like the advisory council was looking at the Eaton's building as being a historic site or something like that. I believe I mentioned that. I know that the member opposite felt that there was some inconsistency in that. I believe I mentioned that, even in Hansard a couple of days ago, informally we were made aware. But I had wanted the official written report coming through my deputy minister, so that I had an opportunity to be able to read it and to be able to weigh something, just following the process that the Historic Resources Branch has input into those kinds of things no matter what the project is, whether it is Eaton's or Maison Gabrielle Roy or any other item that would come forward as a historical site.

Mr. Gilleshammer: The minister has put on the record that he was aware the week after the June

9 meeting that the ultimate recommendation from the Manitoba Heritage Council was to designate Eaton's as a historic site, historic building.

Mr. Lemieux: If the member opposite, and I thank him for the question, is asking me whether I knew informally in generic terms that the end result of their discussion and the recommendation going to the Historic Resources Branch or coming back was that they were looking at the Eaton's building being a heritage site, I would say yes. In other words, I had never received a written report or anything from the branch. There was no written report of any kind coming from the branch or analysis of the recommendation or anything like that.

Mr. Gilleshammer: In Hansard on June 21, you said you had not received a report of any kind. It says you have said: I have not received a report of any kind.

In fact, you just told us that you had a verbal report with the basic recommendation of what the Manitoba Heritage Council was going to recommend to you. You said on the 21st in Hansard: I have not received a report of any kind.

I suggest to you, sir, you did receive a report. You received a verbal report, and we have a major contradiction here.

Mr. Lemieux: There is no contradiction here. There is a recommendation that was made from a one-paragraph recommendation made by the chair of the advisory council to the branch. That one paragraph was stated in a memo to me from Mr. Carson. That was the recommendation, a recommendation to the branch. The report then followed on to me through Mr. Carson on June 27.

When I stated to the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) that I had not received a report, the document I have in my hands is the one that I made public and tabled, that is the report. Again, that is what I mean by the language. Mr. Chair, if one is not listening closely to the question, the two words are intermingled, "report" and "recommendation." That is why I am trying to be careful, at least to try to put my position on

record, saying that recommendation that came from the advisory council to the Historic Resources Branch was a recommendation.

The report I talk about was a report that I was waiting to see, the report coming from the Historic Resources Branch that would take a look at is the owner in favour of having it designated? What was the re-use of such a building? What does the municipal government, being the City of Winnipeg, when they take a look at the building, what is their position with regard to the building?

So the report I am referring to is that document that I had wanted to have go through the process, which I understood that was what was going to happen, go to the Historic Resources Branch, then go to the assistant deputy minister, then on to the deputy, and then by memo and a report to me. I did receive it, on June 27. I did not receive a report before then.

I received verbal comments from staff the following week, I cannot remember the exact day, but I did not receive any detail or anything. I said I want to see it go through the normal process. Let the Historic Resources Branch receive. They have the recommendation; let them look at it and provide me with some kind of a report, a written report on their findings and what their conclusions would be with regard to the designation of Eaton's.

That is what I mean by the intermingling or interchanging of words. In questions from members opposite, I found that after a few days people were using the words "report" and "recommendation," interchanging that. That is why I had wanted to try to be forthright in saying I did not receive the report. That is what I was making reference to, the report I received from my deputy minister via the chain through the Historic Resources Branch, the ADM, the deputy minister, and then to myself.

The recommendation itself went from the advisory council to the Historic Resources Branch. It did not come to me. I did not get a recommendation from the advisory council. Staff said they had understood that Eaton's was going to be recommended as, I cannot remember the exact terminology, but that they were

looking at recommending it from the advisory council to Historic Resources Branch as being an historic or heritage site.

So that is why I want to be very clear on this, Mr. Chairperson, that all the detail came in the June 27 memo or report to me from the deputy minister. That is what I tried to make clear to the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) when he asked me the question. I was telling him that I did not receive a report. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: The minister has acknowledged he knew the contents of the report, because that was given to him by Donna Dul in the days following the June 9 meeting. In the House on the 21st, the minister states: I have not received a report of any kind. Yet he has already said that he had a verbal report from Donna Dul. I say to the minister that there is a major contradiction here, and that is maybe putting the kindest reflection on it.

Later on the 21st, the minister says that he is looking forward to seeing the report and to seeing what they have to recommend. Now, the minister already knows what the recommendation of the Manitoba Heritage Council is. It was reported to him following that meeting, and I say that on June 21 he is indicating that he has had no report and he has no idea what the recommendations are. You have contradicted that today, sir. That is a major contradiction.

I think the honourable thing to do is to give us the truth on this, so that Manitobans understand the process.

* (18:00)

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, I will try to be as succinct and straightforward as I can with regard to the process.

A request was forwarded to the advisory council with regard to the Eaton's building, the Eaton's site. The advisory council on June 9 took a look at that request, and upon deliberation they—and having seen later what the recommendation was, that the recommendation to the branch and through the branch to me was going to be that the Eaton's building—I will try to be accurate by reading it right from the report that

came to me: that the evaluation of the historical merit and the physical resource merit of the former Eaton's store on Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, places the building above the minimum threshold normally used to identify properties of provincial heritage significance and that the Manitoba Heritage Council recommends that the Eaton's store should be considered for provincial heritage site designation.

After they did their deliberation, that is the recommendation that they passed on to the Historic Resources Branch.

The verbal briefing, not a report, that I received or verbal comments that I received in passing was that the advisory council had dealt with or had considered the issue of the Eaton's building being a historical site, a heritage site, and that it looks like their recommendation will be to the branch that it should be considered thus, a verbal briefing.

I am not sure what other terminology I can use to that, but there was no written report to me. There was no report of any kind except a verbal comment in passing, if you want to call it that. I mean, it was a briefing. It was less than a sentence. It was a number of words.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

So the point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairperson, is that the report I was anticipating and waiting and made reference to on the 21st of June when the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) asked me, I believe it was the 21st of June, was the report that had to be written up through the branch, the Historic Resources Branch, after they took a look at the recommendation coming from the advisory council, then to the assistant deputy minister, then to the deputy minister.

Then the written report via a memo which I received on the 27th of June from Mr. Tom Carson, the Deputy Minister for Culture, Heritage and Tourism, outlined the background on the Eaton's building, Portage Avenue. It stated on June 9 what recommendation was made and then forwarded on to the branch, and then it talked about the considerations of Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism.

Now, they took a look at a number of issues, and this is what Mr. Carson stated, that the Historic Resources Branch, after receiving the recommendation which I quoted from, took a look at owner interest, took a look at re-use potential, took a look at the condition of the building. They looked at municipal support, public support and other considerations. Then under that on page 3, it says: Here is the recommendation to the minister from the branch.

This is what the branch then recommends to me after having been forwarded the recommendation from the advisory council.

Then, in writing, they stated to me that they felt that the department recommended that careful heritage interpretation at the site as part of the True North redevelopment proposal is an acceptable alternative to the designation of the actual structure. In other words: Let us take a look at the Grill Room; let us take a look at the Wall of Honour; let us take a look at Timothy Eaton's statue. Are there other ways to pay respect to that particular site as opposed to a designated heritage site?

So the process has been followed, Mr. Chairperson. Our Government has been attempting to be as open as possible. Again, I want to make a point that advisory councils and their recommendations and the reports that come from branches and departments are not often tabled in here and members opposite know, the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) knows as a minister, those are confidential often, and they are not tabled, but we wanted to table it because I knew of the urgency of people wanting to know what was the recommendation from the advisory council and what was my branch saying when you take a look at a site like that.

Mr. Chairperson, I know that the member may have questions further to that, but the process was followed. I think where there might have been some misinterpretation on the Member for Minnedosa's part or members of the Opposition, was that they may term when someone says something to somebody verbally, whether it is one sentence or two sentences, somehow that is a report. If that is what the member is alluding to or saying, that is not my definition of a report.

My definition of a report was receiving something in writing that came from the Historic Resources Branch through the deputy minister to me, and I understood that was the process, and that was what I was waiting for. That is my definition of a report. What I received from staff, a couple of sentences verbally, that is a briefing or that is a verbal. It is not a recommendation at all; it was not at that point. That is just a verbal comment. That is a bit of information that they wanted to pass on to me. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Gilleshammer: I am going to leave the Hansard of June 21 and move to June 25, but before I do, and people, I think, are generally aware of the answer, could you tell us for the record what date you received the Manitoba Heritage Council report?

Mr. Lemieux: Using my definition of report, the Manitoba Heritage Council's report came through the Historic Resources Branch through the deputy minister to me. I received that report, my definition, as I have used report—and I have tried to explain that and define it—on June 27 from Mr. Tom Carson. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Just so that we are clear, I am talking about the Manitoba Heritage Council report chaired by the council led by Bill Neville, the report that they were bringing to Government. Your comment today is that you did not see that report, you did not read that report, you did not get that report into your hands until June 27?

Mr. Lemieux: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, when I quoted from the memo from Mr. Carson to myself, there is no need to quote it again, but that recommendation that was made from the advisory council to the Historic Resources Branch, that is the first time that I had seen the actual recommendation in writing, the actual wording that they—like, for example, they identify properties of provincial heritage significance and things like that.

I mean, that is the first time that I had seen that report. The recommendation made and the verbal briefing, or whatever, that said yes—you know, the informal decision that was made, I knew that, as I mentioned before, just the following week after they had deliberated on that

particular issue. But the actual report and the written recommendation came through the deputy minister to me on the 27th, where it was in writing and showed in a paragraph form the actual minutes that had been taken and the actual recommendation passed on from Mr. Neville, I guess as the chair, to the Historic Resources Branch.

They deliberated, took a look at all those issues I mentioned before, and then they passed their written report on to the deputy and then on to myself on June 27. Then I saw in writing on the 27th exactly what their wording was and how they had phrased their recommendation to the Historic Resources Branch. Then I tabled it in the House.

Mr. Gilleshammer: In Hansard on the 25th of June, when you say: I am not going to try and guess what the recommendations are, you actually knew what the recommendations were at that time. You have acknowledged that at the beginning of June Donna Dul had told you what the recommendations were, and when you say on the 25th of June, I am not going to try to guess what they are, you, in fact, knew the recommendations at that time.

Mr. Lemieux: Once again, Mr. Chairperson, Donna Dul, through staff to me, made mention of, as I mentioned, a verbal briefing, if you want to use that terminology, a comment about what the recommendation coming from the advisory council was to the branch now that the Eaton's building, it looks like they want to designate it a heritage site, or something like that. So that to me was not a report; that was the recommendation that was going to be coming to the Historic Resources Branch.

Now, how they were going to phrase it, a recommendation can take many forms, because here it states in their written recommendation, when they wrote it out, the full recommendation, and I will give you an example why it is important to actually receive it in writing, because it states that the evaluation of the historical merit and physical resource merit of the former Eaton's store on Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, places the building above the minimum threshold normally used to identify properties of provincial heritage significance, and the Manitoba Heritage Council recommends that it should be considered.

* (18:10)

Now, it says it is above the minimum threshold. Well, the recommendation from Mr. Neville, it could have said, it may have said: We want to recommend it as a heritage site, but it is not, it does not meet the threshold. I mean, it might be splitting hairs, but it is important to know what they are recommending. Are they just recommending it, you know, it is 50-50? They are saying it is minimum threshold normally. They could have said it met the maximum, and it may have made a difference to the branch when they took a look at it and applied their criteria to it. So the written report I received through the deputy minister on the 27th, where I had an opportunity to actually see the written recommendation.

Mr. Chairperson, if I might, I just want to comment that once again I do not think it can be reiterated or said enough that there was a bit of a precedent set by my tabling an advisory body. They are advisory in nature. Their job is to advise the minister and to give the minister advice. It does not mean they are making the decision, the advisory body. They are trying to use their best judgment as they see it. They were not looking at it to see, they were not allowed to consider whether the owner was accepting or not to have it designated. They did not take a look at the re-use. They never discussed that, I understand. They did not look at whether the City of Winnipeg wanted it or not. They did not take a look at public support. They did not take a look at that.

When I said in the House, and it was not meant to be demeaning of Mr. Neville, but they took a look at a very narrow in scope issue that came before them of Eaton's as a heritage site, a building that is approximately 100 years old, and what kind of recommendation would they make. So, in other words, a lot of what they looked at, they did not take a look at a lot of the details that maybe they would have recommended differently, but that is not their role; that is not their mandate.

So, Mr. Chairperson, I appreciate all the work that Mr. Neville and the advisory council do. There are many other projects that come forward to them, many other sites they have

dealt with. There are other issues that day that they dealt with. I cannot recall what they were, but it dealt with similar issues of being of historical significance or heritage significance. I look forward to that as well. The branch did the best they could and should be commended for that. They hurried, and they tried to do the best job they could to get this before the deputy minister and through me and to me what their advice was with regard to the recommendation made and forwarding a report to me to advise me of what their findings were.

Mr. Chairperson, often it takes four to six weeks for a written recommendation to come forward from the branch. There are other issues they discussed that day that I still have not received, and I look forward to receiving those. They are dealing with similar issues. So Mr. Neville and the advisory council should be commended for all the hard work they have done. They took a look at one narrow-in-scope issue. Right? They did not take into consideration all the other aspects that the branch, Historical Resources Branch, applied to the Eaton's building.

I thank the member for the question, and we have tried to be certainly as open and forthright as possible by submitting and tabling, which I do not believe the Opposition did much of tabling of anything with regard to a lot of other heritage issues. So, I mean, I am looking forward to checking with my department to find out if they tabled any Heritage Advisory Council recommendations in the House.

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): I guess my first question is: Who asked the Heritage Council to look at the Eaton's building? Was it the minister or the department? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: The honourable Minister of Culture, I will call you first before you answer, so the answer will be properly recorded.

Mr. Lemieux: You are absolutely correct. I want to be as accurate as possible. My understanding is that the branch forwarded it on to the advisory council to consider.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Was the minister aware that the branch was forwarding a request to the

Heritage Council? I will leave it at that. Was the minister aware? Was he informed or briefed by his department that they were going to be considering the Eaton's building at one of their meetings?

Mr. Lemieux: I had the opportunity of meeting with Mr. Neville in April or so, and at that time I had made mention to Mr. Neville that it would be my pleasure to meet the advisory council. So that morning I actually spent two hours at the advisory council meeting. I believe I left around noon or so. Mr. Neville, certainly at that time, made mention they were going to be considering the Eaton's building.

It had come forward to them, and they were going to be discussing it. Also, I believe, even when I was speaking, answering questions from the advisory council at that time, they had made mention to me that the item was put on the agenda in the afternoon, and they wanted to discuss it in the afternoon.

So I cannot remember who mentioned it to me, but, certainly Mr. Neville, I believe, or certainly other members of the advisory council that morning mentioned they were going to be discussing the Eaton's building. The Eaton's building was in the news, and members of the advisory council were aware of that. They mentioned that they were going to be discussing it, and, certainly, that is, I believe, how it was stated. They were going to be discussing the Eaton's building.

The advisory council, I certainly do not know all the details on what and how the discussion took place, or how much time they spent on it and so on. But I know, with regard to my discussions in the morning, my question and answer with the advisory council in the morning was very informative to me. They dealt with all kinds of issues and looking at issues down the road.

The Eaton's building was not discussed. They did it, I believe, as a courtesy to me. They did not want to raise it. They just felt it should be arm's length, and they should consider it without having my input or my having any input one way or another in making any comments. I felt that courtesy also should be observed, so that

was a discussion that did not take place while I was there. But I was aware that they were going to be discussing the Eaton's building, yes.

* (18:20)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Normally speaking, and I think it is part of the Order-in-Council process, that Donna Dul, who is the director of the Historic Resources Branch in the Department of Culture, Heritage and Tourism, would be the secretary to the Heritage Council, and would be present at their meetings. I wonder if the minister could confirm whether Donna Dul was indeed the secretary at that meeting that day.

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, I am trying to recall who was at the meeting. There was the assistant deputy minister who is responsible for that area—Lou-Anne Buhr was there. There were a number of government people who attend as ex officio officers. Donna Dul, I understand, even under the previous administration, was the recording secretary. I am not sure how that came about—how she became the secretary of the advisory council. But, obviously, she deals with historic as well as heritage sites all the time as a departmental person. I am not sure how that was arrived at, but Donna Dul is the recording secretary to the advisory council. I guess as an ex officio officer she does that.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I was just confirming whether that was, in fact. It is part of the Order-in-Council, and it has been something that has been traditional. There is no issue with that. I guess then the question becomes, after the meeting and after the deliberations on the Saturday the 9th, Donna Dul would have been quite aware as a member of your staff of the recommendation because she was the recording secretary.

My next question is: Who informed the minister? He says staff. I guess I am wanting to know was it staff in his outer office? Was it the deputy minister? Was it the assistant deputy minister or was it the director of the Historic Resources Branch? Who, in fact, informed the minister, informally, that a recommendation had been made that it was of heritage significance?

Mr. Lemieux: The staff that I am referring to is my special assistant. My special assistant—and I cannot remember, as I said, it was very brief—

had made mention that it looked like the advisory council was going to recommend to the Historic Resources Branch that the Eaton's building be looked upon as being a heritage site, or potential heritage site, or something. As I said, it is one or two sentences and that would be it.

But just to address the other part of the member's question, Donna Dul would have known. She knows the recommendations of all the decisions they make, and she is the recording secretary. I am not sure exactly the process and how it works with regard to what she does exactly and how she writes it up or the role that Mr. Neville plays after that, but Donna Dul certainly would have been aware of the council's intent. I am not sure if Mr. Neville writes the minutes or Donna Dul writes it up and then sends it to Mr. Neville and then Mr. Neville okays it. I am not sure of that process, but I know that Donna Dul would have known. She attends the meetings.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Chairperson, I guess then I would ask the minister who would have informed his special assistant? Would it have been his deputy minister? Would it have been the assistant deputy minister or would it have been Donna Dul or Bill Neville? I mean, who informs his special assistant that a recommendation was coming that the Eaton's building was of heritage significance?

Mr. Lemieux: I am trying to recollect. I do not believe my special assistant stated who she received it from. I do not know if it came. I receive recommendations from the department through my deputy minister, but I am not sure if it was Donna Dul to my special assistant or whether or not it was from Donna Dul to the deputy and then the deputy minister to my special assistant.

My special assistant certainly is there to assist me, but my special assistant is not the person who draws up the reports and writes the reports from the department and those kinds of things. It is something that Donna Dul and the Historic Resources Branch would have done through the ADM and then the deputy minister and then, as I mentioned, it was forwarded on to me.

I am not sure if my special assistant received it from Donna Dul or the deputy minister or the assistant deputy minister. But that was who spoke to me.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess I would ask the minister whether he might send a little note out or get someone that might be listening to call and speak to his special assistant, because I think it is rather important to know who spoke to his special assistant and informed him that a recommendation was coming. I think it is critical that we do know. I am sure his special assistant is a very competent individual and would remember who he or she spoke to, that asked that the message be passed on to the minister.

So I will go on with another question, but he might want to just try to get—*[interjection]* Well, I am just wondering, is there anyone from the department who might be listening who might be able to get that information, because I think it is extremely important to know. I mean, the minister has put so many inaccuracies on the record. This is all about credibility and it is all about knowing what the process was.

Now, my next question would be: Did the minister, subsequent to that, give any direction to his department? Did he, as a result of that rumour, speak to his deputy minister about it? Did he ask any questions? Was there any discussion with this deputy minister or the assistant deputy minister or Donna Dul? Was there any meeting in his office? He indicated in some earlier answers that he received some verbal briefing. *[interjection]*

I hear the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) saying, well, it was in the paper. This is about credibility; this is about accountability. It seems like it runs through every ministerial office, the lack of credibility and the lack of the ability to tell the truth in this House. I think that we need to get to the bottom of this issue.

Point of Order

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Education, Training and Youth): Mr. Chair, I did hear some remarks that I think represent unparliamentary language in that last outburst. I would appreciate it if you could review the remarks and

see if there was such a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairperson: The honourable Member for Minnedosa, on the same point of order.

Mr. Gilleshammer: On the same point of order, in Hansard on June the 21, the minister says: I have not received a report of any kind. Earlier this afternoon, he indicated that he did have a verbal briefing from people in his department, and he acknowledges that at that time, he knew what the major recommendation of the Manitoba Heritage Council would be.

So to put the kindest reflection on this, there is a contradiction there, and if somebody asks whether he is telling the truth, I think that is the realm we are moving into.

Mr. Caldwell: Just on the same point of order as we are continuing this, the point raised by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), I believe, is a dispute over the facts, the point raised in the first point of order from the Member for—

An Honourable Member: It is the same point of order.

Mr. Caldwell: Same point of order? Okay.

Mr. Chairperson: I will listen to some more contribution to the point of order; it may be something new, other than those who have already spoken. A point of order is a violation of the rules or the use of unparliamentary language. It should not be used as a vehicle for debates. The rule in this Assembly is that disputes as to facts are not points of order. That is the rule.

* * *

* (18:30)

Mr. Chairperson: The honourable Member for River East, to continue with the questions.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Chairman, I guess the question that I have is: Before June 21, did the minister have any verbal discussions or any verbal briefings with his deputy minister, the assistant deputy minister, the director of Historic

Resources from the time the Heritage Council made its recommendation and from the time he received verbal information? After he received verbal information from his special assistant that the recommendation was coming, did he discuss the issue of the designation of the Eaton's building with any of his staff?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, once again I would like to reiterate that it was unprecedented that we table the advisory council's recommendation through the report submitted by the Historic Resources Branch, through the deputy to me, unprecedented, I understand. Certainly, as I mentioned before, I do not believe that Culture, Heritage and Tourism or any other minister before that, whoever was responsible for the advisory council, ever tabled a recommendation or the subsequent branch's report to the Legislature. You know, what I am talking about is about open, forthright, trying to put it on the record exactly what has gone through the deputy minister coming from the branch, and then prior to that, coming from the advisory council so everyone could see it and read it.

You know, this point should be made. As the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism, I could have taken that recommendation, and I could have made a decision and/or not made a decision and said nothing, zero. I could have said nothing. There is nothing, I am advised anyway, certainly through the legislation or anything that I would have to make any comments publicly or otherwise with regard to any recommendation that they made.

The reason I am mentioning that, Mr. Chairperson, is because there is a great interest in the community, I believe for the public good and also for members of the Opposition, that I wanted to put this forward so everyone would have an opportunity to see what came to me as the minister, what I was receiving and what I had to weigh and the decision I had to make. Was I going to be looking at the Historic Resources Branch and the report they sent to me considering everything they weighed and try to balance against one narrowly focussed consideration that the advisory council had to look at—is it heritage or not?

So I wanted to put that on the record. I wanted to state to this House and to the people

of Manitoba: Look at what the Minister of Culture and Heritage and Tourism is receiving. This is what the minister has received; this is what the minister has to look at; this is what the minister had to base his decision on, so there would not be any doubt in anyone's mind, whether it is the Opposition or the public or people who are very supportive of the Eaton's building and wish it to remain the empty building that is there or become filled with other businesses, and so on.

I wanted everyone to know what I was receiving and what I had to consider. So when I tabled that and presented that to the House, that is exactly what I was doing. I had wanted to make absolutely clear that everyone was clear on what I had to consider and what I had to look at.

I do not want to use the word "nitpicking," but, again, this terminology of "report" and "recommendation," the recommendation came from the advisory council to the Historic Resources Branch. The report came from the Historic Resources Branch to the ADM, to the deputy minister and then to me. That was the process, but I wanted to table it so everyone was clear on what is the Minister of Heritage considering when he is making his decision or not making his decision whether or not a building in this particular case should be considered a heritage site.

I believe, Mr. Chairperson, that this Government as well as this minister, with what I just finished saying with regard to what we presented to the House and shown, whether it is the term sheet or anything else that has been tabled, again it has shown that the process has been open. We have tried to inform the Opposition as well as the public so they would be aware of what has been presented certainly to me as the minister and what I had to consider.

So, you know, Mr. Chairperson, if the members of the Opposition wish to pursue this line, that is their prerogative. I would make the point, though, that after a certain point I believe it does become nitpicking and I believe it becomes not—*[interjection]* Well, the truth is that we have been very forward in everything we have and in presenting that to the House. We have been very open with regard to that, and the

process has been open all along. We certainly wanted to take a look at a lot of aspects.

I mean, the Opposition from day one has tried to have it both ways with regard to this issue. So when we are trying to put forward this issue, we are trying to say, okay, get off the fence; are you supporting the True North Project or are you not?

We have tried to put forward that argument. If you are supportive of it, say you are supportive of it, but do not continue to make comments in the Legislature that make people look at it and say—you are putting all kinds of doubts in the public's mind as to what is going on. Nothing is going on except that we are being open and forward with what the True North proposal is.

With regard to the Eaton's building, I believe that what we are going to do and what True North will do—they had an open house. They spent a day with the public inviting the public to see what they are wanting to do. They had an open house trying to show the public what they are attempting to do in the True North Centre. You have a private sector who is driving this, the three levels of government who are being supportive, and we believe that we are moving ahead.

When I made the comment today about as the phoenix rises, Mr. Chairperson, that is what is going to happen with Eaton's. The Eaton's building was good in its day. The Eaton's building served its purpose. It was a shopping centre. It was a shopping centre that the Premier (Mr. Doer), rightfully so, said that The Bay department store should be supported by the public in Manitoba and Winnipeg because that building needs the support of Manitobans and Winnipeggers.

Again, it is a beautiful building, but if people are not going to support it, it may be boarded just like Eaton's is, sitting empty and with all the cobwebs in it and for 18 months or 2 years no interest as far as I have been advised has been shown in that building whatsoever.

So here you have a group of private entrepreneurs wanting to do something to revitalize

downtown Winnipeg. Now, as a government, we are trying to be very supportive of that, and I believe that the public of Manitoba are supportive of that. I believe the public will support the True North Centre as well, because within the term sheet, and, certainly, discussions about community access to that facility where you have high school hockey, Manitoba junior hockey, amateur sport having an opportunity to use that facility, and the Winnipeg Arena itself, as the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) stated, it has had its day. It is almost 50 years old now. That building is falling apart, and everyone, I believe, in Manitoba and Winnipeg knows we need a facility.

So, Mr. Chairperson, I made the mistake, and I will call it a mistake, the other day of raising an issue of a day gone by where issues were not so openly tabled in this Legislature, where people could discuss it and where ministers would be on the hot seat having to address it. I welcome that because I am proud of what this Government is doing and how open we are.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

* (18:40)

Mrs. Mitchelson: The minister went on ad nauseam supporting absolutely everything except heritage in this province of Manitoba, something that he, as the Minister responsible for Heritage, in the province should be an advocate for.

Mr. Chairperson, I asked a very simple and a very direct question. The minister went on and on in that five- or ten-minute answer and did not answer the direct question. My question was very short. It was very simple. When he got the informal word from his special assistant that the Heritage Council was going to recommend designation of Eaton's, did he have any discussion subsequent to that with his deputy minister, his assistant deputy minister, the director of Historic Resources?

This is about ministerial responsibility. This is about ministerial accountability. It is a very straightforward answer, yes or no. Did he have

discussions between the time that he got the informal recommendation, or whatever, verbal, informal, he has used all kinds of different language, and the time that he got the memo from Tom Carson? Did he have any discussion with any officials within his department about the designation of Eaton's or the informal recommendation?

Mr. Lemieux: Well, Mr. Chairperson, there are two parts to this, with all due respect to the member opposite who asked the question: that I am supposed to be an advocate for heritage, which I am as the Minister responsible for Heritage. Certainly I have to tell you that it truly is a challenge. I may be wrong, but the member opposite, I believe, was the minister responsible for the area at one time, and I know that she knows how challenging it can be because, as a minister of the Crown, it is a balancing act.

What a minister has to do is you have to weigh a lot of options, and often, you know, Mr. Chairperson, your department will give you all kinds of recommendations. Again, you have to take a look at their reports or what they put down to you as far as recommendations. You have to try to make the best decision that you possibly can in the interests you believe, or as the minister believes, of the public of Manitoba, the citizens of the province. And so it is a difficult challenge at times because there are issues that have come before members opposite that are not easy and yet you have to depend certainly on your branch or your department with regard to advice that they are giving you. In this particular case, the branch in their report stated that they felt that the heritage building, the Eaton's building should not be declared a heritage site, and so that was their recommendation or certainly their advice to me through their report.

Again, it is difficult. But with regard to whether or not this Government is very supportive of heritage, that portion of the question, we are very supportive and we are advocates for heritage. That portion of the question, we are very supportive, and we are advocates for heritage. There are other buildings within this province that will certainly be looked at in days to come, in months and years to come, that our

Government will have to look at designating as heritage sites.

Once again, the process will take place where the advisory council will take a look. It will be forwarded to the advisory council. The advisory council will discuss it. They will make a recommendation to the Historic Resources Branch and will follow that process. Then it will come to me via the same way, through my deputy, that the recommendation of the advisory council and then the advice given by the branch came to me on the Eaton's building.

So there is a real challenge there in being the Minister of Heritage and having to take into consideration the advice the branch of your department is telling you. When you are making a decision, you have to weigh. There are things you have to weigh. That is exactly what I did as a minister. I had to weigh with my branch, the Historic Resources Branch, with their expertise, what they were saying to me in their report compared to the narrow focus the Heritage Council were looking at.

Again, it is a challenge, and I admit that. It is a real challenge, as the Minister of Heritage, to be able to do that. You are looking at the advice provided from within your department and also the narrow focus the Heritage Council took a look at. I did that. I do not mind admitting it was difficult and it was tough to do. It was difficult to look at that, to weigh that and to make a decision, to make it public. I believe it is the right decision. That should be said. I believe it is the right decision, in this particular case, for the city of Winnipeg but also for Manitobans in the long run and for the people of Manitoba.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am going to be very direct, and I am going to be very simple. I am going to continue to ask the question until I get a direct, honest answer from the minister. When he got the informal information from his special assistant from someone in the department—and he tends to fail to remember, Mr. Chair—I mean, I have great difficulty, having been a minister for 11 years and being briefed and having a special assistant, in believing any special assistant would come to a minister with informal,

rumour-type information without providing the source of that information.

I am questioning the honesty and the up-front answers the minister has already given me, but since his special assistant is not around and he cannot get the information for me from his special assistant, I am asking the very direct question: Once he heard that from his special assistant, did he have discussions?

I do not want to hear the diatribe about how wonderful his Government is and all the wonderful things they are doing for downtown Winnipeg. The question is, the very direct question—and until I get an answer, I am going to continue to ask the question: Did he speak to his deputy, his assistant deputy minister or the director of Historic Resources about the recommendation after he heard it informally, from the time he heard it informally till he got the report from his department? Did he talk about this issue with his departmental officials?

Mr. Lemieux: I am not sure what the Opposition is trying to look for. If they are looking for the truth, we have been very open as a government, and also what we have done is not only tabling the document and the recommendations—*[interjection]* You know, Mr. Chairperson—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. Only one member at a time.

Mr. Lemieux: The short answer, Mr. Chairperson, is no.

Mrs. Mitchelson: So the minister has said clearly on the record that, until he got the report on his desk on the 27th of June, he never once spoke to a departmental official about the supposed recommendation that he had heard from his special assistant. He never went to his deputy minister to ask a question, or he was never briefed, because he did say in an earlier answer today that he was briefed on this issue.

So he is saying that he never had one word of discussion with any departmental official

about the designation of the Eaton's building. I just want confirmation of that from the minister.

Mr. Lemieux: Look, Mr. Chairperson, maybe as a new minister I should maybe not try to get too many points on the record with regard to what we are doing in True North. *[interjection]* No. The answer is, no. I said it before. I wanted to make sure that this process, that the branch had an opportunity. I wanted to make sure that the branch had an opportunity to take a look at the recommendation, Donna Dul was there, she was a secretary or the ex-officio officer, to have an opportunity to do that without having my input into it.

So my special assistant said that this is what the advisory council is looking at and not knowing what the recommendation is, what their language was or anything, that is it. So, Mr. Chairperson, maybe as a rookie MLA and a Cabinet minister, maybe I should not have taken up too much air time trying to put our case forward, because I believe the public knows it. We have been forthright. Maybe I should have answered the member's question more directly, if that is what is frustrating her.

So, you know, people can fish as long as they like, Mr. Chairperson, but that should be done on the Red River, not here, or on Lake Winnipeg, because there was no undue influence or anything else passed on by the minister with regard to this issue. The branch was allowed to take a look at their criteria against what they had received from the advisory council, and then they forward that through a report, through my deputy minister, to me.

