



61386-3

Second Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

38 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXVIII No. 59 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1989.



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIBERAL
ANGUS, John	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BURRELL, Parker	Swan River	PC
CARR, James	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CHARLES, Gwen	Selkirk	LIBERAL
CHEEMA, Gulzar	Kildonan	LIBERAL
CHORNOPYSKI, William	Burrows	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.		PC
DRIEDGER, Herold L.	Niakwa	LIBERAL
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIBERAL
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Laurie E.	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Virden	PC
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Ellice	LIBERAL
HAMMOND, Gerrie, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HEMPHILL, Maureen	Logan	NDP
KOZAK, Richard J.	Transcona	LIBERAL
LAMOUREUX, Kevin M.	Inkster	LIBERAL
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANDRAKE, Ed	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MINENKO, Mark	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
OLESON, Charlotte, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PATTERSON, Allan	Radisson	LIBERAL
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Rhineland	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles	Springfield	LIBERAL
ROSE, Bob	St. Vital	LIBERAL
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
TAYLOR, Harold	Wolseley	LIBERAL
URUSKI, Bill	Interlake	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
YEO, Iva	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, October 27, 1989.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement that I would like to make, and I have copies for Members of the Opposition.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, as the Minister responsible for Seniors, to announce the public consultations on the Discussion Paper on Elder Abuse.

I am tabling the schedule of meetings along with a copy of the letter being mailed to seniors organizations inviting their participation in the consultation process.

Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to be able to give Manitobans the opportunity to discuss the tragedy of elder abuse, as well as hear their concerns on other issues that they are facing, such as housing, transportation and health care. I am confident that all my honourable friends agree that the crime and tragedy of elder abuse must be stopped.

The Discussion Paper sets out a number of recommendations to combat elder abuse: identify physical abuse and provide follow-up support for victims; create a central registry of abused elders; provide options and protections against financial abuse; enhance the ability to intervene when abuse is detected; provide effective support for the caregiver; make counselling available to help avert the tragedy; and, develop a community support system to combat the isolation and invisibility which often faces both the elderly and the caregiver.

People have had an opportunity to review and consider the Discussion Paper. Now it is time to respond. My staff at the Seniors Directorate will travel to all regions of the province. Following the meetings in rural and northern Manitoba, a series of meetings will be held in Winnipeg. I want to stress that this is an initial list of meetings. Additional locations may be added if it is shown that a need exists. Since we all agree that the problem must be solved, all that is left now is how that will be done. The consultations will go a long way to doing that.

Another very important aspect of the meetings will be the opportunity to discuss other areas of concern. We want people to take advantage of the local meetings to make sure that the problems facing particular communities are heard. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): We, on this side of the House, certainly would like to respond to this ministerial statement, and we are pleased to see that finally after 17 months we actually have some small action and

progress in the area of the Seniors Directorate. We are pleased to see that the Minister has decided it is very necessary to have discussions and consultations with the people in Manitoba.

I do caution the Minister, however, that one certainly hopes this Minister will be different than his colleagues responsible for the Status of Women and responsible for day care in that when you do receive the information from the people of Manitoba, we hope you will listen to what they have to say and not make autocratic decisions which are not based on the information you receive.

So we do hope, as you travel across the Province of Manitoba and you hear what people have to say, that in fact you will take that into account and actually make some decisions based on these consultations. We on this side of the House have certainly been calling for some legislation in the area of elder abuse. Although we will be looking at these discussions, we have much expertise and data to already suggest that legislation is long overdue. We hope these discussions and consultations will move quickly in the sense that we still feel it is very, very important that we have some legislation in the area of elder abuse.

So we will look forward to the results of these particular discussions, Mr. Speaker.

* (1005)

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): While the New Democratic Party Caucus is always supportive of any progressive action which can better conditions for seniors and for the elderly in our province, our initial response is conditionally supportive. It is based on our experience with a Government that has brought forward consultation paper after consultation paper after consultation paper with no results in legislation, with no results in progressive action, with no new programs and policies that are intended to meet the needs of Manitobans.

So what we have seen a Government do throughout its short 18-month history is create expectations that it then dashed, because it refused to follow through on any of the consultation which was sincerely given to it by Manitobans who thought they were involving themselves in a process that was going to result in progress and found out all they were involved in was a public relations gimmick by the Conservative Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that is not the case with this consultation paper but knowing the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey) as we do, we are very skeptical.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of work has already been done—

An Honourable Member: That is a personal attack.

Mr. Cowan: They say this is a personal attack. This is not a personal attack. This is an attack based on

Friday, October 27, 1989

the experience and based on fear that what has happened in the past is going to repeat itself again by a Government that refuses to take action and tries to hide its inaction behind consultations and public meetings.

So do not let any one Minister feel singled out, because all Ministers on that side are equally guilty of that sort of public relations gimmick over the past 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of work has been done in this area. Marguerite Chown has done a tremendous amount of work already on behalf of seniors. There are other seniors that have been involved in this area. We hope they will take advantage of the consultations and during that consultative period they will push hard for legislation. Consultations should not be perceived or not intended to be a replacement for action, and quite frankly we have seen that happen far too much in the past.

I note that the meetings carry on throughout the province but stop in Thompson. I would suggest that if they want to have a fully consultative process, there are a lot of elderly in remote communities. There are a lot of seniors in the North in communities such as Churchill and Gillam who would find it difficult to get down to Thompson for meetings. So we will be encouraging the Government to hold meetings in those areas in a very timely fashion.

I note that the last meeting is scheduled for January 18. At the rate that this legislative Session is unfolding, Mr. Speaker, I think that will allow for legislation to be brought forward at this Session based on these consultations, and that is what we will push for as a New Democratic Party Caucus.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have today from the Teulon Collegiate forty Grades 9 and 11 students, and they are under the direction of Alvin Reinsch. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Meech Lake Accord Racist Editorial Cartoon

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, this Legislature and through it all Manitobans expressed their concerns about the Meech Lake Accord. In unison, we all recognize the distinctive nature of the Province of Quebec. We also spoke of the need to include our aboriginal people of the need to recognize our multicultural heritage, of the need to make paramount our Charter of Rights.

Last night I was, and I am sure all Members here as all Manitobans were, saddened to see our legitimate

concerns depicted as racist through cartoon in *Le Devoir*. We in the Liberal Party want today to reaffirm our support to the Task Force Report and to ask the Premier how he intends to respond and to ask the Premier how he intends to respond to this unfortunate misrepresentation on Manitobans.

* (1010)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I certainly thank the Member for Selkirk for that question. Clearly, I am as troubled and upset as any Manitobans about the portrayal by the Quebec media of the Manitoba position, because the Manitoba position reflects the broadest possible consultations that have taken place on the Accord anywhere in the country. It reflects strongly and accurately the views of all Manitobans, the vast majority of Manitobans, who presented more than 300 briefs to the committee, the all-Party Task Force. It presents the consensus view of the people of Manitoba and indeed all three Parties in the Legislature.

As such, I know that it is designed to attempt to resolve the constitutional impasse that we currently face, and certainly it in no way is a racist report. It is indeed a report that seeks to ensure that the pluralistic view of Canada, a Canada that we all know based on not only English and French, not only Quebec and the rest of the country, but indeed upon the aboriginal heritage of our country and the multicultural future of our country, accurately I believe, portraying what constitutional making should be in this country. I think it is extremely regrettable that view is taken in the Quebec media.

Mrs. Charles: Thank you, Mr. Premier, for that reply.

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Environmental Impact Study

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): I shall go on with my questioning to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns). Manitobans' worst fears about Rafferty-Alameda Project are coming true, Mr. Speaker.

The federal Government has abdicated its responsibility to perform a full environmental impact study. Ottawa signed the International Water Agreement with the United States yesterday, despite the fact that Manitobans and environmental concerns have not been addressed. Why has the provincial Government backed off from its demands of a full EIS that it demanded on June 26, 1989?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I would have to very emphatically refute the allegation that Manitoba's concerns have not been addressed. We can be very pleased that we have, with the efforts on the part of a number of my colleagues, principally the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), who has had numerous discussions with the federal Minister, the Honourable Lucien Bouchard, on this matter.

As a result, the treaty that was signed yesterday includes at least three specific clauses that sets out

very specifically the kind of protection that Manitoba will enjoy under this agreement, sets out the kind of management of the entire Souris River basin that Manitoba will participate in as a full participant with North Dakota and Saskatchewan, with the ongoing support of Canada in terms of any international difficulties that we may come into.

Furthermore, it specifically states in the agreement that was signed yesterday that Manitoba in no way loses its right to appeal directly to the Joint International Commission on Boundary Waters, which we have had before the agreement was signed which we continue to have after it was consummated yesterday in Washington.

Canadian Wildlife Federation Rafferty-Alameda Court Challenge

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but those reassurances will not guarantee the protection of our waterways. Will the Government therefore apply for intervener status joining the Canadian Wildlife Federation and other individuals to quash the federal licence until a full EIS study is completed?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): The answer is no. What we will do is get on with the job of managing the Souris water basin in a way that is most beneficial to Manitobans.

We will be setting up very stringent water monitoring control mechanisms. We will sit on a board that will have a direct management hand as to how these structures will be managed. We are assured by the treaty as we were assured before of the full flow of waters under the international treaty that we have been accorded. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, under that kind of a tripartite management, we look forward to maximizing the benefits to Manitobans under the agreement that was signed yesterday in Washington.

Mrs. Charles: Mr. Speaker, you cannot manage something that has already been destroyed.

With a new question to the same Minister, we have seen—

An Honourable Member: What has been destroyed?

Mrs. Charles: Will be destroyed if the dam goes through.

* (1015)

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Environmental Impact Study

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): We have seen this Government roll over and die on its demands for a full EIS study because of the pressure from their Tory cousins in Ottawa and Saskatchewan.

Since the impacts of the project cannot be determined because there is not sufficient data base in place to determine the impacts on the project, will the Minister

demand that the project be delayed until a full EIS study can be completed and a proper base line data is in place?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, for once I come very close to agreeing with the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles). You cannot manage a water resource that no longer is there. You cannot manage a dry river basin, and for the people in the southwest and for the people in Regina, I have a great deal of empathy for what they have faced over the years in this question.

Our job is to maximize the opportunities that this project makes possible for us, and I am satisfied that specific clauses are in the international agreement that we will provide that kind of hands-on management in Manitoba's interests as we proceed along with the articles and the clauses that safeguard Manitobans with respect to the Souris River Water Basin.