* (18:50)

Mrs. Mitchelson: When the minister's special assistant told him that there was a recommendation coming, verbally told him that there was a recommendation coming from the Heritage Council, did he direct any of his political staff to speak to anyone in the department about this issue?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, my special assistant mentioned it to me that what the advisory council's intent may have been. I do not

know what the proper wording was, but, no, there was no direction to go to anyone else or to do anything.

This is something that the Historic Resources Branch had to look at and had to weigh, and then come to me with a truly independent report that could be passed on through the assistant deputy minister, and through the deputy to me, and giving me something that I could weigh and look at and be able to compare what Mr. Neville said and the advisory council, and what the Historic Resources Branch was weighing.

So, Mr. Chairperson, that is what was done. I believe that the right decision was made. It was a difficult one, but I believe I made the right decision.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I just have one more question along this line. I guess the question would be: Did the minister take this issue to Cabinet, or did he share it at a caucus meeting? Did he speak to any of his colleagues about the recommendation that was coming forward? Did any staff from the Premier's Office or Executive Council speak to anyone in his department about this issue?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, I will try to be as direct as I possibly can. The answer is that staff gave me an oral or verbal comment with regard to the recommendation and that was the extent of it. The Historic Resources Branch had to be allowed to do their job and to take a look at the issue, and they did. As former ministers, they know.

A person mentioned to me actually on the street that you get advice all the time, which is really interesting because one would want to say is that not the staff's job? Is that not the responsibility, for people to be certainly providing people with information.

I can tell you that in this particular case, Mr. Chairperson, after having received a comment with regard to the advisory council, I can say that that is where it stopped. I wanted the process to take place. The process was followed. That is the important part. The process had to

take place, and the process was followed. A decision was made, difficult as it was. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Just to review some of the comments the member has made. Earlier he acknowledged that he was given a verbal briefing shortly after the June 9 decision made by the Heritage Council. Then on June 21 the minister says: I have not received a report of any kind. Then on June 25 the minister says: I am not going to try and guess what the recommendations are. Then on June 28 in Hansard he says: Certainly the Premier (Mr. Doer) and I have said also that the council's recommendation, we heard about it shortly after the council's meeting. The Premier and the minister heard about the recommendation shortly after the council's meeting.

That meeting was on June 9. Yet on the 21st, you are saying: I have not received a report of any kind. On the 25th you are saying: I am not going to try and guess what the recommendations are. Then on the 28th he admits in his own words that he and the Premier knew about it shortly after the council's meeting.

Now, people looking in might wonder whether there is a lie being told here. We cannot use that term in here. People might look and say: Is he intentionally deceiving the House? But we cannot say that in here. There are so many contradictions here. He also says that he did not receive the report until the 27th of June. Well, in Question Period the Premier says it was transmitted to the Government last Friday, which was June 22.

The honourable minister is faced with so many contradictions. The easiest way out of this is to tell the truth about it. There are no contradictions? The minister is saying that he has not received a report of any kind. Then he says that he and the Premier (Mr. Doer) have heard about it shortly after the council's meeting. Is that not a contradiction? I would ask the honourable minister to come clean about the sequence of events here and acknowledge what the truth is about this matter.

He has indicated and others are saying the minister got the report in his office maybe on the

20th, maybe on the 21st or the 22nd. His staff know this. People know this. The minister is saying he did not get it until the 27th. The Premier is saying it came on the 22nd. There are too many contradictions here, Mr. Chair. I think the minister should take the opportunity to correct the record and lay this out in a correct fashion. I would give him that opportunity now.

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, I have gone through the process and the sequence on a number of occasions. Obviously the Opposition are the ones that do not get it. The public of Manitoba get it. The House gets it. People understand the process and understand what has taken place. The recommendation came to the branch.

The branch, after doing due diligence, forwarded the report on to the deputy minister through the ADM to the minister. The minister had to weigh what he had received on the 27th, had to take a look at what he had received and then made a decision based on what the Historic Resources Branch was recommending, as well as on what the advisory council had recommended to them. So the people get it. The Opposition does not get it.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Well, I want to go back to what the minister said in the House on June 28. He says: Certainly, the Premier (Mr. Doer) and I have said also that the council's recommendations we heard about shortly after the council's meeting. The council's meeting was on the 9th of June, so the Premier was aware of the recommendation in early June.

Would the minister confirm that?

* (19:00)

Mr. Lemieux: Again, Mr. Chairperson, I want to reiterate that the process is in place. We have a process which, I believe, the former minister also followed. The process is the advisory council received something. They took a look at the Eaton's building as a heritage site, one very narrow-focussed issue related to the heritage site.

They did that. They passed on the recommendation to the Historic Resources Branch.

The Historic Resources Branch took a look at the criteria. Then they passed on their report on to the ADM. The deputy minister then forwarded that on to me.

I had to make a decision, and I supported the recommendation made by the Historic Resources Branch as to that the Eaton's building, taking everything into consideration, should not be designated an historical site. Is that hard to understand?

Mr. Gilleshammer: The minister has contradicted himself so many times with the statements he has made in Question Period and the statements he is making today. There is a way out for the minister and that is to acknowledge that some of the statements he has made are incorrect, that they have been factually incorrect.

The minister is the guardian of heritage in this province. He is the one that the heritage community looks for to protect and honour the heritage in this province. Is it any wonder, given what the minister is putting on the record, the inconsistencies, the contradictions that he refuses to correct, is it any wonder that the chair of the Heritage Council has resigned?

I say to the minister that you are judged each and every day by the staff in your department and what you bring to this House and what you say publicly. They understand fully the sequence of events that have happened, and they see the contradictions that the minister has put on the record. Is it any wonder that the chair of your Heritage Council, the well-known heritage expert in this province, has resigned? He says because he felt constrained in his duties. What did he mean by being constrained in his duties? What would the minister say to him when he says: I am constrained in my duties?

Mr. Lemieux: I will put this on the record over and over again. Mr. Bill Neville is highly respected in this community. Mr. Bill Neville is respected by us as a government, respected by me as the Minister of Heritage, and he felt in his letter to me of wanting to step aside as the chair, that he wanted to be able to be a public citizen. Mr. Neville wanted to be a public citizen and be able to participate in the debate on heritage. He

felt that being the chair of the advisory council that he was unable to do this.

He is a highly respected individual, highly respected by us and highly respected by all Manitobans, and I respect his decision, regrettably. I regret it, because I regret that his knowledge and the counsel that he provides that I will not be able to receive that any longer. I will hope that I can receive it informally from him, but as the chair of the Heritage Advisory Council, I will not be able to receive it, and that is regrettable.

But he is an honourable person. He wants to be able to participate in the debate, and I would say that he is certainly an individual of great intellect. I regret that his counsel will not be provided to me in the formal way as the chairperson, but certainly informally I hope to be able to meet with him and discuss with him the process and discuss with him ways to improve Heritage. Thank you.

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): I just want to confirm some dates with the minister. Could he just confirm to the House the date in which the Premier (Mr. Doer) announced the True North Project?

I will repeat that for the minister. Mr. Chair, could he just refresh the House's memory and tell us the date on which the Premier of Manitoba announced the True North Project?

Mr. Lemieux: I am sorry, Mr. Chairperson, that I did not catch the question at first, but now I do. I am not sure of the date. I am not sure what date it was announced in the House.

Mr. Praznik: I am looking for any member of the Government who is there just to refresh us as to what date the True North Project was announced, because, if I am not mistaken, it was in May. It was in the month of May, was it not? I asked the minister if he can just confirm it was in May.

Mr. Lemieux: I cannot recall. I do not know the exact date. I want to be accurate as much as humanly possible, but I am not sure what the date is. I know that the whole information is public by law and that the issue with regard to

tabling the advisory council's recommendation and so on and the report that was presented to me by the department through the deputy, we tabled that, but I am not familiar with the date that the Premier announced the True North Project in the House. I am not sure when that was, but I can find out.

Mr. Praznik: Well, Mr. Chair, let us look at the scenario that the Minister of Culture and Heritage is asking this House and the public to believe. Sometime in May this Government announces publicly the True North recreational complex for Winnipeg on the downtown Eaton's site. They do not announce a project somewhere in the downtown. They do not announce that they are looking for a site. They announce in May that a deal has been put together, and the Premier makes it very proudly, that there will be a downtown arena subject to the City Council approving it and subject to the federal government, but certainly with the full support of the Doer administration that there will be a major project on the downtown Eaton's site and that it will happen, makes that commitment in May.

Now, the minister confirms to us that sometime around this meeting of the Heritage Council on the 9th of June, he and the Premier (Mr. Doer) were made aware that the Heritage Council, an independent body, had recommended that the site be considered for heritage status. Then the minister tells us that at no time after he or the Premier was made aware of a recommendation that if it were carried out it would be the end of this grandiose project that the Premier had just announced in May.

The minister, Mr. Chair, is just telling us to believe that neither he nor any of his political staff nor the Premier nor any of the people from the Premier's Office nor any of the people from the Executive Council nor any of the high-ranking government members who were involved in negotiating this, I do not know if it is Mr. Kostyra or Mr. Schroeder, whoever, or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), that none of the people in the Doer government, none of the high-ranking officials, upon learning that the Heritage Council had just thrown a wrench into their plan, this minister is telling us that no one then proceeded to have any conversation

whatsoever with the staff, the public servants in the Department of Culture and Heritage to say there is a little problem here, that if you accept this recommendation, if we go through this recommendation, our star project that we had already announced for that site would be in trouble.

This minister is trying to tell us that nobody, no one called in Tom Carson or called in some of the staff and said, you know, we have a little problem here. Maybe you should just massage a little recommendation that we turn down the Heritage Council—*[interjection]*

Well, the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) says we are dreaming in technicolour, but they are asking the people of Manitoba to accept that after making one of the star announcements of this Government, the jewel in their crown, they would argue, that nobody, no one talked to the bureaucrats in the Department of Heritage about this report from the Heritage Council that would, in essence, if accepted, stop the project cold.

Now, Mr. Chair, I find it just so unbelievable to think that there was absolutely no conversation, I am going to ask this minister again to tell us whether or not there was any discussion at all between any member of his political staff, his staff, any member of Cabinet, the Premier's Office, Executive Council, any of the departments involved in negotiating True North. Will he confirm that no one had any conversation whatsoever with any staff in his department about this report? I am asking if that would be from the deputy minister on down.

* (19:10)

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, I do not know how they operated. I know how I operate, and I know how this Government operates. If they went into the civil service showing disrespect for the confidentiality and the impartiality that civil servants can show, as a former lawyer, the member should understand that people do and are able to differentiate and to be able to take an unbiased decision and be able to look at it and be able to provide advice. This is exactly what happened in this particular case.

The Historic Resources Branch was given an opportunity, after they received the recommen-

dation from the advisory council, to decide and weigh it with the criteria that they looked at. I will mention it again, and I will try to be brief. They looked at owner interest, re-use potential, condition, municipal support, public support and other considerations. The memo came to me. That is what they had to weigh against the recommendation that was made by the advisory council. That was done.

We have pride in our civil servants in this province that they are able to be unbiased and take an approach. This idea that the member opposite from Lac du Bonnet has the nerve to insinuate somehow that we are going to be coming heavy handed down upon civil servants to make a decision, they were allowed to make an honest decision and an honest report forwarded on to me of what they thought. They had to look at the whole picture, and they felt, as the minister, I needed certainly to look at the whole picture in order to make a decision and to balance that. It was a difficult decision, and I made it.

They are the ones who do not get it. The member opposite is watching too much Perry Mason, and this is not the place for it. Thank you.

Mr. Praznik: Somehow I feel that I am watching too much of Bozo the Clown right now, Mr. Chair. I am going to repeat the question for the minister because, if this minister believes what he has just told this House, then he should have no problem to stand up here today and unequivocally, unequivocally tell this House that not one of the public servants in his department involved with this issue, from the deputy minister on down—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Please, one at a time.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Chair, my colleague the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) is so disturbed by what he has witnessed in this House today that it is hard to sit still in a chair.

I want to ask the minister again if he believes and wants us to believe what he is telling this House, then will he today give us his unequivocal guarantee that, from the deputy minister on down in department, not one of the

officials involved in this decision had any discussion in any mean or form, in any way whatsoever with any political staff member of the Government, with him, with any Cabinet minister, with any MLA, with anyone from the Premier's Office, with anyone from the staff of his Executive Council, with anyone who was involved in the True North decision or any other part of the political arm of government, Mr. Chair, that they had no conversation, communication whatsoever?

If he believes us and wants us to believe it, I ask him to stand in his place now and tell us that is unequivocally the case.

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, obviously I cannot comment for the whole civil service, for other individuals and who they spoke to or who they did not speak to. I know what I did as the minister, and the minister allowed his heritage branch to do due diligence with regard to the recommendation that came to them and to look at it and to balance it against the items that I stated before.

I am not going to comment on how disturbed or not disturbed the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) is, but I just want to comment that, Mr. Chairperson, I can speak for myself and the decision I had to make. It was a difficult one, and I believe it is the right one. I think Manitobans understand it, Manitobans understand the process, and it is the Opposition that is having trouble understanding the process.

Ms. Nancy Allan, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, we have the minister now not prepared to confirm to this House. He leaves on the record that it is possible someone did speak to someone in his department because, again, I think it is important he speak to his department about this issue. I think it is important to look at the scenario again. If the minister does not recognize how important this is, then, quite frankly, I think we are in very big trouble.

In May, the Premier (Mr. Doer) of this province announces what he intends to be a jewel in his re-election crown. He announces

this project that he is very proud of, that he says will be on the Eaton's site. In early June, according to this minister in one of his admissions, he indicates that he and the Premier were made aware that the Heritage Council chaired by Bill Neville had recommended that the Eaton's site be considered for heritage designation.

It does not take much to figure out that if, in fact, that recommendation is followed through with, it would be the end of the True North Project on that site, and the Premier (Mr. Doer) would have a major political embarrassment after having made that announcement.

So it is very interesting to note that the minister says, when his political staff kind of walk in to his office and says, you know, Mr. Minister, there is a little report there that says we might have a problem. I mean, most ministers would have said we have a big problem here, because we have just made an announcement. The Premier's neck is out on the limb, and we now have this report. We now have this report that says this should be a heritage building.

This minister wants us to believe that he looked at it and said, oh, well, I am just going to let it float through the department. We are not going to worry about this at all. If they recommend it should be a heritage building, well, I will just have to accept it, and the Premier will just have to be embarrassed. Our Government will just have to eat some crow. But I am such a good minister that I am just going to sit back, not talk to my deputy, not raise it with any of my staff. I am just going to let the winds blow and nature take its course. If a political crisis comes out of it because our project is now troubled, well, that is the way it is, because the process will go.

* (19:20)

So he is now trying to tell us that when his political staff flags what could be a major political embarrassment for the Government, he is now claiming he just did not want to do anything. *[interjection]* Well, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Sale) who is abandoning his constituents here. If the Conservative Party was

in power, we would have run it through the proper processes. Our announcement would have been subject to those processes. It would have had public input, not the closed-door dictatorship that we see growing across the way.

What the Minister of Culture (Mr. Lemieux) is wanting us to believe is when his political staff flagged with him what could have been a major embarrassment to the Premier (Mr. Doer), this minister said, oh, I am just going to let it go the way it will go.

An Honourable Member: Yes, because we have some integrity. That is why.

Mr. Praznik: Well, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Sale) says they have integrity. They had enough integrity or did not have enough yesterday to vote down this issue going to a Clean Environment Commission report, which they always called for. They did not have the integrity to put it to the Provincial Auditor. Now they do not have the integrity to admit they are covering up an interference, I would think, in their department to shut down a heritage report because it would have been a political embarrassment to them. This is integrity?

So, Madam Chairperson, I want to ask this minister to tell this House that if his department of officials had recommended that this be a heritage site—

An Honourable Member: If, if, hypothetical.

Mr. Praznik: Well, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Sale) says hypothetical. The minister is telling us he would leave it up to his officials. So I would just like to know: If those officials had recommended this be a heritage building, would the Government then have announced that they had abandoned the True North Project, because that is the logical consequence? Would he have then killed the True North Project if his officials in his Historic Resources Branch would have said, we accept the report of our heritage committee; we accept the report chaired by Bill Neville, and we would recommend the Eaton's building for heritage designation.

Is he now telling the House that would then have been the end of the True North Project? That is my question to the minister.

Mr. Lemieux: You know, Madam Chairperson, as I see it, the issue here is the process. The process was followed, a process they implemented, and a process that was in place when the previous administration was the government of the day.

Unfortunately, we have a party that is scratching the dirt for anything to justify their opposition to the entertainment complex, any issue they can see to try to dig something up to justify their opposition to this complex. On the one hand, they say they are supportive of it; on the other hand, they do not, also which they proved by voting against the project yesterday, which is also on the record. They voted against the project yesterday, and Manitobans will remember that.

So the issue is the process. The process was followed and—well, the process was followed; I mean, the process that they had as a government. That is the process we followed and a process that we made open and public and tabled the final report.

So, Madam Chairperson, the Opposition can scratch for dirt and look under rugs and carpets and in closets for all kind of ghosts. I am not sure what they are looking for, but the issue is the process. The process was followed. We are proud of the process that was followed. We tabled it. We were very open with the public in Manitoba and we are going to also be very pleased to see the True North Project take place.

I wish they would come clean and tell us once and for all where they stand on this, because one day, it is one thing; the next day, they are voting in favour of it or against it, and then the next day, they are coming out and saying, oh, yes, we like it but, but, but.

Madam Chairperson, I feel that the issue was process here. The process was followed and we were served well by the process.

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, this minister is asking Manitobans to believe that when he talks about the importance of process, he is asking us to believe that after this Premier (Mr. Doer) made his big announcement about the True North Project on the Eaton's site, after he

made that announcement, this Government would have turned around and said, whoops, guys, we have to cancel it, because you know what? Bill Neville and a few officials in the Department of Heritage said we need to make the Eaton's building a heritage site, and you know what? We, as the Gary Doer government, will just accept that, and we will just cancel True North, and we will just face the public about why we announced it and then three weeks later cancelled. Right? *[interjection]* Well, they want us to believe that, but we have heard this minister get up and say, well, the Eaton's building is just rat-infested anyway. It should just be ashes out of which this great project shall rise like a phoenix.

We have heard members opposite run down and really take away from what was Eaton's building because, quite frankly, I do not believe and I do not think Manitobans believe, that this Government would have allowed their crown jewel project to go down, because Bill Neville and the Heritage Council recommended it could be or should be a heritage building. The minister is trying to tell us and he wants us to believe that after his Premier (Mr. Doer) who put him in Cabinet, who keeps him in Cabinet, had made this tremendous announcement that he is highlighting all around the province, that this minister, when he heard there could be a problem, did not have any conversation with his deputy, had no conversation with any of the staff, never suggested that. You know what? Maybe the process is to just make sure we do not have a recommendation, so I do not have to turn it down.

Well, I tell you, if we were in government, we would have made sure that proper process was followed, but, first of all, we would have been looking for win-wins where we could have seen Eaton's building developed and an arena. So the minister is asking Manitobans to believe that he did not raise the issue, did not flag it. I want to ask him when it was brought to his attention that the heritage report was there, did he raise it with the Premier?

He has indicated the Premier was aware of it. Did he have any discussion with the Premier what the result would be if his department recommended that the building be designated as

a heritage site? I am going to repeat that question for the minister. I would like him to tell this House, what, if any, conversation he had as the Minister responsible for Culture and Heritage, what conversation he had with the Premier after he and the Premier became aware that if his department recommended this be a heritage site, it could put the wrenches into the True North Project and cause them political embarrassment.

What, if any, discussion did he have with the Premier or the Premier's staff?

Mr. Lemieux: Again, we talk about the process. The member opposite is asking Manitobans to believe whether or not the process was followed. Yes, it was followed. We have the advisory council that dealt with an issue, passed that on to the Historic Resources Branch who applied their criteria to that and then forwarded their report through the ADM and deputy minister and then on to myself.

Then that I had to look at, and I had to weigh—as I mentioned before, I am not going to get into other issues that have been debated in days gone by and how people dealt with issues as a government. I know how I dealt with it, and I know how this Government has dealt with it, in a very open fashion, tabling documents, a term sheet tabled and tabled this particular report that came to me from the deputy minister, made it very open and public and gave people an opportunity to read exactly what I as the minister received. The Opposition certainly received that and had an opportunity to look at it.

* (19:30)

An Honourable Member: I think they appreciated that.

Mr. Lemieux: I would hope that they appreciate it because then they had an opportunity to look at it and see exactly what I had received as the minister from the branch and what I had to look at and what I had to make a decision on.

Again, the process was followed. We are proud of the fact that we followed the process and the process has served us well. The True North Project is certainly—in all likelihood will proceed. We certainly look forward to that,

because what we are talking about here is also redevelopment of downtown Winnipeg, and we look forward to that very much. I believe all Manitobans look forward to that and look forward to seeing a new entertainment complex in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, what is evident is the minister refused to answer my question. You know, that is part of the key issue here because I—*[interjection]* No, I asked him about conversations with the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the Premier's Office, when he was aware that this Historic Resources report, chaired by Dr. Bill Neville, was there and could put the kibosh to the Premier's big announcement.

I want to ask the minister again: Can he tell the House what, if any, conversations, communication took place between him and the Premier and the Premier's Office? If he is telling me that there was none, I want him to put that on the record.

Mr. Lemieux: It is difficult to know where to start because we have gone around and around on these issues, trying to clarify the difference between a recommendation and a report. I think that is understandable what that is. I just want to state that the process is extremely important in issues like this, and the process was followed because they are very, very important issues.

I know that once again I just want to commend all the hard work that Mr. Bill Neville, which the member opposite from Lac du Bonnet made mention of, that Mr. Bill Neville has worked extremely hard for 10 years and he is a highly respected individual and, regrettably, he is not going to be the chairperson of the advisory council. I asked him to stay on as a new minister. I wanted to certainly have his counsel and his expertise. I did that in April, and he agreed to stay on, which I consider myself fortunate that he did. He has a lot of knowledge, and it is regrettable that he has selected, in his words, to be a public citizen so he could be able to speak on this issue.

So the process was followed, Madam Chairperson, and I am not sure what the opposition is fishing for, but I can just say that the process was followed. We are pleased that

we are going to move ahead, and we are going to move Manitoba and Winnipeg ahead into the next millennium. Thank you.

Mr. Praznik: You know, we are still looking for the minister to come clean with the House and the people of Manitoba and just tell us the truth about the political concern that was there.

But I want to ask him a few questions about this great public document, and I say great with tongue in cheek, that he has talked about, his departmental report. You know, it is very interesting when one looks at this document, the document the minister is relying on to say the process has worked. Let us just look at this particular document. It starts out in the background, and, by the way, I am referencing the document the minister has provided signed by his deputy, Tom Carson.

The background information clearly comes out and talks about the fact that the Province, the City and the federal government announced their big project on the 14th of May, 2001. It clearly comes out and sets out the background here, that this is a big government project. So the department is operating under this cloud, quite frankly, of the Premier (Mr. Doer) making this big announcement.

It goes on to talk about the owner interest. Well, there was not a lot of owner interest, it says, in other development because these people were already in the project. Then it goes on, and it talks about the condition of the building. It says that his Historic Resources Branch does not have any engineering or architectural reports indicating the structural condition of the building. So, as a result, the building condition has been assumed not to be a factor, which would disadvantage the project. But he does not do any work to find out whether or not this building could have other uses, which is a key argument from those who have opposed its demolition.

Another point they make is municipal support, that they reconfirm the City of Winnipeg is in True North. They talk about public support and a reference, of course, that with the Premier's (Mr. Doer) announcement everybody is going to love the Premier on this announcement. So the public wants an arena.

None of these have to do with the heritage quality of the building or other options for the building. It is not in this report. Then it goes on, the recommendation to the minister, it recommends that—oh, it does say in this report that it is recommended to be of medium to high heritage significance. We heard this minister in this committee saying it was really just minimum. His own department said it was medium to high significance.

What is the recommendation to the minister at the end of the day? It is, well, basically, we have not looked at the structure. We have not looked at any other options. We have not had a process to see if there are any realistic other development projects for it. We know that our political masters in the Premier's Office have announced the biggest announcement of their term in office. We know that City Hall and the mayor have announced and supported this project, and we know that the owners of the building are financially tied to this project. So what this report says is we do not want to rock any boats.

This report is not a report about what could be done with a medium to high heritage significant building, of medium to high heritage significance. This is a report that says we do not want to rock the Premier's boat. This is what this report is, and any Manitoban who reads this report will see through it like the pane of glass in a window. This is not a report any credible Minister of Heritage who truly believes in heritage could rest his argument on. This is a summation of the political world in June of 2001 in Manitoba.

The owners of the building want to develop it, Madam Chairperson. The Premier (Mr. Doer) has already announced the development project. The City of Winnipeg has already announced it. We have not done any structural studies because, my goodness, we do not want anyone to know this is really a strong, good building. We have not looked for any other development projects because, my goodness, we would not want to have any.

This is all about the politics of the day in Manitoba and, Mr. Minister, if your Government has already announced it, we are not going to be

offside with the man who signs our cheques. This paper is not worth the paper it is printed on, this report.

So I want to ask this minister to come clean again with the people of Manitoba and just admit that this was a political decision so that you would not put an end to the True North Project.

Mr. Lemieux: The answer would be no. Secondly, when you take a look at the recommendation that came from the advisory council, it stated that it was above the minimum threshold normally used, and so comments are made by the Member for Lac du Bonnet about it being so-so. I was just reading from the recommendation of the advisory council to the Historic Resources Branch, so the process was followed.

Regrettably, I guess, it is not the answer that they want because the Opposition is against True North. They do not want it. They do not want redevelopment of Portage Avenue. That is regrettable. I guess we will have to agree to disagree, but we want to look ahead. We want to see this complex take place and revitalize Portage Avenue, as the Red River College will on Princess Avenue, all the heritage façade there, as well as the Big 4 building. So we, as a government, yes, are concerned about heritage. The days and months and years ahead will show that we are. We are looking forward to this project taking place and the revitalization of Portage Avenue. Thank you.

* (19:40)

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): The answers of this minister have been quite interesting. I listened to the minister's answers on monitor. I have been here in the House listening to his answers, and the minister's answers weave a tale of cover-up. They weave a tale of deceit. The minister has not been able to answer any specific question that has been put by any of the colleagues on this side of the House.

The Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) asked a number of questions, which the minister did not answer. The Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) asked a number of questions, which the minister did not answer. The Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik)

asked a series of questions, and no answers are forthcoming.

Now, Madam Chair, the minister just said that this project was above the minimum threshold. Well, that is true. That is what the report says, but he forgets to read the rest of the report because, in the recommendation section of the report, the first sentence says: The Eaton's building has been recommended as having medium to high heritage significance.

So I ask the minister to read the whole report. Do not read the preamble and forget about the rest of the report. Madam Chair, this minister talks about the fact that he considered all elements from the recommendations made by his staff. Well, what issues deal with heritage in this recommendation? Can the minister explain the elements that he considered regarding heritage that come out of this recommendation, because the only element here that deals with the heritage aspect is the fact that this building has a medium to high significance as far as heritage is concerned?

Then the recommendation speaks about the fact that we already have, in essence, made decisions about what should happen with the building, so no structural studies have been done. Is that not an important aspect in determining whether or not a building should be saved in a heritage sense? Is that not one of the key elements?

Madam Chair, we have seen buildings in this city, buildings across this province that have been preserved, that have had a much lesser significance in a heritage sense than the Eaton's building has, and yet the minister says that this is just above the minimum threshold. So the minister has indicated in the House that, yes, his office had been talked to by Ms. Dul. Then he says he did not know anything about it until about the 25th, I believe, but yet, in his answer, he said that shortly after the meeting we heard about it. He says we heard about it shortly after the council's meeting.

So, Madam Chair, the minister goes from one extreme to the other. He does not come clean in the House, and so we keep asking those same questions. So I want to ask the minister

what factors he considered, because he was the one who made the decision. He said he made it single-handedly. He did not consult the Premier. He did not consult Cabinet. He did not consult any colleagues. He made it single-handedly.

Madam Chair, I want to ask him what elements he considered, beyond what is in this recommendation, because obviously there must be more that he had to consider than what is in this recommendation.

Mr. Lemieux: With regard to the report that came from the Historic Resources Branch, they do make mention of a couple of things certainly that are very important, for example, that the Manitoba Heritage Council does not normally, nor did it in this instance, review condition, re-use or feasibility matters, as the council's role is advisory on heritage merit or significance of a potential site or building.

Now just under that, on page 2 of the report, it talks about the considerations of Manitoba Culture and Heritage. It talks about the owner interest. Since '86, since the previous administration was in place, not a site has been approved as a heritage site without the owner's approval. That is one issue I certainly had to consider.

That is not to say that in the future, just because an owner does not wish to have it designated, that it will not happen, but I just want to state that is an important factor as well. Also re-use potential. I took a look, and certainly in the report it talks about when considering possible locations for a downtown campus of Red River community college, Manitoba Transportation and Government Services evaluated the Eaton's store, the Princess Street block and the site at University of Winnipeg. The resultant report, *Red River College—A Case for a New Campus*, described the Eaton's building as poorly suited for conversion to a 21st century learning centre. So those are the kind of aspects. You take a look at—[interjection]

The member opposite is asking what I considered, and I took a look at the report that I had before me, presented to me through my deputy minister of what I had to consider. I took a look at these aspects, the municipal condition, for example. This is a good point, and I will try

to be brief about it. One can show respect or give heritage credence to—it does not have to be a building of four walls and a building. You can look at the Grill Room; you can look at the Wall of Honour; you can look at Timothy Eaton's statue. You can look at a number of different aspects of the building, not just looking at the whole building. Just like the façade on Princess Avenue for the Red River community college. You keep the front. That was deemed to be important. It is not necessary that you keep the whole building a square box.

This has been pointed out by a number of individuals that you can show respect and show respect for the heritage of the building and the historical aspects of a building by keeping parts of it.

Here it talks about the City of Winnipeg Historic Buildings Committee making recommendations that the committee recommend inclusion of two war memorial plaques, for example, or the Grill Room or the lobby and managers' dining room on the fifth floor or other aspects of it, not just the box and the building itself. There are other ways to show that you can respect the building and the heritage and the history of it by keeping aspects of it, not just the square box. There are other ways of doing it. Certainly that recommendation that was made, it does state the department recommends that careful heritage interpretation at the site, as part of the True North redevelopment proposal, is an acceptable alternative to designation of the actual structure. It is an acceptable alternative.

So when I took a look at this report, I had to rely on my civil servants in the Historic Resources Branch. They have experts there, people who have dealt with this while the Opposition was government and now that we are Government. The process was followed. The Historic Resources Branch passed on their recommendations. I certainly had considered it, difficult decision as it was. I know that Manitobans will respect that, and they do respect that. Sometimes we have to make difficult decisions, and we look forward to moving ahead and redevelopment of Portage Avenue.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I have never heard a more feeble response to a specific question as

it relates to criteria for heritage designation. If this is his example of how he considers the importance of heritage buildings in the province of Manitoba, then the province of Manitoba has a serious problem in terms of this minister being the advocate for heritage preservation in our province. This is a pathetic response.

Here is a report that has a recommendation that is three paragraphs long. I asked him what other criteria he used to measure whether or not this building should remain a heritage building. He says that it is a box. Yesterday, from his seat, he said it was rat-infested. He said that from his seat yesterday. He said it was rat-infested so I want to know—

Point of Order

Mr. Lemieux: Madam Chairperson, I do not mind having comments attributed to me that were made, but I certainly did not say it was a rat-infested building, and I am not sure what else was made.

But there are comments, it is true. The member is saying that there are people in Winnipeg who are stating that the building is rat-infested and run-down and so on.

So just to make that point of order, that no comments were made when I was standing in Question Period.

The Acting Chairperson (Ms. Allan): It is not a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

* * *

* (19:50)

Mr. Derkach: The reason I make that point is because the minister says he considered criteria with respect to heritage buildings. Yet, from his seat, he said it was rat-infested. So, therefore, that was one of the criteria that I guess he would have used to determine whether it should be a heritage building.

Now, he cannot convince Manitobans that these are the total criteria that he would apply to any heritage building in this province. Madam Chair, I want to ask the minister whether or not

he has run these recommendations and the report of the Heritage Council past any people in the federal government.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, when I receive a report, and I trust that when the member opposite was a minister that he was not so critical of the civil service that presented him with a report, because that is who wrote this report for me, was the Historic Resources Branch through the ADM and through my deputy minister.

I mean, they are doing the best they can. You know, I would hope that the member opposite would apologize to the branch that wrote this report because they did the best they can at providing me with some information. I am sure he will. I am sure he did not mean to demean the people that wrote the report.

Mr. Derkach: The minister is laying the blame at the foot of the civil service in this respect. He is saying that it is the civil service's responsibility to give him the recommendations, and they provided him with the recommendations.

I am asking him what criteria he used to put these recommendations against to ensure that, in fact, the building met all the criteria, the recommendations met all the criteria that are used to designate a heritage building? That is what I am asking. The second question I am asking is whether or not he has run this by the federal government who have an interest in this building.

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, once again, this report was presented to me through my deputy minister. It was a report that was written by the department, the branch. You know, they did the best job they could under the information they had. They took a look at the recommendation made by the advisory council, and they came up with their criteria to measure up against the recommendation. So, again, the recommendation they made to me was that the True North redevelopment proposal is an acceptable alternative to the designation of the actual structure.

So, again, I said it was a difficult decision, and I am not denying that. The member opposite

is absolutely correct. It is a very difficult decision to make. Yet a decision had to be made. I mean, the City of Winnipeg certainly made their decision. The branch looked at that. Was there municipal support? They placed some weight on that. They placed some weight on the condition as they knew it, because the Department of Transportation and Government Services had looked at the building when Red River community college was in its early stages and people were looking for a site. They took a look at the re-use potential, what kind of re-use potential was there, and also the owner's interest.

I mean, those are the kind of criteria that the branch looked at in order to provide me with a report to make a decision on.

I agree, the decision was difficult, and I agree with the member opposite. It is not easy, but yet the process was followed and the process is a good process. I am not saying that it is not, even though the Opposition, it was the process that they used to designate many buildings. I just want to say that the branch, they have our total respect and our confidence in their writing of reports and documents that they provide to us for decision making.

Mr. Derkach: I asked the minister what criteria he provided to the department that were to be followed in making the recommendation to him.

Mr. Lemieux: I mentioned before that it was the criteria that were in place by the previous administration. They are the ones who put the process in place and the same process was followed. Thank you.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chair, the minister is saying it is the same criteria. So are those the instructions that he gave his department with respect to following the criteria and making the recommendations? Are those the instructions that he gave his department?

Mr. Lemieux: I did not give any instruction to my department. They knew the process; they knew the criteria that they would measure. They followed what they had continually followed for the '90s, when the previous administration was in government, I would suppose, until I received this. Then I saw their recommendation and I saw

the considerations that they looked at. That is what they used to measure it. I could only go by the report they submitted to me.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chair, is it true that one of the criteria used in establishing whether or not a building will be designated as a historic building is the physical structure of the building?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chair, I am not an expert in heritage buildings and I am not an engineer either, but when I take a look at the considerations, it just says the Historic Resources Branch does not have any engineering or architectural reports indicating the structural condition of the building. As a result, the building condition has been assumed not to be a factor which would be a disadvantage to the project. It has been assumed that the structural integrity is not an impediment and yet the building was looked at when Red River community college was in its early stages, and it was bypassed.

So the Member for Russell should maybe have a discussion with the person who sits beside him who used to be the minister. I am presuming it is the same criteria that were used when she was the Minister of Culture and Heritage. Thank you.

Mr. Derkach: Again, Mr. Chair, we have the minister dodging the question, as he has done all evening. The question is whether or not the issue of the structural soundness of a building is taken into account in establishing whether a building will be designated as a heritage site, as it is in every other historic consideration that I know of.

I want to ask the minister whether or not these criteria were followed by his department and whether it was something that he considered seriously when he looked at the recommendation. We have a problem here.

Mr. Lemieux: There is a problem. The Opposition does not understand that the process was followed and a decision was made, but everyone else does. They are having problems, looking and scraping and scratching for dirt, and the process was followed.

A report was submitted to me and I went by the report that was submitted to me looking at the considerations that they placed against the narrow focus that the Manitoba Heritage Council had to look at. Their criteria were very limited in how they view heritage merit. They looked at just one narrowly focussed aspect.

The branch had to look at a number of different issues, owner interest, re-use, and so on. Having that applied, they certainly made a recommendation to me and I looked at it and I accepted their recommendation, the branch's recommendation, not to designate it a heritage site.

Mr. Derkach: I want the record to show that I have asked this minister the same question three times and three times he has refused to answer. Mr. Chair, I asked the question regarding the physical structure of the building, whether or not that is an important element that should be considered when we designate historic buildings, whether or not he, in fact, considered this and whether, in fact, he asked the questions about the fact that it was not considered.

He continues to attack us as an opposition about this issue but it is becoming very clear that this is a cover-up, Mr. Chair. He is covering the backside of the Premier (Mr. Doer) in this issue. That is becoming very evident, and I think it is becoming evident to Manitobans. I ask him one more time about the physical structure of the building, and whether or not it is not a key element in considering the historic value of a building.

* (20:00)

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, I will tell the member opposite one more time that the report that was given to me was the information I had to go by and I went by their recommendation. They are the experts with regard to heritage. I trust the civil servants that we have and the evidence they looked at. They provided me with a recommendation that stated there are other ways to look at heritage significance and the building does not have to be designated a heritage site. I will repeat that over and over for members opposite.

They are not understanding the process. Hopefully, that is clear now and that the recommendation that was forwarded to me is what I based my decision on, a report that was written from the Historic Resources Branch that have all the expertise in this area, which as a new minister I do not. I am dependent on the Historic Resources Branch to provide me with that information.

Mr. Gilleshammer: On June 21 the minister said: I have not received a report of any kind. I have not received a report of any kind. Would it not be more truthful to say: Except that the department has given me the details of the recommendations from the Heritage Council? Would it not be more honest and truthful to say that?

Mr. Lemieux: Once again, I will get back to the process and the process that was followed. The member opposite is certainly asking that and, well, it gets back to the process because I thought we clarified the difference between a recommendation and a report.

I will just conclude my remarks because we did go through the definition of a report and a recommendation before, and a written report is what I have received and that is what I was expecting was a written report.

Mr. Gilleshammer: So the minister has acknowledged that he would have been more accurate if he had said I have not received a report of any kind, except I did receive a verbal report. I think that is what he is agreeing to.

Mr. Lemieux: It would be accurate to say that a recommendation coming from the advisory council to the Historic Resources Branch was a recommendation, and that the report I was referring to was a written report that was given due consideration.

The recommendation from the advisory council was given due consideration by the Historic Resources Branch and then submitted to me in writing, which came through the deputy minister which I tabled in this Legislature, which is unprecedented for a written report to be tabled in this Legislature from an advisory council which is advisory in nature and makes

recommendations to a minister and certainly does not have to be tabled in this House, which we did.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Well, the minister's answers are plainly silly, and I have given him an opportunity to correct the record. He chooses not to.

Let me move to Hansard of June 25, where the minister says: I am not going to try and guess what the recommendations are. I am not going to try and guess what the recommendations are.

These are the recommendations that he has acknowledged that his staff have briefed him on. These are the recommendations that he knows have come from the council. Would it not be more accurate to say: I know what the recommendations are at this time. I do not have to guess; I know what they are.

Mr. Lemieux: It definitely would have been a guess, because, in their recommendation of the advisory council, it states that the Eaton's store on Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, places the building above the minimum threshold normally used to identify properties of provincial—you know, above the minimum threshold. It could have been a lot above, it could have been not above.

Mr. Chairperson, it would have certainly been guessing to see what the recommendation would have been, and I was not about to guess. Especially having the Historic Resources Branch having an opportunity to place their criteria against the recommendation and the report. I was looking forward to see what the recommendations were. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: I would just remind the minister that the eyes of the heritage community are on him, and the decisions he makes and the statements he makes. There are people in the heritage community, in the public, in the department that know exactly what the truth is, and I am saying to the minister that he loses face with that community.

He loses face with his departmental staff the more he prevaricates on this issue. I have given the minister a chance to correct the record, and

he likes to skate around it and talk about all these other things. In the Hansard of June 28, he indicates that the Premier and himself knew about the council's recommendation shortly after the council's meeting. Did you brief the Premier on that information?

Mr. Lemieux: With all due respect to the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), I believe that the heritage community out there, yes, is certainly watching not only this aspect, but the heritage community also understands that there are around 170 different buildings that have been designated as heritage sites around the province. They are looking at a number of different other sites that certainly are going to be considered to be heritage sites in the future. I think, one thing, they are looking at me and they are saying, as the Minister responsible for Heritage, that you will give due consideration and thoughtful consideration, and take a look at the recommendation coming from the Historic Resources Branch to you. You will take a close look at that and you will be able to make a determination.

When your own branch and department make a recommendation to you as minister because they have the expertise, they are not just dependent on a minister that is going to make a decision just on a whim. That minister, being me, will depend on the expertise provided by the Historic Resources Branch, that many, many of those individuals have worked there for 20 years plus and have gained a lot of expertise in this area, and they know that this minister will count on their counsel when making a decision.

That is what the heritage community will look at and they will also look at the Red River community college facility. They will look at the Big 4 building, formerly the Ashdown Building. They know that yes we do indeed care for heritage in this province; that we are very supportive of heritage in many other ways. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Well, does the minister not find it interesting with all of these other heritage achievements that the chair of the board never resigned at that time? He resigned at this time because you have really fouled up the process.

I would like to ask the question over again. You have indicated in Hansard of June 28, that

you and the Premier (Mr. Doer) heard about it shortly after the council's meeting. And I ask the question: did you brief the Premier on the recommendation from the Heritage Council?

Mr. Lemieux: Again, on the record, that we have the highest degree of respect for Mr. Neville. Mr. Neville in his letter stated to me that he wanted to be a public citizen to be able to publicly comment on this particular building, on this issue. So he felt that he would be in a difficult position as the chair of the advisory council to be able to be a public citizen.

So, you know, Mr. Chairperson, Mr. Neville is highly respected by me. I regret that his counsel I will miss, because of all of his experience. Again, I mention, as the new Minister responsible for Heritage, that one does count on counsel from the Historic Resources Branch as well as the advisory council. So there are a lot of projects next week, next month, next year that are going to come up that I am going to have to give consideration to, and I look forward to receiving information from the advisory council and recommendations in going through the process which was followed this time as well. Thank you.

* (20:10)

Mr. Gilleshammer: Well, I would ask the minister for the third time. He indicated that the Premier (Mr. Doer) and he were aware of the recommendations that came from the council. Did he brief the Premier?

Mr. Lemieux: Again, Mr. Chairperson, the Opposition has difficulty understanding the process. We have tried to go through that process. We have gone through the definition of recommendation. We have gone through the definition of a report. We have gone through this over and over, and the process was the same followed by the Opposition when they were the Government.

We tabled, made public the term sheet. We made public the recommendation from the department to me. We have been very open with the public, and we are trying to show the public that this building, the Eaton's building, was given due consideration. The department and the

Historic Resources Branch took a look at it and applied their criteria to it.

They made a recommendation to me as the minister on how they felt what a decision should be. I had to consider that, and I supported the recommendation from the branch.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Well, I would ask the minister for the fourth time. In Hansard, he indicated that he and the Premier (Mr. Doer) were aware of the recommendations of the Heritage Council shortly after the June 9 meeting. I ask the minister again: Did he brief the Premier on the recommendations from the Heritage Council?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, I have mentioned on numerous occasions about the process, and I know that the Opposition is scraping and scratching and opening closets and looking for ghosts. Maybe from their point of view, the only way you can find something to be against the project is to try to dig something up and try to justify why you are against it, because they did vote against it.

The public of Manitoba will judge them on that, and the citizens of Winnipeg will judge them on that. When redevelopment of Winnipeg and downtown Winnipeg starts to happen with Red River community college, all the shops that are opening up, the co-op store, the new entertainment complex, the citizens of Winnipeg will judge the Opposition and why they are against it and voted against it and did not want it. Thank you.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Well, the honourable minister is on the record in Hansard on June 28 that he and the Premier were both aware of the recommendations shortly after the meeting of the council. Will the minister indicate whether he briefed the Premier on these recommendations, Mr. Chair?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, just to address the report that came to me with regard to Mr. Tom Carson, the deputy minister, and to myself, within the report—and I know a lot has been made about taking a look at the issues that the Historic Resources Branch had to take a look at—they are the ones with the expertise. They are the

ones who provided me with the information. I was the one who made the decision. I am the one who supported their recommendation to me, not to designate it a heritage site. I supported their recommendation, and I announced that and tabled it.

That is the process, and I am sure that is the process that was followed by members opposite, that recommendations came forward in this particular case as the minister—and not having to table it. It is certainly a precedent to table a recommendation or a report based on a recommendation from the advisory council.

So when you take a look at all the considerations of Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism and the recommendation that they made, under the circumstances, I believe the right decision was made. I believe that history will show the right decision was made with regard to the Eaton's building. I know a lot of Manitobans and a lot of Winnipeggers want to move on, and they want the redevelopment of downtown Portage.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Well, the minister's credibility is at stake, and he continues to give silly answers. I would ask him again: His comments in Hansard on the 28th, where he says that he and the Premier (Mr. Doer) were aware of the recommendations shortly after the meeting of the Heritage Council, did the minister brief the Premier on the recommendations of the Heritage Council? Did he bring that information to the Premier himself?

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, again, I just want to reiterate a number of misconceptions that have been put forward by the Opposition. You know, at one time, they started trying to nitpick about report and recommendation and continually going over and over with regard—and then, I think, we got that, hopefully have got that straightened out with regard to report and recommendation. So I tried to explain it, certainly to the best of my ability.

Again, the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) made some disparaging remarks with regard to the report itself, and what kind of a report is that to make a decision on. It was a report that was written from within the

department, and it is something that I had to base my decision on. Once again, I just have the utmost respect and confidence in the departmental officials that put this report together for me.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Chair, again, to put the kindest look on the minister's comments over the last few days and weeks, he has been consistently, factually incorrect. He has been given the opportunity to correct those statements, and he has contradicted himself. He is losing face with his own department, who many of them have worked in Heritage all of their working lives. They believe in the heritage of this province. In fact, the minister, in a press release on June 28, talked about the celebration of the commitment and excellence that is so evident in the field of heritage. He is giving lip-service to his role as a minister.

He says here the dedication to preserving heritage that we acknowledge and applaud today provides a real legacy for all the people of Manitoba. By his comments and by his actions, he is denigrating the people on his staff, the volunteers who serve on the Heritage Council. His answers here today for the most part have been just plain silly as he tries to stickhandle his way around important issues, comments that he has on the record.

The minister is the guardian of heritage in this province, and his colleagues think he has done a fine job. One of the leading heritage authorities in the province who chaired for many years the Manitoba Heritage Council has resigned. He has resigned because he felt constrained in his duties. This is language that everybody can understand.

* (20:20)

The history of the Heritage Council is that it has been given the freedom to review heritage buildings, to review everything to do with heritage, and never before has the chair of that council said he felt constrained. He also says he is disappointed in the Province's decision to fast track the demolition of the Eaton's building, to fast track it, which flies in the face of what the Manitoba Heritage Council has given him in this report, a report that for the longest time he has

denied having seen. He is on the record as saying he has received no report. Then he is contradicted by other people, a member of his department who said, yes, I phoned to give him a heads-up. Well, what is a heads-up? It is a warning that there could be a problem here.

The minister denied first of all that he received this heads-up and said, well, I never talked to her. I have asked him if he briefed the Premier (Mr. Doer). He acknowledged the other day the Premier has been aware of this since early June. He has refused to answer a direct question and instead given many, many silly answers over and over again. He is losing credibility in the eyes of his department and the eyes of the heritage community, and, I dare say, in the eyes of his colleagues over there.

It is a good example, when you put something that is wrong on the record, your best bet is to correct it. The easiest way to deal with it is to correct the record and say, no, I misspoke myself. I made a mistake. That was not the case. We have given him ample opportunity today to correct the record. He has refused to do that.

The former chair, Bill Neville, says he would like to see public debate. Everything the minister has done, everything the minister has said is to stifle public debate, is to not allow that debate to happen. Again the minister is doing a very, very serious disservice to the heritage community.

There are many, many buildings that have been given heritage status in this city and this province that have taken a while before they have been redeveloped. It has taken a while before the community has found a use for them. What is obscene here is the fast track we are on. The minister is not doing justice to his portfolio and the people he is there to defend, the people he is there to work with, the people he is there to advocate for. He had the opportunity to receive the report and at least take a period of time to appear to look at it, at least have the courtesy to look at the report and give it a fair evaluation instead of right from day one making up your mind and then being factually incorrect on the record, which is as plain as can be to anybody who reads the record. He has been given a chance to correct it and he has refused to do so.

As a result, I believe there could be more resignations. There could be more resignations coming forward.

The minister indicated that he did not receive that report until the 28th of June. Yet others are saying, no, it was on his desk much earlier than that. I think he has compromised many long-serving officials in his department in the way he has handled this. That is truly unfortunate. These are people who have been career civil servants, and I would say the vast majority of their career has been in Heritage. I cannot help but feel how upset they must be that the minister is not following an open process here and that he is not putting correct information on the record. I think the minister, from his experience before, found that there are some pitfalls in this business when the correct information is not put on the record and that he does not own up to what the real situation is.

I would ask him one more time if he is prepared to revisit those comments and clarify them, which would bring them into line with what the community is thinking, what most of us in this House are thinking, and it would give us a chance to start over again and feel that, yes, this minister sort of made some mistakes and, instead of correcting them, added to them. I would ask him again if he is prepared to acknowledge that some of his comments earlier were half-truths at the best and that he could very well step forward now and make those corrections. Would he be prepared to do that?

Mr. Lemieux: I just want to say, as I have said all along, is that the proper process was followed, a process that they had in place. We followed the process. The process has worked. Recommendations sometimes are difficult to make, some decisions, but I followed the recommendations of the branch. How can that be insulting or undermining the branch and civil servants? I followed their recommendation to me, Mr. Chairperson.

I am wondering if it is possible to ask for a bathroom break of about one minute.

Mr. Chairperson: Is there leave that the minister and everybody else who are here almost all this time can have a little break, recess? Is it agreed? *[Agreed]*

The committee recessed at 8:26 p.m.

The committee resumed at 8:29 p.m.

Mr. Chairperson: Committee, please come to order.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I will have to say that this is an extremely sad day for Manitobans in the province of Manitoba. We have seen a minister that has not come clean, has not been straightforward and provided answers to very direct questions about what happened and how he became aware of the issues surrounding the Eaton's building and the proposed designation, a recommendation that was made to him by the very council that he appointed as minister.

Let us not forget that the members of that council are volunteers, but they are also members who are directly appointed by the minister. They are appointed by Order-in-Council, and the government of the day chooses very carefully who they want to represent their interests and give them advice.

* (20:30)

Mr. Chair, this minister and the Government and the Premier (Mr. Doer), who signed his name on that Order-in-Council appointing those volunteers, have turned their backs completely on the volunteers that they put in place to give them advice.

I have heard the minister several times tonight talk about the wonderful attributes of Bill Neville and how he is really going to miss his counsel. Well, it is passing strange that the one piece of advice that Bill Neville gave to this minister, and that was advice to designate the Eaton's building as a heritage building, was rejected outright by this minister. So what counsel is he going to miss, Mr. Chair? That was his chair, his volunteer, who was endorsed by his Premier and his Government. They turned their backs on their volunteers and the people that they believe best represent the issues of heritage in the province of Manitoba. So the record needs to show that this minister has failed the very people that he put his trust in to represent him and his Government. We have not yet heard the

minister come clean on who, in fact, briefed the Premier (Mr. Doer) early in June on the recommendation that came from their volunteer council that they put in place.

Mr. Chair, I have grave concerns. I was the Minister responsible for Heritage in the province of Manitoba for five years. That was a significant commitment, and I got to know the staff over in the Historic Resources Branch quite well. We had many issues to deal with, and I have great respect and admiration. I want to tell you that they were fiercely committed to ensuring that the right thing was done, and they were strong advocates in support of preserving our history and our heritage. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chair, we hear the Member for Brandon West (Mr. Smith) ask what was tabled. I want to tell him that we never took a ball and demolished a heritage building as significant as the Eaton's building. So we did not have to table some made-up report, and this minister and this Premier (Mr. Doer) used the bureaucracy that supports our history and our heritage.

Mr. Chairperson, the bureaucracy in the Department of Culture has seen a sad day today when they were used in the manner that this Government and this Premier has used them, to put together a report that supports an announcement they had already made. They did not even consider waiting for their volunteers on the Heritage Council to make a recommendation on that building before they made an announcement. That decision was made. It was final. They turned their backs on the history and the heritage of our province.

Mr. Chair, the record needs to show that it was this Premier and this minister, this NDP government, who acted in a manner that is unprecedented in the province of Manitoba. I want to indicate again that this is indeed a sad time for Manitoba and for Manitobans. You know, I look at the minister and I know he is feeling under a lot of pressure, and I think he is feeling rather badly.

We have been asking him to clarify things for us and to give us some straight answers and to show responsibility and leadership for his ministry and his department. I am not so sure

that we can lay the blame solely on the minister's shoulders, because I do not believe that he has really had the opportunity to stand up and advocate like he may really want to do for our history and our heritage. I think that he has been directed and has been used by his Premier (Mr. Doer) to support something that he is torn between, because I really believe deep down that the Minister responsible for Heritage is an honourable man, and that when he signed and took on the responsibility to advocate for and to protect our heritage and our history in Manitoba, he was serious about the job that he was undertaking.

I believe, Mr. Chair, that he has been cut off at the knees by his Premier who already had made an announcement and had not even consulted his department, had not even asked his Minister responsible for Heritage whether there was a heritage issue, whether the building was evaluated by his department or by the volunteers that he appointed and signed his name to as Premier. So I believe that he went ahead prematurely, did not look across government departments to see what the outstanding issues were, because this Premier wanted a shrine built to him. He stepped on and manipulated his ministers, and they had no choice but to obey. I believe that the reason the minister is not answering the questions tonight is because he has been told that he had better not tell the truth and put the Premier's credibility on the line.

So I want to indicate again, that I am extremely disappointed. I believe that, maybe, the Minister responsible for Heritage in the province of Manitoba is feeling a little uncomfortable and a little manipulated by his Premier and by his leader. So with those comments, I know we are not going to get straight answers from the minister. The spin doctors have been working overtime, but I know that this is an issue that is not over. I know that there are many out in the community that are extremely concerned about the lack of integrity of this Government and the ramming through of this process.

When I was the Minister responsible for Heritage in the Province of Manitoba, there were heritage buildings downtown like the Metropolitan Theatre and the Capitol Theatre that had

been designated as historic sites and had been sitting empty for years and years and years. There was no use found for those buildings, but I did not bring forward a recommendation to demolish those buildings. When you are an advocate and when you have a responsibility to advocate on behalf of heritage in the province of Manitoba, you have to take that responsibility seriously.

Mr. Chair, I believe that this minister has failed, and has failed miserably in that respect, but I am not laying all the blame on his shoulders, because I believe that his Premier, his Leader has to share the responsibility with him and really should be standing up as the Leader and the Premier of this province of Manitoba, admitting that he made a mistake, admitting that he should slow this process down and show some respect for the history and the heritage of our province.

* (20:40)

Mr. Lemieux: Mr. Chairperson, let me get a couple of things on the record, and I will try to be brief. Just because the answers are not the ones that the Opposition wants to hear and they do not hear them, that does not mean that it is not the truth.

Let us make it absolutely clear that everything we have said here tonight and have said all along with regard to this project is absolutely the truth. We have been very forthright in tabling what we have. We have been very clear in following the process from start to finish.

I want to say, and the public of Manitoba should rest assured, that this Government is very concerned about heritage. We have Princess Street, where Red River community college is taking place. We have the University of Winnipeg. We have the Big 4 building, formerly the Ashdown building.

This Government is concerned about heritage. We will continue to be concerned about heritage in the week and months and years to come.

House Business

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there is

unanimous consent for the Committee of Supply to recess briefly to allow the Speaker to resume the Chair. The purpose is to seek consent of the House to have the House sit until 11 p.m.

Mr. Chairperson: Is there unanimous consent for the Committee of Supply to recess to allow the Speaker to resume the Chair? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would canvass the House to determine if there is leave not to see the clock until 11 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the House to continue to sit until 11 p.m.? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, please resume the Chair in Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Concurrence Motion (Continued)

Mr. Chairperson (Conrad Santos): We are resuming Committee of Supply.

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Chair, I want to come back to the Minister of Culture on a very important question because let us remember the scenario here. The 14th of May, the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Doer) makes a major announcement about what I am sure he will tout as the jewel in his achievements as Premier, announces the True North Centre to be built on the Eaton's site. Then around the 9th of June, the Manitoba Heritage Council, that little group of volunteers who are the public's bulwark against the destruction of our heritage buildings in our province, they make a recommendation that the Eaton's building should be considered for heritage building standards.

Now, we all know that if that is accepted and brought into fruition, if that happens, that the True North Project then is in trouble. Now,

what becomes very important here is how this Government reacted to the news. How did they handle this situation? The Government wants the public to somehow believe that the minister let due process take its course, that the report came through the department, the department reviewed it and made a recommendation that it not be accepted and that no one in the Government, not the Premier (Mr. Doer), not the Deputy Premier (Ms. Friesen), not any of the staff, not any of the planners, none of them were in the least concerned that the jewel of their announcements might come to be destroyed.

Now, if these officials had in their process recommended that this be a heritage site, the minister somehow would like us to believe that the Premier then would have come out publicly and said, well, you know, the True North Project is just going to have to move. We were a little premature. We were a little wrong, because our officials in the Heritage Council had recommended it be a heritage building, and we will just accept that because that is the process.

The minister is asking Manitobans to believe that the Premier of Manitoba, when he heard this news, just sat back and said, oh, well, I might be a little embarrassed, but I will not concern myself with it. The minister would like us to believe that, as a minister, oh, he would not be concerned with it. He would not tell his Premier. He would not raise it with the political spinners that maybe there was a little problem with their big announcement. Oh, we would just let our little officials go about their work, and if they recommend it, well, Mr. Premier, you will just have to go out in front of all the people of Manitoba and announce that a little mistake had been made and there would not be a downtown arena. We know the Opposition would not embarrass us in the House over it. We know that everyone would just go on.

Well, that is what the minister would like us to believe. I do not know how naïve the minister is, but this is becoming a fairly incredible story. Then the minister would have us believe that the report prepared by his officials in which he claims there was no concern expressed about how if the report of the Heritage Council was accepted the Premier's (Mr. Doer) big announcement would come tumbling down. He would

have us believe that this report that was done by them did not in any way take into consideration the politics of the Government or its embarrassment. He points to this report as just a wonderful document that made a decision that he can support.

Yet when we read this document we find out it is signed by the deputy minister, who is appointed by the Premier, who works for the Premier, who answers administratively to him and to Jim Eldridge, who is an honourable man, that no one, the minister would have us believe, in the Premier's Office, not Mr. Eldridge, not the Premier, no one spoke to Mr. Carson about how important this issue was to the Government. He would have us believe that.

But when we look at the report signed by Mr. Carson, does this report look at the structure of the building? Does this report tell us whether this building is about to come tumbling down or have a viability? No. Does this report tell us whether or not there was a real look to see if there were other people who would be interested if they knew the building was structurally sound? No, the report does not tell us that. Does the report give us an outline of the balance of the historical significance of the Eaton's building in western Canada, what other buildings would be like it, are there five or six other similar structures to represent that era? No, the report does not tell us that. Does the report tell us the value of that building to the film industry in Manitoba? No, it does not tell us that.

This report that the minister stakes his reputation on as a Heritage minister and as a minister of the Crown, what does it say? It says that on the 14th of May of this year the Government entered into an agreement to tear the building down and build an arena. That is what it tells us. It tells us that the City of Winnipeg wants an arena on that site. It tells us that the owner of the building, who is involved in the project, wants the project. It tells us that it has not looked at the condition of the building. It tells us that the announcement of the arena is so important that the Heritage Council really does not matter.

It does tell us something interesting, unlike this minister, who is trying to get us to believe

somehow this Eaton's building, really one of the unique structures of the last century, I mean, when we hear the reports from architects now who tell us how it was built, how it can be converted, how an atrium could be put in the middle, how it is a unique structure that is probably better built than most of our modern buildings in our capital cities today, the minister tries to downplay the value of that building, yet his own report does say that it has a medium to high heritage significance.

* (20:50)

But what is the recommendation? This report does no comparison of the historic significance of how many other buildings are like it in our city. This report does not look at whether the building is structurally sound. This report does not look at any other possible options and proponents of projects that could come forward if they knew it was structurally sound and if it was available for those projects. It does not look at any of those. All this report does is recognize the political reality that the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the City of Winnipeg have committed to tear the building down. That is what this report says.

So it recommends that we have to recognize the historical significance of the building after we have torn it down in the new building that the Premier has announced. This is the report that this minister has relied on. So what he is asking Manitobans to believe is that somehow no one in this administration was, firstly, concerned about the Heritage Council report and that, secondly, a right decision was made because the officials acknowledged that, because the Government had already committed to the arena project, well, we could not recommend this building to be saved, not because it did not have significant historical value, not because there were not others who might be interested in it, but because, quite frankly, the decision had already been made.

So that is what this minister is asking Manitobans to believe. Quite frankly, I think any thinking people do not believe that, cannot believe that. Members of the New Democratic Party caucus who really might have an interest in heritage should be very concerned about this process and this decision. I want to ask this

minister, he said in this Legislature, on the 28th of June, and I quote: I thank the member for the question. I just want to clarify something, that repeatedly I have said that I had not received any formal report, which is different from what he told the House earlier. He said he had a report of any kind. Now he admits he had an informal report. Well, it already brings into doubt this minister's statement to the House. He also says that certainly the Premier, and I quote: and I have said also that the council's recommendation, we heard about it shortly after the council's meeting.

This minister told this committee that it was his assistant who told him about this issue. I would like to ask him, since he told this House on the 28th of June that the Premier also knew about it, since he learned about it from his assistant informally, I would like to ask him how he knew how did the Premier know about it.

Mr. Lemieux: A lot has been made about the report and how the civil servants who prepared it are somehow inaccurate or somehow incompetent because of the report they presented to me. Now I want to tell you that this Government on this side never, never will attack the writings or advice or documents that have been written and drafted for us. It was a document that the department, a number of individuals, it has been commented on, that have spent a lot of time within that department, and the document that they gave through to the deputy minister to me certainly was a document, I believe, that they took a lot of time putting together for my consideration.

I know that, within the recommendations, they make a lot about the recommendations meaning nothing. In their recommendations, the historical cultural branch mentions that True North has established a Heritage Advisory committee to examine the ways of interpreting the history of the T. Eaton Company store and its Winnipeg operations. Interpretative exhibits can be an excellent means of recognizing the social and economic impact of the T. Eaton retail mail order business at less cost than full-scale preservation of the structure. So right there, Mr. Chairperson, they are giving me a recommendation to say that there are other ways to recognize the heritage qualities of Eaton's. You

do not have to keep the square building to recognize that.

Once again, I will repeat that this Government is committed to revitalization of the downtown and Winnipeg. We have committed ourselves to a number of different heritage projects. As the phoenix rises from its ashes, the True North Centre shall rise from the former Eaton's building breathing new life into the downtown of Manitoba.

I repeat that again, because we believe it. We know it is going to happen, and on that note, I just want to conclude by saying that the advisory council and all the work that it has done, there are many other projects and heritage buildings that lie ahead for consideration. We look forward to that, and we certainly have the utmost of confidence in the Heritage Council. Thank you.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Chairperson, we have asked this minister time and time again: How could he tell the House on the 28th of June, how could he refer to the fact that the Premier (Mr. Doer) knew about something, that he wants the House to believe he had only heard from his executive assistant? When we ask him how did he know the Premier knew, he will not answer. We ask him again; he will not answer. We ask him again; he will not answer. That failure to answer speaks volumes. It tells us this minister has something to hide, that this minister is not telling this House the whole truth.

You know something, Mr. Chair, we have an observation to make. We think that the Premier (Mr. Doer), when he heard about this, knew he had a problem. We do not know who did it, but we are sure that the instructions went to this minister's department to make sure this report was fixed, to make sure that the problem was fixed, to make sure that the heritage issue went away. You know what? Maybe this minister did not know. Maybe he is a patsy for this Government. Maybe he is the scapegoat. Maybe he is being held out to dry again by his Premier (Mr. Doer). Maybe he did not know because, quite frankly, his Premier's Office gave the instructions to his staff because he could not tell us with any certainty that no one from the Premier's Office had talked to staff. Maybe he

knows. Maybe he does not. But what is certain is there is a stink, a stink rising on this issue.

You know, if members opposite can sit and be a little smug about this—but do you know the difference, Mr. Chair, from the members opposite and their compatriots at City Hall? City Hall had a report from their advisory committee that said declare it a heritage building. But you know what the City Hall people did? They had the courage to accept the report, make it public and then reject it and accept the responsibility for that. What we have from this Government and what is painfully evident is they had the report. They hid it. They did not want it to be made public, and then they had to have it covered up and fixed because they did not have the courage to say, no, we reject the report.