Compensation Agreement

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): To the same Minister, there has been no clarification of the compensation agreement for any damage to Manitoba's environment. Does this mean that Manitoba will be forced to bear the cost of repairing any environmental damage that may and probably will occur?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): I simply ask the Honourable Member to read the agreement. The agreement has a very specific clause in it that deals with compensation. It is open-ended. We have not put any dollar figures on it. We have not put a ceiling on it. We have not put a minimal on it. We believe that there is no reason why compensation ought to be a problem because we will have a direct hand in the management of the water.

Floods have ravaged this Souris River Basin in the past. Floods have caused a great deal of loss to farmers and to individuals and to communities, both on the American side in Minot and on the Canadian side, but we will be part of the management team that will manage those waters in a controlled way, notwithstanding that there is a specific clause in the agreement that sets out that compensation is available to us should compensation be required.

Environmental Impact Study

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): We may need compensation. If you are not that sure why will you not do an environmental study on it and get the data base?

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Agreement Tabling Request

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question to the Minister of Environment is: last summer we had to table the draft agreement, dealing with the agreement between the United States and Canada, because this Government would not table the agreement. Has there been an agreement signed that

deals in a better way with the water quality issues of Manitoba, with the federal Government of Canada and the United States Government, dealing with the water quality provisions as opposed to the licence that was granted which gave Manitoba no protection on water quality?

Would the Minister table the agreement between the United States and Canada in this Chamber as it was signed yesterday?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, we can make available any information that we can possibly release in that regard, but I think we need to also look at the fact that the federal Minister of the Environment agreed to and has, as recently as yesterday, reconfirmed that the environmental assessment from Garlic Lake will be completed.

Water Quality Standards

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Member has not answered the question. Conditions 4 and 5 on the Environmental Licence issued by the federal Government in Regina, and then announced a couple of hours later in Winnipeg, allows for the Province of Saskatchewan and the federal Government to establish the water quality standards for this downstream water project and only allows Manitoba to be consulted about. It does not allow us to establish those water quality standards. Is that the standard wording that is going to be used to determine water quality standards for Manitoba, the provisions and the water licence, the sell-out by the federal Government for Manitoba, and the sellout of this Government to the federal Government in not getting joint determination factors for water quality in the Souris River?

* (1020)

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, we will participate in the establishing of the water quality and quantity standards that we are going to be looking for, and I just indicated the base line that we will be using to start from. That is why we asked for the complete federal assessment to be done. We did not achieve that. We are now working very hard to make sure that we achieve the same goals through various other mechanisms that are at our disposal, and we believe that we are, to a large extent, going to achieve those goals. However, we have to do it in spite of the fact that we did not get the full environmental assessment by the federal Government.

Mr. Doer: That begs the question, given the fact that the licence says that Saskatchewan and the federal Government will determine the water quality conditions, we will only be consulted about it. Given the fact that the Minister just said that we did not get the full environmental assessment, why is the Minister not adjoining other groups in Canada to intervene on behalf of the downstream water effect on Manitoba which has been devastated by the licences that have been granted in Saskatchewan and by the federal Government and

will create an unbelievable precedent for Shoal Lake water quality, down the road, in terms of downstream water quality effect?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, there will be mechanisms of which Manitoba will be a full partner, and we believe that the overall management of the basin and the water regime that is in place will be the mechanism by which we will achieve the protection and answer the concerns that are being raised in relationship to this project, and we believe the tripartite agreements can achieve that. I would ask the Member opposite if he thinks that the way that interprovincial relationships need to be solved is through the courts, because it seems to me that there are better mechanisms for Governments in this country to deal with each other.

Mr. Doer: It is not a tripartite agreement on water quality. The Minister is not being forthright with Manitobans. It is a bipartite agreement between the federal Government and the Province of Saskatchewan for water quality.

Environment Department Staffing

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): I have a final question to the Minister of Environment. During the Speech from the Throne last year, we were told that some 14 staff would be hired to deal with the environmental challenges we have in the province. We commended the Government for those initiatives. Since that time not only have those staff not been hired, Mr. Speaker, but there were five staff out of staff in his department that are leaving because they are not satisfied with the action of this Government on environment.

Can the Minister please tell us, is that part of whole environmental culture that he has created in his department which is manifested by decisions like Rafferty-Alameda and other projects?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Leader of the third Party wants to operate on the basis of rumours. I very recently had occasion to spend a day over at Building 2 talking to the various members of the department, and I was quite pleased with the attitude and the state of morale within the department.

In reference to the fact that we are not yet fully up to speed on the filling of all the positions within the department, I think that he needs to keep in mind that what we have is a planned, detailed, process providing environmental services to this province. We are not going to run out and fill positions until we have the position clearly identified for the responsibility of work and make sure that we have the services available to all parts of the province.

Thompson, Manitoba Physician Shortage

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, the primary health care, which is the cornerstone of health

Friday, October 27, 1989

care, is not readily accessible in Manitoba communities. Recently Thompson suffered a blow due to the departure of two physicians. Can the Minister of Health tell us what special measures he has taken to ensure that the quality of health care is provided to citizens of Thompson?

* (1025)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) raised this question earlier this week. I provided him with some answers, and I will provide my honourable friend with more detail.

On Wednesday of last week, some ten days ago, we were informed that the two physicians mentioned were leaving the community of Thompson for personal reasons without giving their patients or the hospital any advance notice. My honourable friend acknowledges that from his seat. When we were notified of that on Wednesday of last week, we began some immediate temporary and long-term action.

First of all, the Northern Medical Unit has placed in Thompson one of their physicians whose specialty is obstetrics to assist with the high number of deliveries that Thompson Hospital performs in northern Manitoba.

Secondly, we began an immediate advertising campaign through the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower. We have had, in the week that we have been advertising and actively phoning, some very interested individuals who are looking at the Thompson practice with the intention of moving to Thompson and providing that kind of service.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the departure of those two physicians will be very soon rectified through efforts taken by the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, we have put forward a very practical solution to solve the problem in Manitoba, a unique internship program for all the rural communities. Can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us why he is refusing to implement such a practical and economical solution?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat interested in my honourable friend's question because I believe on Tuesday of this week in Estimates, we went through step by step my honourable friend's proposal. There is absolutely nothing preventing those physicians that my honourable friend refers to from entering the internship program of medicine at the University of Manitoba Faculty of Medicine. The difficulty is that those individuals, unfortunately, whether they have attempted or not I cannot answer, but those individuals have not passed examinations which define basic criteria and qualifications necessary to enter the internship program. When they have successfully completed those examinations, the opportunity is there for them to participate in the internship program.

Physician Shortages Immigrant Physician Licensing

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that some foreign physicians come, use Manitoba as a stepping stone, and use our tax dollar to move to larger centres. My question to the Minister is: what measures will he put in place to make sure that these physicians, when they come, sign at least a five-year contract and not abuse our tax dollars?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Well, Mr. Speaker, again, on Tuesday of last week we discussed this issue in depth with my honourable friend. I pointed out to my honourable friend that some physicians take their internship in Newfoundland, study further in Saskatchewan, practise in rural Manitoba, and end up in Winnipeg. I mean the Charter of Rights does not allow us to put restrictions on the mobility of professionals or others in Canadian society.

My honourable friend says, why do we not undertake a contract? A contract could be written not for five years but for 25 years of service. It could be signed by the individual coming to Canada, but that kind of a contract is unenforceable under the Charter of Rights. My honourable friend ought to consult with his colleague immediately behind him who is a practising lawyer, and he will receive that opinion.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

European Health Spa Closure

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): A couple of short years ago, a string of fitness centres closed their doors on many Manitobans with little or no notice. Last week, another fitness centre in Winnipeg's north end told many of my constituents that this north end institution is closing its doors, and if they wished to continue their memberships, to go to other locations. For many of the seniors who use this neighbourhood facility, this closure will make it very difficult for them to maintain their level of fitness.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery). Has he or his department over the last several days investigated the circumstances surrounding the closing, and in particular has he investigated complaints that memberships were sold even after the time when the board of directors or the owners made the decision to close that facility?

* (1030)

Hon. Edward Connery (Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I thank the Member for that question. Yes, our department has taken a very serious look at what has happened. The particular health outfit has other facilities in Winnipeg, so those individuals then can go to other locations. Now we agree, when

you buy your health facility in a certain location, you do not want to drive all across Winnipeg to go to another one. We simply agree with that fact. We are not very pleased that they did this. The new legislation that is coming forward will address part of it, but the company is in Winnipeg and it has other locations that can service people.

The new legislation, if they misleadingly or deceived the people into believing that they would have that service in the location that they thought it would be at, would be misleading and we would be able to deal with it. We hope that the legislation, when it comes forward, will go through very quickly so we can deal with those sorts of injustices.

Consumer Protection Legislation Memberships Inclusion

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the same Minister. Does that legislation that he intends to be introducing, is he intending it to be introduced in this Session and will it include measures dealing with the protection of memberships? Also, we have been recently advised that the centre will be closing sooner than originally expected, or originally stated. Can the Minister comment on that particular provision as well?

Hon. Edward Connerly (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Member should know full well that the legislation will be introduced in this Session because it has already been given first reading. To get into the separate clauses of the legislation at this time would not be appropriate. When the Bill has been introduced, then we will have an opportunity to go through it clause by clause.

Let it be known that this particular piece of legislation has been on the books since 1975. The previous Government did not have any care or interest to introduce that legislation. Well, they sat there for six and a half years looking at it. This Government is bringing it forward.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

European Health Spa Safety Standards

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Is his department, and specifically the Health Promotion section, working with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to ensure that safety standards are in place to deal with some of the complaints of overcrowding of facilities that have been brought to my attention and which will inevitably result if all the members of the two facilities that are closing go to the downtown location, which is probably the closest one? Is he looking at that? If he is not, he certainly should be.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I realize my honourable friend's concern

in terms of the closing of two private health clubs. They are causing an inconvenience to certain customers in the local area that have drawn up their contracts with them.

Unfortunately and maybe this is something the Liberals would consider as part of their governing regime to absolutely insist that private businesses be not allowed to close, et cetera. That is unfortunately something that we cannot achieve. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the issue of safety, there is always inspection of an assurance of safety standards that takes place in health care matters. So my honourable friend, in wanting reopening of the spas—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Co-operative Development Manitoba Statistics

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Co-operative Development (Mr. Connerly). Yesterday, we got a bit of a peak at the progression in the Department of Co-operative Development when Supplementary Estimates were reviewed. We found out that his office, the Minister's office, which provides assistance to the Minister has more than doubled with an increase of nearly four staff, while at the same time the developmental section of the department which provides assistance to co-operators and to co-operative organizations has been reduced by five staff years, a drop of 20 percent in the last year, a drop of 30 percent in the last two years under the Conservative Government.

Can the Minister confirm that—just as happened with the Lyon Conservative years—there has been a significant drop once again in the number of establishments of new co-operators in Manitoba since the election of his Government and at the same time there has been a significant increase in the dissolutionment of other co-operatives, thereby significantly reducing co-operative opportunity in this province?

Hon. Edward Connerly (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the four additional positions that the Member refers to is because they are ministerial positions. Consumer and Corporate Affairs were with the Attorney General, and when they were separated off to give more focus to Co-op Development and Consumer and Corporate Affairs, there were the four additional positions that were made available and were required.

The question the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) asked is very appropriate for the Estimates process. The Estimates process has been frustrated by the Opposition, and we have not been able to get on with the Estimates process. So when—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, more focus by this Government has resulted in less co-operatives out there, and hopefully they will become a bit less focused on how they can destroy that movement.

Friday, October 27, 1989

LynnGold Resources Inc. Worker Co-operative Analysis

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): My question to the Minister is: given that employee ownership has saved many failing industries through the establishment of worker co-ops, can the Minister indicate if his department has done -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

Mr. Cowan: Can the Minister of Co-operative Development indicate if his department has done any research, any preliminary work, on the possibility of the continuation of the LynnGold operations under restructuring as a worker co-op?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): The Member tries to leave an impression that we, on this side of the House, are not concerned about co-op development and co-operation with workers.

Let it be known, in 1946 my father was a founding member of the Vegetable Growers Co-op in Winnipeg. We are very supportive of co-ops and co-op development. I have also been the chairman of a marketing board, which is a form of co-operative development. When they talk about worker co-ops, I led the debate in Montreal to have all of the provinces agree to work with a federal/provincial program on worker co-ops. We, on this side of the House, are very strongly supportive of worker co-ops.

As far as the LynnGold one we have not had any request from them. If the workers at LynnGold want to come to our department, they will have all of the consultation and support available to us to help them in their time of crisis.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, sometimes you have to reach out rather than just wait for requests.

Lynn Lake, Manitoba Minister's Meeting

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): This is my last question to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). I underscore the fact that it is my last question so he will be more at ease with answering without fear of rebuttal.

An Honourable Member: It is interesting that you acknowledge that there are rebuttals in Question Period.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

An Honourable Member: Contrary to the Rules.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I do not need any lectures on the Rules in this Chamber from the Premier (Mr. Filmon) or any of his colleagues—

Mr. Speaker: And the question is?

Mr. Cowan: I do require some assistance from you, Mr. Speaker, in ensuring that the Premier and others do not continually chirp from their seats trying to take away from the seriousness of the questions which are being presented.- (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Churchill has the floor.

The Honourable Member for Churchill, kindly put his question now, please.

Mr. Cowan: Since the Minister of Mines is travelling to Lynn Lake today if the weather permits—and there may be some doubt at this point in time—and he says he already knows what LynnGold -(interjection)-

* (1040)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will get this question out. Order, order. The Honourable Member for Churchill, kindly put his question now, please.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I will start my question again. Given that the Minister is travelling to Lynn Lake today, given that he already knows what the company will be saying today, will the Minister, out of respect for the legislative traditions of this Chamber, inform the House as to what he knows about the situation in Lynn Lake before he goes out of this Chamber and informs the general public as he did yesterday.

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): I will give the Member for Churchill leave if I may for rebuttal.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): It is a pretty serious situation.

Mr. Neufeld: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) says it is a serious situation and indeed it is. I will be, weather permitting, going to Lynn Lake this afternoon to discuss the situation with the town and discuss the situation with the people who are interested in it.

The company has not yet, as far as I know, made any news release, and I am not at liberty to say what that news release might be. I said yesterday and I will say again today, the decision to keep the mine open, or close the mine, will not be that of the Government. It will be that of the company, and I think it is out of respect that we must wait for them to make the decision and for them to make the announcement.

Manitoba Health Services Commission Physician Assessments

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the Health Services Commission in this province has to exercise some financial control, but they are paying too much attention to statistical average and not enough attention to special needs.

Will the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) direct the MHSC to recognize that older doctors with older

patients have practices that have to be assessed on the basis of their special character, not according to statistical averages?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I believe my honourable friend is referring to a specific physician who practises out of Transcona, and let me tell you that I share some of the frustrations that his patients may be experiencing right now.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the Manitoba Health Services Commission that has undertaken this initiative with the physician in question. The physician in question has been overservicing a number of patients over a number of recent years. That has been referred to the Medical Review Committee, an impartial body set up of peers to review patterns of practice. That Medical Review Committee agreed that the physician was in fact overservicing in some individual patient circumstances. The physician appealed that ruling of the Medical Review Committee to an arbitration board on which both the Medical Review Committee and the physician choose members. That arbitration board subsequently considered the issue and agreed that the physician was overservicing his patients.

Now this is not an issue before the commission. This is an issue of peer review of patterns of practice by physicians reviewed by their peers, other physicians. The Government and the Manitoba Health Services Commission do not have the responsibility in making that decision as to the practice of individual physicians as reviewed by their peer group.

Mr. Kozak: Mr. Speaker, the Minister refers to overservicing. This is overservicing in terms of province-wide statistical averages. Good preventive medicine, medicine that avoids hospitalization, means more frequent checkups and house calls. It is more humane for the patient and less expensive for the taxpayer.

Will the Minister direct the Manitoba Health Services Commission to pay some attention to these facts and not penalize these doctors, these patients and the taxpayer as a result of hospitalizing the individuals who can be treated at home?

Mr. Orchard: My honourable friend has the right phraseology to show care and concern, but unfortunately he does not have his information correct. Mr. Speaker, I repeat for my honourable friend, this is not a decision by the Manitoba Health Services Commission for Government. There is a Medical Review Committee of physicians across the province who examine the pattern of practice to assure that some physicians are not abusing, if you will, the privilege of unlimited billing and non-restrictive billing to the taxpayers of Manitoba for services performed. That group of peers who are physicians have said that this particular physician is over servicing some of his patients. That was agreed to by an arbitration hearing again -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

Mr. Kozak: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I repeat that this decision is being made on the basis of province-wide

statistical averages that do not apply to elderly doctors with elderly patients, a special form of practice. Will the Minister demand that the MHSC and affiliated organizations not penalize elderly doctors with elderly patients?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, there is no penalization by the commission or the Government of those kinds of physicians. What is at decision-making here is that the physician so identified as overservicing patients is brought before, not a group of Government bureaucrats or politicians, but a group of his peers; other doctors who practise professionally in Manitoba, who have said that with all factors being considered, and the physician presents his unique case, his peers decided that the individual physician was overservicing his patients.

That was not Government that made that decision, that was not this Cabinet that made that decision, that was not the Manitoba Health Services Commission that made that decision. That was a group of physicians, knowledgeable in the practice of medicine, a peer review, and they have made the decision. An arbitration board, again chosen not simply by the Medical Review Committee but by the physicians themselves, have agreed to uphold that decision, Mr. Speaker.

Consumer Protection Legislation Amendments

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): I think it is important to follow up a question asked by the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) given the indifference and arrogance shown by this Government today, particularly the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) showing no understanding of a community like the north end, no understanding of preventative measures in terms of health.

My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) who talks a good line but knows that if he had introduced the amendments that this Caucus had put forward to this Legislature 14 months ago, a situation like we saw this week involving the European Health Spa would not have happened.

My question to the Minister is: will he tell this House if he is prepared to swallow some pride and introduce those amendments immediately, not wait another day, and tell us why if he is just copying the NDP Private Members' Bill, what is taking so long?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I can guarantee you we did not just copy the Member for Elmwood's (Mr. Maloway) Bill. The consultation process had not been completed. It was a draft Bill that the Member had available after the last election. We have concluded our consultation with the various people that should be involved. That Bill has been introduced for first reading and as soon as it is printed, it will be distributed immediately as it is printed. We have looked at the Member for Elmwood's Bill, and we do not think that it would have had any effect on the events that took place in north Winnipeg at the health spa.

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for the Interlake.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Could I ask leave of Members of the Chamber to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for the Interlake have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mr. Uruski: Mr. Speaker, Members of my caucus and I would like to bring attention to Members of this House about an event that is occurring this evening in the City of Winnipeg concerning the disastrous effects that were felt by the islands of the Caribbean from the hurricane Hugo. There is a benefit dance being held tonight at 8 p.m. at the Sheraton Conference Centre on 139 Smith Street. I would like to urge all Manitobans and Members of this Chamber if they can to possibly attend this function, if at all they are able to.

We know that thousands of people in the Caribbean lost their homes as a result of this devastating hurricane. The resources in the Third World are not there to be able to provide the kind of assistance that we see being made available to the citizens of the Oakland, San Francisco area in the earthquake. The entire U.S. Treasury, in effect, through the disaster assistance, is made available to those cities, while in the Caribbean that type of assistance is not available.

* (1050)

I want to pay particular tribute to the volunteer efforts of the Hurricane Hugo Relief Committee. There will be entertainment tonight, I am advised. A Caribbean cabaret which will feature performances by the Carri-Cana singers and the Afro Caribbean dancers, as well as recorded music and food. The rebuilding process that is necessary because of the underdeveloped economy, those thousands of citizens rely on the goodness and charity of citizens around the world. I ask all Members and all Manitobans to make whatever effort they can to attend this function of relief efforts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Brandon East have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I would like to have leave to make a non-political statement if I might. Mr. Speaker, this weekend the Markus Project of Brandon is celebrating its 10th anniversary. Some of you who attended a couple of weeks ago, various displays of various organizations trying to help poor people and underprivileged people in the Third World may have seen the various displays in Room 254, and certainly Markus was there among the others.

What Markus does, is provide information on Third World Development problems to the citizens of this

province and elsewhere. They have been particularly active in the Westman area and perhaps some of my colleague MLA's in western Manitoba may be aware of its existence. It has had a considerable amount of support from church groups in rural Manitoba who are concerned about this problem of international development.