What is shameful is the Member for Wolsley (Ms. Friesen), who served on The Forks board in another day as a citizen, who stood for heritage, who stood for access to the public, who left a legacy to the people of Manitoba through her work, today is a part of a sham to cover it up and to not stand up and even take responsibility for their decisions.

This is a government of spinners, of spineless individuals who will not stand for their decisions but blame it on their civil servants, of ministers who are forced to cover up the Premier (Mr. Doer). This group is despicable, and their time here will be short.

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): I would like to read from Hansard a couple of quotes from the Deputy Premier (Ms. Friesen). This is a quote from Hansard. I will quote the Deputy Premier: Again, I am really trying to look at the role that the Province and the City are taking in long-range planning for heritage buildings, particularly in view, it goes on to say, of the need to reserve the buildings so that we can at least plan for them 10 years down the line.

* (21:00)

Another question that she asked the minister when she was in Opposition, and I quote again from Hansard: Does the minister have any plans for provincial initiative here in the sense that empty buildings can be used by expanding or

new government departments? Do you have any plans to use the existing heritage stock in that way, any long-term plans through Government Services, or in conjunction with?

Mr. Chairman, this is the Deputy Premier when she was in opposition. At that time, she was a strong advocate for heritage restoration, for the adaptive re-use of heritage buildings. At that point in time, when she was in opposition, she was a strong advocate for adherence to Plan Winnipeg.

As I mentioned to her yesterday, given her background with The Forks, given her knowledge of history, particularly with regard to the fur trade and the historical importance that Eaton's has played in developing western Canada and, in particular, the fact that the store we have on Portage Avenue is the third store built by the T. Eaton Company and, certainly, one of the most magnificent ones in all of Canada, given that that was her position in opposition, I fail to understand why today when she is in government responsible for overseeing Plan Winnipeg in her role as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs—could the minister explain to the people of Manitoba, could the minister explain to the people she worked with or she served with on the board of The Forks, to the people who worked with her in a consultative manner in the development of The Forks, which has taken place over a long period of time, does she have any plausible explanation for why she is sitting idly by while her Government and her Premier (Mr. Doer), in particular, is in such a rush to destroy a building of tremendous historical significance in the city of Winnipeg?

Why is her Government unwilling to stop the process, to consult with the public, to look seriously at adaptive re-use of that significant structure, to do what she said she would do when she was in opposition, and that is to look seriously at ways to preserve buildings, even if it takes at least 10 years, because at that point in opposition, she stood on her principles? At that point, she wanted empty buildings, particularly those of historical value, to be filled by expanding or by creating new government departments, and she wanted to take time to see that that happened.

Why, less than 18 months after she was elected to office, did she give up on the Eaton's site, on the Eaton's building, after only six months? Because it was a year ago, a year ago in March, that the building, with the Premier's consent, was put up as a sacrificial lamb for his ego because his ego wanted him to have a new downtown arena.

What has changed her mind and what reason can she give to the people of Manitoba for changing her principled approach which she espoused while in opposition as to the value of heritage buildings in the city of Winnipeg? Why is she sitting idly by now and is unwilling to stand behind her principles and to force her Government to stop with this mad rush to destroy that building and consult in a positive way with the citizens of this province and particularly of the city of Winnipeg, so that we can end up in a win-win situation where we not only preserve the history and the legacy and the value of that heritage building, and just, by-the-by, we also preserve an opportunity to garner what has been estimated at about \$5 million a year in taxes?

I should not have to remind the Deputy Premier (Ms. Friesen) that at one point in the history of this province and of this great city, that land on Portage Avenue where the Eaton's building sits paid the highest taxes in all of Canada for the privilege of occupying that site. Now her Government is rushing ahead to pass quickly, to change the regulations so that site can be taxed at 10 percent—and it is in the term sheet—of its value. So, economically, it does not make sense, but economics should not drive this situation. It should form a part, and hopefully the Finance Minister (Mr. Selinger) will look into that.

I want to ask this minister when she will do the right thing, stand by her principles and stand up and fight her Premier (Mr. Doer) to save this site and ensure that not only do the citizens of this city end up with a brand-new entertainment complex, one that they can be proud of that is sitting on a site that is big enough for it, but also we will have pride in the fact that we were able to adapt that great building on Portage Avenue and use it for another 50 years. Does the minister have an answer?

Hon. Jean Friesen (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Chairperson, it was rather a long introduction to a question.

My department is responsible for, the member referred to it as the overseeing of the city of Winnipeg. I do not think that is the way the City of Winnipeg sees it.

An Honourable Member: Plan Winnipeg, he says.

Ms. Friesen: Oh, sorry, Plan Winnipeg. Responsible for the overseeing of Plan Winnipeg does sound better.

I think the member has looked at Plan Winnipeg. I think he had some active participation in that, at least one section of that, CentrePlan. As the member is aware, Plan Winnipeg, as it exists at the moment, and presumably as it will in the future, has a number of roles and responsibilities for the city and for planning. Some of those deal with heritage resources. Some of them deal with business resources. Some of them deal with, one might say, population and regional resources. There are a number of requirements in Plan Winnipeg for the city to develop sub-plans for particular areas of which CentrePlan was one and out of that have come a number of interesting opportunities, I think, such as CentreVenture.

Plan Winnipeg suggests that the city must encourage tourist facilities and services. That it should encourage activity on downtown streets by supporting appropriate mixed land use developments. Plan Winnipeg also suggests that a healthy downtown requires a commitment and a vision for all of downtown of which heritage resources are a part, and, of course, of which regional resources are a part, too, in the development of Winnipeg as a regional centre, whether it might be in recreation or whether it might be in tourism or whether it might be in a number of other areas as a service centre, for example, or at the airport or in a resource for environmental services. I think the City of Winnipeg has an interest in that as well.

So Plan Winnipeg has a number of requirements, guidelines, suggestions and directions for the city. It is adopted by the city, and it becomes

a by-law and something that the city and council and its committees and staff and citizens refer to frequently in some cases and perhaps less frequently in others from time to time.

* (21:10)

So I think the member, and this is the context I would put his question into, should be aware that any city, any local authority, and, in fact, when The Heritage Act was adapted to encourage local designation and local consideration of historic resources, it was, I think, something that most Manitobans welcomed. They welcomed the opportunity for local citizens to be involved in the designation of heritage; both buildings and sites, and landscapes and streetscapes. I think The Manitoba Heritage Act, while not unique in that sense, was certainly an act which made a very strong attempt, Mr. Chair, and I think it has been quite successful in some areas, to create local heritage committees.

I spoke in the House today, when the member made some comments and perhaps a question, about my own particular interest in history, and I tried to ensure him that I strongly believe that history was a very democratic process. It is not a highly technical field. It is not a field I think that seeks to exclude people. I know most academic disciplines do not, but sometimes by their very nature, or a narrow audience, they do exclude, but history seeks to include. It seeks to draw people to their past, to reflect upon their past, and to think about the connection between past generations and present generations. That, at least, would be a western, and I mean that in the sense of western European version of history.

There are, of course, many other kinds of histories. There are some histories which depend upon interpretation of different kinds of science, perhaps more oral history, rather than written record. Western European history, that it is the kind of academic history that we have inherited in this country, although that is changing. We are certainly seeing a great deal more use of material history such as one might find in parts of Ontario and Québec, or oral history such as we might find in parts of northern Manitoba or indeed in some of the communities in the rural

part of Manitoba. Oral history plays a very important part in the development of heritage.

So I caution the member in suggesting that history is something which is specialized. It is not. Nor is it something which depends just upon buildings. I know the member did not mean to suggest that. He is focusing on buildings, but what I wanted to give him a sense of was that history is much broader than a single piece of evidence, and that it does depend upon an interpretation of so many different elements of our past. That, perhaps, is the only specialized training that one would claim to have, or to have been fortunate to have been offered, and that is the ability to look at different types of evidence. Certainly, if one were to look at heritage resources in Manitoba, you will find that some of them are preserved in archives.

I suppose that one of the greatest and most internationally renowned of Manitoba's heritage resources is the Hudson's Bay Company Archives. The Hudson's Bay Company Archives, 300 years of records, some of the most interesting records, I think, that are held in Canada. We are very proud in Manitoba to be the home of the Hudson's Bay Company Archives and, in fact, very grateful to the kind of assistance that the Hudson's Bay Company has given to the province of Manitoba, not just in bringing the archives here, which they did in the 1970s but also in providing the funding to promote those archives, to preserve them. That is an important heritage resource, I think, which all Manitobans recognize.

You know, the Hudson's Bay Company has gone beyond that. In recent years, I must admit I do forget the date, one thing you do find is that historians perhaps think more in terms of decades and generations than specific dates, but, nevertheless, the Hudson's Bay Company has provided additional resources to the Museum of Man and Nature, for example, which was the beneficiary not of the archives but of the Hudson's Bay Company ship itself. That was a very important and a most highly attractive addition to the Museum of Manitoba, as it is now called.

I think we are all very proud, too, of the Museum of Manitoba, which in part through its

access to Hudson's Bay Company collections has been given a three star by the Michelin Guide, something I think is very important to tourism and heritage tourism of Manitoba, that unique, unique historical resource, one element of our heritage which I think Manitobans are very grateful to the Hudson's Bay Company for and have undertaken under successive governments. I do not want to say that this is our Government, although indeed it was under Premier Schreyer that the Hudson's Bay Company Archives were first generated.

Now, Mr. Chairperson, the—*[interjection]* Pardon? I am only just beginning. We are talking about archival resources here.

I might want to talk about oral histories and the oral histories that have been done. Oral history I think is something again that the provincial archives have played a very great role in. It did some very fascinating interviews with I think newly arrived immigrant communities. I think those will be very valuable in the future. I know that there are some oral histories that are being conducted at the moment by the rural archives and indeed that many small, local museum societies see that oral history is a very, very significant part and something that is quite often lost. Oral history, expensive as it is to do, is an area that is often lost to us.

Oral history, architectural history, costume history, for example, material history, Manitoba—I do not know if many members have been to the Dugald Costume Museum. I do not know if they have the MLA for that area in here. But the Dugald Costume Museum, again, is one of those hidden heritage jewels of Manitoba. It is a national museum. It was one of the beneficiaries, and let me pay tribute to the federal government, of the federal, I have forgotten the word now, but the program indeed that began when Mr. Pelletier was the minister, a program of diffusion, that is what it was, diffusion and dissemination of Canada's heritage.

The Costume Museum was begun by a very active, able and a very talented woman. Well, perhaps the Member for Springfield (Mr. Schuler) knew her. I think she has since passed away, but her legacy lives on in a national museum, which I think is, bar none, one of the

most innovative museums and which has collected together the material costume history of Manitoba. I believe that this has been supported by all governments. So, when we think of heritage and when the member wants to talk about heritage, I just wanted to suggest to him that this was a very broad field and that heritage does not just exist in buildings, although it does in part, but it does exist in so many parts, in our memory, in our oral history, in our material culture, in our museum culture as well as, of course, in our written history.

* (21:20)

Mr. Loewen: Well, it is unfortunate that the minister does not want to address the real issue which is the need to find an adaptive re-use for the Eaton's building which has a great deal of history of all sorts associated with it. But it is also encouraging that today she wants to talk about Plan Winnipeg, when yesterday she did not want to have anything to do with it.

She has quoted the number of areas in Plan Winnipeg that she has used to support her stance for a quick tear-down of the Eaton's site. I would just like to put a few on the record, too, because Plan Winnipeg does speak at length about putting downtown first and encouraging and supporting the adaptive re-use of heritage buildings and the location of government offices and staff in the downtown.

All of these could be applied to adaptive re-use of the Eaton's building: Ensuring its zoning and building by-laws and its administrative procedures support the concept of mixed land use and compact urban form in the downtown which certainly does not apply to the construction of the building on the site she is talking about; providing incentives such as heritage tax credit programs; building code equivalencies for heritage buildings and mixed-use zoning that encourage the provision of housing, including warehouse conversions and new construction throughout downtown; encouraging mixed-use residential development that integrates retail, service, business and institutions needed by downtown residents which certainly could apply to the Eaton's building; supporting the creation of pedestrian-friendly downtown environments—she wants to close the road, put overhangs over

it, enclose the sidewalks; encourage more pedestrian activity; encouraging compliance with design principles, these and many more; ensuring that all projects for which it is responsible reflect exemplary urban design and maintenance, which this new building will not do.

There are many, many more. In fact, it has been identified that there are over 20 principles of Plan Winnipeg that this minister is condoning the breaking of in her desire to support her Premier's (Mr. Doer) ego in his need to construct in a very hurried fashion a new edifice for himself in downtown Winnipeg.

But time moves on and I know we have other business, so I would really, I guess, like to ask the Deputy Premier if she really believes that passing a bill in this House that will see pubs open on Sunday, particularly those in downtown Winnipeg that are rather notorious in their reputation, like the St. Regis, the Garrick Hotel and perhaps even one she may be more familiar with in her constituency on Sherbrook, the Sherbrook Inn, does she really feel that having these pubs open on Sundays, as her Government is promoting in this House, is going to be positive either for her constituency or for downtown?

Ms. Friesen: I think these questions are generally appropriate for a different minister, but I can, from a municipal perspective, which is my responsibility, indicate to the member I think as I have done at all the AMM meetings at which I have spoken that this new proposal before the Legislature is one for which there is the opportunity for every municipality to opt out. I have drawn that to their attention. I have been very open and said that that may well be a concern in some municipalities. So that was done.

Mr. Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: The question before the committee is the motion moved by the honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Mackintosh) that the Committee of Supply

concur in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2002, which have been adopted at this session by the three sections of the Committee of Supply sitting separately and by the full committee.

Shall the motion pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: Those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: The Yeas have it.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mr. Conrad Santos (Chairperson): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a motion regarding concurrence in Supply, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Member for Wellington (Mr. Santos), seconded by the honourable Member for Transcona, that the report of the committee be received. Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

* * *

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), that this House concur in the report of the Committee of Supply respecting concurrence and all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2002.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), that the House resolve into the Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to.

* (21:30)

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

Capital Supply

Mr. Chairperson (Conrad Santos): The Committee of Ways and Means will come to order, please. We have before us for our consideration the resolution respecting Capital Supply. The resolution for Capital Supply reads as follows:

RESOLVED that towards making good certain sums of money for Capital purposes, the sum of \$342,950,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Shall the resolution pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing the resolution, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the resolution is accordingly passed.

Main Supply

Mr. Chairperson: We also have before us for our consideration the resolutions respecting the Main Supply bill.

The first resolution for Main Supply reads as follows:

RESOLVED that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 2002, the sum of \$6,349,180,600 as set forth in

Schedule A (Operating Expenditures) be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Shall the resolution pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: Those in favour of passing the resolution, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: Those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In the Chair's opinion, the resolution is accordingly passed.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: The second resolution for Main Supply reads as follows:

RESOLVED that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 2002, the sum of \$58 million as set out in Schedule B (Capital Investments) be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Shall the resolution pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: Those in favour of the passing the resolution, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Mr. Chairperson: Those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In the Chair's opinion, the Yeas have it.

The resolution is accordingly passed.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mr. Conrad Santos (Chairperson): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted a resolution regarding Capital Supply and two resolutions regarding Main Supply, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 45—The Appropriation Act, 2001

Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move that leave be given to introduce Bill 45, The Appropriation Act, 2001; Loi de 2001 portant affectation de crédits, and that the same now be received, read a first time and be ordered for a second reading immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave to move the motion? [*Agreed*]

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 45—The Appropriation Act, 2001

Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance): I move that Bill 45, The Appropriation Act, 2001; Loi de 2001 portant affectation de crédits, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House, and that is seconded by the Attorney General (Mr. Mackintosh).

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement for leave to move the motion? [*Agreed*]

Motion agreed to.

* (21:40)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 44—The Loan Act, 2001

Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney General (Mr. Mackintosh), that leave be given to introduce Bill 44, The Loan Act, 2001; Loi d'emprunt de 2001, and that the same now be received, read a first time and be ordered for second reading immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to move the motion? [*Agreed*]

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 44—The Loan Act, 2001

Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney General (Mr. Mackintosh), that Bill 44, The Loan Act, 2001; Loi d'emprunt de 2001, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to move the motion? [*Agreed*]

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bill 47 on the Order Paper under debate on second readings?

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 47—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001

Mr. Speaker: To resume debate on second readings, Bill 47, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen).

Is there leave for the bill to remain standing in the honourable Member for Fort Whyte's name?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been denied.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is second reading of Bill 47, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

* * *

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bill 44, The Loan Act, 2001; Bill 45, The Appropriation Act, 2001; and Bill 47, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001, for concurrence and third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Government House Leader have leave to make the motion? *[Agreed]*

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairperson (Conrad Santos): The Committee of the Whole will come to order to consider Bill 44, The Loan Act, 2001; Bill 45, The Appropriation Act, 2001; and Bill 47, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001.

Bill 44—The Loan Act, 2001

Mr. Chairperson: We shall proceed to consider Bill 44, clause by clause.

Shall Clause 1 be passed?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: No? The 140 hours have expired; therefore, this is no longer debatable.

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3(1)—pass; clause 3(2)—pass; clause 3(3)—pass; clause 3(4)—pass; clause 4(1)—pass; clause 4(2)—pass; clause 4(3)—pass; clause 5(1)—pass; clause 5(2)—pass; clause 6—pass; clause 7—pass; clause 8—pass; schedule A—pass; schedule B—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Bill 45—The Appropriation Act, 2001

Mr. Chairperson: Next we shall consider Bill 45, clause by clause. Clause 1.

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Chair, I was just wondering if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) could inform the House, I just want to make sure that there is no money in this bill or within the Budget that is going to go towards a footbridge in St. Boniface.

Mr. Chairperson: The bill is no longer debatable, but the Opposition had—

Mr. Laurendeau: This is Bill 47.

An Honourable Member: That is another bill.

Mr. Chairperson: We are on 45.

Mr. Laurendeau: I will ask you on 47.

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clause 5—pass; clause 6—pass; schedule A—pass; schedule B—pass; preamble—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

* (21:50)

Bill 47—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001

Mr. Chairperson: We shall now proceed to consider Bill 47, clause by clause. Clause 1. This one is debatable.

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Chair, I think the Minister of

Finance heard my question the first time, but I might repeat it. I would just like to make sure from the Minister of Finance that there is no money in this year's Budget for a footbridge over to St. Boniface from The Forks.

Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance): As the member knows, there is money in the Budget for the federal, provincial, municipal Infrastructure Program, the details of which are in the jurisdiction of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen), who is actively in negotiations with other levels of government as to the appropriate priorities for that envelope.

Mr. Laurendeau: Mr. Chair, seeing as the Minister of Finance sits on Treasury Board and controls these expenditures, we want to make sure that he is firmly opposed to such a construction. We are wondering if he will put his position forward for the House.

Mr. Selinger: I will be supporting policy decisions and negotiations as entered into by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen) that work in the best interests of all Manitobans.

Mr. Laurendeau: I can see that this minister has taken dancing lessons or skating lessons from the Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mr. Lemieux). [*interjection*] Not heritage anymore, it is demolition now.

Mr. Chair, I was wondering if the Minister of Finance could tell us: These monies that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs will be dishing out, will they not be going through Treasury Board where this minister sits?

Mr. Selinger: There are, as you know, delegated authorities to all ministers. Depending on the size and scale of the project, some will be going through the Treasury Board process. Other projects, depending on their size and scale, will be within the jurisdiction and delegated authority of the minister responsible.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: A point of order being raised, the honourable Member for Lakeside.

Mr. Harry Enns (Lakeside): Mr. Chairperson, I think my House Leader is ragging the puck.

Mr. Chairperson: On the point of order, a dispute over the facts as to seniority is not a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Laurendeau: To the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), I wonder if he could tell me what that discretionary level is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen).

Mr. Selinger: Subject to confirmation with my officials, I believe that the discretionary authority is up to a half a million dollars for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Laurendeau: So the minister has just confirmed that her discretionary amount will not cover the amount required to build his footbridge into St. Boniface.

So, Mr. Chair, seeing as the footbridge, the share of the provincial government will be \$5 million, and it is over the minister's ability to fund, will the minister please put forward his position on whether he will be supporting this initiative when it reaches the Treasury table?

Mr. Selinger: As the member knows, those hypothetical questions are not technically in order, according to the rules of this House, but, once again, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen) will do her usual splendid job of negotiating with other levels of government, bring forward recommendations which, of course, will be discussed at Treasury Board in Cabinet, and a proper and appropriate decision will be made and publicized as that time arrives.

Mr. Laurendeau: I was wondering if the member could tell me when he expects this footbridge to be constructed.

Mr. Selinger: Once again, Mr. Chair, that is a hypothetical question relating to a hypothetical decision which has not yet been made.

Mr. Laurendeau: We have learned that "hypothetical" is not a word around this Government. We have seen what happens when they do their deals behind closed doors, when they are able to rip down heritage buildings, Mr.

Chair, and destroy our history from the past with their backroom dealing.

We are just trying to make sure that this minister does not cut some backroom deal with Mr. Duhamel, who is insisting on having this bridge built. We want to make sure that this minister does not have his arm twisted and forced to support a project that I am sure he does not truly support because he would much better see these allocations of dollars going into flood-proofing for the city of Winnipeg, but I will leave it at that.

Mr. Chairperson: Is it the wish of the committee that we proceed in blocks of clauses? *[Agreed]*

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 through 5—pass; clauses 6 through 8—pass; clause 9—pass; clause 10—pass; clause 11 through subclauses 14(1)—pass; subclause 14(2)—pass; subclauses 15(1) through 17(2)—pass; subclauses 17(3) through 18(2)—pass; clauses 19 through subclauses 21(3)—pass; subclauses 21(4) through 25(1)—pass; clause 25(2)—pass; subclauses 25(3) through clause 28—pass; clauses 29 through 31—pass; clauses 32 to subclause 34(1)—pass; subclauses 34(2) to 35(3)—pass; subclauses 35(4) through 36(2)—pass; subclauses 36(3) through 37(2)—pass; subclauses 37(3) through clause 39—pass; clauses 40 and 41 on page 24 of the bill—pass; clauses 42 to subclause 43(4)—pass; subclauses 43(5) through 43(11)—pass; enacting clause—pass; table of contents—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

* (22:00)

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mr. Conrad Santos (Chairperson): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 44, The Loan Act, 2001; Bill 45, The Appropriation Act, 2001; Bill 47, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001, has directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), that the

report of the Committee of the Whole be received.

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 44—The Loan Act, 2001

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), by leave, that Bill 44, The Loan Act, 2001, as reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

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

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Bill 45—The Appropriation Act, 2001

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), by leave, that Bill 45, The Appropriation Act, 2001, as reported from

the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

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

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Bill 47—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), by leave, that Bill 47, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001, as reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave? *[Agreed]*

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the following bills: 24, 28, 31, 32, 38 and 25.

Mr. Speaker, would you canvass the House to determine if there is leave not to see the clock until 12 midnight.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement to not see the clock until twelve o'clock? *[Agreed]*

DEBATE ON CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 24—The Liquor Control Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: To resume debate on concurrence and third reading of Bill 24, The Liquor Control Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. Norbert.

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, all too often, we see where this Government is moving ahead. I attempted at the committee to move amendments to this bill which would have made it acceptable, but this minister saw fit to dispose of those amendments. I will not be supporting this bill.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose Bill 24. I believe it is wrong for the Government to extend the hours of liquor services, while decreasing the hours for health care services in Bill 25. I believe that it is a shame and wrong for this Government to be extending access to alcohol, at the same time as they are decreasing access to surgical services by cutting off and eliminating virtually the access to surgical services and surgical centres and clinics in the evenings. So I oppose this bill, given the direction that this Government seems to be going.

It is a government that seems to want half-time health care but full-time alcohol and, I believe, that is the wrong direction this province should be going. I would say, as well, that there is another issue which is important and that is, that this Government, in bringing in this bill and extending the hours for alcohol, is also, at the same time, doing very little to address the real issue of fetal alcohol syndrome. There is a lack of balance in the approach that this Government is taking in terms of extending alcohol, but doing very little in the other direction to address a very important health issue in this province and that is, the issue of fetal alcohol syndrome. So I will oppose this bill, Mr. Speaker.

* (22:10)

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to sit through committee hearings on Bill 24 and listen to members of the public, specifically one Gary Kowalski, who made a very compelling presentation, and I want to indicate very clearly that I will not be supporting relaxing the serving of alcohol on Sundays. That is exactly what this bill does.

We heard very much the stories about some of the activities that happen that are associated with alcohol that are not socially acceptable. We heard about some of the negative impacts that serving alcohol on Sunday or being able to buy alcohol on Sunday in our province could have on many that are disadvantaged within our society. We heard about the vulnerable people that live in some of our communities that have issues and problems with alcohol and alcohol consumption. We heard also that Sundays are very often a day

of rest for those that work within our health care system, in the emergency rooms of the Health Sciences Centre, for instance, where the issues that are related to drinking that take people in to use our health care system are very negative and that, in fact, Sunday does give those in the emergency department a much-needed breather, an ability to take a bit of a rest from some of the issues that they deal with on a day-to-day basis.

We also heard, Mr. Speaker, that the emergency services, vehicles and personnel get a much-needed break on Sundays, as a result of alcohol vendors and beverage rooms not being open. We heard very compelling evidence that the incidence of domestic abuse is somewhat lessened as a result of Sundays being a bit of a day of rest for the sale and consumption of alcohol. I was very impressed with the work that has been done in bringing forward the issues that were brought forward by Gary Kowalski, and I saw all members of the committee on both sides of the House listen very intently to the comments that he did make.

You know, I went home, before we went clause by clause, very troubled and really had to do some soul searching about whether this was the kind of direction I believed our Government should be taking and whether it was the kind of direction that I could support. I came to the conclusion very quickly that it was not a direction that I wanted to go.

As the minister of Family Services for six years in the province of Manitoba, I saw the needs within our community for some of the most vulnerable and some of the most disadvantaged, whether they be those that were victims of domestic violence that we had to provide supports and services for, whether they were those supports that needed to be provided for infants born with fetal alcohol syndrome, and we attempted to develop the programs after the fact to deal with the issues, but I believe that the social harm that Sunday openings and increased sales and availability of alcohol will do nothing to enhance our Manitoba community. Therefore, I cannot support this bill.

One other compelling reason that I am not in favour of this legislation is because I asked the minister responsible for alcohol in the province

of Manitoba whether, in fact, he had sat down and talked to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) and asked the Minister of Justice what the additional cost in his budget would be for the additional police services that would be needed on Sunday as a result of the liberalization, or the opening up of vendors and beverage rooms on Sundays. The minister responsible had not even consulted with the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister responsible whether he had consulted with the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) to see what the implications on the health care system—a system where we are already short over 1100 nurses, where the nurses in the emergency room at the Health Sciences Centre are burdened with very significant issues. I asked whether he had talked to the Minister of Health and asked him what the increased budget for the Department of Health would be, to ensure that the emergency room at the Health Sciences Centre was staffed up to meet the increasing needs that Sunday openings of alcohol would require. The minister had not consulted with the Minister of Health.

I asked the minister whether he had talked to the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Sale) because, very often with irresponsible consumption of alcohol, comes an increased incidence in domestic violence. I asked whether the minister had consulted to find out from his colleague what increased resources would be required in his department to provide for the services that would be required for those that drink irresponsibly. The minister could not answer that question. He had not talked to his colleague.

So what research was done by this Government to look at what the cost implications would be on the government departments that I have talked about, and what would the social impacts be on our community? Mr. Speaker, is there really a necessity to have wide-open liquor sales and consumption seven days a week, rather than six days a week?

I would suggest that this is a government that is moving down a slippery slope, because alcohol sales and consumption on Sunday will lead to the expansion of gambling on Sunday. This is the slippery slope that this Government is

moving down. It is the first step towards wide-open alcohol sales and, I might suggest, the opening of our video lottery terminals. This is the first step, and I am afraid that what we are seeing is a government that is determined to ensure that those that are most disadvantaged within our communities are going to have access to the very things that they do not need additional access to. So I want to indicate that I am very disappointed that we see a government moving in this direction.

I would hope that some members on the Government side of the House would think very carefully about exactly what they are doing when they stand up and support this legislation. There is absolutely no need to move forward in this direction, and I want to indicate very clearly that I will not be supporting the liberalization and the expansion of alcohol sales on Sundays in the province of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (22:20)

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I, too, just want to put on the record that I will not be supporting this bill.

This past weekend, we celebrated July 1, and I saw a bar open in my constituency. I was shocked that it was open. I thought perhaps I had missed something at this Legislature and that it had passed in the dark of the night, and I missed it. So I stopped, and I went in. I asked to speak to the owner. I went up to him, and I said: Is the new law in place that will allow you to be open on Sunday? He said, no, we do it by special permit. He said we have done it for the last several years by special permit. It dawned on me that we do not need to open a bar seven days of the week, on a Sunday; they are by special permit on special occasions. The Government's argument for bringing this forward was that it was going to be forward thinking and for tourism. I say to you it can be dealt with in a different way.

I would ask all you members on the other side if you went home and spoke to your families and asked them if they thought it was a good thing. If you can stand up here tonight and vote for this and vote for this with your hearts

and tell me that your family said to you, yes, I think this is a good thing for all Manitobans, this is the right thing for all Manitobans and, if you can stand up and actually vote and support a bill like this—*[interjection]*

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable Member for Seine River, on a point of order?

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am experiencing difficulty hearing the honourable Member for Turtle Mountain with his comments on this bill.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask all honourable members that are carrying on conversation to please do so in the loge or out in the hallway because it is very difficult to hear the honourable member speaking. I thank the honourable Member for Seine River.

* * *

Mr. Tweed: Mr. Speaker, as I said, my comments will be brief, but I do challenge members to speak to their families and see if this is a matter of importance to a government that they would stand and support this and if you can tell me that your family said to you it is the right thing when we see so much devastation created by this problem and extending it.

You know, we talk about trying to create opportunities in downtown Winnipeg. Do you think that bars in downtown Winnipeg are the ideal situation that we want to present to the people and the public coming into our province? I think not. So I ask you to consider it.

I agree with the Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson), and I am not going to say it is going to be the Government, but you are going to get extreme pressure from the liquor industry and from the alcohol industry and the people that supply these types of services saying, well, you know, we have taken the first step. We have started introducing alcohol on Sundays, probably to a lot of families that do not need it and to a lot of people that probably should not be anywhere near it. The next level of pressure is going to be coming into the gambling because they are going

to suggest to you that we just cannot make it on the alcohol sales anymore, and we need a little more revenue. The pressure is going to be put on governments to increase the gambling side of it.

I do not think we want to be seen as a province doing that to our population and to the people that we represent. We of the Legislature of this province, are the lawmakers of this province, and we are heading down a path of destruction and devastation, I believe, in our communities by allowing this huge access to alcohol and to consumption.

I am not a believer in government being Big Brother over people. All I am saying is: In your consciences and in your hearts, do you believe this is the right thing to do? I will be voting against this bill. I spoke to my family, and they said this is not what people in Manitoba need. This is not what we need to increase our tourism. This is not a good thing for Manitoba. So I would urge all members to look deep inside their hearts and their souls and stand and vote their consciences on this bill, because it is not a bill that is going to defeat the Government, but it may be a bill that shows that this province can stand up sometimes for the right things, for the right reasons, and not just do it because somebody else is doing it and somebody else suggested that it was a great idea. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): I will put some brief comments on the record in regard to Bill 24. It is not a bill that I can support in its current form. The Sunday opening is clearly a concern in the downtown area. Some areas are very disadvantaged. Our police have warned us. In fact, I drive through some of the areas that were addressed by officers who spoke to the committee. I drive through these areas, especially if we work late here, or if I am out and I drive through them.

You know what? Every time I drive through, it just hurts my heart when I see they are lying on sidewalks. We are stopped at a red light. We have seen them where they are fighting each other. Each one of these people could be a father or a mother, a son or a daughter, a wife, husband; it is a relative; it is a loved one. These are human beings, certainly, loved by somebody,

who have gotten themselves into a certain state. Perhaps, in a very small way, what we can do for the family is at least have one day where that member does not go out and, perhaps, go too far in the drinking of their alcohol.

I look at them. As I say, we drive through those areas. I think that was actually somebody's child once. That was somebody's dream. They raised them. It was their love. It was their future, and they look at them. These are the people that are stumbling out of the bars. Do we really have to give them one more opportunity? Is that really what we want to do? Is that really what this bill wanted to address? It was supposed to be for tourist areas.