What it does, Mr. Speaker, is promote international development education in rural Manitoba dealing with matters such as the environment, pollution, world food supply and so on. It has been very successful and it is an educational program. This weekend they are celebrating their 10th anniversary, and they are having a banquet, of course. This is typical of this organization. Their keynote speaker happens to be the co-founder of Greenpeace Canada, and the Green Party of Canada, Mr. Jim Boland whose topic is "Transitions to a Sustainable Society—How To There From Here." I believe that is a topic that all Members of the House are very concerned about. I believe it has played a successful role over the years. I trust and know other Members will join me in wishing them the very best for continued success in this program of promoting world peace through its educational programs. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for St. Johns have leave to make a non-political statement?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Ms. Judy Wasylcyia-Leis (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, I had the privilege of congratulating a prominent artist from my constituency. Today, I would like to offer congratulations to a couple of other artists who do not happen to be in my constituency but who will be familiar to us all in this House.

The first is congratulations to Winnipeg ceramic artist Grace Nickel, who accomplished an amazing feat, won a bronze award at the Second International Ceramics competition held recently in Mino, Japan. Members of this House will know that Grace Nickel, who works as a library slide technician at the Winnipeg Art Gallery, competed against more than 3,000 artists from around the world, and her winning entry was a moth-shaped vessel in shades of deep red, black, white and grey.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, for those interested in more contemporary music, I would like to congratulate the Winnipeg band, Crash Test Dummies on signing an eight-record deal. This is obviously a major achievement for a Winnipeg band and will be a significant boost to the music industry in this province. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills in the following order: 32, 27, 31, 34, 42 and the remaining Bills as listed on today's Order Paper?

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 32—THE CITY OF WINNIPEG AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), Bill No. 32, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to rise on the proposed amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act. This Bill 32 is one of three Bills before this Chamber dealing with The City of Winnipeg Act and we will not only comment specifically on the Bill but comment on the Bill's relationship, in principle, to the relationship of other Bills that are before the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, we have asked this Minister for the last year and a half to come forward to the Chamber with a full and comprehensive plan, either in legislation or in policy paper or in a White Paper as we did a year ago, or two years ago. Regrettably, we are still in a very, very serious legislative vacuum and a very serious policy vacuum dealing with the City of Winnipeg and the amendments thereto.

Yes, there are a lot of specific proposed technical changes to The City of Winnipeg Act, and some substantial changes in terms of the way in which the citizens of the City of Winnipeg, our largest municipality, are allowed to deal with the city and the manner in which the city is prescribed to be governed, Mr. Speaker. We still do not know, receiving 32, 61 and 62 where the Minister is going in very, very important issues facing the citizens, and yes, we can deal with the powers of the mayor, but it is very difficult, if not legislatively impossible, I would suggest, to do a fair job to the citizens of Winnipeg to deal with only the powers of the mayor when one is not dealing with the rights of citizens.

Mr. Speaker, if you are going to increase the powers of a particular authority that is elected in our City of Winnipeg we must also look at the rights of citizens and, therefore, although the Minister has in a great number of cases copied or brought forward similar amendments to what we had proposed in our White Paper and what we had left behind for the Minister to table in this Chamber, we are still not left knowing what rights of the citizens will be left to offset the increasing powers of the mayor which we support in general terms.

Mr. Speaker, so we are left with a dilemma. Do we proceed with the powers of the mayor and a greater accountability of the mayor through the appointments at City Hall in a vacuum with the planning process, or do we anticipate what we believe should be put in as amendments and do that in a later stage, or do we allow these Bills to go to committee and welcome the public participation on the pieces of legislation and judge ourselves accordingly, in terms of our own ideas on the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker, we believe, and we proposed in our White Paper, that to deal with the fundamental issue

arising out of the Cherniack Report, of who is in charge in the City of Winnipeg, that we should provide greater leadership, greater responsibility, and therefore greater accountability for the mayor in the City of Winnipeg. We are not talking about the individual, Mr. Speaker, but we are talking about the position of mayor.

We are not talking about the gang of 18 or 19. We are talking about coalitions that we will build up at City Hall. We are talking about the relationship of council with the mayor and its effect on the citizens of Winnipeg. We therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that the mayor should receive more power, more responsibility and therefore more accountability.

We believe that should be matched and twinned with rights of citizens in the planning process, in the zoning process, in the community committee process, Mr. Speaker, and in terms of the community committee having the right to appoint the other half Members of the Executive Policy Committee so that we would have a balance of accountability between the mayor, and we would have a balance with the rights of citizens in the City of Winnipeg. That is we came forward, arising out of the Cherniack Report and the number of recommendations that came before the City of Winnipeg Review Committee, saying let us know who is in charge?

When we do not have enough police on our streets, we do not know who is in charge. When the budget goes up and the taxation goes up too high, we do not know whose body to tie the can too.- (interjection)- Mr. Speaker, I do not even want to deal with—if one that deals with the irrelevancies of the Members beside us, you know, they have been running around asking us for the last couple weeks what amendments we are going to put in so they can put them in first. I mean that is the urban policy of the Liberal Party. They have one Member of their caucus that is totally against any planning at all, and they have other Members of their Caucus that want to go the same way as the New Democratic Party and give the citizens a right to planning. It is a tweedle-dee tweedle-dum Party, Mr. Speaker, on any issue.

(Mr. Harold Gilleshammer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Mr. Doer: Now let me get back to the Bill, because it is very, very important.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): Order, order.

* (1100)

Mr. Doer: Well, you may be surprised, but I do not want to burn the Member in their caucus. It may be very close to the Urban Affairs Critic -(interjection)- I will not burn him in private, because, quite frankly, he is a very, very capable Member of your caucus.- (interjection)- No, I respect the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr). I do not agree with him on all issues, but I think he has very similar ideas of urban planning that we do and, quite frankly, that runs in conflict with the Minister who has not put in a policy paper, a White Paper, or legislation dealing with the planning.

Friday, October 27, 1989

Now, I can understand, Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister not being able to do that a year ago. In good faith we did pass many amendments that were proposed by the Minister a year ago, because we felt that it was important to get on with the reform and it was not the Minister's fault. It was our fault that the Government had changed and there was a new Government in place.

Mr. Acting Speaker -(interjection)- no, it was our fault, you never get in a situation like that. We took on good faith the Minister's statements when we asked him in his Chamber a year ago, November 1, 1988, Tuesday, what he would be dealing with on urban sprawl and development, and why would we not have legislation proposed to deal with the suburban sprawl and the great impact it has on taxpayers and the great impact it has on the discrepancy of services between the suburban areas of the city and the need for revitalization in the inner city.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to quote the Minister. I want to quote the Minister, and I will not talk about his comments on the gang of 19. That was a year ago, but I will say that the Minister did say that, I do not believe that proper legislation should come forward piecemeal on The City of Winnipeg Act. I will at the time—and I repeat again for the Member, that I will bring in the necessary changes of The City of Winnipeg Act during the next Session.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister has not fulfilled that commitment to this Chamber. He has not brought in full and comprehensive changes to the City of Winnipeg. He is making us, and we as legislators, deal with the proposals on their individual merit but outside of the whole approach to The City of Winnipeg Act.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in years gone by, whether it was the early proposals on Unicity, whether it was the proposals in the late '70s, and the Member for Brandon (Mr. Evans) may want to correct me, but in the late '70s, I think it was, one of the judges had conducted another report, we were always operating out of a report and we were always operating out of a whole set of policies when we were making individual changes to the Act. Because this Act, although it is about 500 pages long, and it looks like a telephone book, it is a Rubik's Cube, and when you change certain parts of the Act in terms of the powers of the mayor, you do affect other powers and rights of citizens if you do not change them, or if you do not give us a plan or a vision. So we are very distressed that we have no plan, no vision, no idea, no White Paper, no policy paper in dealing with the component parts of the City of Winnipeg.

We have been given a schedule of when the Bills will be coming in, and we have been given no undertaking of what will be contained within the Bills. Quite frankly, Mr. Acting Speaker, I do not think it is good legislative practice for the Opposition to anticipate what the Member is going to bring in and move amendments to his Bill in an ad hoc way. I think that does the Legislature and the City of Winnipeg a disservice. But we may be looking at amendments to his Act because we cannot look to his Act to know where we are going, and I think that is very regrettable.

Therefore, I would like to look at the other sections of legislation that are missing from the Minister's three Bills, and therefore missing from Bill No. 32.

Yes, the Minister has dealt with the relationship of the mayor, of the clear definition of responsibility we called it in our White Paper, and he has taken half of our proposals in terms of the mayor appointing the Chairs of the key groups of EPC. We support that part of the Bill if it had the other parts to it. We support the idea that when the budget comes forward in the City of Winnipeg, as it does every January, that the mayor of the day should not be able to say, as usually what happens: oh, that is not my budget, that is the budget of the EPC, which he sits on; or that is the budget of the Board of Commissioners, I will fight on behalf of the citizens to reduce that budget.

We do not believe in a system, Mr. Acting Speaker, where somebody can advocate something and criticize it at the same time. That is why we believe that the mayor that is elected by the whole city should have the responsibility for running the budget, should have the responsibility for running the police and protection, should have the responsibility for works and operations, and the other key committees of council. So we support the idea that it is better for a person elected by the total citizenry to have that responsibility and, therefore, that accountability, than have the option of a coalition that is unelected, in its coalition form, decide who will be the Chairs and the mayor, and that coalition always fighting about who is responsible for what decisions by what body and, therefore, the citizens not knowing who to hold responsible for in a democratic election every three years, which is required by the Act.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we also propose to balance that idea in our White Paper, which is rejected by the Minister, that the community committees appoint the other members of the Executive Policy Committee. It not be coalitions at City Hall, it not be the mayor, but we had proposed that the community committees themselves have vitality, have purpose, and have something besides just passing zoning variances. I do not know. I give councillors of all political stripe credit. When I watch cable television on some Saturdays for a few minutes, and watch the endless amounts of variations, et cetera, that they go through in a responsible way, I give them full credit for that kind of activity and that kind of work on behalf of the citizens of Winnipeg. It is a long task. It is a technical task. It is a detailed task. It is a task that does not get a lot of public attention or credit.

A good councillor dealing with variances, I suggest, probably has no credit at all for that -(interjection)- Well, the Member for Elmwood suggests it is very good TV, and perhaps it is, but I have watched it a while, and I am always quite impressed with the work that goes on in those committees by the elected representatives, often, quite frankly, with very little recognition from the public in terms of that requirement.

You know, media cover is just like this Chamber covers Question Period or a few good debates by a few individuals, but there is very little coverage of the kind of day-to-day work that goes on. It is just like Question Period. They cover it every three weeks, City Council, and sort of all those activities, but they do not cover—you do not get the same kind of attention to very important local decisions and neighbourhood decisions and that is just the nature of our democracy.

We had proposed therefore that there was a balance, something which the Minister is not proposing in Bill 32. He is in fact giving more power to the mayor than we had proposed and giving more power in areas that do not have a lot of responsibility. He is appointing four members of the Executive Policy Committee that have no specific responsibility. We had suggested appointing six members from the community committee, one from each community committee, the mayor, the deputy mayor, and the four chairs of the committee would come—the mayor and the council—well, Mr. Acting Speaker, the mayor and the four chairs and the deputy mayor would be six, as the Minister has proposed, and the community committee representatives would be the other six. If you had sort of a group in a community that wanted to really push one of the six areas concerns in the overall city priorities there would be that direct representation on the Executive Policy Committee.

Now the issue is, who should decide who that representative was? In the old days, pre this Bill, it was the so-called gang that would decide who that member was and if you were not part of that gang, for example, you may have six small "l" Liberals in a certain area, or five small "l" Liberals in a certain area, one Conservative, and if the gang was predominantly Conservative, they could pick the one Conservative rather than really expressing the will of that community.

* (1110)

Let us put it a different way. If you had four environmentalists, say of northeast Winnipeg, say you had three environmentalists -(interjection)- it is very important, say you had three environmentalists in the northeast section of the City of Winnipeg, as we do now, and one developer in the city, that we do now, then you would have a situation where the predominant group at city hall may choose the one developer. He may be a nice person, have a lot of respect for the individual, but I do not always agree with his philosophy, as you would expect, may choose that one individual that has accused us all of being weak-kneed and he may be right, and deny the opportunity for more of the expression of the total area to be represented on the Executive Policy Committee.

We want to seriously look at our original proposal. We want to seriously look at the balance—we wanted to balance the community committees off with the mayor. This Minister has given everything to the mayor and, Mr. Acting Speaker, we are not looking at the person, we are looking at the position of mayor over the longer run and we believe that the community committees should balance off the power of the mayor.

The community committees themselves which represent 100,000 people should be able to elect -(interjection)- that is why I made the point that we have to deal with the position of the mayor, not the existing situation, and a better question would be if the Honourable former Member for Burrows was elected we would absolutely have no problem at all with the structure we have proposed. Let us get on with the Bill.

We have some reservations about the Minister giving more power to the mayor than what we have proposed

and absolutely no balance to the community committees or the council itself, except to elect a presiding officer.

That brings us to the second major change in the Bill, Mr. Acting Speaker, again a change that we propose, to go with the presiding officer of council. We had proposed that in our White Paper, I think the Cherniack Report, if I am not mistaken, had proposed that. It was a matter that we had referred to City Council and we have believed that the presiding officer of council should be elected by the members of the committee and be elected by the total council, not be elected or appointed by any grouping from the mayor.

We fully believe that the mayor should be out of the chair and onto the floor and therefore we believe that the mayor who is proposing the budget, the mayor who is chairing EPC, the mayor who is accountable for police protection, the mayor who is accountable to all the citizens of the City of Winnipeg should be out of the titular position of the City of Winnipeg and be into the decision-making position and accountability of the City of Winnipeg and therefore a position that we had proposed in our White Paper, we will support.

Mr. Acting Speaker, moving into other sections of the Bill, we had proposed, as the Minister had proposed, that the City of Winnipeg be equipped to deal with the Ombudsman and certainly we will support it. That was a proposal that came out of our Cherniack committee report. We had recommended that proposal to the City of Winnipeg, and quite frankly the City of Winnipeg council in our consultation with the City of Winnipeg had said no to that proposal. We will be reviewing with the citizens the appeal process from the Ombudsman and the appeal process for the provision, the freedom of information in the Bill and in the various stages of City Council.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we believe further under the access to information that there should be a process that is not only objective in its appeal process but is perceived to be objective. We will be awaiting the opinions of the public presentations at the committee in terms of the appeal process in the City of Winnipeg.

In dealing with campaign expenses, again this was an issue we put forward in the Cherniack report. It was put forward under our White Paper, Mr. Acting Speaker, and we believe that radical changes must be made to the City of Winnipeg election expenses. The stories of envelopes being left for campaign contributions have gone on for years. It is a practice and a rumour that is repugnant to the citizens of the city. It is repugnant to all Members of this Legislature that follow strict disclosure guidelines, follow strict accountability guidelines, and are subject to losing their seats as penalties for breaching any provision of adequate campaign expenses, adequate recording of campaign expenses, full disclosure so that the citizens will know as we do in this Chamber, the citizens will know who is giving what money to whom.

It is interesting to note that the Conservatives receive 57 percent of their money from corporations. I was shocked to see that the Liberals receive 85 percent of their money from corporations. I thought you people were equal in terms of your corporate friends. It is obvious the Liberals have even more corporate friends.

Friday, October 27, 1989

The NDP receives 70 percent of its money from people, 19 percent from unions, and 9 percent of its money from corporations, probably the best balanced Party of whom we are accountable for in the province. Mr. Acting Speaker, that is why when the Liberals give us a rough ride about finances it is a lot harder for us to have bingo, and bake sales, and have membership drives and those kinds of grass-roots campaign that we have to have for fund raising. That is why we cannot call an election every couple of months. We have to raise our money from real people, from the senior citizen's \$5 contribution. We do not go to George Richardson and get \$20,000 like the Liberals and Conservatives do. It is a lot harder to get \$5 at a time, Mr. Acting Speaker, and that is why it is going to be very interesting to see the disclosure provisions for the Liberals and Conservatives in City Hall, the land development money and the blood on the hands of the Liberal and Tory coalition at City Hall with the adequate and reasonable disclosure provisions. There should be no dollar that is contributed to any politician that is not fully disclosed, fully accounted for, and as I say, we have no problem with our 19 percent contributions from employee organizations and unions as opposed to the 57 percent. Well if anybody would know anything about the court decisions, we cannot force contributions on anybody. I would refer the Member to -(interjection) good, so I hope when we look at some amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act dealing with campaign disclosures that we will have the support of the Liberal reform-minded Party. We will see when we put those proposals on the table.

Further, Mr. Acting Speaker, moving into other sections though that we feel are absolutely lacking in the Bill, there is no way of dealing with planning in the City of Winnipeg. There is absolutely no opportunity for the citizens of City of Winnipeg to know what their rights are, in terms of planning processes. We have the White Paper in the City of Winnipeg that provided the legislative framework to have all the social and economic costs of any suburban sprawl or any development be fully listed and be fully developed for purposes of the public knowledge. We believe that all economic operational and social costs of any development should be first of all forwarded publicly as part of the proposal, Mr. Acting Speaker. It should be articulated, in terms of what the citizens will have to pay. We believe that they should be fully disclosed prior to any decision being made on the City of Winnipeg and the sprawl.

We believe that the new Plan Winnipeg, the Greater Winnipeg Development Plan, should be expanded, and the scope and content should be much greater in its scope, and be much greater in its concept. We believe that social and economic policies must be developed for the City of Winnipeg, and strategies for implementing the planned policies and objectives must be put in place again in the Plan Winnipeg proposal that we have.

* (1120)

Mr. Acting Speaker, it is safe to say that the city, for the last 10 years, has operated on democratic assumptions that have been totally false. The Tories and the Liberals at City Hall have operated on the

philosophy that we should develop the city so individuals will have a choice of where they will live. That is the position of the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus). That is the position from the Member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst). That is the position of the Member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme).

It is a philosophy that says wherever the developers want to put their shovels we will let the citizens therefore live. Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, the demographic assumptions made in the early '60s that Winnipeg would have a population of 700,000 by the year 1990 are not true and have not taken place.

We have suburban sprawl in south St. Vital, some of which was conducted illegally that has meant that the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg have had to spend millions and millions and millions of dollars in their property tax assessment, supporting snow removal services that they cannot afford, supporting maintenance services that they cannot afford, supporting new schools that this province cannot afford, supporting health care facilities and resources that this province cannot afford, supporting libraries that this province cannot afford, and the CBC has projected it to be \$100 million, supporting all kinds of services that has meant that the City of Winnipeg has had drastic tax increases where the citizens cannot support it.

We believe that the City of Winnipeg's own Planning Department has a better idea of where to go than the City of Winnipeg councillors. The City of Winnipeg Planning Department says the real growth areas that will put pressure on the City of Winnipeg in the next 10 years will be in the area of environment and in the areas of health care. Areas quite frankly, Mr. Acting Speaker, that are really in the purview of the provincial Government, not in the area of the civic Government.

The areas that will have the least demand are in the areas that the city is expanding the most, because they have not yet realized that their own Planning Department, and our Planning Department, has stated that they have enough lots zoned to the year 2010, and there is absolutely no need. In fact that is a financial disaster, to continue to expand the city unnecessarily.

We also proposed revitalizing local planning and expanding the role of the community committees. We have proposed more local plans so that local communities could be involved in greater planning in their own areas. We had proposed that the City of Winnipeg, on page 27 of our White Paper, come fully under the new Environment Act and not continue to break the laws as this Government has allowed to happen. We have proposed that we have a waterways authority for the City of Winnipeg, a three-way authority, to deal with the real problems of the City of Winnipeg, with all the buck passing between the three jurisdictions, and the citizens having nobody to hold them accountable to.

Mr. Acting Speaker, how many minutes do I have? How many more minutes?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): Eleven minutes.

Mr. Doer: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker, it will not take that long.

Another key area that we recommended that the Minister is coming forward with in Bill No. 62 is abolition of the additional zones. We believe that the City of Winnipeg should not conduct the zoning activities in West St. Paul, East St. Paul, Tache, and Ritchot, which are the four remaining additional zones. I know why the Minister is trying to abolish these additional zones as well as we have tried to.

I think it is an absolutely insane situation where West St. Paul comes to the City of Winnipeg for a zoning variance. The City of Winnipeg agrees or disagrees with those zoning variances and then it comes to the Province of Manitoba, as a person who said no to changing agricultural land to residential in West St. Paul, and as a former Minister who is now being sued by West St. Paul, and citizens of West St. Paul, for exercising a consistent policy, I can understand why the Minister wants to abolish the additional zones. However, here is another complete lack of planning by this Government dealing with the additional zones.

We also identified, on page 30 of our White Paper, the total lack of any co-ordination between the land-use policies inside the City of Winnipeg and the land-use policies outside the City of Winnipeg. We recommended that there be a commuter-shed policy, a greenspace policy, and legislation to prescribe the land-use policies outside the City of Winnipeg and co-ordinate it with inside the City of Winnipeg for the commuter-shed.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we should agree, and we should agree in this Chamber, that one of the greatest inadequacies of planning in the City of Winnipeg, over the last 25 years, is to talk about urban sprawl in the City of Winnipeg and have ad hoc decisions on urban sprawl inside the City of Winnipeg, and have urban sprawl leap frog and leap frog and leap frog outside of the City of Winnipeg, and Manitoba not have any co-ordinated approach to that unco-ordinated planning that is going around the City of Winnipeg.