I mean, if there were certain things that were supposed to be addressed, then why did we not address those areas? Instead, we inflict more on those people who turn to alcohol, perhaps to drown their sorrows, to try to escape the kind of life, perhaps, that they are in. We put extra pressure on our police forces. We put extra pressure on our health system, and you know what, I just cannot in good conscience support this bill.

I think there were probably some good intentions when it started out. Certainly, we had talked about amending some of the things that were particularly troublesome to us, but I, again, tonight, will drive through that area and, again, I will see things. I hope we do not drive through those areas and stop looking. I hope we do not drive through those areas and start ignoring those people. We should drive through those areas. I mean, those are human beings and that certainly has to affect our hearts.

You know what, Mr. Speaker? I am sorry, but Bill 24 is not one bill that I can support.

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): I am opposed to this bill. I think it is appalling that this Government would take this step and find it necessary to open pubs and liquor vendors, beer vendors and liquor stores on Sunday. There is no need for it. There is nothing positive that will come out of it. It is particularly galling that this Government, which repeatedly wants to speak out of all four sides of its mouth, comes to this House with this type of legislation. This is a

government, the NDP party that wants to tell people all the time: Well, we stand for families. We are there for the little people. Well, who are you hurting with this bill? You are hurting those families. You are hurting the little people.

You are opening pubs, and what are you saying to people, to families? You are saying to families: Take your children to the lake on Sundays. Take them out to the beach; have a great day. By the way, leave them at the beach and go to the pub; come back and pick them up and drive them home. That is what this Government is saying. I should not be surprised because this Government is saying the same thing about gambling. You know, take the kids down to the new arena, take them down to the hockey game, drop them off and go play the VLTs, and then pick them up at the end of the game. That is what this Government is standing for.

This Government talks about the need to have convenience. They talk about what if somebody drops over on Sunday and you want to entertain them and you do not have any liquor. Well, the liquor stores are open now, so you can go down and get liquor and entertain them properly. Why do you need to have liquor to entertain? What happened to the days when somebody could just drop over and have a visit and not need to have alcohol? Those are the values we should be looking at.

* (22:30)

What is behind this bill? I think what is really behind this bill is this Government's addiction to revenue from gambling, because they know, and the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Smith) who is responsible for this bill, knows full well that most of the pubs are not going to open on Sundays because there is not the volume without the VLTs. So the next step is: Gee, we cannot be competitive unless we have VLTs. That is the road that we are heading down.

This is a government that wants to stand up and brag about all they are doing for downtown revitalization. Well, not only are they philosophically way off track, not only are they wrong in their implementation of their strategy

for downtown revitalization, but then they present a bill to this House which flies directly in the face of downtown revitalization, and flies directly in the face of the redevelopment of our urban areas and the core of the city that need it most. I believe there must be a number of members on the opposite side of the House that are very dissatisfied with this bill. I hope they will take the opportunity to stand up, say their piece and vote with their conscience, because they know in their hearts that this bill is wrong. They know that the premise is wrong. They know philosophically that this bill is wrong.

We do not need to have pubs open on Sundays. We do not need beer vendors open on Sundays. We do not need liquor stores open on Sundays. For 20 years I worked in a restored heritage building in downtown Winnipeg, which happened to be located across the back lane from the St. Regis Hotel in-between the Garrick Hotel on Garry. I have seen the damage and destruction that goes on in our inner city as a result of overservice in these facilities, and there is nothing that the Liquor Control Commission will do on regular hours, Monday to Saturday, and there is nothing they will do about overservice on Sundays.

Members opposite know this and yet they try to stand up and tell this House that they will do something about overservice. That will do nothing to revitalize downtown. It will ensure that those neighbourhoods are less safe than they are today. They will ensure that fewer and fewer people visit our downtown and want to come downtown, and this Government knows that.

They also know the neighbourhoods in our city that need revitalization, and the Wolseley neighbourhood is a good one. What good is it going to be to the Wolseley neighbourhood to have the Sherbrook Inn pub open on a Sunday afternoon? I mean, give our heads a shake. How ludicrous is that? What good is it going to be to have the Westbrook pub open on a Sunday afternoon in the core of Winnipeg? What is that going to do for safety and for revitalization of those neighbourhoods? Nothing. It is just going to drive it down and down. *[interjection]*

Say it. The Minister of Family Services (Mr. Sale) will not stand up and say it because he

knows. He is the one that should be voting against this bill. He is responsible for families. He is the one that stands up in this House and tells us what his Government is doing for pregnant women in our community. Well, he should go down to the St. Regis on the first Sunday that it opens and see what he has done for those unborn babies. He should go down to the Sherbrook Inn the first Sunday that it is open, or down to the Westbrook Inn the first Sunday that it is open, or over to the Garrick Hotel the first Sunday it is open, and he should see what he and his Government have done for unborn babies. Then he should come back to this House and tell us with a straight face, and tell us from the bottom of his heart what he has really done for pregnant women in our society.

But most galling for this bill, and these are very galling, this is a government that is saying: On November 11, let us open up the pubs. On November 11. My grandfather gave the ultimate in terms of personal sacrifice—*[interjection]* Well, the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) says he had a drink every November 11. He is right. In the legion. I will tell him my grandfather fought in two world wars, and he went to the legion on November 11. Out of respect for him, I would go to the legion on November 11, but out of respect for him, I do not think anybody should go to a pub on November 11.

Let us treat that day with the respect and treat those veterans with the respect they deserve. I would encourage this Government, if it does nothing else, if it does not have the courage to stand up, if members opposite do not have the courage to stand up and vote against this bill, the very least they can do, out of respect for the veterans who have served this country, took the risk of giving the ultimate sacrifice so that we can be free, to come back with an amendment to close those pubs on November 11. What is the point?

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, this is really an emotion bill, and this is an emotional debate because this really comes down to the heart of what governments are. This really differentiates parties, political parties, and differentiates clearly the political will of governments to say no.

I find it extremely interesting that this NDP government will, on one day, introduce Bill 23 and then speak highly and mightily of stopping drunk drivers from driving farm machinery, tractors, stopping them from driving, and, yet, the next day on Bill 24, introduce a piece of legislation that will open liquor consumption seven days a week.

Can you imagine the father taking the children to Sunday school on Sunday and the two ministers of the cloth sitting on the Government side who, by the way, were both on the committee that passed this bill? Men of the cloth. That they would stand and support this legislation is almost unbelievable, and then they would stand on Sunday and preach the word of God to their congregations and say: Well, before you leave here, I just want to say to you we just passed a law that you can go for a beer right after. By the way, when you drop your children off at Sunday school and you do not want to attend the services, you might go for a beer at the corner while your kids are attending Sunday school. Can you imagine this?

How the Member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg) could stand in his place and vote for a bill like this is almost unbelievable. *[interjection]* I know. It is astounding that the people he represents, the area of this city that he represents, will now be told that he, that his Government, his NDP government that elected him and the people who elected him, he will now ram down their throats that they will have open pubs.

It is like the young constable that used to be a member of the Legislature, appearing before committee, who is now a constable in the city of Winnipeg, told the committee. He said: You will have beer and blood running down the streets in downtown Winnipeg. He said: Surely, we can give it a rest for one day, can we not? We can give it a rest for one day. God ordained it. The good Lord ordained it. He said six days you shall work, six days, and the minister here of the cloth sits in his seat and says: What about the message of choice?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to that minister: What about the message of choice? What is the sermon you preach every Sunday? Are families

not important any more? Are not our children, the very essence of the continuation of society, are they no longer the important ones? Is the one day a week that was set aside, that was ordained to be set aside by the good Lord, the Lord's Day, is that not important any more? I ask the men of the cloth here. I ask the Member for Rossmere: What is this society coming to?

But what is most outstanding is the virtual oxymoron that has been created by this Government in, first of all, introducing Bill 23 and making a big play about getting drunken drivers off the road, and, the next day, introducing Bill 24 and saying we are going to throw her wide open and we are going to pour the liquor to them. What kind of thinking goes on in this building? What kind of people have the people of Manitoba elected to be their representatives, to look after the implementation and the development of law?

Can we realistically, conscientiously, support this? Surely their Leader, Premier Doer, will tell his members to vote with their conscience, and, surely, there will be enough members on that side of the House, on the Government side of the House, who will be allowed to stand freely and vote against this bill, to maintain and protect the Lord's day, as we should.

* (22:40)

Mrs. Joy Smith (Fort Garry): I would like to say I am vehemently opposed to this bill. I listened that night at Law Amendments, at the Committee of Supply, when a policeman got up and spoke about what would happen with Sunday opening of pubs and—*[interjection]* Mr. Speaker, I wish, instead of the taunts across the hall from members opposite as I am speaking, that you would allow them to settle down and be quiet, so I can make some of my points, because this is very near and dear to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for Manitoba. I listened very carefully to all the presenters the night they came to speak against the opening of pubs on Sunday, on Bill 24. I listened very carefully, and maybe it hit me harder because I am the mother of a policeman, and I called him that night and I talked to him and all the

policemen were saying very clearly we want a day of rest. When Mr. Kowalski came in and made his presentation, he said: There is no need for pubs to be open on Sunday. There is no reason for this, and I shake my head. I look across the way. I see two ministers of the cloth, the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Sale). They know in their heart of hearts there is no need to have pubs open on Sunday because Manitoba is about families. Manitoba is about building supports within the families.

When I listened to the Member for Brandon West (Mr. Smith) stating that he had consulted with everyone about open pubs on Sunday and it was not a big deal with anybody, I am saying here tonight, publicly, it is a real big deal with the police force in Winnipeg and in Brandon and across Manitoba, because you know what?

We are short of policemen here in Manitoba. In Winnipeg, we have Hells Angels, we have second-generation gangs, and guess what? Now we have the opportunity, because of this Government's decision, to open the pubs on Sunday and to allow for families to have more access to alcohol on the streets, in their homes. There is no purpose here.

We see the police force, we see the Emergency Measures people, we see hospitals, we see ambulance drivers that want a break. I talked to my own sister, who is a nurse, about this. She spent quite a while in the emergency room in Health Sciences Centre at some point in her career. You know what she said? It was a relief on Sunday because the business was not so big in the emergency rooms in the hospital. I asked her: What do you think the nurses would say about open pubs on Sunday?

I have not found anybody who wants open pubs on Sunday. In my church, in my environment, everybody is against it. It is not necessary. You know what? This is about choice. This is about the choice of this Government to govern in a responsible manner. As the Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed) stated: Go home and ask your families. I went home and asked my family. I went home and asked my policeman son. I went home and asked my sister who is a nurse. I

have asked a lot of people. I have not found anybody who wants open pubs on Sunday.

So this Government is not giving a choice to Manitobans. They are putting irresponsible legislation through. This Government does not build families. It does not enhance police forces. It does not help support the hospital system, and, tonight, what I am seeing is some of you hanging your heads away from me as I am speaking. I am seeing some of you having second thoughts and I am asking members opposite to show courage tonight.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) is chirping along the way about everything being so right about pubs being open on Sunday. As the head of the educational system in this province of Manitoba, that is not something you will hear any teacher say. I am calling on members opposite to show courage tonight and vote against this bill, because members on this side, due to what we have heard from the public—you know what the sad thing is, due to what we have heard from the public, we are voting against this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, we sit in the safety of the inner chambers of the Manitoba Legislature. We sit in safety because we have security people at our front doors. Who is going to be there on Sundays when families and when children and when moms need help? They are not within the confines of this safe little environment. They are there. They are in their homes. The liquor does take legs and feet. It goes out the pubs into the homes as well.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a very regrettable bill. It is a very sad day for Manitobans. We have courage on this side of the House. We are going to stand up against it and I am asking that you on the other side do the same. Thank you.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): Thank you very much. I appreciate the comment. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on behalf of my constituency and simply indicate that I will be voting against this bill. I do not believe it is something that the people in my area are looking for, but I also believe that true for many other Manitobans.

So to be consistent with the direction that the people in the Pembina constituency have taken, I just want to put on notice that I will not be voting in favour of this bill. Thank you very much.

Mr. David Faurschou (Portage la Prairie): I rise this evening to enter into debate on Bill 24. I want to say, at the outset, that I will not be in favour of this bill, and we have heard many arguments.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to much of the information that has been shared here this evening, it is truly from the heart and it expresses the experiences that members on this side of the House have gone out and sought out, not only from their own families, but friends and neighbours and truly reflect that of their community.

In committee we ask very specific questions of the Government as to the impact of this particular bill. The Government had, in their own words, no idea of the cost to the Justice Department and that of the police department. Further, they had no answers as to the impact that it will have on Family Services Department of government.

The Minister responsible for the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission (Mr. Smith) stated that he could not guarantee that VLTs would remain closed on Sundays because it is not within his jurisdiction. I hear the Minister responsible for Gaming (Mr. Ashton) is saying that he is providing that guarantee that VLTs will not come into operation on Sunday. However, at this point in time, we all know why the VLTs entered into the beverage rooms in the first place was to supplement revenue. To have on Sunday operations without VLT revenues be detrimental to the ownership of that business—as the sun will rise, business owners in operations of beverage rooms will apply to this Government for operations of VLTs on Sunday.

* (22:50)

We do not know what the impact is going to be on families on Sunday. The Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) asked explicitly as to our position on shopping on Sunday. There was

a very fundamental difference between the Sunday shopping legislation that passed in this Legislature, and that was the opt-in clause, not opt-out clause as is in this legislation. Every municipality within this province had the opportunity to say, they did want to have Sunday shopping. This one does not. It says every municipality is now open on Sunday, unless you opt-out. A very fundamental clause in all of this is that the municipalities do not have jurisdiction to say what licensee is open and what licensees remain closed. It is all in or all out.

I look to the minister responsible for this legislation in this House today, a former city councillor. What he says in this legislation not giving the option to municipal elected officials, that they do not have the savvy. They are not bright enough to select within their own community as to what licensee is acceptable and what licensee is not acceptable. They are saying that each municipality must say all open or all closed.

When we came into Confederation, there was a fundamental right offered to every municipal jurisdiction in the new province of Manitoba and it remains today, Mr. Speaker, and that is the local option when it pertains to alcohol. Every municipality in this province has the right to say yes or no to alcohol service and supply on Sunday. At that point in time, there was only one class of licensee. Today there are 11. Why is this Government not allowing the municipal governments of this province to say that they have the savvy, they have the electoral right to decide which type of licensee is open?

I am certain there are municipalities that will, in fact, support the liquor mart being open on Sunday or the local golf club being able to serve on Sunday as well. I know by special provision, provided you have meal service, that you can obtain a beverage on Sunday. But there are numerous communities throughout this province that do not want beverage rooms open. Beverage rooms are a different licence-holder, and this is what we have heard from the populace of Manitoba that is in opposition on a carte blanche opening on Sunday.

I will not be supporting this legislation, and I am very distressed that amendments that we

proposed in the committee were not recognized for their merit. Mr. Speaker, in that light once again this Government has failed to heed and listen to the people of Manitoba. I thank you for the opportunity to address this here. Thank you.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 24, The Liquor Control Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

* (23:00)

Formal Vote

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

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

The question before the House is Bill 24, The Liquor Control Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Aglugub, Allan, Ashton, Barrett, Caldwell, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Friesen, Jennissen, Korzeniowski, Lathlin, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Maloway, Martindale, McGifford, Mihychuk, Nevakshonoff, Reid, Robinson, Rondeau, Sale, Santos, Schellenberg, Selinger, Smith (Brandon West), Struthers, Wowchuk.

Nays

Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Driedger, Dyck, Faurshou, Gerrard, Gilleshammer, Laurendeau, Loewen, Maguire, Mitchelson, Murray, Penner (Emerson), Penner (Steinbach), Pitura, Reimer, Schuler, Smith (Fort Garry), Stefanson, Tweed.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 30, Nays 21.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 28—The Labour-Sponsored Investment Funds (Various Acts Amended) Act

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to introduce three amendments to this bill, please.

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

Mr. Tweed: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen),

THAT Bill 28 be amended by striking out section 17.

Motion presented.

Mr. Tweed: Mr. Speaker, I am looking for direction. I have two more amendments. Can I— [*interjection*]

Mr. Speaker, the amendment put forward brings back the original intent of the bill when it was originally presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Tweed: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen),

THAT Bill 28 be amended as follows in section 20:

(a) by striking out "Clause 23(c) is replaced with the following" and substituting "The following is added after clause 23(c)"; and

(b) by renumbering the proposed clauses 23(c) and (c.1) as (c.1) and (c.2) respectively.

Motion presented.

Mr. Tweed: These clauses reflect the fact that the prospectus that was issued in the spring by Crocus to raise money and raise tax-exempt money from the Province reverts back to the original proposal and actually produces honesty in the fact that the prospectus that they presented to the public was real.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Laurendeau: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Tweed: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen),

THAT Bill 28 be amended by striking out subsection 36(2.1) as added at committee stage.

Motion presented.

Mr. Tweed: Mr. Speaker, this clause truly reflects the prospectus that was written in the spring in which money and funds were collected by the Crocus Fund and suggests that the new proposal basically suggests to the people of Manitoba that they have been duped.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Laurendeau: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Tweed: I believe I can put a few comments on the record in regard to Bill 28? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The amendments we brought forward were—

Mr. Laurendeau: You have to move the bill first.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, is there leave to deal with Bill 28?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to deal with Bill 28? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Mines (Ms. Mihychuk), that Bill 28, The Labour-Sponsored Investment Funds (Various Acts Amended) Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* (23:10)

Mr. Tweed: Very briefly, we believe on this side of the House that the people of Manitoba were duped when they made their investment decisions this past spring, and particularly into the Crocus Fund. The fund clearly states that the investment vehicle that this fund will use would not invest in certain assets and in certain deals, and this Government, recognizing that they were in a bad deal with the True North Project, changed the legislation to make it effective so that they could use it.

Not unlike this Government, who tried to rob \$30 million out of MPI, who took liberties with the Hydro and refused to go to the PUB with their proposed amendments; not so much unlike the Minister of Culture, who stood here and denied things that he said previously in this House. But then why should he? We have had the Leader of this Government, the Premier of Manitoba, basically tell Manitobans one thing, deny it, and refuse to admit he said it. So, Mr. Speaker, this bill truly reflects the entire direction this Government is going in. It is basically, if you do not like the rules, we will change them, and if somebody gets in our way, we will break the law to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will be voting against this bill.

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): Mr. Speaker, we will be voting against this bill, primarily on the principle that this Government has treated the 27 000 Manitobans who have invested in the Crocus Fund in a dishonest fashion, and they have done it so that the Premier (Mr. Doer) can satisfy his ego and build his edifice in downtown Winnipeg. We have seen the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism (Mr. Lemieux) misinform this House.

We have witnessed the Minister of Industry, Trade and Mines (Ms. Mihychuk) misinform this House on a simple issue. She admitted the other night in the committee that the investment in the Crocus Fund and the True North Project was not a qualified investment. She admitted that it did not meet the needs or the requirements to be included in their 15% reserve fund, and she is hanging her hat on the fact that in her interpretation, the Crocus's investment is not an investment in real estate or real property, primarily for the purpose of gaining income from rent.

She talks about it in terms of equalizing the Crocus Fund and the ENSIS Fund, and we are for that. She could have done that without removing the section on ineligible investments, which she did at the demand of her Premier, because he realized when he was negotiating behind closed doors that the only way this deal would flow, the only way it would fly, was if the Crocus Fund stood behind the \$61.5-million

worth of debt that he was using the public purse to satisfy. It would only fly if this act was changed and ineligible investments were removed. He knows it, and the minister knows it.

They should be ashamed because all they had to do on May 9 was answer the question in the House, stand up and say proudly that we are for—

An Honourable Member: You were wrong.

An Honourable Member: Admit it.

Mr. Loewen: Well, the Premier (Mr. Doer), the Minister of Industry and Trade (Ms. Mihychuk), and the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen) want me to admit that I was wrong. What I would like is for them to apologize, because all they have to do is take a look at section 136 of The Securities Act to realize that somebody could be on the hook for a million-dollar fine, due to the fact that the Premier, on a wink and a nod, told senior officials at the Crocus Fund to ignore the law because he would change it, just as the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) ignored the law.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Government had voted with us for these amendments and had left the section in the act that dealt with ineligible investments, and left those regulations in the act which were in the prospectus issued every year that the Crocus Fund went out to the people of Manitoba, and asked them to invest on the basis that if they put it in their RSP they would get an 80% tax credit, this Government, on a wink and a nod from the Premier (Mr. Doer), decided they would change the law overnight. Did they do it on January 10 before the prospectus was issued? No. They waited until the money had been raised, close to \$30 million of hard-earned Manitobans' money that they were putting away for their retirement income.

This First Minister waited until that money was raised before he told anybody that he was going to change the legislation. He owes not only me an apology; he owes the 27 000 Manitobans who invested in the Crocus Fund an apology and, as well, Mr. Speaker, he owes them the opportunity to remove their retirement funds

from that fund. I would hope that he would do that.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I just rise to put a few comments on the record in terms of Bill 28.

I have some serious reservations about one section of this bill, as the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) has outlined. Nevertheless, I think there is some substantive merit in much of this bill, and I will, in fact, on this bill, support the Government.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 28, The Labour-Sponsored Investment Funds (Various Acts Amended) Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Laurendeau: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Bill 31—The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of

Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen), that Bill 31, The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to just comment briefly on Bill 31, having listened attentively at presentations at committee and given this some consideration.

Quite frankly, I oppose this legislation. As this bill has been designed by the NDP government, it is a bill which really nobody wants or agrees with in its current form. It was designed to help the City of Winnipeg, and yet the bill does not come into effect until January 1, 2002, which causes immense problems for the City of Winnipeg, because you still have to go through all sorts of problems which, for the City, they would have to face based on the way that things have been done in the past. On the other hand, we heard from people like David Sanders that there is a whole array of issues that would have been much better addressed with more study and more time and more consultation in a fair way.

So, on this bill, I think it is poorly put together. It serves neither the city well nor many others in the community well, so I oppose it.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): This is a piece of legislation that has been sloppily put together by the minister and has been brought forward in response to some people whom we have working in the assessment area who do not want to do their jobs properly.

I hate to say this, Mr. Speaker, because I have a great deal of respect for a lot of assessors, but when you allow the Board of Revision to increase an assessment based on the evidence that an assessor brings forward after he hears that there is an appeal coming forward from an

ordinary homeowner, I think it is wrong. The onus should be on the assessor to ensure that that assessment is right. The onus should not be on the property taxpayer who never works in that assessment area, but only gets a tax notice once a year, and then has to compare it to neighbouring properties and then go forward with an appeal.

Now, usually, the small property owner does not take with him an army of lawyers to fight an appeal. He simply goes there by him- or herself and asks the Board of Revision to consider his case because he feels that, based on the evidence, the very superficial evidence, if you like, that he has been able to gather around his property, it appears that his assessment is out of line.

* (23:20)

But now we have the fear of intimidation, intimidation by assessors who, when he goes to present his case, have the ability then to say: Well, I am going to recommend to the Board of Revision that your assessment be increased. He does not have to have a reason. He can manufacture that reason, bring it forward and, all of a sudden, that fear of intimidation will cause that small property owner to withdraw his or her appeal. That happens, Mr. Speaker.

Why was this bill brought forward? I know exactly why it was brought forward, because assessors feel that there are some people getting rich off the system. They feel that the people who represent taxpayers on appeals are making too much money from the taxpayers. That is the last thing that people should be concerned about, because if I as a taxpayer feel that I will hire somebody on a contingency basis to fight my case, that is my business. That is not the business of the assessor.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing is this. Everybody who goes forward with an appeal is then subject to fear from the assessor. I can tell you cases. I think that there are people who can stand up and tell you personal experiences where they phoned the assessor about the fact that their assessment was too high, and have been told: If you do not like it, come forward with your appeal. We will deal with you at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that she would not tolerate this kind of intimidation, but I, quite frankly, say she has no control over it because she will never know when it happens. If the minister wanted to address the whole issue of assessment, she should have looked at the mess that still exists in the assessment area because, although we tried to clean it up over a period of eight years, it will take more than that to clean it up completely.

I would give the minister lots of latitude to work with taxpayers to clean that system up. There are people like Mr. Sanders, who came forward with some reasonable suggestions as to how we could address this issue, but I think giving the authority to the Board of Revision to be able to increase an assessment is a wrong-headed approach to providing some equity and clarity in the assessment area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Government to re-think this because this is not a good piece of legislation for the people of our province. Thank you.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 31, The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Bill 32—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen), that Bill 32, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Bill 38—The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): I would like to propose an amendment to put forward to Bill 38. I would like to seek leave to put an amendment forward.

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been granted.

Mr. Maguire: I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen),

THAT Bill 38 be amended by adding the following after subsection 3(3):

3(3.1) The following is added after subsection 5(5).

No more than two non-residents permitted

5(5.1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the right to be named in the list of electors under clause (1)(c) or (d) is limited to a maximum number of two persons in respect of each parcel of land referred to in clause (1)(c) or (d).

Written consent of majority required

5(5.2) If more than two persons would have, but for subsection (5.1), the right to be named under clauses (1)(c) and (d) in respect of a parcel of land, the enumerator or revising officer shall add to the list of electors the names of the first two persons who

- (a) comply with subsection (6); and
- (b) provide the signed consent of the majority of the other persons entitled to have their names added under clause (1)(c) or (d).

When consents are to be provided

5(5.3) The signed consents referred to in clause (5.2)(b) shall be provided to the enumerator or revising officer in each year in which the enumerator is required to make a list of electors under section 11.

Motion presented.

Mr. Maguire: Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak to my amendment that I am putting forward to The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act, which is Bill 38.

I bring this amendment forward again this evening because we did bring it forward in committee, and it was very heavily discussed that evening, and many pertinent points were made on this particular amendment. I know that the Government wants to do a full review of The Elections Act, an amendment act, in Manitoba. Our caucus, the PC Party, would certainly

support that full review of the act in the province of Manitoba, but I bring this amendment forward because the next municipal election takes place in the fall of 2002, and there is some urgency to deal with the situation that determines who can have the right to vote in a municipal election.

So I urge the minister to urge her caucus members to support this amendment in report stage here this evening so that we can meet the deadlines and still go ahead with a full review of the act in the province of Manitoba. I want to just say that, first of all, we had urged the minister to withdraw her bill or include this in as a secondary motion as an amendment of her own, but she chose not to do that. The bill that has come forward has only a couple of changes in it, and most people, including AMM and the City of Winnipeg, have indicated that Bill 38 in its present form, Mr. Speaker, would certainly not solve any problem in regard to undivided ownership of property by non-residents in a municipal election.

I want to say that, presently in Canada, eight out of thirteen provinces and jurisdictions in Canada, including the territories, do not allow non-residents to vote. Simply put, if you are not a resident, you do not vote. Mr. Speaker, British Columbia has a situation where one vote is allowed in an undivided situation of non-resident property owners, and what the amendment proposes this evening, that I have put forward, is that two votes per property for undivided interests for non-residents be allowed, regardless of how many names on the undivided interest in this particular piece of property.

* (23:30)

This is very important from the point of view of influencing municipal elections. That is certainly to be taken into consideration in regard to who can be the representative in that area, but it has a big impact on what this Government says they give a lot of lip service to, and that is development of our rural economy, Mr. Speaker. Special interest groups could come into a region and own a very small parcel of land and the case we are talking about, in one particular case in Manitoba's instance that has been dealt with already in this province, the parcels of land broke down to one one-hundredth of an acre. I

do no believe that that is a very sound way to determine who should be representatives in our electoral regions in this province and have an influence on the kinds of development and economic activity and diversification that needs to take place in our rural economy.

So that is why we brought this amendment forward. It is why I am bringing it forward again. Basically, I am bringing it forward in case the Government has had a change of heart between committee and tonight, giving them one last opportunity to bring this forward so that the bodies of AMM and other bodies in Manitoba do not have to go through the undue influence of having to worry about racing this through in a full review of the bill and not really getting that review complete by the time the next municipal election rolls around in the fall of 2002.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing I am going to say about this bill is this amendment removes the onus on the individual or the rural municipal board or its administration to determine what the term "colourable" means in regard to whether or not property is being used in an undivided manner to influence the results of an election in a municipal ward. An individual or those R.M.s should not have to spend their own time or their own energies and dollars as was done in the particular case in Winchester where an individual declared that he had spent up to \$20,000 of his own money to deal with a particular situation of having to come to credibility in regard to where that municipality was.

I know this has been dealt with by AMM's board. I urge the members of the House this evening to accept this amendment and move forward so that we can have a clear and unencumbered full review of the elections amendment act, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the amendment to Bill 38. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Ms. Friesen), that Bill 38, The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of adopting the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Laurendeau: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

**Bill 25—The Health Services
Insurance Amendment and
Consequential Amendments Act**

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, is there leave to deal with Bill 25?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to deal with Bill 25? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), that Bill 25, The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: Is it the will of the House not to see the clock till 1 a.m.?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to not see the clock till 1 a.m. [*Agreed*]

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Charleswood, on Bill 25.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed an act that will strengthen accountability in the health system as it relates to RHAs and health corporations, but it did not do anything to address the issue of ministerial accountability. The real challenge is for any minister to make sure that the health care system is responsive, efficient, effective and sustainable.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) is failing in all three areas. I

would say, however, I think he wants to do things better. I think he has good intentions, but he does not know how to make it happen. We know that good intentions alone will not do it. He has not been able to put a plan or a grand scheme in place. He is just not sure what to do, so instead he does very little except put more and more money into the system, a system which, it is becoming more and more obvious, is failing its citizens.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, where is the minister when the media wants an interview with him, when they want answers to questions and they want to hear what he offers forward as solutions to problems? In fact, so many times this minister has ducked from the media, he has avoided the media. I quit counting after 18 times when he refused comment, was not available for comment or sent out one of his spinners to comment. I hardly think that is showing accountability for our health leader in this province.

In fact, in Brandon, on a particular issue regarding a doctor shortage, the minister's spinner said it was not important enough for the minister to comment on that particular issue. Where is Manitoba's health care leader when he is supposed to be showing accountability for what he is doing? Most of the time, he is hiding behind closed doors.

The most disturbing situation I have witnessed is this minister ducking his responsibility in a particular situation, and, actually, this has been the most disturbing situation for me since I became a politician. It was the day that families with children with leukemia were in this building, and they wanted to meet with this Health Minister. This minister hid from the families for 45 minutes in this Chamber. He avoided meeting with them. He refused to talk to the media about the situation, and he used some excuse that he had to speak to a bill in the House.

At first, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not quite sure whether a deal had been set up, and I did then later speak to our House leader and found out that this particular minister was not to speak to his bill till 4:30 in the afternoon. Question Period was finished at 2:30, and we had a Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) sitting in this

House, telling the families that he could not come out there to speak with them because he had to be in the House in order to speak to a bill. I have to say that disturbed me more than anything that I have experienced since becoming a politician, and it embarrassed me as a politician. No wonder people are cynical about politicians when that kind of behaviour and that kind of lack of accountability are being demonstrated by members of this Chamber. I think it was a gross breach of his responsibility as a Minister of Health.

* (23:40)

Yesterday, I was very disturbed to hear of the death of Herman Rogalsky, this being the third death that we know of. Mr. Deputy Speaker, three people dying under this minister's watch, I think is a very serious matter. Where is this minister's accountability to make sure that the health care system is responsive in situations like that?

After yesterday's news coverage and this morning's news coverage, I am standing here with a heavy heart speaking of the situation that occurred with Mr. Rogalsky, and I have to say the number of phone calls and e-mails that I have received today from families in desperate need pleading for my help, because the health care system is failing them. Some of these stories, even as a nurse in health care, I have never heard such serious, serious issues come forward. Nurses warned this minister, after the last death, that it would happen again; and it did. This time, I will warn the minister that it will happen again, unless he moves proactively to address the many changes in our health care system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, fundamental reform is needed, and the status quo is not acceptable. In looking at all of these calls that I got today, and the stories that have come forward to me, the pleas that were made to me, I fully and truly believe that the status quo is not acceptable, because it is failing Manitobans. Albert Einstein once observed that no problem can be solved by the same level of thinking at which it was created. Yet this minister seems to be very content with the status quo, only more of it.

What does he do? He goes out and buys the Pan Am Clinic for \$7.3 million, which does not

bring anymore doctors, nurses, procedures into the system at all. His accountability for that, I think, needs to be seriously questioned when we look at ministerial accountability from our top health leader in this province. That was a very poor decision to be made, and, certainly, all it does is adds to the status quo of what is happening.

The minister is not in anyway showing innovative fundamental reform that is needed to sustain this health care system. Then he introduces Bill 25, which I firmly believe is going backwards from any other province in Canada and other countries all over the world. In fact, with this particular bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we are going to see a continuation by this minister of breaking a key principle of the Canada Health Act, and that is of accessibility.

I also have to question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether it does contravene the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It is going to be interesting one day when we have a Manitoban, or perhaps a Canadian, who is going to stand up, and challenge governments on the issue of their right to access to care. We enshrine these principles into the Canada Health Act, accessibility being one of the most significant ones. Yet it is the one that is being broken over and over and over again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to wonder why, when principles of the Canada Health Act are being broken, why the federal government is not in more of a position to act with provinces to try to ensure that provinces are not breaking those key principles. Instead, the federal government fines provinces in many instances for breaking certain parts of this that do not even impact on patient care. Accessibility impacts directly on patient care. I think one day we are going to see somebody that is going to come forward and challenge the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I think they are very likely going to win their challenge.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me say something right up front about Bill 25. It is a bad bill. Let me count the ways: No. 1, it puts politics before people; No. 2, it decreases access to care; No. 3, it condemns ailing people to long waiting lists; No. 4, it compromises patient safety and patient

comfort; No. 5, it reduces choices for patients. Imagine in today's day and age, where you have a choice about everything else in our lives, the one place we do not have any choice is in our health care system. Is that not strange to you? Our most cherished social program and the one where we have absolutely no say about how it is delivered.

Number 6, this bill blocks innovation; No. 7, it eliminates incentives for those who want to improve our health care system; No. 8, it maintains the status quo; No. 9, it maintains escalating health care costs; No. 10, it builds a bigger and bigger and more expensive monopoly. Certainly what this Government is demonstrating since they took over, the health care system is becoming a bigger and bigger monopoly. It really is impacting on the quality of care that is not being extended to patients.

Number 11, it promotes invasion of privacy and intimidation; and No. 12, I believe it interferes with the delivery of palliative care, midwifery and home care, if one were to look at the definitions very carefully. No wonder this minister brings such an ill-thought bill forward. He has no plan. He told doctors that. He has no grand scheme, he said. So, like he said, he is going to try this and that, and I guess Bill 25 is one of the things he is going to try. He will keep what works, and he will discard what does not work. What an irresponsible way to manage health care, not only just the dollars that are in it, but what a disservice to Manitoba patients who are counting on this minister to deliver good health care in Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we need to stop the pretence on the political level that the system is fine, and innovation is somehow unpatriotic. Leaders are paid to look ahead and prepare to meet changing needs, not remain mired in the status quo. When we address innovations, we do not need fearmongering from this Government, which the NDP immediately resort to instead of having an intelligent and open debate, nor do we need more sloganeering about two-tier medicine. That leads only to division, zealotry and paralysis when what Manitobans deserve is informed consensus, creativity and reform.

The Doer government, too scared to debate the issue of private health care, has chosen to simply cut it off with this legislation.

The *National Post* on April 16 of this year made some interesting comments, and I would just like to read a few brief comments into the paper: more money, more beds, more doctors, more nurses, more status quo. Medicare in Saskatchewan is doomed if that is all that is prescribed to fix it. This conclusion follows an extensive review of the province's health care system by Kenneth Fyke, a respected health policy specialist and former Deputy Minister of Health in Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

The claim that the system must have more money to do more good, argues Mr. Fyke, assumes that all of the money is being well spent. This is lamentable. Public funds are being wasted, often in large quantities, at the same time as some people are truly suffering for want of access to timely, quality services. They go on to say: Democracy's great virtue is the free exchange of ideas. Conversely, the truncation of genuine debate probably accounts for rising cynicism among voters. Political discourse is failing Canadians.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are certainly seeing the lack of a debate being allowed by this Government as having and going to have a huge impact on Manitobans, not only now, but definitely in the future.

The Globe and Mail on May 10 of this year made some interesting observations as well. They indicated that the Canadian Institute for Health Information, which, by the way, this Minister of Health likes to quote from time to time, and I gather he respects what they say, have made some interesting comments. Their data show that medicare is not financially sustainable. It does not wipe away the differences between rich and poor, urban and rural, or have and have-not provinces. It is time to stop pretending it does.

* (23:50)

The editorial goes on to say that the quality of Canadian health care cannot be measured by the amount of public money put into the system, estimated by CIHI at \$67.7 billion in 2000. Outcomes are what matter.

Finally, from further on in the editorial, they indicate medicare seemed to work when health

care was about going to a doctor and being sent to a hospital, where you either recovered or died, but that era in health care has disappeared. New technologies have revolutionized medicine, saved lives and enhanced the quality of life for chronic disease sufferers. So have expensive, new drugs, which consume 15.5 percent of public health care spending versus 8.8 percent in 1975. The challenge, as the CIHI report reminds us, is to develop a sustainable system that permits Canadian access to these new treatments without bankrupting the provinces.

Let me say something else. We support publicly funded private clinics. Let us be clear. The context of our comments is around publicly funded private clinics. Manitoba has a solid track record in this area for three years. We have had three. They have been a wonderful asset to Manitobans who needed access to care, providing 3500 procedures a year. They have taken stress off our system. They were even praised by Dr. Brian Postl during the announcements regarding the Pan Am purchase, where Doctor Postl said that private clinics were lower cost than hospitals, they were more innovative, and they were more efficient. This is very significant, this coming from the doctor who is the head of the WRHA, saying that the private clinics have lower cost than hospitals, they are more innovative, and they are more efficient.

In fact, another interesting comment made was by Doctor Hildahl in an interview with the *Winnipeg Sun* on March 15 of last year. Doctor Hildahl indicated that in an era of rapidly growing health care costs, private clinics may be one solution to help ease the burden of medicare on taxpayers. Imagine Doctor Hildahl recommending private health clinics as a solution to ease the burden of medicare on taxpayers. Interesting that these comments are coming from physicians in the system and yet now the Government introduces Bill 25 and the minister somehow, and where he gets it from I am not totally sure, tries to convince people that private clinics cost more. Well, who is right? The Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) who says that private clinics cost more or Dr. Brian Postl who says that they are lower cost than hospitals, that they are more innovative and more efficient?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, having publicly funded private clinics is hardly what one would call Americanization, but I know that is exactly what the NDP will try to pin this label on us, and, of course, that is going to be deceitful and that is going to be politically opportunistic for them because having three publicly funded private clinics in the whole system is hardly the Americanization of health care in Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I fully recognize that this Government and this Premier (Mr. Doer) will demonize us by saying that we want to Americanize the health care system. This minister will take political advantage of what he knows to be dishonest and has absolutely no credence. We fully expect this minister to play games like that. We fully expect him to lash out. We see him doing that in the House when he gets defensive, when his back gets pushed against a wall. He lashes out. He lacks the courage really to face an honest debate, and it is easier for him to try to deflect in the manner that he is becoming recognized for.

For the record, let me say, that the World Health Organization rates the American health care system as No. 39, France is rated No.1, Italy is rated No. 2. So guess where we are going to be looking when we bring forth ideas about how to improve our health care system? We will be looking at the European systems that are rooted in values and principles of equality and accessibility similar to our own, and the public will support us because the public is increasingly frustrated and angry with the waiting lists that are growing under this Government. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they recognize that waiting lists are growing under this Government. The increasing number of phone calls that I am receiving on a daily basis from people who are concerned about the way they are being treated in this system is only going to continue to grow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even Roy Romanow encourages the NDP and others to stop fixating on the U.S. as the only alternative to medicare. In fact, he says we need to get out of that box. He also suggested that Bill 11, the Alberta law that allows the public system to pay private surgical clinics to operate on patients who need overnight treatment does not cross any lines.

Well, Mr Deputy Speaker, the NDP are very comfortable in the box that Roy Romanow accuses so many people of being in, but we have long since moved past that. We have been doing our research, we have been doing our homework, and we are getting a good sense of what Manitobans want. This Government chooses to remain in the status quo and thrive on rhetoric, the blame game and fearmongering. They fearmonger instead of promoting an honest discussion over problems about our creaky health care system. The truth is health care is in trouble and some of the professionals, in fact, many of the professionals in the health care system would say it is in trouble, not just in Manitoba but right across this country. What we do need is honest, open discussion in a search for innovative ways to save medicare.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this should be about people, not about politics and not about politicians. We are seeing this become more and more political and more about politics, and that is certainly evident in the introduction of Bill 25. On February 7 of this year, this Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) told a *Free Press* reporter that the NDP government will block plans by a Vancouver health care firm to set up a private hospital in Manitoba. The minister went on to say that such a centre would allow patients to jump the queue for insurable services. The Health Minister said he is prepared to bring in legislation to block the company's plan, and he said if he had to change definitions of private clinics to private hospitals to do it, he would.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know exactly where Bill 25 has originated, and that is politics before people if I have ever seen it. Bill 25 is a knee-jerk reaction to the B.C. doctor who wants to come into Manitoba to help patients, because, he said, he wants to help get the longest waiting lists in Canada down. It is most inappropriate that this Minister of Health has allowed this situation regarding The Maples Clinic to become so personal between him and the doctor who wants to set up that clinic. In fact, I have never, in this whole last year, seen any minister become so personally involved in a situation as this Minister of Health has in this situation. I really have to wonder why he has gone that far.

It really begs the question of why this minister is wanting to get rid of private clinics.

We have had three of them in Manitoba, publicly funded, privately run, for three years, perhaps a little over three years, and they have functioned very, very well for the people of Manitoba. Yet the minister says they compromise medicare and the integrity of the system. He puts out his news release that he does not want these clinics around because they compromise medicare and the integrity of this system. The minister struggles to explain exactly how that happens. In committee the other night, he could not explain it to the media. He cannot explain it, and he cannot explain it to the public.

* (24:00)

At the same time, while he condemns private clinics, he continues to send patients to them, and, in fact, continues to allow some to exist in the province. One really has to wonder how he can, without losing credibility, maintain such a system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister continually infers that private clinics are about user fees and queue jumping. He indicates that to the media all of the time. He says he wants to prevent user fees and queue jumping. The other night in committee I asked the minister to tell me where in Manitoba that happens, because he continues to perpetuate the myth that he is going to be the saviour of health care by preventing user fees and queue jumping. I asked him to give me an example where that actually happens in Manitoba. Guess what? He had no answer, because it does not happen in Manitoba. The Tories, in 1998, stopped that practice from happening. It was our government that brought in legislation, that took away user fees and that took away queue jumping, and we were the ones preserving this publicly funded health care system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Government, this Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak), this Premier (Mr. Doer) continue to embarrass themselves with their absurd comments when it comes to the issue of publicly funded private clinics. In Manitoba, patients are not charged. Patients do not jump queues. In fact, even if we look at the cataract waiting list, it is actually managed centrally by the Misericordia Health Centre, and they manage it centrally for the city. So that is hardly queue jumping.

For the minister to be constantly misleading like he has, over and over, is dishonest, and it does a disservice to this whole debate in this province. The minister manipulates a discussion, and after listening to the Premier for part of this evening, I will allege he does the same thing. They manipulate the discussion further on this whole issue of publicly funded private clinics.

In fact, I find it is quite shameful the way they do not hesitate to perpetuate the myth. Yesterday, an op-ed piece in the *Winnipeg Free Press* was probably the most manipulative piece of writing I have ever seen since I have gotten into politics. Garbage would be a kind word used to describe that particular article. It was so misleading and lacking of facts that this Government should be embarrassed with what they put forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what did we learn at committee the other night? It was interesting that the Minister of Health discarded any views of the World Health Organization and their evaluation system of health care systems throughout the world. In fact, the Minister of Health basically discredited the World Health Organization, if you can imagine.

Like, who does he think he is? The World Health Organization is highly, highly recognized through the whole world. We have got this Minister of Health here in Manitoba that trashed the World Health Organization last night and discredited all of their findings and downplayed the fact that France had the best health care system in world. He could do nothing but criticize all of that. What a narrow-minded view in looking at our health care system.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) also will not allow overnight stays in clinics, even though the College of Physicians and Surgeons supports overnight stays. If we are going to be looking at this from the patients' perspective, how is that bad? When you are going to preserve patient safety, you are going to promote patient comfort. Yet this Minister of Health will risk all of that. He will compromise patient safety, but he will not compromise his ideology on this issue.

This minister is incredibly naïve if he thinks that doctors are going to trust him when he says,

oh, but the 11 o'clock is just something that is there, but if a doctor goes over it once in a while that is okay. Is he so naïve? Does he not understand doctors and how they operate, that if they are going to be faced with a \$30,000 fine there is no way they are even going to come near keeping patients until 11 o'clock, because they are going to be the ones having to defend whether or not they are allowed to do that. They will be presumed guilty right from the start.

It is interesting to note that Doctor Postl indicated that the Pan Am might want to have overnight beds. So I am sure the minister is going to find himself in an awkward position around that issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is the whole area of tray fees, which is, I am sure, going to percolate for a little while. We are probably going to see this debate escalate over time, because this minister is going to continue to allow tray fees when it deliberately contravenes a clause in his legislation. By the time this percolates enough, I would not be surprised to see a court case on this and I would not be surprised to see a judge rule on this. It is going to be a judge interpreting that clause. It will be interesting to see whether or not the minister's assurances to all the doctors out there that, oh, do not worry, everything is going to be okay. I do not believe it is going to be okay. There are some very, very nervous physicians in this province who are watching to see what is going to happen with that.

A very disconcerting aspect of how this minister misrepresents Bill 25 is his use of the words private hospital. In fact, that is not even part of this issue. That is such a phantom aspect to this issue. It is disgraceful the way the minister continues to use it, perpetuate private clinics as private hospitals.

Basically he kept his word. He said: I will keep the B.C. doctor out of here. It may be a deceitful way to do it, it may be skewing the debate, but this Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) is so ideologically bent in what he wants to achieve that he will actually go this distance to prevent providing another opportunity to improving care to patients in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the minister talks about preserving medicare and he is going to preserve the integrity of medicare, he does not want to compromise medicare, you know, he does not tell the public that he is in full control of how many private clinics we have. He is in full control of how many procedures they do every year. He can add more clinics. He can take away clinics. He can raise the cap or he could lower the cap. He does not have to introduce such draconian legislation that it actually impacts on patient care and adversely affects patient care, but he is so ideologically bent in it that he is willing to go that route instead of working. *[interjection]*

He says he is pragmatic. There are certainly a lot of doctors snickering out there a little bit about that, because they certainly do not find that this Minister of Health is particularly pragmatic. If he was pragmatic, he might at least have spoken to Doctor Godley to find out if there was any opportunity for collaboration. But he did not even do that.

On June 14, the Minister of Health accused us in this House of advocating for a two-tier system, where the rich can pay and get faster service. I asked him eight times in committee to, again, point out to me where this happens in Manitoba, and you know what? He could not answer the question, and do you know why? Because that does not happen in this province. Does the Minister of Health or this Premier (Mr. Doer), who continue to fear-monger, accusing us of being in favour of a two-tier system, do they really, really not understand the way it works in Manitoba, because publicly funded private clinics are accepted under the Canada Health Act and they are, in no way, part of a two-tier system. But, you know, we have so much fear-mongering and debate-skewing going on that we are actually in a situation in Manitoba where because of their lashing out, their inability to put forward a solid argument about health care, their refusal and fear of getting into a debate, it is harming people in this province.

The Minister of Health continues to base his decisions on his staunch ideology, instead of the best interests of patients. I fully believe he is putting politics before people. The Minister of Health is satisfied with the status quo, even

though Manitoba patients face growing waiting lists and a growing shortage of health care professionals. This Minister of Health is spending \$7.3 million of Manitoba taxpayers' money to nationalize the Pan Am Sports Medicine Centre. In this, the Minister of Health is unwilling to engage Manitobans in a proactive debate on the future of health care. This act will definitely stifle innovation in health care in this province. This Minister of Health is reluctant to examine other health care systems in search of innovations that could be implemented in Manitoba's health care system, and this Minister of Health has admitted that he has no plan for the future of Manitoba's health care system.

* (00:10)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, somebody that has no plan for health care in this province is not going to do good for the patients in this province, and we are certainly seeing that with what we see in the status quo. This minister is committed to maintaining the status quo. He does not have a plan, so he is managing the system by crisis to crisis; the status quo he seems to be happy with where doctors are continuing to leave the province. The nursing shortage has doubled under this Government.

The minister is breaking and, in fact, has broken every health care promise that was made in the election. We see waiting lists that are continuing to skyrocket in this province. We see this minister sitting on \$18 million that should be used for diagnostic equipment and, instead, this Government is sitting on valuable, valuable money that could be used to purchase much-needed diagnostic equipment in this province. When you have no plan, you are not going to provide the best care for patients in this province, and patient care should be what all of this is about. We should be looking at the advantages to patients and we should not be looking at ideology of ministers or governments in addressing issues like this.

All we are getting from this Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) are rhetoric and fear-mongering and no plan and no vision. I worry hugely about this health care system. I worry about what is going to happen to patients in this province.

We have, probably, some of the biggest challenges in health care we have ever seen just around the corner. We have an aging population that is going to impact not just Manitobans, but also Canadians, probably in a way we have never, ever seen before. We have Pharmacare costs that have absolutely shot through the roof. We have information technology and other technology that are going to impact the system so greatly I am not sure where we are going to find the money to even do that. Yet we have a government who has spent almost half a billion dollars in the last two years. That is 22 percent. I do not think we have seen an improvement in our health care by 22 percent.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, definitely what we have seen in the last few days in our health care system is definitely worse. We fear for what is going to happen. I doubt he will do it at this point, because he is so stuck in his ideology, but this is a bad bill for Manitobans. I would urge the Government not to have this bill passed tonight, because I do not think it is going to be good for anybody in this province now or in the future.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to put a few comments on the record with respect to this bill, because I believe that this bill is one that has the interest of all Manitobans only because it takes our system backwards.

Generally, as ministers of Health, the goal is to try and enhance the health services to the citizens of our province, but this bill drives us back. I think speaker after speaker have stood up and indicated why this bill really drives the system backwards. If you compare this to any jurisdiction in Canada, we seem to be going upstream. Everybody else is going the other way, whereas Manitoba seems to be fighting the tide. You have to wonder why.

We heard about the ideological bent of the minister and this Government. We heard about the draconian measures that are being taken in this legislation. We hear the wrong-headed approach that is being taken in terms of where this is leading us. All of those things are true, because this legislation is going to do nothing to address the issues, the serious issues that we have in this province as relates to health care.

Nobody, the minister could not answer, neither could the Premier (Mr. Doer) answer the question as to what buying the Pan Am Clinic would do in a positive sense to health care in our province. If we were to take that \$7.3 million that will be spent on the purchase and renovation of the Pan Am Clinic and we were to invest it into the provision of health care for people, today we might have averted the kind of death that we saw in the hallway in one of our hospitals. We might have been able to address some of the other serious concerns of people who have had to leave this province to have their medical conditions attended to.

This is a waste of taxpayer dollars, because if the Government is true to its word that it wanted to increase the number of procedures that were done at the Pan Am Clinic, and this has been said time and time again, all they had to do was to lift the cap, increase the cap, and they could have done more procedures.

Well, the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) accuse us of wanting a private health care system in our province, which is not true. We have said it on the record many times, that we support a public approach to the health care system in our province. We have to also be practical. We have to look at what the needs are. We have to look at ways that we can serve the clients of the system in a better way than we have in the past.

It may mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have to open up the doors of privately run clinics so that they can augment and complement the system that we have in this province today. Whether it is Doctor Godley, or whether it is Doctor Hildahl or whoever it may be; if this province opens its doors to allow those kinds of facilities to operate, not that they should do it competition with our public health care system, not that they should skim off patients from our public health care system. But, indeed, that they complement the services that are provided by our public health care system. We would then be working towards achieving a much more effective and a much more efficient health care system.

We hear about attitude. I just listened to a tape a little while ago, an individual who was

speaking, a former leader who was speaking about the vision he had for his province, about the vision he had for the society that he was wanting to lead. There was a plan put in place. There was a vision. There was an attitude there about how we could build a province, how we could build a system, how we could care for the citizenry of our province. That is what we do not have from this Government. There is no vision. There is no plan. There is no vision for the province in health care. There is no plan from this Government in terms of meeting the needs, the critical needs, in the health care area.

We heard during the election campaign, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the now-Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) were going to eliminate hallway medicine in a matter of six months. They repeated that after they were elected. But reality has struck, and they have not been able to do it; nor do they have a plan in doing. They point to the fact that we are going to have more nurses and more doctors. All of these initiatives that they speak about were started in the administration that came before them. They were started by our administration, the Conservative administration, in this province.

* (00:20)

They are reaping some of the benefits of those initiatives, and so be it. But we asked them to lay a plan before Manitobans that is going to take us into this new century in health care, in a way where we are going to be better able to meet the needs of people who need the services of our health care system. If we continue to throw money at the system without changing it effectively, we are going to find out that the system is unaffordable by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I looked at the appropriation bill today, and it says that we are going to be spending something in the neighbourhood of \$6.8 billion in this province this year. I can tell you that less than five years ago, we were spending a billion dollars less in this province. We were somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5.4 billion. In these few short years, we have increased, if you like, the budget of our province by a billion dollars. We keep throwing money into health care like there is no

end, but, yet, we refuse to look at the fundamental issues that we need to look at in order to change the system. This bill does nothing to address those issues.

My colleague the MLA for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger) has put very eloquently on the record her perspective of what needs to be done. We have offered suggestions to this Government, but their ears are deaf to those suggestions. They have a very narrow approach and a very narrow view of where we should be going in health care, and it is tragic.

We saw the three deaths in our hospital in the waiting areas and in the hallways of our health care facilities. I am not going to lay the blame personally on either the Minister of Health or the Premier, but we have to learn from these tragic occurrences. We have to change the system, so that those kinds of things do not happen again. The nurses within these facilities warned this Government that death was going to happen again. We heard the Member for Charleswood indicate that it is going to happen again if, in fact, we do not change the way we do things.

There was no need for Mr. Rogalsky to die if, in fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we would address some of those issues. Buying the Pan Am Clinic does nothing to address that kind of a situation, because that money is wasted on capital that we do not have to be investing in. We do not need to be landlords. We should be putting our money into providing services to Manitobans. There was no consultation on this as well. This was just a philosophy that the Government chose to pursue, and an action they chose to pursue because of an ideological bent.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

I think down the road the Government will know and will find out how wrong they were in taking this course of action. If you look across the land, every other jurisdiction, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, is moving in a different direction, where they are blending private clinics with public facilities, private services with public services. What we should be looking at is providing the best service possible,

regardless of whether it is provided in a public hospital or a private clinic. Then we would truly be looking after the needs of Manitobans.

I do not want to take any more time. The hour is late. We have spoken on this bill before. It is a bill that I think we need to be very careful about. I have to caution this Government that they need to be very careful. The Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak), this cannot be a happy time for him. The Minister of Health has to be feeling the pain of what the condition of the health care system in this province is. The Minister of Health, I know, has to be feeling for those families who have lost loved ones because our health care system has not been able to respond. But if he is going to feel that pain, then I ask him to look at changes that need to be made in the system that are going to be more responsive than what we have seen from this Government in the last two years.

This Government has been in office for two years, Mr. Speaker. It is not as though they have just come into office. They have had time to change. They have had a long time to change. When they came into office, there were grandiose statements made about how they were going to change the system. I will never forget that clip on television where the Premier (Mr. Doer) was not looking straight into the camera, but off to the side, and saying if we need more nurses we will find them. If we need more doctors, we will find them. If we need more beds, we will open them. He kept going on and on about what he was going to do, immediately, giving the people of this province the false pretence that he was going to be able to fix everything overnight. Then he gave himself a deadline with regard to hallway medicine. He said six months. Six months came and went, and now we have a pathetic apology from the Premier when he stands up to talk about how the health care system is today. He says, oh, it is tough, but we are working towards changing.

What is their plan? Have they laid a plan before the people of this province? Have they engaged any people who will be looking at how we can change the health care system, some of the fundamental changes that have to be made? They criticized us for the Connie Curran issue, yet they are implementing the policies that were

brought forward as a result of Connie Curran. They are still implementing them today. If they thought that she was so wrong, why have they not scrapped those policies? They are implementing them.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you something else. They criticized us for the regional health. I remember the now-Minister of Health standing in his place here and criticizing us in the way we were implementing regional health. Finally, after two years, the minister admits that regional health is here to stay, and it is a good program. Yes, it still is evolving and it still requires changes and those changes have to be planned. There has to be a vision put forward in how we are going to move from here, but the Minister of Health is not providing that. The Government is not providing it. Instead, they come to this Legislature with a bill that drives the whole system backwards, does not show any vision, does not show any progress.

When we went through this bill, something else that appalled me was that if a doctor was going to be performing a procedure in what they deem is a private hospital, whether it is on an emergency basis or not, that doctor could be fined up to \$30,000. I have talked to the Minister of Health, and he has assured me that they will be putting into the regulations an article that is going to soften this blow, and if, in fact, a procedure has to be done on an emergency basis at what they deem a private hospital, it could be a home, they will exempt the doctor from being charged, which I think is a step forward at least from where they are.

But they define in there private hospital. We do not have private hospitals in this province. We have not had for a long time. This is a phantom issue. They are talking about something we do not have, but then they give it a definition, and they say that a private hospital can be a house where treatment is delivered. So maybe a baby is born. As long as there is a surgical procedure in this private facility it could be considered a private hospital. They are trying to invent a definition for a private hospital in a province where we do not have private hospitals. How silly can we become? The people see through this.

Then they say if you are a physician you are not allowed to do any procedures in what is deemed a private hospital. Is the doctor going to start thinking about this being a private hospital if he is in a home where he has to do an emergency procedure? Does he have to have the threat hanging over his or her head that they may be fined \$30,000 because they are doing a procedure that might save a life? Why do we not concern ourselves about providing proper services to our people? Why do we not concern ourselves about allowing doctors to carry out a procedure regardless of wherever it is, as long as it meets the Health Act and as long as it is to save a person's life or to address a health situation?

Mr. Speaker, there is no way on earth we should support this bill. There is no way the Government should even be bringing a bill like this in, because it does not show any vision. All we want for the people of our province is a system that will effectively and efficiently deliver health care services equitably across this province to the best ability we have in this fine and wonderful province of Manitoba.

With that, I conclude my remarks.

* (00:30)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on Bill 25. As I have indicated previously in this House, I am opposed to this bill because I believe it introduces into Manitoba part-time health care.

The problem with Bill 25 is an amendment found in section 64.2(1) which says: "No operator of a surgical facility, and no medical practitioner, shall provide a surgical service in a surgical facility if the person receiving the service would normally require post-operative care in the facility after 11:00 p.m. on the day the service is provided."

I think this introduces part-time health care. Let me say why. Sometimes a patient can be in the post-operative recovery room for one or two hours, but this is very dependent on the nature of the procedure being done and the post-operative course. If you are going to go by the rules of Bill 25, Mr. Speaker, no patient should enter the

post-operative recovery room after 5 or 6 p.m., because you normally need to allow for the possibility of up to five to six hours potential post-operative recovery room time. So for a one-hour operation a surgical procedure cannot start after 4 or 5 in the afternoon. If a procedure requires a longer recovery room time then it cannot begin after noon or at best early afternoon. So this leaves us with a part-time surgical service, part-time health care service.

The necessary result of Bill 25 will be to virtually eliminate evening surgical procedures in surgical centres. It will take away much of the flexibilities of the centres to deliver care. The experience in surgical centres in other jurisdictions from British Columbia, the United Kingdom, Sweden and elsewhere has been that evening surgery is often optimal from the point of view of the patient, the surgeon, the anaesthetist and the nurses. Why should Manitoba restrict surgical procedures to some times of day and not to others? Surely there should be the flexibility for clinics to provide operations when it is convenient for patients and for doctors.

For expensive operating rooms, it does not make sense to use them only part of the day, when they can, in fact, be very conveniently used at other times. When we have long waiting lists in Manitoba, and the use of facilities into the evening can help reduce those waiting lists and improve the quality of care, why not do so? By unnecessarily restricting the use of surgical facilities, the NDP is sadly introducing part-time health care to Manitoba.

It is curious that the NDP is moving to restrict access to health care in the very same legislative session when they are expanding the hours of operation for liquor stores and other services providing liquor. In expanding the operations of liquor stores, the NDP is following a trend for retail outlets to provide a wider array of service hours. It is curious that when it comes to health care, the NDP is moving in the opposite direction to limit the hours of access to surgical procedures.

The NDP action to bring in part-time health care does not make sense, and I oppose it. The NDP government has claimed, and the Minister

of Health (Mr. Chomiak) has claimed, that he is introducing this bill to eliminate private hospitals from Manitoba. Let us examine the evidence for the minister's postulate. We have in this province a Private Hospitals Act. The minister could have made changes to ban private hospitals. It would have been simple, but he did not.

Let us see what the minister did do. The minister changed the definition of a private hospital. A private hospital now means a house or a building in which one or more patients are received and lodged for medical treatment or for care and treatment for childbirth but does not include, Mr. Speaker, a hospital as defined under The Hospitals Act.

Well, there are two parts to this. The first removes a reference to the fact that it can be defined or licensed by the minister as to what is a private hospital. A private hospital does not talk about whether private refers to ownership, management, contracting out, or what. It does not define what is private. It does not do an adequate definition of what is a hospital. The amendment is a failure. It does not make sense. The approach or the postulate that the minister is banning private hospitals is not borne out by examination of the facts.

Let us go a little bit further in looking at the definition of hospital under The Hospitals Act, and that is easy because this act changes the definition of a hospital under The Hospitals Act. It says quite clearly that hospital means a hospital is defined in The Health Services Insurance Act. Well, that is quite interesting, so we should then go to The Health Services Insurance Act and see what a hospital is. When we go to The Health Services Insurance Act to find out what a hospital is, what we find is a hospital in Manitoba that is designated as a hospital by regulation by the minister.

In other words, the minister can decide what is a hospital and what is not a hospital. It is not even said in legislation what a hospital is. Clearly, this is not good legislation to have this circuitous pointing at other acts to find out what a hospital is, only to find that it is not actually in legislation what a hospital is; it is in some definition that the minister has and can change at his whim. This is rather arbitrary.

I suggest that the minister's claim that he is banning private hospitals is false. He is trying to put something over on the people of Manitoba. This is a mistake. This is not what this act is about. This act is about giving Manitobans part-time health care instead of full-time health care, and I am opposed to this act.

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, is it the will of the House not to see the clock?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to not see the clock? *[Agreed]*

* * *

* (00:40)

An Honourable Member: Question, Mr. Speaker?

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 25, The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendment Act. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Formal Vote

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

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

The question before the House is Bill 25, The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendment Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Aglugub, Allan, Ashton, Barrett, Caldwell, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Friesen, Jenmissen, Korzeniowski, Lathlin, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Maloway, Martindale, McGifford, Mihychuk, Nevakshonoff, Reid, Robinson, Rondeau, Sale, Santos, Schellenberg, Selinger, Smith (Brandon West), Struthers, Wowchuk.

Nays

Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Driedger, Dyck, Enns, Faurshou, Gerrard, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Loewen, Maguire, Mitchelson, Murray, Penner (Emerson), Penner (Steinbach), Pitura, Praznik, Reimer, Schuler, Smith (Fort Garry), Stefanson, Tweed.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 30, Nays 24.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: I move, seconded by the First Minister (Mr. Doer), that when the House adjourns today it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker, upon the request of the Government.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to move the motion? [*Agreed*]

Motion presented.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise to put a few comments on the record about the events of the last few months and this session, the changes that we have seen

in the approach that the Government has taken from what they promised during the election a little less than two years ago. I want to comment on four areas: first, about democracy; second, about rural Manitoba and agriculture; thirdly, about health care; and, fourthly, about the part-way, tinkering kind of approach that the Government has taken.

First, let me comment about democracy, public consultation, public involvement. The NDP had promised much in this area, but when it came down to looking at the major project development with the demolition of the Eaton's building and the building of a new arena, I asked for public hearings, and we have had no provincial public hearings.

Instead, what have we seen? We have had reviews of the heritage status of this building; a review that was done by the Heritage Council of Manitoba and recommended that this building be, in fact, a heritage building. Was there then a public hearing to assess this review, this report and look at the merits and demerits? No.

What happened was that the Minister of Heritage (Mr. Lemieux) discussed this with his deputy minister, and we have a report from the deputy minister which says this should not be a heritage building. The Minister of Heritage is normally appointed by the Premier to defend the interests of heritage in this province, to defend the heritage of Manitobans and we have had a minister who has turned out to be the chief wrecker, the chief demolition expert in this province.