There is no question that what goes on in West St. Paul, East St. Paul, Headingley, La Salle and other areas of the city, affect the planning, the tax base, the resource base, the schools, the hospitals, the ambulances, the greenspace, the agricultural space and the environment between the two areas.

We think that you cannot abolish the additional zones without having a commuter-shed policy. So again the Minister is asking us to deal with Bill 32, Bill 61, Bill 62, in total isolation, in total isolation from a co-ordinated planning approach to our suburban sprawl, to our waterways, to our local planning, and to our commuter-shed as it affects the additional zone.

We believe you cannot deal with increased powers to the mayor without having co-ordinated and increased powers for the rights of the citizens. Although the proposals to have the committees chaired by appointments made by the mayor of the City of Winnipeg were proposals we put forward in our White Paper. We think the Minister has totally failed to develop the concurrent balance of rights of citizens as they affect planning and as they affect the development of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we are left in a situation with the three Bills that have been placed forward by the Minister of having to deal, in an ad hoc way, with amendments that we will be proposing to try to provide a balance for the rights of citizens with the powers of the mayor.

I do not believe that is the best way to develop legislation. I said so before. It is really incumbent upon the Government to come forward with a White Paper, or legislation, that prescribes the total picture rather than having us, in this Legislature, anticipate what the total picture will be and have to react, as the citizens have to react, with our proposals.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we have three Bills before us, Bill 32, Bill 61, and Bill 62. We believe that Bill 32 is now missing a number of key philosophical points that we will have to incorporate either in Bill 32 or Bill 61, Bill 62.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

We are planning on giving greater rights to citizens. We are planning on proposing amendments that will provide the balance that is missing from this Bill 32 in dealing with the powers of mayor. By having examined it in caucus today, we want to hear from the citizens of Winnipeg at the committee stage of exactly what they perceive to be the rights of citizens that should be incorporated in this Bill and at the committee stage on Bill 61 and Bill 62.

* (1130)

We will, therefore, allow this Bill to go to committee today. I say, we will allow it to go to committee today. There is no blank cheque, Mr. Speaker, on what we will do at the committee and no blank cheque that we will pass this Bill quickly, because the Minister feels we have to get a pass for the November 6 or 7 meeting of council, because the Minister has failed to deal with the rights of citizens, and we will have to determine whether we can move amendments in this Bill and in Bill 61 and in Bill 62 to deal with the powers of the mayor but the legitimate rights of citizens, which is the corollary of a fair and democratic City of Winnipeg Amendment Act.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, because of the similarities of the appointment position for the mayor, we will allow this to go to committee. But I will say to this House and the people of Winnipeg that we will be looking at amendments at all three Bill stages to deal with our priority of the rights of citizens to balance off what we believe to be much greater extreme powers for the mayor in allowing the mayor to appoint all of the Executive Policy Committee members, not just the four committee members there chairing committees as we had recommended, and to deal with all the rights of citizens for planning and all the rights of the citizens for zoning, and all the rights of the committee for citizen participation. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: I would like to draw all the Members' attention to the loge to my right where we have with us this morning Mr. Sam Uskiw, the former Member for Lac du Bonnet. On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this morning.

BILL NO. 32—THE CITY OF WINNIPEG AMENDMENT ACT (Cont'd)

Mr. William Chornopyski (Burrows): I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to perhaps make a little contribution to this debate. I can assure you that I will not be as long-winded as the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

The City of Winnipeg Act was written in the early '70s and it was written in haste, obviously. It has been reviewed on two occasions since that time, and at least on one occasion by a Member of the Party that wrote the Act. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Cherniack, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that he had to be very careful what he said about the Act, because of who wrote it. But there are many flaws in this Act. There are many flaws even today that perhaps should be reviewed and changed.

I was hoping that this last review would recommend to the Government that the Board of Commissioners be eliminated. I think we have witnessed, in the past number of years, that they have not added to the City of Winnipeg; in fact, they have confused, if anything, the process in the City of Winnipeg.— (interjection)— Perhaps I missed that. Well, I am happy, I must say that I am happy to hear that.

What this Act has done in the early '70s, it was supposed to have unified and made great changes to our form of city government, but in fact the opposite has happened. It was so different that it remained the same. They proceeded to amalgamate 13 municipalities into one. They proceeded to tear down our police stations in these 13 municipalities, tear down their governments that existed prior to Unicity, and then immediately proceeded to rebuild them again. So that now we still have police stations in these municipalities, and we still have fire departments and we still have everything that we had before.

An Honourable Member: We are expanding.

Mr. Chornopyski: And we are expanding on them. So as I said a while ago, this unicity form of government is so different that it is exactly the same, perhaps a little worse than the previous. So it has done absolutely nothing, at great expense to the people.

The unification has done harm to our Police Department, a great deal of harm. There was great harmony in our Police Department prior to Unicity. That was not the case after this unification. It is certainly not the case today, which is very evident. We have a great deal of problem with our Police Department and our Fire Department. In instances where there are promotions they had to fit people in. There was a great

deal of unhappiness and I think there are people in this Chamber who probably remember those times. I certainly do. So it really has done nothing. We have a unique form of city Government, but it is certainly not what it really was meant to be. So there are changes needed and a great many of them.

The speaker before me mentioned the community committees. I know that what he really is saying is that they should be funded, and to what extent I do not know. That is another duplication as far as I am concerned, because anytime you fund a body of people to do certain things, you are duplicating something and there will be conflict. There is conflict there today. I sat there for 13 years and I have seen a lot of conflict. The resident advisors are really not sure what it is that they are there for and they want to be councillors. They want to have a vote. They want to have a say instead of being the advisors that they were originally meant to be. That was not spelled out to them properly. They appoint resident advisors and they come in uninformed and they leave uninformed.

We have just Wednesday replaced a group with another group in City Hall because one group to me is no different than the other. They can call themselves whatever they want to call themselves, but they are still a group and we have —(interjection)— a gang, that is right. We have now in City Hall 13 new faces that have no idea what is ahead of them, what they are supposed to do or not to do. They will be confused for the next 9 to 12 months and they are supposed to be governing the city. There is absolutely nothing provided anywhere for these people by the city to give them a little course in what it is that a councillor really is supposed to do.

I would like to see that added into the Act — (interjection)—

An Honourable Member: That is right. That is a good point. They do it for all the school trustees.

Mr. Chornopyski: They do it for everybody. These people take on a great responsibility dealing with great amounts of money and really do not know a thing about it. They get elected and they vote and they are supposed to vote right. They do not know whether they are right or left, but they are going to vote anyway because you are compelled to do that. So there are many, many things that should be done that are not done and I am not sure that funding the community committee is one of those things. I have my reservations about it. I was all enthused about it at the beginning when I first entered city politics, but I soon learned that that is provided there to create a conflict between councillors and resident advisors.

(Mr. Darren Praznik, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

We went through a review not very long ago of the City of Winnipeg Act and nothing really happened after that review for some time. The change in our society takes place extremely fast, but the change in how we do things for some reason does not take place. Well I would urge the Minister to make the necessary changes. I think the Honourable Minister is aware of

the changes that are necessary there because he has also served as a city councillor for a number of years. I know that he knows what is right and what is wrong. Those two are not difficult to separate. I would like to see Council on a full-time basis. When this City of Winnipeg Act was by the way written in the early '70s, the population was something like 350,000 in the City of Winnipeg. We are growing. We are over 600,000 today.

We can no longer say that we can govern the City of Winnipeg on a part-time basis and do a good job. You cannot do that after four o'clock in the morning as they are doing today. There is nobody in his right mind that can make a right decision when he has been on his feet for 18 hours. That is absolutely ridiculous.

* (1140)

Mr. Acting Speaker, so I certainly would support a full-time council. That is long overdue. If the council was on a full-time basis, I could see reducing council as well, which is really insignificant. It is so insignificant if you want to save money. It is almost a laughing matter when they say they are going to save \$130,000 a year if we reduce council to 18. You reduce one commissioner and you are saving \$90,000.00.

A commissioner that came from Ontario recently, the chief commissioner, already has said that the freezing of our taxes two years ago was a mistake. Now he is proposing that we double our taxes because we froze them for two years. We do not need a commissioner like that. We need a commissioner that can tell us how we can reduce taxes.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the people of this City of Winnipeg, there are many of them, and many of them are in the riding that I represent that can no longer afford to live in their own homes today, never mind increasing taxes double to what they have saved in the last two years because of the freezing. So we need somebody to get a handle on this problem of taxation and the cost of education and the cost of policing.

As I said a while ago, our police department, there is no harmony in there. The chaos has been created back in the early '70s and it still exists today. It will exist until there is that turnaround that the old guard leaves and the young take over, but that is a little ways away yet, so as taxpayers we are paying a great deal of money for something that we are not getting. The problem exists, not with the police department. The problem exists with the politicians, and that needs to be changed.

There is a great opportunity at this time, since we are dealing with The City of Winnipeg Act, and I think the Honourable Minister will agree with me, maybe not vocally, but he may give me a nod, that there is a real opportunity now to separate the school tax from the property tax.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the city government is on the firing line year after year after year because of the cost of education. The average citizen, when he gets his tax bill, does not care which is which. He looks at the bottom line and it is \$2,300, and he says it is too high, but 60 percent of that is education.

I think it is time that the school board became responsible enough that they collected their own monies, their own taxes, and were able to stand up and face the public and say, yes, why it is going up and—

An Honourable Member: Other than that we will get Michael Wilson to attach it onto the GST.

Mr. Chornopyski: That is a good idea. I will buy that. I can go for that -(interjection)- That is right. Mr. Acting Speaker, I just wanted to bring these few points to the fore because it is easy to stand there and be for the people. We are all for the people. That is why we are here. Not only the New Democrats, I think everybody here is concerned about the people and the high taxes. I certainly am. I live among the poorest in Winnipeg, and I know what it means for the average worker that is earning \$7 an hour and then gets a tax bill right after Autopac, and all the other things, income tax, and it is very difficult to scratch up enough money to pay the tax bill.

I just wanted to very, very briefly bring some of these points to the fore. Hopefully the Minister will take heed and perhaps see fit to make some changes in that respect. Thank you very much, Mr. Acting Speaker.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

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

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of house business, I know that the Government, and I know that all Members indeed want to see this Bill proceed quickly to committee so that representation can be made and we can hear from interested individuals as to their opinion of the Bill. I would ask the Minister if he is intending to have the House Leader, Government House Leader, if he is intending to have the Bill moved quickly to committee next week, that he attempt to give notice today or as soon as possible, so that those interested individuals will have time to prepare themselves and arrange their schedules accordingly.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Churchill is right on the mark. As a matter of fact, as debate was proceeding today on this Bill I have discussed the matter with the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) as well as Members of the Liberal Party and of my own caucus and we have agreed that the Committee of Municipal Affairs should be called for Tuesday evening at 8 p.m., October 31, to deal with Bill 32 and I am so announcing, in Room 255.

Mr. Speaker: In Room 255. I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader.

**BILL NO. 27—THE FISCAL
STABILIZATION FUND ACT**

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 27, The Fiscal Stabilization Fund Act; Loi sur le Fonds de stabilisation des recettes, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne? (Agreed)

**BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR
RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis). Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns? Leave? Agreed.

BILL NO. 34—THE LOAN ACT, 1989

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 34—the Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill 31, as I understand it, leave is required to allow it to stand and we were hoping that Honourable Members would either speak to the Bill or pass the Bill.

**BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR
RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT (Cont'd)**

Mr. Speaker: Was there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), Bill No. 31? Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: No.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Churchill, on a point of order.

* (1150)

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the fact that the Government believes that leave is required, but I think if one goes back and reviews the history of how this House has operated, in many instances, most instances, co-operated with respect to allowing Bills to stand, you will find that it is a somewhat ambiguous situation and you will find that perhaps even the Government House Leader, or Members of his caucus from time to time took a different position under different circumstances with respect for the need to have leave for Bills to stand.

This is a problem that has confronted this House, not just this Session, and not just in this instance, if it is indeed a problem in this instance. We on this side have experienced some frustration when the Government House Leader himself stood Bills in Private Members' Hour for meeting after meeting after meeting sometimes up to 12 or 13 or 14 times in a row.

I think that perhaps the House Rules Committee might want to meet on the whole issue of the practices of this Legislature with respect to the standing of Bills and the allowing of Bills to stand in Members' names for extended periods of time in order to try to develop a more consistent practice in a more consistent procedure. I certainly, on behalf of my House Leader, can indicate that we would like to see this situation resolved so that there are some written practices or rules that can be enforced and applied in a consistent fashion.

In all instances, rather than create a controversy today, with respect to not letting the Bill stand, what I would like to do is give my commitment to the Government House Leader that the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), or someone in her place, will speak to this Bill when it next comes before the House. If they have that commitment, that it will be spoken to if it is called on Monday, that is not to say that we will pass it, because this Bill is going to suffer very slow progress, if progress at all through this House. The fact is that it should not be done by way of extended standing of the Bill, and we will have some one speak to this Bill on next Wednesday, when Bills are next call.

In the meanwhile, I might suggest that the Government House Leaders get together with yourself, Mr. Speaker, and have a meeting of the Rules Committee to try to clarify this situation in the future, so that we do not get caught up in the type of impasses which we have found ourselves subject to in the past.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader, on the same point.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): The Honourable Member for Churchill is right on again, Mr. Speaker, when he refers to different circumstances requiring different approaches, and we understand that. I do remind the Honourable Member that I am informed that at one time, or perhaps more than one time, a former NDP House Leader by the name of Anstett, has -(interjection)- has denied leave—indeed, the Honourable Member for Churchill. We do have that kind of history, I suggest.

I remind the Honourable Member and the Members of his caucus that this Bill has been on the Order Paper for some extended length of time. We will go along with the Honourable Member's suggestion and allow the matter to stand today. We would like to hear from the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) on Wednesday next, or someone in her stead, from their Party. We recognize the view taken by the Members of the New Democratic Party on this particular Bill. We recognize that, but we also see this Bill as a priority Bill for this Government, and therefore we do raise this as a concern. So we will not deny leave today.

Mr. Speaker: There is leave that this matter will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis).

BILL NO. 34—THE LOAN ACT, 1989

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 34, The Loan Act, 1989; Loi d'emprunt de 1989, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East who has 10 minutes remaining, the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just offer few concluding remarks on the second reading of this particular motion, The Loan Act, 1989, and remind Honourable Members that whether they like it or not, public investment, which this document reflects, has an important bearing on the economic situation in the province. I know some Members of the House may not believe how much in public investment, they seem to think that it is only private investment that counts, that provides for economic growth.

The fact is, that public investment, as well, is equally as important, and particularly when we look at public investment as listed in here being in the Hydro electricity area, the Telephone Systems, the other corporations, the Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Water Services Board, Data Services. These are dollars put into organizations that are productive, that are producing goods and/or services that are required by the people of the province. So I say, Mr. Speaker, whatever the level, the level has some impact on the economy of Manitoba, and I would suggest that among the foremost of these has been the Manitoba Hydro electric system, because whenever you go about building a Limestone project, or indeed a Conawapa, which may occur in the future, that you have got a large amount of money that does create jobs, that does create business activity in the province, and does have a positive effect.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, particularly as I mentioned last day, about one of the items mentioned in the Bill, the Manitoba Data Services Limited, which is being proposed for sale by this Government. We think it is a big mistake. It is a corporation that has been very successful. It has been making money, but more importantly, it is providing an efficient service to Government departments, Government agencies and Crown corporations who need the services of this type of mainframe computer organization. Not only has it been—if you want to measure success in terms of profit, Mr. Speaker, it has been successful in terms of being able to reduce the rate that they charge to their customers very significantly over the last 10 years.

What cost a dollar, one unit of computer service 10 years ago, is down to around 45 cents today. Therefore this is an organization that has been a credit to the people of Manitoba, to the Government of Manitoba. I am very worried that if a sale goes through of MDS to the private sector we will have a quasi monopoly situation, and there will be no control whatsoever over a private company that can virtually rip off the taxpayers if it so chooses.

The Government, the Minister, has not assured us whatsoever on this particular matter, Mr. Speaker, nor do we have any assurance with regard to the economic spinoff that the Government says will occur by privatizing this. As I mentioned previously, there has been a positive economic spinoff from this corporation as a public enterprise in the past and there can indeed be in the future.

* (1200)

Manitoba economy is being threatened today by a series of events, many of which come out of Ottawa, including policies such as the Free Trade Agreement that is being pursued by the Mulroney Government and is supported by this Government. It has had a debilitating effect on Manitoba's industrial base.

Other measures taken by the federal Government, the GST, goods and services tax, that is going to have a very negative effect on the Manitoba economy, the cutbacks in VIA, the closures of the military bases. All in all these policy announcements are going to be, and are, bad news for the Province of Manitoba.

There is a quiet erosion going on also in our private industrial base. One picks up the paper day by day just about every week where you hear of some closure or some scaling down. Just the other day Carter Day Ltd. announced they were going to send their engineering staff to Minneapolis. We are losing a cadre of technical people, qualified people, who play an important role in that operation. Now we are losing that, so we will not have that sort of research and development component with engineers as we did in the past.

There is erosion going particularly in Rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, Marr's Leisure Products, 43-44 jobs totally eliminated by the fact that the Free Trade Agreement eliminated tariffs on leisure products. That was one of the first to be affected as of January 1 of this year. As a result the company saw fit to sell out to an American company, which is now producing those products and selling them back to Canada. So our loss is the United States' gain in this respect. Forty-four jobs is a very significant number I would submit, Mr. Speaker, in the City of Brandon.

Steinbach has been hurt as well through the decision of Toro to no longer stay in Manitoba, to go back to Minneapolis, back to Minnesota, and they will just simply sell their products back in Canada with little or no tariff to prevent that sale.

In terms of Campbell Soup, again the company is saying it is getting ready to deal with competition in the North American market, the increasing competition because of free trade, so therefore, it is deemed advisable, after 20 years in Portage la Prairie, to consolidate in Ontario, I believe in Toronto specifically.

Then we have the Neepawa hog plant, another problem that perhaps for different reasons, but nevertheless it is a problem, that affects the economy in a negative way. It affects the farmers involved. It surely affects the workers involved in that particular operation.

So in particular, we have a threat to our industrial base, but we particularly have a threat to our rural economy. There is rural disintegration occurring in Manitoba. We have industries that are folding; we have small towns that are gradually disappearing. They are gradually contracting. They are losing certain retail outlets. They are losing certain services that were vital to those particular towns, and the reason they are losing those retail services, of course, is because of the situation of farm income, which we know has not been very attractive. It has been devastating the last few years and indeed even now is not that great.

So we need a plan for rural economic development, Mr. Speaker, and I know there has been a committee set up across the way by the Government, but so far we have seen no action. All we have heard is that there are studies going on and considerations, but there is no plan of action and, indeed there is no consultation to speak of with the people in rural Manitoba. At least I know of no consultation that went on years ago.

I recall when we had the Regional Analysis Program of the Province of Manitoba whereby we involved—at first it was 75 communities, but others wanted to come in so we had more than 75 communities in Manitoba involved actively in how they could go about, themselves, and also in co-operation with the provincial and indeed federal Governments to enhance growth in those communities.

There was public involvement. We do not have any of that today, Mr. Speaker. There is a committee dealing with rural economic development, but so far no action and certainly no discussion.

So, Mr. Speaker, I dare say therefore if you looked at the population figures for rural Manitoba you would see some serious declines. The fact is that the Manitoba population, the entire province, is either declining in some quarters or certainly remaining stationary.

When you consider the fact that at the same time the City of Winnipeg is increasing its population, not that dramatically but nevertheless increasing, what that means, by simple arithmetic, is that the rural population of Manitoba is declining and, Mr. Speaker, I would trust all Members of this House would be concerned about that. I suggest that through the Government public investment, as represented by this Loan Act, you do have and can have a significant impact on rural economic development. You will have a significant impact on the entire economy, whether it be through the utilities, whether it be through co-op loans boards, whether it be through the Water Services Board, which provides needed infrastructure to towns and cities for water and sewer, or whether it be through a tourism agreement, or whether it be through the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation, a very important Bill, very important spending, that does have an impact on the province. I would trust that this Government, in its concern to conserve money and to reduce spending, will also consider this in a positive light, that how can they use public spending, public investment, in such a way that we can enhance economic development, enhance economic growth and indeed stop the population drain that is now occurring. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), and commented on by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), on whether or not leave is required that a matter remain standing in another Member's name without leave, I would like to state a few of the past practices of our House.

Our Rule No. 21(1) states in part that: . . . "questions, notices of motion by Members, and orders not taken up or proceeded with when called may be allowed to stand and retain their precedence; . . .".