There are concerns, and there is due process relative to the environment when we are looking at projects in this province. There is an environmental act and class 2 developments are covered. There is a process for looking at these. There is a sustainable development strategy, the COSDI report, which the minister so proudly tabled a year ago. This is my strategy, said the minister. That strategy calls very clearly for public involvement every step along the way of major projects in this province, but we have not had it.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Lathlin) seems to have forgotten the

elements, the fundamental tenets of his own strategy. We have a code of conduct which the Minister of Conservation tabled earlier this week. That code of conduct calls for adequate public involvement and consultation all the way along. Sadly, we have not had it.

* (00:50)

There are reasons for due process, for public involvement and public consultation. Those reasons are that there are a lot of wise people in Manitoba, and the interests of citizens, of business and our Government are well served to listen to the people who are knowledgeable in this province, to give people the opportunity to provide recommendations, improve projects, have a second look.

One of the dismaying things is we were led to believe that this Government had undertaken a very, very thorough assessment of the Eaton's building and that it was nothing more than a dilapidated, rat-infested building that was not worth very much. Well, the reality is we are now getting more and more reports that this building is structurally sound, remarkably flexible. It was one of the most innovative structures of its day. It is a landmark structure. Interestingly enough, this was a symbol, a heritage symbol, a symbol of the inventiveness, the social, technological inventiveness of this province.

The NDP now are determined to demolish this symbol. I think they do not believe in inventiveness, entrepreneurial and social and technological. They want to demolish the symbols that stand for this kind of Manitoba inventiveness. It is too bad. I think the Government should have taken a little more time. There should have been more involvement by Manitobans in this process, because Manitobans have a lot to contribute when asked.

I think that we might have improved, we might even have ended up with not one but two projects, a revitalized Eaton's building and a new arena on the space next to the Convention Centre. But the Government is on a headlong rush. The chances of that now seem remote, because the Government has not taken the chance to really consult and involve Manitobans in the decision making.

I want to move on to a second area and talk briefly a little bit about rural Manitoba, where

we have a lot of concerns and an agricultural perspective, a lot of concerns about agricultural perspective, the low commodity prices. Many farmers are concerned about the future. One of the real, central duties of government should be to make sure that risk for agricultural producers is lower and that there is adequate drainage in place.

I have asked the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Lathlin) on a number of occasions for a full report on all the provincial drains in the province, but we have not had it. It is now almost two years, and we do not even have an assessment of the status. We had, when we made the visits to Dauphin, to Brandon, to Beausejour and the committee meeting in Winnipeg, a lot of concern about drainage, a lot of concern that the provincial government was not doing its part to make sure the provincial drains were in good shape.

In fairness, there are municipal responsibilities, there are individual farmer responsibilities, but at the very least we should expect that the provincial Government would do its task well.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

I would like to put in this context visits that I made to parts of rural Manitoba this last Monday, July 2, just to see what the status was, the drainage and the crop situation. I visited many farms, toured crops from Morden to Carman to St. Claude to Portage to MacGregor. I had to look carefully at the quality of the crops and the situation of drainage, touring with an individual who is particularly knowledgeable in this area. The assessment quite frankly was that the provincial Government and in some cases the municipalities basically were not doing their job properly, that there looked to be millions of dollars of crop losses that will likely occur this year, that will occur this year because the provincial Government has not done its job properly.

There is a major problem with drainage when agriculture producers lose millions of dollars because the drainage is not done properly. Then the Government, of course, loses

taxes; businesses are in trouble; farmers are in trouble, all because the provincial Government has not adequately done its job. They can make excuses from here to there, up one arm down the other, but the reality is that the job has not been done. So for a government which has talked about agriculture and its importance, this Government, the NDP government, has not done what it should have done.

Let me move to talk a little bit about health care. I will not spend much time, but I do want to say a few words. Bill 25 introduces part-time surgical care, does not use resources efficiently, because you cannot have operations in the evening. But there are other issues. There are preventive issues which have not been attended to properly. The minister has said maybe sometime in the future he is going to have an initiative to prevent or decrease smoking in this province, but so far in two years he has done nothing. We have had lip-service to fetal alcohol syndrome but very little action. There has not been a substantive, preventive health effort.

One of the important issues which arose from the report, which we received from Justice Sinclair, and then the Thomas report which followed, emphasized the importance of quality assurance, improving the quality, decreasing the number of errors. What we have seen, in fact, whether they are errors or not, but patients dying in the hallways, in the waiting rooms. We have seen problems. Clearly the design of the system needs to be improved. There has not been the attention that there should have been to quality of care. The result is much higher costs and poorer quality than it should have been because there was not the attention to quality that this Government should have paid.

We are all too aware that Manitoba spends in public health care dollars in this province more than any other province per capita. There needs to be better, smarter spending in health care, better quality so we are not wasting resources, better quality so we are providing better health care.

The last area that I would like to talk about is the fact that the NDP government in this session has shown a part-way approach: timid,

tentative, tinkering approach to social justice in Bill 41.

To Bill 38, instead of doing the job properly and addressing the concerns of people in the R.M. of Winchester, what we have seen is that the bill does not address one of the major concerns that citizens have been raising in this province about local governments: that there was a problem with people owning land and partial shares on land, and this problem still exists because the NDP government did not follow through. They did not do the proper job that they should have done to fix up the legislation properly.

* (01:00)

We have a Minister of Conservation (Mr. Lathlin) who last year proudly proclaimed The Sustainable Development Act. The sustainable development strategy is the COSDI report. The COSDI report has some strengths and weaknesses. I do not think it is as good a strategy as it could be, but it does do some good things; it lays out some recommendations. My understanding was that the Minister of Conservation was going to implement those recommendations because they were his strategy. One of those recommendations was that there would be a sustainable development auditor who would be able to look at the projects, at the proposals that were going through this province like the Eaton's and the arena proposal.

But we do not have a sustainable development auditor to look at these issues. We are going to have some major issues in northern Manitoba, new power projects. We have some issues to clear up in Cross Lake and the fact that the Northern Flood Agreement arrangement with Cross Lake has still not been completed.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

There are issues to clear up, yet there is no sustainable development auditor to provide audit, advice and input on these issues. Let us hope that the Minister of Conservation, Mr. Speaker, will correct this situation, will implement his own strategy. Let us hope, but we have

waited a year and it should have been done in a year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will bring my remarks to a close. I believe the NDP government have let down Manitobans from the point of view of democracy, that the NDP have let down Manitobans from the point of view of adequately addressing drainage issues, that the NDP government have let down Manitobans by providing part-time health care even when they are increasing the access and making full-time alcohol access available. The NDP have let down Manitobans by providing a tinkering, timid approach to a number of issues instead of doing the proper job that they should have done.

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): I want to say a few words about this session, Mr. Speaker.

It has been my first session, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is very interesting, that I have made some observations and I have learned some things during this time. Before I go on, I would like to say that there are a couple of things that I thought were very interesting that happened this first session. Before I do that, I would like to acknowledge the pages, who, I think, during the session did a wonderful job for all members on all sides.

Also, I think it is important, and I would like to acknowledge by name the six legislative interns, the three that worked for the New Democratic Party, Vince Barletta, Sarah Freund and Colin Lemoine; and the three interns that worked for us, Jürgen Derrer, Bonnie Hiltz and Erin Melrose. I believe that they did wonderful jobs and should be acknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, I think from time to time, as happens in this Chamber, people look at it and sometimes get caught up in the theatre of what happens in the Chamber, but I think it is important that all Manitobans realize that there is serious work that gets done in this Chamber that is part of a very special part of the democratic process.

When I started out, I did say that I had learned something during this first session. What I learned was that the Member for Concordia,

the First Minister (Mr. Doer), did just about anything he could in an election campaign to get elected. That First Minister said, and I quote: Elect me and we will end hallway medicine. Immediately we will go out and we will hire nurses. Immediately we are going to go open new beds. And if you elect me we are going to slash waiting lists.

Well, what I have learned is that he has broken all his promises. There is no credibility. I learned that there is a hidden agenda on the other side. They cannot be trusted. It is always, no matter what happens, the Doer-knows-best approach. He has misled Manitobans. They have gone close to breaking the law. What did they do? They put in legislation to fix it.

When you look at the fact that we have a minister of Heritage Council who misled this House, he misled the House about receiving the Eaton's recommendations from the Heritage Council. Well, now we find on one day something happened another day. Another letter came, not sure what day this letter was there. It is just a pattern that starts. Unfortunately, there is no end to it, because when we were talking with the Premier, we asked the First Minister about how he felt with respect to what was happening with the True North Centre. We understood it to believe that there was \$10-million worth of money going into it on behalf of the taxpayers of Manitoba, that there was \$3-million worth of tax relief on the construction of it. We were led to believe that there was \$1.5 million that was going to be capped. Well, all of a sudden that changed. The tune changed.

The Premier (Mr. Doer) said when I asked him during concurrence, well, it is in the term sheet. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that anybody who is going to sign the term sheet, you would think they would know and understand it, that they would be able to explain it. But he could not. So he is hiding something from Manitobans.

The Minister of Industry and Trade (Ms. Mihychuk) changed the act governing the Crocus Fund to enable it to invest directly into this project. There was a big to-do on the other side about apologizing, got to apologize, because apparently the questions that were being asked made somebody nervous. So rather than sit back

and look at what was there, let us change the legislation, another way of trying to get around what is really bothering them. That is that members on this side were merely questioning on behalf of the taxpayers of Manitoba. Any questions that drive to the fact that the taxpayers of Manitoba are going to be involved in something, then they get nervous and they do not want to answer those questions.

* (01:10)

Hydro applied to PUB, Mr. Speaker. They applied to PUB in February, because they knew that, as was required by the law, they would have to go in front of the Public Utilities Board. All of a sudden, it gets withdrawn, and we changed the law so that we do not have to do that. Well, if they do not like the rules, they just change them.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) directed his staff to make changes to the teachers' pensions before the legislation was introduced. Well, they do not like the rules, they just change them.

The Premier's staff, right out of the Premier's Office, last year, the Premier's highest-ranking staff violated The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act by withholding information that they were in receipt of, even after media requests.

One thing that was very interesting when we had a discussion with the Premier, when we were talking to the Premier, when we were asking questions, we asked him about a letter that came forward to us, and it was in response to a request on travel. The chief Clerk of Executive Council wrote, and I quote, this was what was in the letter: The Premier has requested that I advise you that the travel cost details shown in the attached summary are comparable to the totals for yearly travel by the previous premier. He went on to say, quote: For your information, the staff time required to process this request was in excess of 75 hours. The total cost is estimated at \$3,000.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I asked the question of the Premier when it was clearly said: The Premier has requested that I advise, when I

asked the question, so are you interfering with the request, well, what we got was a ramble about, well, if you really feel that this is important then you can go to the courts.

All we were talking about was the First Minister (Mr. Doer), who was on the record as talking about transparency, all we heard, rather than saying I did interfere, I apologize, I am sorry, was, well, the member opposite, meaning me at the time asking the questions very strongly, then you can go to the courts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber, when one makes a mistake, an error, as the Premier clearly did, you just admit it and you move on. That is the way it should be. Instead, you change the rules or else you challenge and say, well, okay, so I misled, but, you know, do not ask me because I am saying, if you have trouble and you do not like what I said, then you go to the courts. You know, that is not the way that I believe that this Chamber should operate.

On the fact that you go back and with the blood money flip-flop, Mr. Speaker, make reference to the fact that Premier Gary Doer promised Manitobans the day before the September 21 election that all tainted blood victims would receive compensation under an NDP government. *[interjection]* Well, they want to applaud a flip-flop. Another thing that was said: Doer would not commit to extending compensation to all hepatitis-C victims. He would only say the Province is examining various options. Again, here is one comment, and then you get a flip-flop.

On MPI, here is another one. Gary Doer misjudged Manitobans when he attempted to—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I hate to interrupt the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, but when making reference to all honourable members, please name members by their constituency or ministers by their portfolios. I ask the co-operation of all honourable members.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, of course, I am referring to the First Minister (Mr. Doer). The First Minister misjudged Manitobans when he attempted to raid \$30 million from MPI. A legal opinion advises that such a move would have

been contrary to the very act governing the corporation. Well, what we have is another flip-flop. Mistake made; yank it back; flip-flop is what we got.

On the Budget, the Budget was long on spending, short on tax reduction and absent of a long-term vision. It is pivotal that when a government brings in a budget, particularly when you look at what is happening across the landscape, that you be competitive with the rest of Canada. Unfortunately, this Premier (Mr. Doer) failed to make sure that Manitoba remain competitive. Polls in Manitoba have shown that young people in businesses are concerned about their future in this province. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce shows that 75 percent of young Winnipeg residents would move somewhere else if they had an opportunity. Under his watch that is what they are saying.

Furthermore, a poll conducted by the CFIB shows that more and more Manitobans, more and more Manitoba businesses are concerned about the Doer government's changes to labour laws and about what might be coming. The poll speaks for itself. There is no question that under this Government it is clear that the grass is greener on the other side. While the Premier might try to educate our young people and while he might try to ensure that they have a solid education, what happens once they graduate? The opportunities are outside here because he has failed to keep Manitoba competitive. What did some of the people outside that have observed this Government, Mr. Speaker, say about this Budget? Well, they called it the urge to splurge.

I said that government is about choices. It is about making choices. Today the Premier spoke. What he said and what he did, he chose to spend today rather than working hard for tomorrow. He chose to put this Government on a spending spree that is clearly unsustainable. As a matter of fact, to prove that point, what did they do? For every six dollars, they spent six dollars for every one dollar of tax relief. They tried to spin that one. No, it is not six. They tried to say it was less than that.

But is it not interesting? Is it not interesting that it was the CFIB that came out and claimed that the tax cuts from last year were included in

the Budget? The Government should also include increases. They did not count the Province's new green tax on pesticides and fertilizers and the \$2-per-carton tax on cigarettes.

If anything, the CFIB said they were too generous to them. Hey, big spenders. Here is another one. Hey, big spenders. Well, they are talking about the fact that they are trying to be competitive with Saskatchewan. Well, we on this side of the House say that is not good enough. It is not good enough to be competitive with Saskatchewan. There are other provinces and jurisdictions here that are taking action while they sit by the sidelines and fail to do so.

Well, you know, the First Minister said, so, you know, on that side you say that we are spending too much money. What would you cut? Well, where do we start, Mr. Speaker? There is no question that this side of the House would not have put \$7.3 million into bricks and mortar. We would not have hired the extra staff that they felt that they needed, a burden to the taxpayer. We would not have given the bigger salaries that they have given to their staff. We would not have done those things. We would not have bought United Food shared services the way that they said they did. Now it is the property of cook-chill.

On the Budget the NDP has no excuses. That is the real story out of yesterday's provincial Budget, a financial plan laden with lavish spending and very short on tax relief.

The importance of tax relief to Manitobans is lost on this Government. Manitoba lags behind on income taxes. The Manitoba government is the best in the West, but they are the best in the West at collecting income taxes. What a thing to be known for, the best in the west at collecting income taxes.

Clearly, people in Manitoba are looking for some action. As recorded in another article: Give us tax cuts now; British Columbia's Liberal government has given 25% income tax. Virtually every other province in Canada accepts the fact that lower taxes benefit the economy.

* (01:20)

Now, I know that is something on the other side they will struggle with. That is a difficult thing, and maybe, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it, but I will speak a little slower, because this is important. Every other province in Canada accepts the fact that lower taxes benefit the economy, but the Doer government still believes a high tax regime is the key to future prosperity.

Many companies bypass Manitoba. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because there are opportunities in other provinces. They fail to keep Manitoba competitive, drowning in taxes. These are all positions taken by people in Manitoba.

Tax freedom day. Tax freedom day, Mr. Speaker, falls in Manitoba on July 2. Even Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island are better off than Manitoba when it comes to taxes. That is unacceptable.

Despite the fact that this Government has found in excess of \$800 million of new revenue, they have gone out to spend it. So what do they have to do, Mr. Speaker? Well, we better start raising some fees. We had better start going back to the taxpayer's pocket, take a little bit more out.

Well, what have they done? Registration fee for farm trucks is up. Dealer plate fees are going up. Vehicle registration is going up. Manitoba drivers' licence fees also increase. With all of the money they have, back into the taxpayer's pocket for just a little bit more. Well, the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, what did they say in response to a letter from the honourable Minister of Labour and Immigration (Ms. Barrett)? Well, they were quite concerned about the interpretation that the positive data and the facts update somehow suggested that businesses are, quote, not hurting under the NDP. Those were the words that were quoted.

They go on to say in their letter: Firstly, if we were to seriously pursue the question of the impact the New Democratic Party has had on the business community, it is not enough to analyze how the economy is doing. We would have to ask whether the economy would have been healthier without our current Government's initiatives. We would probably also have to ask how much stronger the economy would have

been if the Progressive Conservatives had been elected.

There are indeed some signs that businesses are hurting under the New Democratic Party. Bankruptcies are up, Mr. Speaker. Comparison between February 2001 and February 2000 indicates we have 3000 fewer full-time jobs. Data for 2000 reveal that Manitoba had a net loss by interprovincial migration to each of the Atlantic provinces. To my knowledge, this is from the president of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, that has not happened ever before.

Well, it goes on, Mr. Speaker. The NDP is spooking small business. Anxiety over Manitoba's labour laws has skyrocketed amongst small- and medium-sized businesses. Well, they are going to say, that is when we introduced Bill 44, and everything is okay now. It has all subsided. Well, it is interesting that this report came out June 13, 2001. That attitude that pervades, that scared Business Manitoba, still is very much alive and, unfortunately, well in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was quite fascinating during the debate, that despite saying less than one year ago the Minister responsible for Lotteries (Ms. McGifford) said, oh, we will not advertise. We do not advertise.

That was a year ago. Now, she has embarked on a massive advertising campaign. You can hear the flip-flop all the way to Las Vegas, Mr. Speaker. I must read a quote which I am sure members opposite will find most interesting: The Government has promoted gaming in this province to the point of ridiculousness. The Government has promoted gaming in this province to the point of ridiculousness. That was a quote.

Well, that quote came from the Member for Minto (Ms. Mihychuk) when in opposition. But as we are learning with this crew, that was then, this is now. Well, I guess the question becomes are they trying to raise another \$20 million? Is that the order that came from the Premier's Office. We have to lure more people in here. We have to get them in here because we need more revenue. One way to do it is to get them by luring those people in.

I would like to talk a little bit about agriculture, Mr. Speaker. The commitment to agriculture in our rural communities is, again, a theme of broken promises from the other side. Just a few days ago, the Agriculture Minister (Ms. Wowchuk) came back from a meeting with her colleagues. Those colleagues were all from across Canada. She signed a communiqué outlining a new vision for agriculture. Evidently, she forgot to read it. The vision for renewal that she has is to say to farmers: Do not farm; get off the farm; away you go; move on; move out. No opportunities in farming.

The farmers in Manitoba have enough tough time fighting Mother Nature. They do not need to be fighting the Doer government. Their idea of renewal is to have farmers work off the farm or just get off the land. We believe that this minister should be lobbying for an immediate cash input, reminding the Premier (Mr. Doer) of his promise to secure a meeting with the Prime Minister, something else that he said he was going to do and another failed promise. Well, it seems we have heard numerous times from this Premier that a promise made is a promise kept. Well, that certainly does not apply to rural Manitoba because they promised and they failed.

Month after month goes by, yet this Government refuses to recognize the hurt arising as the result of the 1999 flood. Time and time again, the Government has refused to put together a disaster assistance program and be prepared to collect the money from the federal government, just as the previous government did for the devastating flood or the forest fire of 1999. It is shameful that this Government has failed to implement any of the recommendations of the Rural Business Task Force chaired by Bob Rose. This Government's blind indifference to the victims of the 1990 flood is, quite frankly, despicable and will soon not be forgotten by the people in rural Manitoba. These communities are attempting to recover from this disaster, and, frankly, it is a testament to their tenacity alone, not to any assistance due to the Doer government.

Conservation, Mr. Speaker. What do they say about conservation? Well, they did not say much but, certainly, the Sierra Club had something to say. The Premier (Mr. Doer), they

said, is more of a talker than a doer when it comes to environmental issues. Allow me to quote directly from the report: Premier Gary Doer could get an A for rhetoric. Promises to establish protected areas are found everywhere, including in the Budget Speech. What has been missing is actual protection. The Doer government plans in a black box.

Yes, the Doer government does plan in a black box, far away from public scrutiny. Let me give you a couple of examples. The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Lathlin) failed to notify residents about a major gas spill in East St. Paul. The same minister failed to notify residents of an oil spill into the Winnipeg River. The minister hummed and hawed and dawdled before, under heavy pressure, finally removing contaminated soil from East St. Paul. The minister failed to protect wildlife habitat from slipping below the standards established by the previous government, thereby earning a C-minus grade from the Canadian Nature Foundation.

* (01:30)

One has to wonder about this Government's ability to manage the province's resources when it cannot even get a press release right. Again, they once talked about an initiative sustainable land-using plan on the east side of Lake Manitoba, and then, all of a sudden, realized, oops, it is Lake Winnipeg. Well, one hopes that the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Lathlin) did not go to the wrong place.

Mr. Speaker, on education. The Grade 3 assessment: we heard the teachers express serious concerns about the amount of classroom time that was taken away in order to prepare for and administer the Grade 3 test. I quote briefly from an article: Many teachers were given in-service time and, in some cases release time, to carry out these assessments.

The result? What appeared to be a relatively benign election promise has turned into a more cumbersome, more time-consuming workload increase than the previous exams. Grade 3 students lost valuable instruction time with teachers as they were reviewed and were tested on Grade 2 curriculum content. The provincial assessment, according to this article, did not

provide teachers with standard materials, which begs the question. How standard is the assessment? Clearly, it is important to know, at an early age and an early level, what the learning ability of children is.

When it comes to amalgamation, Mr. Speaker, the minister stated he wants fewer divisions by October 2002 school board elections and gave school divisions until June 30, 2001, to voluntarily amalgamate or he would take stronger measures. Some divisions have indicated there would be no benefit to the students or taxpayers by amalgamating. So there is fear that this minister may force amalgamation, and there is concern about the direction he really is going to take. When we asked him about the June 30 deadline, he looked at us and said: June 30? What June 30 deadline? I may have said that. I do not know what I meant.

Clearly, there is confusion out there, and I think it shows that this Government does not have a plan for education. Divisions look at merger. Doubt they will see gains. Boards ignore merger decree. Quote: Our opposition is quite clear. It is really the minister's responsibility to develop new boundaries. It is a completely naïve approach, it was called.

Many of us are in the dark. Is there a plan?

We feel we should be taking our lead from the province, said Transcona-Springfield Superintendent, Paul Moreau, whose division has not been able to identify cost savings or improvement for students that amalgamation would produce.

What exactly is the Government's position on the issue? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education, Training and Youth (Mr. Caldwell) insists school divisions must amalgamate. The Deputy Premier (Ms. Friesen) has expressed deep concern because, as she stated: The bottom line is that there is no economic or educational rationale for proceeding with forced boundary revisions.

Mr. Speaker, there clearly is confusion. The Deputy Premier is saying boundary revisions will not save money. Well, maybe, a novel approach, maybe the Deputy Premier and the

Minister of Education could get together. That would be unique, and that would be something that would be very different.

School taxes. Just as we saw in last year's school funding announcement they made, there are a good majority of school divisions that have not received funding to prevent property taxes from going up. The long-term impact of Bill 42 is also likely to lead to increased property taxes, Mr. Speaker, by eliminating a school board's ability to pay from consideration during the bargaining process.

This Government has yet to seriously address the problem of the education support levy. School taxes on the launching pad. Trustees blame soaring expenses. Lack of help from Education Minister. Post-secondary education. The tuition rebate.

While lower tuition fees are clearly beneficial, our Government introduced the Manitoba learning tax credit and expanded scholarships and bursaries. The NDP tuition policy does not specifically target students in need of financial assistance.

The minister has no long-term plan for tuition policy. He has failed to provide funding to institutions to cover the loss from the tuition cut. The University of Manitoba did not receive enough money from the Government to cut staff programs and equipment. Well, a one-stop shop for student loans, concerns being raised whether, in fact, this is going to work. Concerns being raised by the very students that are supposed to be using this as their way to finance their education.

On the University College of the North, the minister has announced plans to have the University College of the North up and running in the fall of 2003. The minister said she prefers to use existing buildings wherever possible. That is fair, but as our esteemed critics have asked this minister, she is moving too fast. Is the Province ready, struggling to meet the infrastructure needs of post-secondary institutions without building new ones? Has the minister looked at technological advances such as distant education programs and the use of the Internet which, I believe, everybody is supposed to be

hooked up to at some point according to a promise that they made? Will they use the Internet to deliver educational programs instead of spending more money on bricks and mortar? A question asked which never gets answered is what effect will that new university have on the current ones that already exist in the province?

When it comes to justice, Mr. Speaker, this Government is a crime. An evening of terror, that is what Manitobans wake up to. Police, students fear for lives in Fort Garry. The suspect then terrorized his young hostages for more than an hour. You are not safe at all in any part of the city, the neighbour added. Family victimized in home invasion. A young North End mother is living in fear for her family's safety after they were the victims of a bloody home invasion early yesterday morning. World War III headlines that frighten Manitobans. Home invader roughs up senior. Ecstasy seizure a record for city. Crime rate up 40 percent.

Another issue when you come to talk about rural Manitoba. The original plan in the rural courts of Manitoba is that they were all going to be cancelled and transferred to Brandon. Well, our party said, That is not acceptable. Members of this caucus went out and forced this Government to rethink that. In fact, we were able to save some of those rural courts so that all people in rural Manitoba were not being penalized by the Doer government.

* (01:40)

When it comes to gangs, once again, what do we see? A spike in gang-related violence in Winnipeg. Hells Angels use gunplay to instil fear. Hail of bullets fired by gunmen misses Hells Angel's two-year-old son. Tot survival amazing. These are the kinds of issues that Manitobans read about every single day under the watch of this Premier. Family left in fear by teenagers' attack. Windows broken, children beaten. An exasperated mother of five says she and her husband are being forced from their West End home because of violent teenage gangs running the community. It is not safe for us there. Neighbours on edge after gang shooting. House torched a second time. Firebombing linked to biker gang strife. Cops brace for more violence.

These are the kinds of headlines and kinds of facts that Manitobans are looking at under the leadership of this Premier (Mr. Doer). Drive-by spree over? Wondering, has something come to an end because we have seen far too much of it in this province?

Gunfire on the streets of Winnipeg. November 15, 2000, a stray bullet fired. November 30, 2000, three men are injured in a hail of bullets. December 9, a Winnipeg teen is struck by a 12-gauge shotgun blast. December 10, 19-year-old Jeremy Nolan is shot in the wrist and both legs. December 13, the 15-year-old occupant of a 1986 Chev takes a bullet behind the ear. December 17, Greg Marsden, 19, is shot and left for dead by acquaintances. January 14, the body of Bradley Russell Anderson is found on a road near Stony Mountain. February 12, a 21-year-old man is shot outside an apartment block. May 4, a group of teens open fire on an empty Mustang parked in a driveway. June 16, Steven Yellowback is arrested after a sawed-off shotgun was fired into a house.

Well, Mr. Speaker, clearly, no plan, no sense of community, no sense of safety, and no mercy for gangs is what we read one time. The Manitoba government must declare an all-out war on biker gangs before an innocent person is killed. This has become a very serious issue. When you have people being shot in the streets of Winnipeg, it is only a matter of time before an innocent victim is going to be hurt.

On the very famous 19-point or 18-point gang plan on the NDP action plan: The community policing grants, nothing additional to date; prison gangs suppression teams, nothing announced to date; crimes of children legislation, none to date; youth job prospects funds, nothing announced to date; safe schools charter, none to date; school police officer program, police officers still are not in classrooms, unlikely to happen, given the police shortage; province-wide gang hotline, well, they set up something, but the hotline is not dedicated to dealing with gang activities; communities alive, to date funding has not included policing efforts; and an all-party victims' rights bill, that has yet to see the light of day under this Government.

Mr. Speaker, what we see on the other side when it comes to justice is a lot of photo ops, and because there is no action, there are a lot of photo oops. That is all it has come down to.

Well, now you can listen to the Premier (Mr. Doer) remind us about how everybody in Manitoba should relax because he was going to come to health care and he was going to solve it all. Well, here is what we heard: If it means having our nurses rehired to have beds that we have already paid for staffed rather than having people in the hallway, then we do it. That is what the Premier said during the election campaign. Well, now we understand and we hear: Well, Mr. Speaker, you cannot just add water and mix to get nurses. Well, you either can talk the talk or you cannot. Once again, we find this Premier misleading Manitobans.

On hallway medicine, well, to quote one of the members on the other side, this is a doozy, Mr. Speaker: We have got to get the beds as soon as possible because people want an end to hallway medicine. This was the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak). He reminded us that that is our No. 1 priority; that is the reason we got a mandate.

Well, we know that one month after this lot was elected Government, that they said: Hallway medicine to end by April. Well, that is what was said, Mr. Speaker. We also heard November 23, 1999, that the people are in the ER, the hallways of Manitoba, on a year-round basis. Health Minister Dave Chomiak said yesterday: That is wrong and we were elected—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would like to once again remind all honourable members, when making a reference to other honourable members, please address them by their constituency or honourable ministers by their portfolios. I would like to once again remind all honourable members and ask for full co-operation.

Mr. Murray: Well, Mr. Speaker, to be accurate, please let me reread it: People are in the ER hallways of Manitoba on a year-round basis, the Minister of Health said yesterday. That is wrong and we were elected to end that.

Is it not interesting that four months after they were elected, Mr. Speaker, there is a wonderful picture here, and it says: We are still on target; we are still on target to eliminate hallway medicine.

Well, it is. Six months, the deadline came. What happened when the deadline came? Their deadline, their promise, what happened? Well, all of a sudden we saw headlines: Hallway medicine cured. Hallway medicine cured. Hallway medicine vow fulfilled, the NDP said. Hallway medicine eight months after it was supposed to be done, according to their headlines, eight months after, hallway medicine goes on. One year later: Premier blames shortages of nurses for problems. A desperate shortage is preventing the NDP government from keeping its promise to eliminate hallway medicine, Premier Gary Doer said yesterday. Quote: We need more nurses to fully implement the promise.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what a revelation that was. What an incredible revelation that must have been because one year later the Minister of Industry (Ms. Mihychuk) said, and she admitted, that the NDP, her words: has not made good on all of its health care pledges. But she says: At least some improvements have been made. She went on to say: Hallway medicine is not ended. If we could have corrected it in one year, we would have.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing they did not have her doing the campaign election ads because at least she might have had some sense of honesty with the people of Manitoba.

Sixteen months later, Mr. Speaker, what did we see? Patient pile-up. Oops, patient pile-up. Hallway medicine suddenly reappears, and then we had the true confession that we were all interested in hearing. Well, there it was, and one of the several election pledges the NDP has failed to make good on was highlighted in a report card earlier this week. The probe found the NDP failed to make good on 11 of its 20 promises.

* (01:50)

Why the promise, Mr. Speaker? Why the desire to mislead? Well, we found out because there it was: Selinger drops the bomb, excuse me, I apologize, the Minister of Hydro, the Minister of Finance drops the bomb. Finance Minister says NDP's promise during last year's election campaign to end hallway medicine in six months was not a responsible pledge.

We on this side of the House would like to congratulate that minister because he had the ability to come clean with Manitobans while the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) stood by silently. What did we find now 18 months after this Government has been in power? Hallway medicine remains. Another headline: Patients are still in hospital hallways. Finally: The NDP cannot claim hallway medicine gone.

He said what his party would do to eliminate—and get this, Mr. Speaker, because I think this is an interesting idea. What he said was his party would eliminate, quote: the persistent everyday someone-in-the-hallway-getting-medical-treatment-on-a-regular-basis-all-year-round situation. Funny, we do not remember seeing that on their billboards.

On waiting lists, Mr. Speaker, hospital waiting lists, clearly, have gone up, such as CT scans and MRIs. They have ballooned under the leadership of this Premier. Cash shortages cancel joint surgeries. Well, we know they do not have a plan. They have admitted they do not have a plan for health care.

Now we are looking at shortages and cancellations. A patient in pain after hip surgery is put on hold. Once again, these are the kinds of things that Manitobans have to suffer through because of lack of planning from this Government. Crisis seen in joint replacement surgery—why are things going in the wrong direction? Well, it is because all they would do is make a promise, knowing they could not keep it. Ultrasound wait balloons to months. You talk about ultrasound, and what they say is it has never been this bad. Doctor says public must speak out about medical shortages. Well, again, here we see a situation where the medical professionals, the doctors, they are prepared to speak out against it, but nobody on the other side

is listening. So what do we get? We get rhetoric. We get inaction. We get a sense that nobody on the other side cares about the patients of Manitoba.

Well, I hope that this will get some serious attention, because it comes to the unfortunate incident that three people have died waiting for care, and it is the first time that anybody has had to go through that since 1983. I think that those sorts of tragedies are very unfortunate, but again, as people come forward and say that these are going to continue, why will nobody listen on the other side? Why will they not be there for those people to take action? This is a very, very serious issue, and I am afraid that it is clear that they do not care, that there is no sense that, yes, we can try to do something, we can try to make this better, but, no, all they want to talk about is, well, we know best. We know best. We have all of the answers. Rather than listening, they come out and they try to hammer away with all of the answers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about nurses, nurses clearly have come out, and they have demanded action on the act. Clearly, the act was passed some two years ago, and it sits in abeyance. Why? Because there is no action on the other side. They do not know what to do. There is no plan. When Seven Oaks has to divert ambulances, you have to know that we have a serious problem. When ERs are closing for a lack of nurses, these people on the other side, this Government on the other side should just stand up and say: Let us have a debate. Let us find out from the people of Manitoba what kind of a system they want for their health care system.

The president of the Manitoba Nurses' Union starts by saying it is time for this Government to act, Mr. Speaker. The fact that they have created 1.5 percent more full-time positions for our members in two years, according to that president—it is deplorable. Well, as you look at the health care system, clearly what we have seen is a government that is unprepared to listen and debate with Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was interesting when I read a response that came through that this is the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak)

who said I have to rely on the recommendations of my officials. Well, is that not interesting? When it is convenient, of course, but when his own department tells him, do not buy the Pan Am Clinic, well, I will not have to rely on them, I guess, as much as I thought, because we better go out and buy some bricks and mortar, because that is the way that we think that we can solve health care in Manitoba.

Well, this is a government that just does not get it. Manitobans are demanding a better health care system, but all this Government wants to do, all they want to talk about, is what they think they know better than all of the health care professionals out there, Mr. Speaker. That is what they believe. They believe that they have all of the answers, and despite the fact that there have been numerous articles, numerous people writing out, people saying, let us give us a chance. Let us give health care a chance. Let us not frighten people. Let us bring them into the process. Let us make them part of what is right, because one thing that they have not understood on the other side is that it is Manitoba's health care system, not their health care system.

Some Honourable Members: More, more.

Mr. Murray: I am just getting started.

Mr. Speaker, when you talk about the fact that there are opportunities for health care—we had some discussion about Bill 25. Members on this side of the House understanding that we have to have a debate with Manitobans, and not be afraid to have that debate. If the ideas that have come forward from the other side are not quite right, there is nothing wrong with saying, we can learn, we can do better. There is nothing magic about saying, we have to have all the answers because, clearly, when it comes to having answers, they have none. They have none.

So, after two years in office, what kind of progress have we seen, Mr. Speaker? Well, when it comes to issues like justice, we see photo opportunity and no action. When it comes to taxes, tax relief, understanding competitiveness, all we see is the rest of Canada going in one direction reducing, understanding that hard-working people should put more money back in their pockets.

This group goes the other way. Just make sure that taxes are higher here. That is supposed to be a good thing. When it comes to health care, this lot has no answers. They have no clue what to do. They have admitted they have no plan. They have no idea what to do on that. This Government is all about broken promises. He had a chance to solve hallway medicine. He failed. He had a chance to cut waiting lists. He failed. He had a chance to get more doctors and nurses here. He failed. He blames everybody for his own promises, but he cannot take it himself. Every chance he gets to make a promise, he fails.

This Premier (Mr. Doer) has no credibility. Manitobans cannot trust this Premier, Mr. Speaker. They deserve better, and in two years they will get better.

* (02:00)

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his high-road presentations in the Chamber tonight and his selective recitation of many newspaper articles over the last period of time. I am sure by the year 2009 they might get over the 1999 election, although I am not sure what therapy to represent to members opposite.

I think today is a wonderful day to be in this Chamber, a wonderful day for all of us to be in this Legislative Building. The privilege that we all enjoy is wonderful. I think it is a real honour for all of us to be in this Chamber debating the best interests of Manitobans. I also believe today was a wonderful opportunity to celebrate so many wonderful Manitobans, so many people who were recognized today. The clock, we cannot see the clock, so technically this is still yesterday, but I do not want to get into that technicality. We might get a point of order or something out of that.

Mr. Speaker, the award winners of the Order of Manitoba I think truly represent the best in this province. The people who were awarded today: A trapper in northern Manitoba; a miner in northern Manitoba; two people who came from one high school, Sisler High School, in the North End of Winnipeg, and became giants in Canadian political life, and now remain as

wonderful contributors to Nigeria's human rights and Asian human rights; a wonderful individual from Gladstone, Manitoba, who has worked with people in health care all her life and continues to work on behalf of seniors in our province; an individual, Dick Martin, he was called Richard today, so I think I better call him Dick Martin. Of course, I was speaking of Gary Filmon and Lloyd Axworthy and Mr. Colomb and others, but Dick Martin, as I said, was a miner, also started an occupational health centre, and now is representing the people of Central and South America in terms of labour rights as part of the trade negotiations that are going on.

We can indeed be proud of Heather Bishop, who has been advocating on behalf of people for decades for equality rights, a wonderful musician, as the member has said, a person who provided leadership for the first Women in Trades organization at the Red River community college, an individual who as a musician writes wonderful children's music—I will not sing the belly song tonight, the belly button song—and, of course, a person who writes adult books, Carol Shields, who has won Pulitzer Prizes, on behalf of all Manitobans; an individual who played in the community clubs of Winnipeg, went to the music halls of Los Angeles and around the world, and is back, you know, owning part of the Salisbury House in Manitoba.

So wonderful, wonderful people who we can celebrate, the heroes of Manitoba who demonstrate the inclusive nature of our province, who demonstrate the best and most positive of our province, I want to start my comments today by thanking each and every one of them for remaining true to their roots, remaining true to their community, remaining true to their values, and making Manitobans proud wherever they go and whatever they do.

I also want to thank Clarence Barber, who was also a recipient. I had the opportunity of meeting with him under the MacDonald Commission on trade, but to read back his history and discover he was involved in providing the cost-effective benefits of the original floodway, and amongst all the other honours he has been awarded. It is truly remarkable the individuals that have been recognized today.

It is I think important for all of us in this Chamber to recognize that we, in this Chamber, are more than just people that take personal shots at each other. We are people that are representing over a million Manitobans, and it is important for us to disagree on substance perhaps, perhaps on vision, perhaps on the follow-through on plans, but we should elevate our debate. We should elevate the debate in this House and be worthy of the people that just went before us today in this Chamber.

I am very optimistic about Manitobans. No matter what side of the aisle we sit on, we should be optimistic about today, and we should be optimistic about tomorrow. It is very, very important to be so. We, in this session, have continued to build on what we believe, in substance, not in personality, but in substance, in a vision, in a plan that will be for the benefit of most Manitobans if not all Manitobans in the future.

We believe that changes are necessary. We believe that education is not a cost; it is an investment. We believe that you cannot have an economic strategy without an education strategy. We believe in investing in our universities, the infrastructure that had deteriorated, the affordability that had been eroded, the hope that was being put into question for many of our young people, and so we have embarked on a strategy that builds for our future.

We do not have all the parts in place yet in education, in post-secondary education and public education, I daresay, but we believe strongly that it is so crucial to our future that kids in high school feel that university is affordable, that kids in high schools feel the community college courses are relevant and appropriate, that businesses believe that we have the flexibility and agility and creativity to target programs. That is why we are very pleased that, not only in expanding and doubling the community college programs in Manitoba, not only doubling the spots, and, yes, we have health care needs and other needs in the public sector, but there are many needs in the private sector. We literally can hire as many people as we can train in so many industries. Our only limitation for many of these industries is people and training.

* (02:10)

In the aerospace industry today, and I just raise this as one example, when we announced the aerospace investment, has a campus right beside the Air Canada maintenance base, right on the airport complex. We have not only Air Canada planes being maintained at that base, we not only have the expansion of Boeing and Bristol and Standard Aero, we have the most successful cost-per-mile airline that has just started out of New York, Jet Blue, being maintained here, planes flown here from New York to Manitoba. We have the America West program airplanes being maintained here in Manitoba. We just need more trained people, and we believe strongly that that is our future.

We are proud that we are proceeding with the Red River College campus downtown. This is an idea that was not unique to us. We did rework it to accommodate the doubling of community college spots. We did rework it from 1000 students to 2000, and we decreased the cost per student by 50 percent to make it doable, but we will restore the historic Grain Exchange building. We will use adaptive strategies to restore that building. We will not only be proud of the 2000 students in downtown Winnipeg with new high-tech, media-sensitive, futuristic courses in downtown Winnipeg, we will restore a historic building. It will be a pride for all Manitobans no matter what your political stripe.

That speaks to a second difference between us. Again, this is not a difference of personality, this is a difference of substance. This is a difference of vision. We believe that the heart of the city, downtown Winnipeg, the heart of the capital city of Manitoba, could not continue to deteriorate year after year. We believe that the heart of a capital city represents also the soul of a province. We have to invest and be creative in downtown Winnipeg. That is why the Red River community college is so important for our vision of the future of Manitoba. The Big 4 building, the Ashdown building, with the combination of private sector and arts organizations, are very important for us. The whole issue of Neighbourhoods Alive! in other centres besides downtown Winnipeg, Thompson and Brandon, as well as downtown Winnipeg, for housing is extremely important. Yes, we believe in

improving and enhancing the Keystone Centre in Brandon. There are many other recreational complexes in Manitoba that are needed, and, yes, we believe in building a new arena in downtown Winnipeg. We believe we have the right combination to do so.

I recognize from time to time there will be a disagreement on location, on the percentages, on the plan on an item like this, but I can say to members opposite, they will recall where disagreements in '95 did not allow us to go forward. They may recall where disagreements in 1992 did not allow the community to go forward. They may recall the disagreements in 1984 when the Province and the federal government had an agreement and it was blocked because of the interests of the Enterprises at City Hall. I know members opposite tried to get things off the ground and get this thing moving. Always, always, always there were not the right combinations of governments and private sector and community interest. There is now.

I recognize some people are concerned about the building. We obviously asked the questions before we even contemplated looking at that site. We are restoring historic buildings. To the credit of members opposite, the adaptive restoration that took place at the Brandon University was a quality decision that they made that I respect. It is important to maintain and restore our history, but it is also important to create a future. We have to have a balance between restoration of our history and preservation of those buildings that are truly historical and a sense of optimism of building a future. That is what this project represents. We believe the CanWest Global job announcement again is high tech and very positive.

We believe that developing and investing in each of our regions is extremely important. In terms of rural Manitoba, diversification will continue to be a priority of ours. Using our strengths and resources will continue to be a priority for this Government. Stewarding more water, for example, will not only provide flood protection in the spring but provide for more alternative crops all the way through the summer. The Shellmouth Dam proposal will provide the ability to grow more potatoes in Manitoba. It has tremendous economic value,

not only on the production side, but also on the value-added side in terms of plants.

We believe that we have to continue, as members opposite did, in the diversification of our agricultural economy. We know that the farm crisis is real in terms of incomes for grain and oilseed producers, but I want to say to members opposite, the largest payment for grain and oilseeds producers in the year 2000 out of the Ag budget and the year 2001 has been produced by this side of the House, not because, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to compare ourselves with members opposite, but cheques that are written at \$50 million two years in a row, at that kind of level, over and above the Ag budget, is a commitment to keep the family farm alive, and is a commitment on behalf of the provincial government.

We believe that each community should be a safe one. We are passing car theft legislation. It will be the strongest car theft legislation in Canada. We believe, as members opposite do, that the unacceptably high number of car thefts—we must have greater deterrents because if an individual, even if they are just going for a joy ride and steals a car. It is dangerous. People die. People are killed. People are hurt. We believe this car theft legislation, when it is known to young people, will be a deterrent for young people to steal cars, to prevent them from stealing cars and prevent them from going on joyrides. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will (a) fulfill an election promise, but (b), reduce the number of accidents and reduce the number of car thefts.

Drunk driving laws are changed, and they will be the strongest in Canada. Bill 10 will close down booze houses and houses of prostitution. We will also, Mr. Speaker, implement hope. We are implementing the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. We want greater partnership with First Nations people. We will also provide lighthouses, 21 lighthouses across Manitoba starting at the Beeper Spence centre at the Indian Métis Friendship Centre in the inner city of Manitoba. We have to give kids more choices to stay out of gangs while they are young, rather than trying to deal with them after they are in gangs. We should all join together in an all-party way to provide hope and opportunity and

choices for kids to stay out of gangs, and we think we have moved forward in that regard here in Manitoba.

In northern Manitoba, we have equalized the hydro rates. We have equalized the hydro rates. You know, I think there was a conversion on the "road to Damascus." The Hydro light went off after objecting to the legislation, and we are glad you finally saw the light. We are glad you finally saw the light and joined in in an intelligent decision. This Legislature, surely, you talk about democracy, this elected Legislature, that is accountable to all the people of Manitoba, surely can make a decision to give the people in northern Manitoba, where the hydro-electric power is generated, the same electrical rates as in the city of Winnipeg. That is not a difficult concept, Mr. Speaker.

* (02:20)

We have eliminated—*[interjection]* I will get to Hydro in a moment. The Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) should be a little patient, just be a little patient.

Mr. Speaker, we have eliminated the user fees in northern Manitoba, and we have a vision for health care and a plan for health care for more diagnostic equipment, not just located in the teaching hospitals but all across rural Manitoba. We understand when you decrease the number of technicians that are trained, you decrease the services to patients. We will increase the number of diagnostic staff to be utilized and skilled in every form of diagnostic equipment. We will return and rebuild the health care system for diagnostic care. One view of nurses is to fire a thousand. Our view is to triple the number of graduates by the year 2002.

We have expanded the community clinics, and we have more work to do. I am really proud that we have one of the most unique preventative programs in all of Canada. Again, a building block for hope for our kids, a building block that has been recognized by national experts like Dr. Fraser Mustard. We have now got the best prenatal and natal program with the underweight baby program. We are proud of that. This program covers all babies at a certain targeted income level, a recommendation made by Dr.

Brian Postl in the Healthy Child report, a recommendation that is worthy of this Legislature implementing. I am proud we are going ahead with that proposal.

We are continuing to decrease the bureaucracies in health and increase the services. We are continuing our health research and health innovation. I think we should be proud and congratulate Doctor Dhalla for hosting 3000 heart experts who will be in Winnipeg starting today. We should welcome them to Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

I am also very happy that we have articulated the strong reasons for our Bill 25. Doctor Shapiro has produced the studies in Alberta and Manitoba and the health advisory committee to show that if you have a profit system running alongside a non-profit system, and you allow individuals and staff to be skimmed out of one system and go to the other system, your costs go up for the whole health care system, and accessibility for people that do not have the wealth goes down. We are not in favour of a health care system where your care is dependent upon the size of your wallet. We believe in a health care system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we recognize with the innovations we have made in the legislation we have changed that we have challenges in health care. When we came into office, before the overexpenditures which we had inherited, we had the highest per capita spending in health care in Canada and we think we did not have the results to justify that. We are slowly, but surely and predictably, trying to reduce the cost, per capita costs in health care, but at the same time putting in the bridges and supports to make sure that patient care is not sacrificed while we make these transitions to community emergency, diagnostic and urgent care.

We have many innovations ahead of us because affordable government is part of our objective. That is why I am so proud of the Budget that we produced in this session that makes our Government more affordable for Manitobans. We delivered on our property tax. We delivered on two payments of property tax credit. We did not promise a decrease in income tax. We have decreased the income tax by 10

percent in our first three budgets, but we are not going the way of some provinces by reducing taxes and increasing debt. That is the way of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Murray). We will lower the taxes in a more moderate way, but we will also reduce the debt and not increase the deficit. I am shocked that the Leader of the Opposition is proposing a deficit budget here in Manitoba again. That is why we are pleased to proceed in this way, Mr. Speaker.

Last year we brought in the fairest family credits in Canada; 2002, we bring in middle-income cuts, tax cuts to small business, corporate tax cuts. We are providing a word in tax reductions that may be foreign to members opposite. First of all, it is greater than what they ever did in 11 years, and they never did anything on the corporate tax side in their careers, but secondly, the very important difference between that side and this side. We do not believe in rolling the dice and raising the debt and raising the deficit. We believe in sustainable, fair tax reductions targeted for those who need it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a low unemployment rate. We have the lowest youth unemployment rate. Our problem is that we do not have enough people. We are getting people from other provinces, but we need to train more of our own Manitoba people available at skilled jobs. That is why we will be building a university of the north, not a university per se, but university courses for northern Manitobans to take those skilled jobs that are going wanting. That is our vision.

But also, Mr. Speaker, we need more immigration, and we are absolutely committed to an expanded immigration policy. We are not the kissing cousins of the anti-immigration parties in Ottawa. We are not the kissing cousins to the anti-immigration party in Ottawa. We still do not know which way some of you voted, but we know some of you are the kissing cousins to the anti-immigration movement in this country. That is not our vision.

Manitoba is blessed with wonderful people and great resources. Our water is a precious resource; probably one of the greatest resources in the world in this century will be our water. We are committed to stewarding that water and

ensuring it is there for the quality of life and economic opportunity of Manitobans. We also know that too much water causes a tremendous amount of disruption and pain. We are committed to the flood-protection strategies that we have put in our budget, \$82 million, \$42 million in rural Manitoba and \$40 million for flood protection in the city of Winnipeg. We are also committed to drainage. We are increasing the drainage budget. We must increase the drainage budget. Too many farms and too many communities are being flooded because of 10 years of neglect, and we are going to try and reverse that. Hopefully, we can get co-operation from some of the federal government bureaucrats that are blocking common-sense decisions in Manitoba.

Water also provides one of our most wonderful, wonderful part of our future. That is Hydro. We believe that Manitoba's future is tied to Manitoba Hydro. We have believed that since the Schreyer government in the '70s and the Pawley government in the '80s. We have been the party that has built Manitoba Hydro. The members opposite are the party that has no confidence. It is the mothball party of Manitoba. Limestone was mothballed by the Conservatives and built by the NDP. Conawapa was mothballed by the Conservatives, and new growth will take place only under an NDP government. That is the future of Manitoba. *[interjection]* Well, the vision of the members opposite—no, I will not get into that. High road.

* (02:30)

We will do so, though, with future partnership with Aboriginal people. We believe the jobs and hope must also go to those people residing adjacent to those bands. When I was in New York last week, we were discussing what has happened in North America in terms of energy. We had raised these issues a year ago to many individuals who are concerned about energy reliability; a year ago before the California crisis we had talked about the lowest-price hydro-electric power in North America and the most reliable energy utility. A year later they believe us.

We also said that we had to have agreements in place with Aboriginal people. The fact that we

have worked with that over the last 18 months to get those in place, many people believe, having seen Robert Kennedy Jr. go down the Hudson River and stop the Great Whale Project, that is not just good social equity in terms of the future of this province. It is not just good practices of inclusion, it is also good economic partnership for our future. They are the places we are putting in place for our future.

We are working on a western power grid. We are working on getting more exports to the United States, but we want to keep our rates low for Manitoba. We have miles to go before we sleep. We have lots of work to do in our future of our province. We have not achieved all the things that we promised that we would achieve yet, and there are many more items that we put on our agenda for the future of this province.

I want to thank the interns, the staff of the Legislative Counsel, the pages, the staff of the Speaker's office, all the staff that we have working for both political parties. I want to thank all the people who are working hard. Any members of the media, if you have praised them they will consider you are trying to ingratiate yourselves and even give you more negative coverage the next day, but I just want to pay tribute to the fifth estate and if any are leaving wish them very well. We will miss you, and I cannot single out any names because I will be in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, we believe a government must work hard on behalf of the people. We believe that governments cannot be mean-spirited but must be inclusive. We believe that governments must embrace the optimistic agenda of the future. We believe in an inclusive vision for Manitoba. We believe there are deep divisions between the two parties here in this province. Education and training; downtown and revitalization of our rural communities; the whole area of Hydro development for the benefit of all of our citizens; health care where we are training nurses, not firing nurses; and Hydro being used in an inclusive way for our future.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am so proud of the team that I work with. I am so proud that all of us are working for all of Manitobans. We do not pledge perfection, but we promise to get up

every day and work as hard as we can for the people of Manitoba. We are a can-do government, and we look forward to the future with optimism.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is that when the House adjourns today it shall stand adjourned until the time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

ROYAL ASSENT

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Blake Dunn): His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

His Honour Peter Liba, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in the following words:

Mr. Speaker: Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba asks Your Honour to accept the following bills:

Madam Clerk Assistant (Monique Grenier):

Bill 44—The Loan Act, 2001; Loi d'emprunt de 2001

Bill 45—The Appropriation Act, 2001; Loi de 2001 portant affectation de crédits

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): In Her Majesty's name, the Lieutenant-Governor thanks the Legislative Assembly and assents to these bills.

Mr. Speaker: Your Honour:

At this sitting, the Legislative Assembly has passed certain bills that I ask Your Honour to give assent to.

Madam Clerk Assistant (Monique Grenier):

Bill 7—The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Hydro-Manitoba

Bill 8—The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les mines et les minéraux

Bill 9—The Vital Statistics Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil et modifications corrélatives

Bill 10—The Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi visant à accroître la sécurité des collectivités et des quartiers et modifications corrélatives

Bill 11—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives

Bill 12—The Real Property Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels

Bill 13—The Social Services Appeal Board and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la Commission d'appel des services sociaux et modifications corrélatives

Bill 14—The Consumer Protection Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur

Bill 15—The Mortgage Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les hypothèques

Bill 16—The Farm Practices Protection Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection des pratiques agricoles

Bill 17—The Student Aid Act; Loi sur l'aide aux étudiants

Bill 18—The Teachers' Pensions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la pension de retraite des enseignants

Bill 19—The Crown Lands Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales

Bill 20—The Farm Products Marketing and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la commercialisation des produits agricoles et modifications corrélatives

Bill 21—The Manitoba Ethnocultural Advisory and Advocacy Council Act; Loi sur le Conseil ethnoculturel manitobain de consultation et de revendication

Bill 22—The Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Fondation de traitement du cancer et de recherche en cancérologie et modifications corrélatives

Bill 23—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route

* (02:40)

Bill 24—The Liquor Control Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools et modifications corrélatives

Bill 25—The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie et modifications corrélatives

Bill 26—The Winnipeg Commodity Exchange Restructuring Act; Loi sur la réorganisation de la Bourse des marchandises de Winnipeg

Bill 27—The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act (2); Loi n° 2 modifiant la Loi sur l'Hydro-Manitoba

Bill 28—The Labour-Sponsored Investment Funds (Various Acts Amended) Act; Loi sur les fonds de placement des travailleurs (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)

Bill 29—The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation

Bill 30—The Securities Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les valeurs mobilières

Bill 31—The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale

Bill 32—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg

Bill 33—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2); Loi n° 2 modifiant le Code de la route et modifications corrélatives

Bill 34—The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités

Bill 35—The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act; Loi visant à faciliter la perception des paiements alimentaires (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)

Bill 36—The Enhanced Debt Collection (Various Acts Amended) Act; Loi visant à faciliter le recouvrement des créances (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)

Bill 37—The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act; Loi sur l'établissement et l'exécution réciproque des ordonnances alimentaires

Bill 38—The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élection des autorités locales

Bill 39—The Archives and Recordkeeping Act; Loi sur les archives et la tenue de dossiers

Bill 40—The Podiatrists Act; Loi sur les podiatres

Bill 41—An Act to Comply with the Supreme Court of Canada Decision in *M. v. H.*; Loi visant l'observation de la décision de la Cour suprême du Canada dans l'arrêt *M. c. H.*

Bill 42—The Regulated Health Professions Statutes Amendment Act; Loi modifiant diverses lois sur les professions de la santé réglementées

Bill 43—The Auditor General Act; Loi sur la vérificateur général

Bill 46—The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale et la Loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine

Bill 47—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001; Loi d'exécution du budget de 2001 et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité

Bill 48—The City of Winnipeg Amendment (Pensions) Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg (régime de pension)

Bill 49—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2001; Loi corrective de 2001

Bill 50—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment (Accountability) Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les offices régionaux de la santé (responsabilités)

Bill 300—The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi

modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba"

Bill 301—The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company and National Trust Company Act; Loi concernant la Société de Fiducie Banque de Nouvelle-Écosse et la Compagnie Trust National

Madam Clerk: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour assents to these bills.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

God Save the Queen was sung.

O Canada! was sung.

* (02:50)

Mr. Speaker: Please be seated.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), that this House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned at the call of the Speaker.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, July 5, 2001

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Economic Crisis	
		Jack Penner; Wowchuk	3571
Presenting Petitions		Agriculture Resolution	
Kenaston Underpass		Jack Penner; Doer	3571
Loewen	3559		
Driedger	3559	Sustainable Development Strategy	
		Gerrard; Lathlin	3573
Reading and Receiving Petitions		Manitoba Retired Teachers' Association	
Kenaston Underpass		J. Smith; Caldwell	3573
Driedger	3559		
Loewen	3559	Members' Statements	
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees		Mr. Dave Pomarenski	
Standing Committee on Law Amendments		Schellenberg	3574
Sixth Report			
Martindale	3560	Ms. Dara McLean and Mr. Rick Scott	
Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs		Tweed	3574
Third Report		Mother Goose Nursery—25th Anniversary	
Nevakshonoff	3564	Allan	3575
Tabling of Reports		Eaton's Building	
Annual Report of the Manitoba Tire		Gerrard	3575
Stewardship Board for the year ending 2001		Bishop Grandin Greenway	
Lathlin	3565	Asper	3576
Oral Questions		Matter of Grievance	
Health Care System		Agricultural Crisis	
Murray; Doer	3566	Jack Penner	3576
Private Health Care Clinics		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Murray; Doer	3567	Concurrence and Third Readings	
Antigang Strategy		Bill 300—The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba	
Praznik; Mackintosh	3568	Incorporation Amendment Act	3579
Eaton's Building		Bill 18—The Teachers' Pensions Amendment	
Loewen; Lemieux	3569, 3570	Act	3580
Loewen; Friesen	3569	Bill 11—The Highway Traffic Amendment and	
Gerrard; Lemieux	3572, 3573	Consequential Amendments Act	
		Gerrard	3581
		Reid	3581
		Gilleshammer	3589

Bill 33–The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2)	3591	Bill 38–The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act Maguire	3671
Bill 34–The Municipal Amendment Act	3591	Bill 25–The Health Services Insurance Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act Driedger	3674
Bill 35–The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act Gerrard	3592	Derkach	3681
Bill 36–The Enhanced Debt Collection (Various Acts Amended) Act	3592	Gerrard	3684
Bill 37–The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act	3592	Report Stage–Amendment	
Bill 43–The Auditor General Act	3593	Bill 18–The Teachers' Pensions Amendment Act J. Smith	3579
Bill 46–The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act	3593	Debate on Concurrence and Third Readings	
Bill 48–The City of Winnipeg Amendment (Pensions) Act	3593	Bill 17–The Student Aid Act	3593
Bill 49–The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendment Act, 2001	3593	Bill 23–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act Gilleshammer	3594
Bill 50–The Regional Health Authorities Amendment (Accountability) Act	3593	Faurschou	3595
Bill 44–The Loan Act, 2001	3656	Jack Penner	3596
Bill 45–The Appropriation Act, 2001	3656	Enns	3597
Bill 47–The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001	3657	Maguire	3598
Bill 28–The Labour-Sponsored Investment Funds (Various Acts Amended) Act Tweed	3666	Dyck	3598
Loewen	3668	Bill 24–The Liquor Control Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act Laurendeau	3657
Gerrard	3669	Gerrard	3658
Bill 31–The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act Gerrard	3670	Mitchelson	3658
Derkach	3670	Tweed	3659
Bill 32–The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act	3671	Schuler	3660
		Loewen	3661
		Jack Penner	3662
		J. Smith	3663
		Dyck	3664
		Faurschou	3665
		Committee of Supply	
		Concurrence Motion	3599, 3609, 3643
		Committee of Ways and Means	
		Capital Supply	3652
		Main Supply	3652

Introduction of Bills

Bill 45–The Appropriation Act, 2001 3653

Bill 44–The Loan Act, 2001 3653

Second Readings

Bill 45–The Appropriation Act, 2001 3653

Bill 44–The Loan Act, 2001 3653

Debate on Second ReadingsBill 47–The Budget Implementation Act
and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001 3653**Committee of the Whole**

Bill 44–The Loan Act, 2001 3654

Bill 45–The Appropriation Act, 2001 3654

Bill 47–The Budget Implementation Act
and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001 3654**Royal Assent**

Bill 44–The Loan Act, 2001 3704

Bill 45–The Appropriation Act, 2001 3704

Bill 7–The Manitoba Hydro Amendment
Act 3704Bill 8–The Mines and Minerals
Amendment Act 3704Bill 9–The Vital Statistics Amendment
and Consequential Amendments Act 3704Bill 10–The Safer Communities and
Neighbourhoods and Consequential
Amendments Act 3704Bill 11–The Highway Traffic Amendment
and Consequential Amendments Act 3704Bill 12–The Real Property Amendment
Act 3704Bill 13–The Social Services Appeal Board
and Consequential Amendments Act 3704Bill 14–The Consumer Protection
Amendment Act 3704

Bill 15–The Mortgage Amendment Act 3704

Bill 16–The Farm Practices Protection
Amendment Act 3704

Bill 17–The Student Aid Act 3704

Bill 18–The Teachers' Pensions
Amendment Act 3705Bill 19–The Crown Lands Amendment
Act 3705Bill 20–The Farm Products Marketing
and Consequential Amendments Act 3705Bill 21–The Manitoba Ethnocultural
Advisory and Advocacy Council Act 3705Bill 22–The Cancer Treatment and
Research Foundation Amendment and
Consequential Amendments Act 3705Bill 23–The Highway Traffic Amendment
Act 3705Bill 24–The Liquor Control Amendment
and Consequential Amendments Act 3705Bill 25–The Health Services Insurance
Amendment and Consequential
Amendments Act 3705Bill 26–The Winnipeg Commodity
Exchange Restructuring Act 3705Bill 27–The Manitoba Hydro Amendment
Act (2) 3705Bill 28–The Labour-Sponsored Investment
Funds (Various Acts Amended) ActBill 29–The Residential Tenancies
Amendment Act 3705

Bill 30—The Securities Amendment Act	3705	Bill 41—An Act to Comply with the Supreme Court of Canada Decision in <i>M. v. H</i>	3705
Bill 31—The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act	3705	Bill 42—The Regulated Health Professions Statutes Amendment Act	3706
Bill 32—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act	3705	Bill 43—The Auditor General Act	3706
Bill 33—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (2)	3705	Bill 46—The Provincial Court Amendment and Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act	3706
Bill 34—The Municipal Amendment Act	3705	Bill 47—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2001	3706
Bill 35—The Improved Enforcement of Support Payments (Various Acts Amended) Act	3705	Bill 48—The City of Winnipeg Amendment (Pensions) Act	3706
Bill 36—The Enhanced Debt Collection (Various Acts Amended) Act	3705	Bill 49—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2001	3706
Bill 37—The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act	3705	Bill 50—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment (Accountability) Act	3706
Bill 38—The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act	3705	Bill 300—The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Incorporation Amendment Act	3706
Bill 39—The Archives and Recordkeeping Act	3705	Bill 301—The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company and National Trust Company Act	3706
Bill 40—The Podiatrists Act	3705		

PROCLAMATIONS

PETER M. LIBA
Lieutenant Governor

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

ELIZABETH II, Queen of Canada

PROCLAMATION

With the advice and consent of the Executive Council of Manitoba, we prorogue the 2nd Session of the 37th Legislature of the Province of Manitoba effective on Monday, November 12, 2001, and convene the 3rd Session of the 37th Legislature of the Province of Manitoba on Tuesday, November 13, 2001, at 1:30 p.m.

HIS HONOUR PETER M. LIBA,
Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Manitoba,
Winnipeg, Manitoba,
November 7, 2001,
GORD MACKINTOSH,
Minister of Justice and Attorney-General.

PETER M. LIBA
Lieutenant-gouverneur

PROVINCE DU MANITOBA

ELIZABETH II, reine du Canada

PROCLAMATION

Sur l'avis et avec le consentement du Conseil exécutif du Manitoba, nous fixons au lundi 12 novembre 2001 la date de clôture de la deuxième session de la trente-septième législature de la province du Manitoba et convoquons la troisième session de cette législature le mardi 13 novembre 2001, à 13 h 30.

PETER M. LIBA,
Lieutenant-gouverneur du Manitoba,
Winnipeg (Manitoba),
Le 7 novembre 2001,
Le ministre de la Justice et procureur général,
GORD MACKINTOSH.