To assist me in determining the accepted interpretation by the House of this Rule, we have reviewed the relevant precedents and have noted that:

- (a) on July 21, 1980, the House was informed by the Attorney General, acting as the House Leader, that the Government "would not be allowing debate on this Bill to stand tonight"; and
- (b) on July 22, 1980, numerous Members of the Opposition distinctly requested leave of the House to have Bills stood; and
- (c) on January 16, 17, and 18, 1984, Speaker Walding ruled that unanimous consent of the House is required to allow a Bill to stand; and
- (d) on May 16, 1984, Speaker Walding ruled that "If there is not leave, the Honourable Member will lose his right to speak if the debate moves to another Member"; and
- (e) on June 25, 1984, the Member for Lakeside requested "the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand."

I am therefore ruling in respect to the matter raised by the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) in accordance with established Manitoba practice, as demonstrated by the references cited, that when a matter is standing in a particular Member's name, if that Member does not wish to speak, any other Member may speak without requiring leave of the House to do so.

I am also ruling that in such circumstances leave of the House is required for the matter to continue to stand in the name of the Honourable Member in whose name it was standing when called. If such leave is not granted, that Member would lose his or her right to speak.

There was leave granted in this instance. The Honourable Member for the Interlake.

* (1210)

BILL NO. 34 THE LOAN ACT, 1989 (Cont'd)

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate in the debate on Bill 34 dealing with The

Loan Act and raise a number of issues with respect to what is occurring, both province-wide and particularly in rural Manitoba, in terms of the agricultural economy and the impact of the state of the agricultural economy on communities, on population trends, on infrastructure across this province.

The one issue I wanted to touch on specifically was this Government's announcement and, in fact, intended capital requirement for a sewer and water agreement that was put into the budget in previous Bills. As yet we have not seen a federal-provincial agreement for sewer and water in this province, and what we see is that it appears that communities that have now been waiting for a number of years for an infrastructure agreement are now going to have to wait a lot longer. That is placing great burdens upon local governments, that is placing great burdens on, in fact, intended investments.

In many communities you have a number of, what would be considered, regional centres or trade centres in the various regions. You have the Steinbachs with requirements for sewage lagoon expansion. You have the Portage la Prairies requiring virtually a total overhaul of their sewer system. You have Brandon requiring a massive capital infusion of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$15 million. You have the Dauphins with need to secure a good water source. You have a number of lesser, when I say lesser projects, not meaning that the project in itself is lesser for the community. It is equally important to those communities but lesser in terms of cost and overall expenditure—the community of Teulon, in terms of the need to proceed with the expansion or the restructuring of a new lagoon. You have the community of Selkirk requiring the construction of a long-term water source for that community. You have probably the second, maybe third, most major water project in terms of pipeline expansion in the West Lake area. This is where, Mr. Chairman, I find the whole process and thinking of the Government somewhat confusing.

All those projects that I have mentioned that are basically on hold because there is lack of federal initiative and federal funding in this whole area, because there is no money, are being held. Yet we have the West Lake project where there was a commitment by the federal Government of cost-sharing, and we have, what I would call, almost absurd situation of the provincial Government aided and abetted by the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), the spokesperson, I am assuming, for rural development, the Member for Selkirk agreeing that they should in fact put a hold on this whole question of water sourcing for the communities of Gladstone and Plumas and agreeing with the Government that somehow this project should be held and the Assiniboine Aquifer should not be tapped into.

We have the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), whose own department issued a licence for this project after going through clean environment hearings. Here is the rub, Mr. Speaker. We had the Clean Environment Commission hold hearings under the new legislation listen to all the evidence that was presented to that committee, recommending to the Minister of

Environment (Mr. Cummings) that a licence be issued. So the licence was issued for that community. Lo and behold, we had 1,100 letters, at least that is the number coming from the Government, of objection to that licence. They were appealing the decision of the department to the Minister.

Now, I phoned his own department and asked them whether there was any new evidence, new information that should be considered by the commission, by the Government that was not presented at those hearings. The department officials who were involved in those hearings at the Clean Environment Commission said, no. Any information that we heard at those hearings—there was no new information presented that would shed any light on this matter.

So what do we have? We have the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) holding up a capital project and I will use his words to me on two issues: 1) that the strength of those appeals is very strong, that is essentially what he told me; and 2) that we think the numbers dealing with Lake Manitoba pumping water back uphill are overestimated by the Manitoba Water Services Board. Those were two of his main reasons.

Well, No. 1, no new information on the hearings, no new information to cast doubt on the commission's decision so the Minister has struck out there; No. 2, claiming that Lake Manitoba figures are out and that is his main thrust for doing this additional study. The numbers presented by PFRA and Manitoba Water Services Board for the Lake Manitoba alternative are not somewhere where you could say, well, we are only 10 percent out in the costing of this project, they are 50 percent more. It is an \$8 million least cost alternative to a \$12 million Lake Manitoba alternative with the quality of water being in question on top of it. So you have the Government holding back the aspirations and the needs of those people in Plumas and Gladstone—(interjection)—

Oh, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment is showing me a bottle of water and I do not know where he has gotten that water and I am assuming—and I will take my own glass of water and drink to him but that is precisely what the people of Gladstone and Plumas cannot do. They cannot go to their dugouts and take water for the cattle because the situation in that area this year is worse than last year.

Here is the rub. While the Minister of Environment is holding up the licence for this community which will only require a 2 percent commitment from the aquifer, 2 percent. Now that aquifer is now committed to the tune of 18 percent. There is approximately—I will use the technical term—73 million acre feet of sustainable yield of water from the Assiniboine delta aquifer as presented by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) engineers. That means in layman's terms that water could be pumped out, day in and day out, to that amount of water and will not appreciably over the long term depress that aquifer.

What is being committed now is somewhere between 10,000 and 16,000 acre feet of water but here is the issue, Mr. Speaker. The bulk of that commitment is not for human consumption. The bulk of that commitment

Friday, October 27, 1989

is for agricultural production which I do not argue against. I say, good, give it to the potato farmers because they are using more than half of that water for the production of potatoes for Carnation. The Carnation plant is another very large user. I say absolutely, do it. But, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand when you issue new licences for irrigation, this year and last year, because there is sustainable yield, how in the world can you say to the community that, no, you cannot have water for human consumption because human consumption by law is the prime use and the prime requirement on the Manitoba Water Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is breaking its own laws, is breaking the Water Rights Act and there is no way that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) should be able to withhold this licence to this community on the basis that he wants to examine some other method that he does not believe his officials, Minister of Natural Resources officials, Minister of Rural Developments officials, and PFRA officials, all those who have been involved in this project for many, many years in the area of water or drought proofing this province.

Mr. Speaker, what is the reason? It must be political interference. It must be political interference by the Minister of Environment (Cummings) because on one hand you cannot go ahead and issue licences for the production of potatoes which we do not object to, and on the other hand you are not going to give people water because that is what has happened.

* (1220)

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of the Environment, on a point of order.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) that the appeal process and the legislation that was designed under his administration means that the department issues the licence, the Minister is the appeal. He does not seem to recognize that.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister does not have a point of order. He knows full well that a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Uruski: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that very well. In fact, only too well to understand and to make the charge that there is political interference in this process, because when I asked the officials of his own department to say was there any technical information or any information in those letters of appeal that would cause the Government to rethink the information that was presented by all the experts to the Clean Environment Commission, they told me no. There was no new information. I understand very well.-(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker, the Minister is saying they have not seen them all. I believe that this Minister is in fact

denying what I would call fair justice to the communities of Plumas and Gladstone and only because their clout in that area, in terms of population, is less than other communities. They cannot shout louder than the other communities because it would be a scandal anywhere, where you have money committed by the federal Government, you have provincial go ahead, you have clean environment hearings giving you the go ahead and yet you refuse to proceed.

Yet for all the other projects that I talked about, there is no money and for this one there is, and they are holding it up. Mr. Speaker, can they not make a decision on this matter when in fact all the technical evidence points that there is no basis for refusing and holding up the licence that the aquifer is only 18 percent committed and this will bring it up to 20 percent, and that the use, the bulk of the use of what is committed in an aquifer is for non-human consumption. I mean, ultimately it is human consumption because it is for the production of potatoes, but to say that, yes, you can have it for potatoes and we are issuing new licences and then no for human consumption, that defies all logic.

They are breaking their own Act, Mr. Speaker. They have in legislation that the priorities of the allocation of water under the responsibility of the Government is that human consumption receive the first priority. What are they denying? They are denying the communities, the farm population and the communities of Plumas and Gladstone the right of access to the water. I plead with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) in this province and the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) who do not have a direct linkage or direct interest in this aquifer that they can use the advice of their technical experts and prevail on the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) to stop the nonsense and proceed with that licence and provide the people of Plumas and area the water that they deserve.

I urge the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) to prevail on his colleague that there is no basis and if there is a basis, if there is one shred of information that says technically some of that information is wrong that your department has presented, let us have it on the record. Let us put in on the record. I am willing to say, look, I did not have all the facts, but, Mr. Speaker, none of the technical experts that I have talked to have been able to give me one shred of information that would somehow contradict what I am now alleging is political interference by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings), nothing more.

So, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of rural Manitoba is suffering as a result of this Government which prided itself in '88 to say, elect us and we will have the pipeline to Ottawa. All we have to do is pick up the phone, pick up the phone and the money will be here.

They even brought in the capital estimates, Mr. Speaker, saying that there will be a sewer and water agreement. Where is that agreement? Where is that agreement? All those communities are waiting for those projects, Mr. Speaker, the unrest is growing. I am sure you have, sir, in your area communities that are probably waiting for extensions or expansions of sewer and water

Friday, October 27, 1989

projects, which affect the quality of life of thousands of rural Manitobans.

Here we have a case where money is available, and they are holding the project up. Talk about—Mr. Speaker, I cannot even put it into words. I cannot even put into words what I think, what I would like to say about the attitude of the Government to these communities. I really cannot, but Mr. Speaker, just this one issue should rile every new municipal council across rural Manitoba, because if the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) can get away with doing what he is doing to the communities of Plumas and Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, he can virtually get away with anything.

This Legislature and the people of this province should not allow the Government to flagrantly abuse the letter, not only the spirit, the letter of the law under The Water Rights Act because here we have the prime use of the resource that belongs to all the people in fact being abused and not allowed to be used by the people who need it most.

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 12:30, I am interrupting proceedings according to the House. When this motion is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have 19 minutes remaining.

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday.