



Fourth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

42 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XLII No. 88 - 1:30 p.m., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1993

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 23, 1993

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

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

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement for the House, copies for members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I have a brief report for the House on this year's summer meeting of the Western Governors' Association, which I attended earlier this week in Tucson, Arizona.

Since 1990, the western governors have invited the western Premiers to participate in their summer conferences each year. Since 1991, they have extended a similar invitation to the governors of the Mexican border states.

All four western provinces and the Government of Canada were represented in Tucson. Senior officials attended from British Columbia and Alberta, while Saskatchewan was represented by Glen McPherson, a member of the Saskatchewan Legislature. Also in attendance for the first time was the governor of Texas, the Honourable Ann Richards, whose state has just joined the Western Governors' Association.

Even before Texas joined, the Western Governors' Association was recognized as the most influential regional group of its kind in the United States. Now with Texas as a full member the WGA will be even more effective, and Manitoba and the other western provinces stand to benefit as

well because of our involvement in a number of cross-border initiatives.

Most of our discussions in Tucson centred on the reconciliation of economic and environmental priorities. I was able to speak with considerable pride about Manitoba's continuing leadership in advancing the principles of sustainable development.

Members may be interested to know that key members of the President's Advisory Council on Sustainable Development, which Mr. Clinton announced last week, are well acquainted with Manitoba's work on sustainable development and have indicated a strong interest in maintaining close contact with us, both directly and through the WGA as they pursue the mandate the President has given them.

The theme of the Tucson conference was Our Lands - New Strategies for Protecting the West. One of the principal examples we discussed was the Great Plains Initiative, a project aimed at protecting wildlife habitat in the Great Plains through a trinational approach based on sustainable development.

Manitoba has participated in this initiative since 1991, and we will be assisting further in the coming year by making our remote sensing capabilities available to our partners in the U.S. and Mexico. We will also continue joint studies on waste management.

The conference agreed to pursue other shared priorities in the coming year as well, including improved north-south transportation and information exchanges on education and health care. I should note that Saskatchewan is an enthusiastic supporter of these additional opportunities for expanded consultation and co-operation.

As might be expected, the issues of NAFTA and the proposed North American Commission on the Environment, NACE, were also discussed in considerable detail. Much of the discussion centred on the U.S. and Mexican positions as well as on the Canadian provinces' efforts to ensure that the design and implementation of the side

agreements, should they go forward, reflect a substantial direct responsibility of provinces in the fields of environment and labour standards.

* (1335)

Our discussions in Tucson will be followed up with regular staff consultations in the coming months. Our main goals in participating in these consultations with the western and Mexican states are ultimately to expand mutual understanding and to encourage co-operation where it can benefit our province in Canada.

The Premiers of the eastern provinces are pursuing similar consultations with the New England governors, and the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec are also stepping up their efforts to work more closely with the governors in their neighbouring states.

Here in western Canada we are privileged to have a growing relationship with a group of states which sought and welcomed our views on shared challenges and which have opened the door to productive consultations with key Mexican states as well. The value of these links is recognized by the federal governments in all three countries through their own increasing involvement and support.

Only a few years ago sustainable development was not well understood below the 49th Parallel. This week it was the dominant theme of the Western Governors' conference. Cross-border dialogue helped make that happen, and it demonstrates why it is so important to continue that dialogue and to broaden it in the years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in responding to the Premier's statement today, we would like to thank him for the statement in the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, it must be interesting to have the new governor of Texas in attendance. I can still recall one of my favourite political statements from any political leader was her statement on George Bush. I think it went along the lines of: Poor old George; he was born on third base with a silver spoon in his mouth—

An Honourable Member: A silver foot in his mouth.

Mr. Doer: Okay, well, the Premier may have some embellished term for it.

She must be a very interesting person to meet with and discuss trade issues.

On the issue of trade, we have rather conflicting messages from the Premier on the whole issue of trade arising out of the Western Governors' meeting.

We understand the western governors were very critical of Ross Perot's statements about the loss of jobs in the United States, the loss of jobs in North America. They were very critical of Ross Perot's statements on the environment and labour standards.

At the same time, we thought it was the position of Manitoba to be concerned about those very same loss of jobs, the very same decline in the environment and the very same decline in labour standards with the proposed Free Trade Agreement. We note that the Premier was the only Premier from western Canada in attendance, and I hope that message got through to the governors of western United States.

We also note, Mr. Speaker, the great claims of the Premier dealing with sustainable development. I think it is important to have positions that we take on the international stage that are consistent with the positions we take in our own home province, and many people are very concerned about the sustainable development policy of this government and its lack of a federal-provincial environmental impact study in dealing with the sustainability of the Assiniboine diversion project in our own province.

The Premier (Mr. Filmon) again notes with great fanfare, the position dealing with the habitat and wildlife. We would encourage him to continue working in that regard, but we would note that the new parks act which was brought in by this government does not include the 12 percent promise that was made by the Premier in terms of endangered spaces. The 12 percent promise that the Premier made in August of 1990 is not in his own parks act and, again, we would like to see where the government is going on a promise that is almost three years old, back in your own home province, as opposed to on the international stage.

* (1340)

We note with interest, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier in Fargo at his first meeting in 1990 talked about trade with United States and Mexico almost on an either/or basis that this is the best way to go. We believe that trade is not only north and south,

but east and west in Canada and east and west in this world. We do not believe in tying our trade policy in Canada and in Manitoba only to the one continental trade agreement. We believe that trade is truly international. I hope, again, that message was brought to the U.S. western governors at the meeting attended by the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, it is timely that the Premier is talking about trade with the steel decision now under the Canada-U.S. trade agreement, with the hog decision a couple of weeks ago. It is very timely that the Premier is talking about trade. We note that at his first Western Governors' conference, the Premier stated, Canada likely net loses so far under free trade.

Many of us think that Canada still is the net loser under the Canada-U.S. trade agreement. We very greatly worry about the NAFTA agreement, and we would have preferred a stronger position from our Premier at that Western Governors' meeting just held this last weekend.

Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for this statement today.

Of course, it is wonderful to see the Premier down cavorting with others from other countries. We are glad to hear about these discussions on many different issues, but I am moved to say that it would be very nice if the same priority and the same types of discussions and the same types of hopes could be expressed about our co-operation within this country before we spend all this time and effort prioritizing discussions in trade with other nations.

Why are we still in this country concentrating on our trade with other nations before we tackle trade within this country? We are Canadians first in this House. I would like to hear the Premier stand up and tell us about progress on western economic co-operation within this country and progress on Canadian economic co-operation, Canadian integration. That is where our future is in this country if we want to be a country in the years to come.

The Premier goes on to say, and I must take great exception if he is down speaking to these people telling them about his continuing leadership and advancing the principles of sustainable development—honestly, Mr. Speaker. He talks

about, a few years ago that concept was not understood below the 49th Parallel. Well, maybe since then they have learned it, but they sure have not learned it up here. The fact is that in this province this government has proven time and time again that it has no idea what sustainable development really means.

Another example in this statement, the wildlife protection, Mr. Speaker. Well, this government gutted The Wildlife Act last session in this House. This session, they are proposing gutting the parks act. So there is very little, if any, credibility in those statements. I am moved to have some sympathy for those in other nations if they are looking to this government for leadership in those areas.

Mr. Speaker, finally, the Premier notes that in the eastern provinces, the same types of discussions are happening across borders. Of course, those are worthy discussions, but I draw the Premier's attention and all members of this House's attention again to our primary purpose and our primary objective in this country, which should be to get together within this country first. Canada first.

Thank you.

* (1345)

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review 1993-94 Departmental Expenditure Estimates of the Department of Labour, as well as the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review 1993-94 of the Manitoba Civil Service Commission.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 52—The Manitoba Foundation Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill 52, The Manitoba Foundation Act (Loi sur la Fondation du Manitoba), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill 53—The Justice for Victims of Crime Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 53, The Justice for Victims of Crime Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les droits des victimes d'actes criminels), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon from the Birtle Elementary School twenty-seven Grades 4 and 5 students under the direction of Ms. May Wady. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach).

Also this afternoon, from the Luxton School we have twenty-six Grade 6 students under the direction of Mr. Walmsley. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

North American Free Trade Agreement Manitoba Position

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

The Premier is quoted as saying that three provinces in Canada are opposed to the NAFTA agreement. We understand that Ontario is opposed, we understand that Saskatchewan is opposed, and we understand that British Columbia is opposed.

Did Manitoba change its position at the Western Governors' meeting the Premier attended last weekend?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): No, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba put very clearly on the record the position we have taken with respect to requiring six conditions in order to be able to support any such agreement.

I elaborated on the fact that two of the six key conditions, of course, were environmental standards and labour force standards, both of which are the topics of the continuing negotiations on sidebar agreements vis-à-vis the United States, and I said that, in that, we shared President Clinton's views, and we were delighted he was taking up those issues because they had been, in fact, two of the key conditions.

I also informed the western governors that, of course, in Canada, our involvement is much more necessary in those two areas since, constitutionally, both labour force standards and environment are primarily provincial jurisdiction.

Triple-Transformation Clause

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, did the Premier raise the issue of the triple-transformation clause that is now proposed in NAFTA that will have an impact potentially on jobs in the apparel and clothing industry in Manitoba, changing the source origin of raw goods, which is of major concern for 5,000 to 7,000 workers in the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba?

Did the Premier raise that issue with the western governors, and did he get any support from the western governors?—because I noted the governors seemed to take a different approach at their meeting. They seemed to take an approach to attack those people who were opposed to NAFTA, like Ross Perot, rather than raising some of the legitimate concerns that Mr. Perot has raised, and others in this province have raised, about jobs and future opportunities in this province under the NAFTA proposals.

* (1350)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member raises the question because he absolutely misrepresented what the governors said about Ross Perot. They did indeed criticize his statements about the loss of jobs to Mexico, but they did not criticize or comment on any of his statements about environment or labour force standards.

Their criticisms were with respect to the very, very severe lack of information and knowledge he had on the topic. They talked about the potential for many things that are important to western provinces and western states, such as the potential for sale of our grain products and many other agricultural products to Mexico. They also, of course, took issue with that.

They were interested, for instance, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that under the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, Manitoba has been a significant beneficiary. In 1991, in the depths of the recession, Manitoba's exports to the United States increased by over 5 percent and, in 1992, by double-digit rates approaching 15 percent.

Obviously, they were very interested in that. In fact, much of the discussion vis-à-vis Manitoba's benefits under the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement centred on the fact that western states thought Canada had gotten the better of the United States, in many ways, under the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and were lamenting such issues as barley, durum wheat, hogs and the tremendous impact our exports have had on their markets.

U.S.-Canada Trade Tribunal Steel Decision

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): We will await the deficit of trade numbers because the Premier to only outline one set of numbers, the increase in trade, without dealing with the whole issue of imports into Manitoba, does not deal with the total equation of our deficit of trade, which has gone up close to \$500 million since free trade has been introduced.

It has gone from about \$480 million to over a billion dollars. We have not seen the latest numbers. The government may have seen them. We are hoping that with the dollar going down, this situation will be somewhat improved, but I think the Premier should give us both sets of numbers when he talks about trade because I think Manitobans deserve the full picture, not half a picture.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government has lost an important decision on hogs with the U.S.-Canada Trade Tribunal. It has since received another setback dealing with steel. This is a \$50-million issue in Manitoba. It is a \$50-million industry. Some 1,900 people in Manitoba are employed in steel-related industries. The tariffs are being

raised by the U.S. Department of Commerce following the decision under the tribunal. This has implications for our exports of steel, and it also has implications for dumping of steel within Canada due to depressed prices.

I would like to ask the Premier: What is his analysis of the impact on Manitoba jobs, and what action and strategy is he taking on the most recent decision, contrary to Canadian best interests and Manitoba's best interests, on steel production and steel jobs?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Well, Mr. Speaker, of course, the member opposite conveniently does not say it, but the fact of the matter is Canada has won more of the disputes than they have lost in the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. That is the first point to be made.

Secondly, the fact of the matter is in the absence of a dispute resolution mechanism, the U.S. could take unilateral action, and we would lose all the conflicts. So in neither case is the member very adequate in his coverage of the issue.

With respect to the potential impact of the steel decision on Manitoba, firstly, we support the position that Trade Minister Wilson is taking, indicating he is shocked by the decision and actions of the United States and certainly will be fighting those very strongly, and we support that.

In Manitoba, the area of major potential concern, of course, would be at Manitoba Rolling Mills in Selkirk. The CEO there, Mr. Leach, who has expressed his concerns in the past, acknowledges that the products currently targeted by U.S. duties represent less than 5 percent of his production and are not strategic or high-margin products of Manitoba Rolling Mills. So he anticipates very little effect.

* (1355)

Family Violence Court Reduced Workweek

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, on March 8, which was, ironically, International Women's Day, I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) why he was instructing his Crown attorneys not to schedule Family Violence Court sessions on Fridays this summer, which will have, as I stated then, a negative impact on the backlog of cases, going against the government's

often-stated policy of zero tolerance for domestic violence.

In light of facts made public today, only three months later, that the backlog has doubled to six months due to the loss of seven Friday sittings this summer and the shortage of four Provincial Court judges, does the Premier (Mr. Filmon) stand by his government's decision that Family Violence Court is not an essential service under Bill 22, and, therefore, is the Premier agreeing with the continuation of the instructions of the Crown attorneys not to schedule Family Violence Court cases on Fridays this summer?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Acting Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question. Most definitely, given the zero tolerance position of this government, there certainly are many more cases coming to the Family Court, and, certainly, there is some additional strain on the human resources there to adjudicate, but I would indicate to the member that Family Violence Court will be receiving an extra Crown attorney July 5, resulting in screening court dates reopening for July and August.

I would also indicate we are still living up to the initial goal of disposing court cases within three months and operating well within the Askov guidelines.

So, Mr. Speaker, we acknowledge there is an increasing number, yet within the guidelines and within the parameters of the decisions made to try and provide greater resources, we are doing so.

Family Violence Court Backlog

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Given that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) also on March 8 told me that one of the basic objectives of the Family Violence Court, timeliness, was being met and would continue to be met, is the Premier satisfied with this six-month backlog in cases which one additional Crown attorney will not make a large dent in?

What is the government prepared to do, other than change the definition of timeliness from three months to six months, to have the domestic Family Violence Court meet its mandate of services to women and children?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the member opposite—and I appreciate her concern. It is a concern we all have with respect to this issue.

When we set up the special court to deal with these issues on a prompt and a timely basis, among many things, this did change the number of cases that were brought forward, changed the pattern of prosecutions to encourage more of these cases to be prosecuted, in fact.

As a result, on a temporary basis, on a short-term basis, this court has been the victim of its own success, so to speak. The volume has increased 70 percent. The volume of cases that are being dealt with has been increased 70 percent in a very, very short space of time.

To give the specific numbers to the member for Wellington, there were 1,800 cases in the year this special court began. Year two, which was last year, that was increased to 2,663 cases, and this year, year three, it is expected to reach 3,065; so from 1,800 to 3,065 over a space of just two years.

That, Mr. Speaker, is really the issue at play here, the fact that far more of these cases are being dealt with, are being prosecuted, and it is indeed in keeping with our zero tolerance policy to be having this much greater opportunity to deal effectively with family violence cases.

The main point is that due to that zero tolerance policy, the public has become more aware of domestic violence as a crime to be taken seriously, and this, coupled with more diligent prosecutorial policy being adhered to by Crown attorneys, results in this increase in these cases being pursued by the specialized Family Violence Court.

We are, in fact, adding the additional Crown attorney as of early July, as has been mentioned, and we are, in fact, applying 12 additional sitting days to the court schedule during June, July and August in order to achieve this, Mr. Speaker.

* (1400)

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, we are not in disagreement about the fact that the backlog, the number of cases, has increased. That is precisely the point.

Given the fact that there is an increased understanding and awareness on the part of Crown attorneys and on the part of women and children in Manitoba that domestic violence is a crime and

should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, what is this government going to do?

In its seeming inability or unwillingness to adequately address these issues, what is this government prepared to do today to ensure the safety of these women and children?

Mr. Filmon: The point the member misses is not that there is an increase in backlog, but that there has been a huge increase in the number of cases dealt with as a result of setting up this Family Violence Court. It has gone from 1,800 to 3,065 over a two-year period—dealt with, Mr. Speaker.

The second issue is, in order to continue to do more to address the number of cases coming forward, an additional Crown attorney has been assigned to this particular issue as of the 5th of July, and over the months of June, July and August, this month, next month and the one beyond, we will have 12 additional sitting days, again, in an effort to deal with that.

I could go into the issues of the unavailability of judges over the summer months and things of that nature that are more pertinent to the issue than the government's efforts to try and solve this. The government has put the resources and the efforts in to try and solve this, I can assure the member opposite.

MLA Salaries and Benefits Legislation

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Today and yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has come in for another round of criticism based on their decision to vote themselves an increase in salaries and benefits.

Some months ago, Mr. Speaker—[interjection] Honourable members should relax.

Some months ago, this government indicated it would be bringing forward legislation to deal with members of this House and their salaries and benefits and pensions in a way that would give the process some credibility, because the public was demanding that elected officials not set their own salaries and benefits, and with good logic.

My question for the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is: When will the government be bringing forward legislation to put some credibility back into this process, given that in past sessions of this Legislature, the members of this House have all suffered in the public eye when things of this nature

have gone through in the last dying days of a session.

When are we going to see some legislation, some leadership to bring credibility back to this process?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): The member talks about leadership. What is certain, Mr. Speaker, is there is no leadership there with respect to this issue.

An Honourable Member: Why are you so touchy?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I am not touchy at all. I am saying the government obviously has to bring forward the legislation after the consultative process has taken place, not only within LAMC but more importantly amongst the draftspeople who are trying to put together a bill right now.

I would say to the member, that bill will be tabled soon. It will be done so, though, only after it is drafted. It is in its final stages of being drafted.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, my question again is for the Premier (Mr. Filmon).

In this process which the minister talks about—and I do hope that "soon" does not mean the last days of this session because the real debate should occur in this House and not behind closed doors, Mr. Speaker.

My question for the minister is: Will he ensure today, can he tell members today that there will be a body put into place which will not leave the setting of salaries, pensions and benefits in the hands of the elected officials of this House?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I am quite at a disadvantage here. I do not know whether the member asked the question on behalf of his own personal interests or indeed his own party. As a matter of fact, his benchmate the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is part of those whole discussions, has been since the beginning day.

I do not know what the Leader of the Liberal Party is trying to do here, but he is walking on pretty thin ice because there is a consensus on how we handle these matters. We are all aware of the sensitivity around them. We all realize we are working towards legislation to try and deal with that, and that legislation will be coming soon.

Now, if the member is saying he is asking this question purely in his own interest, then I wish he would state as much, Mr. Speaker, because I

cannot believe the whole Liberal Party would be in support of that type of question.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, this government drafts legislation. My question for this minister is: When will this government be coming forward with legislation, and will that legislation put into place a neutral body which sets the salaries, pensions and benefits of members of this House to put some credibility back into the system in this province?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, it may be a legitimate question, but all the member had to do was ask his benchmate and he will get the answer, because he was part of the consultation, and he knows darn well what consensually all of us are prepared to put as the principles within that bill.

He does not need to politicize this whole issue and ask me. All he has to do is ask his friend and his colleague and his benchmate, because he knows full well.

Points of Order

Mr. Edwards: I have a point a order, Mr. Speaker. The minister raises issues which are devoid of legitimacy given that he is the minister in charge. This is the government. They should show leadership—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for St. James does not have a point of order. You were attempting to put another question under the guise of a point of order. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): On a new point of order, Mr. Speaker, I know our rules are clear in terms of legislation that has been introduced on the Order Paper, that it is not in order to ask specific questions related to that matter.

I would like to ask for a ruling in this particular case. The Liberal Leader, if he is not aware of discussions that have taken place between all three parties, should be aware there is unanimous agreement in this House for the need for an independent commission.

I really ask whether the question is even in order. Perhaps he should ask the question to his House leader who has been part of those discussions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order that has been raised by the member for Thompson,

the honourable member does not have a point of order.

Now I see the honourable member for Inkster up. You are on a point of order, also?

* * *

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): On a new point of order, in fact, we have a very legitimate question that is being put forward by the Leader of the Liberal Party. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, all we are attempting to do is to get a commitment from this government as to when this government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Inkster, indeed, the honourable member for St. James did ask a question. The honourable member did get an answer to his question. Therefore you do not have a point of order, sir.

* (1410)

Substance Abuse Northern Treatment Centre

Mr. George Hickers (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, today, we have a group of aboriginal youth in Winnipeg, many of whom have cycled the long road from Thompson to raise awareness of the serious problem of solvent abuse in their own communities. It is the same long trip that young people needing treatment for solvent abuse also have to make.

I would like to table in the House today a letter written by the Minister of Health regarding the Cross Lake Treatment Centre proposal in which he refuses to recognize his responsibility in addressing the lack of treatment facilities for solvent abuse in northern Manitoba. In this letter, the minister states that placing an individual in treatment is not the solution unless there is a support system developed for them on return to their own home communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Cross Lake Treatment Centre proposal is all about providing this community support system. I would like to ask the minister to explain to this House and to the people of northern Manitoba why he has refused to acknowledge his responsibility to provide these health care services for northern Manitobans.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has been well

aware of my response to these questions in the past. My honourable friend is also well aware that for a number of years now, aboriginal communities in northern Manitoba have approached the federal government for funding support to place a treatment centre on reserve in northern Manitoba.

That is a federal responsibility which, as I have explained to the House in previous answers, is currently under investigation by a committee struck by the federal government with recommendations, or at least a report, imminent.

My honourable friend surely must recognize the lead role of the federal government in this issue.

Mr. Hickes: Mr. Speaker, the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba's 1990-91 annual report itself notes that a treatment program for youth is available only in Winnipeg on a nonresidential basis. Obviously, this is part of the problem, not the solution of providing meaningful treatment to northern youth suffering solvent abuse.

The Premier (Mr. Filmon) is on record saying his government would co-operate with other levels of government in any program to address issues of poverty.

My question to the Minister of Health is why his government has in this case refused requests to take this matter to the federal government to work out solutions to the problem of solvent abuse.

Mr. Orchard: Obviously, again, my honourable friend was not listening to previous responses I have made on this issue. This province was very much front and centre in the support to St. Norbert Foundation for their establishment of Lemay House, the first adolescent women treatment centre in the province of Manitoba, a funding first for the province of Manitoba, a program first for the province of Manitoba.

That is a response by this government to need. That need existed well before we came to government, but it was this government that took those actions and made those adolescent women treatment facilities. Our partnership with St. Norbert Foundation has made them available for young adolescent women.

That also provides a complementary service to the adolescent male program that is currently available at St. Norbert Foundation.

Mr. Hickes: This government waited three years before it did anything on the antisniff bill our party

brought in, and now the minister is saying in his letter he wants to wait until the federal government does a national review of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is a problem here in Manitoba, and 12 people have already died. I would like the minister to tell this House what action he is prepared to take now to address this serious problem and the lack of treatment resources in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Orchard: I will make a deal with my honourable friend right here and now, with my House leader (Mr. Manness) in co-operation.

Let us call the antisniff legislation that is introduced by this government, that will work. Let us pass it this afternoon, get it to committee and put it into law right now to take the action my honourable friend wants.

Will he make that commitment on behalf of the NDP right now?

Manitoba Hydro Workforce Reduction

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): We all hope, Mr. Speaker, that at some point in time, we are going to be seeing a recovery in Manitoba in terms of employment, the very difficult times we have been through.

But, yesterday, we saw another blow to the recovery of jobs with the announcement by Manitoba Hydro that close to 480 positions are being eliminated. A hundred people will receive layoffs, approximately. Another 70 people will have their positions terminated.

I would like to ask the Minister responsible for Hydro, since I assume today he will be answering questions on this particular matter, whether any review took place of the fact that this severe cutback in terms of the number of jobs is taking place at a time when Manitoba Hydro is projecting a profit in the next year of \$70 million, is receiving over a hundred million dollars extra in revenue in the current year because of the Limestone sale, is in a very good financial situation.

Why are they cutting back in terms of employment at this very critical time in terms of the Manitoba economic recovery?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Hydro Act): Mr. Speaker, as the member is aware, the operations of Manitoba Hydro are controlled by a board of directors and

operated by management, and it has been indicated that with the lesser energy demand, a review of the operations of Manitoba Hydro took place and decisions made so, in fact, the corporation could continue to operate on a sound basis, could continue to maintain some of the lowest energy costs in all of Canada.

Because they are projecting to have some additional revenues, Mr. Speaker, I do not think justifies continuing on with expenses that may be to the detriment of the long-term interests of the corporation.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, since these questions arose in a general sense during our report at the committee on Hydro, but there was no specific mention three months ago of any layoffs, I would like to ask how the minister justifies the fact that Manitoba Hydro, at the same time it is eliminating 400 positions, is going to be increasing its reserves to \$370 million, according to the plan brought in by this minister in the Manitoba Hydro committee.

How can he justify cutting jobs at a time when they are going to be increasing cash reserves?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, again, I have to reiterate for the member of the Legislature, Manitoba Hydro is operated by a board of directors and management who are hired.

The fact that there is a lower demand for energy nationally, activities such as that have caused Manitoba Hydro to review their operations, and it is a decision which has flowed from that.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) suggested I should intervene with the decision of Manitoba Hydro, as he and his government would do, Mr. Speaker. That is not our intention.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, the buck stops with this government. The minister had no qualms about interfering when the Conawapa deal was killed.

I would like to ask the minister then, if he will not take direct responsibility, will the Minister responsible for Hydro call back the Public Utilities committee and call Manitoba Hydro before the committee to answer some very serious questions that are being raised about why they are cutting back 480 jobs at such a fragile time in terms of the economic recovery in this province?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, the member had every opportunity during the committee review of

Manitoba Hydro to ask any number of questions. In fact, we sat two different times—

An Honourable Member: Three.

Mr. Downey: Three different times—I thank the member—at which time he did not raise the question. He is making my case. He had ample opportunity to ask those questions and did not do so.

I think, comparatively to what we are seeing happen in Ontario and other places in this country, that Manitoba Hydro is being well managed and well directed and hopefully will be able to maintain some of the lowest energy rates in all of this country.

Child and Family Services Case Review

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Family Services.

Some time in late June of last year, a mother took her baby to a Child and Family Services agency and begged the family agency to take that child into care. That child was later badly beaten. The minister's staff apparently conducted a review.

Will the minister tell the House today exactly what happened in this case? Why was this baby not taken into care when the mother begged the agency to do just that?

* (1420)

Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family Services): The member is aware that I am under some substantial restrictions from discussing specific cases. I would say that over the last number of years, we have had concerns about the manner in which child welfare is delivered and, as a result, have brought about a number of enhancements that have improved the ability of the agencies to do their work.

We are currently involved in a native child welfare task force. We are involved with a number of the agencies on a Quality Assurance Program to improve some of the perceptions of shortcomings within those agencies.

As a result of that, we are expecting a report to be tabled sometime this fall to discuss in more detail some of the systemic issues which we believe the federal government, the First Nations

and ourselves need to address in relationship to those agencies.

Mrs. Carstairs: With a supplementary question to the minister, can the minister tell this House what his review told him about this case?

Why did this baby fall through the cracks, when it is very clear, according to the minister, that they put in all these safeguards, that they put in all these new protections? Why was this baby failed?

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, the member is aware that decisions are made within agencies, and judgments are made based on cases.

We have acknowledged that we have seen some deficiencies within agencies, and we are taking some substantial steps to correct that, one of which is our Quality Assurance Program, whereby we have put resources of the department at the disposal of agencies to upgrade some of the procedures and qualifications for staffing, as well as the other enhancements we discussed not that long ago in Estimates.

Mrs. Carstairs: My question is very simple. A review was conducted. What did the review tell this minister happened in this case?

Mr. Gilleshammer: Again, the member is aware that I am prohibited to discuss the details of specific cases.

I would say we have acknowledged the concerns that have been raised in respect to a number of the agencies. We have a process in place at the present time. We have a Quality Assurance Program in place, and we have a task force that is currently looking at a number of the issues to do with the agencies. That task force will be reporting sometime this fall.

Arni Thorsteinson Government Funding Repayment

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, over the past month and a half, Manitobans have been shocked at the operation of prominent Conservative fundraisers being appointed to the Senate, and in a couple of cases, having dealings with the provincial government.

Has the Minister of Housing received full payment for the over \$6 million owed to the Department of Housing by Arni Thorsteinson, chair of the Manitoba PC club?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, as the member full well knows, this subject was insured by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, they have the liability. They are dealing with the issue, and matters are in process in order to accomplish that objective.

Bill 47 Security Deposits

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs: Since Mr. Thorsteinson was allowed to keep over \$50,000 per month for almost two years while not paying mortgage payments to the province, how much money in security deposits, tenants' money, is this minister, as a result of Bill 47, handing over to landlords to do as they please?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not authorizing anybody to hand money over to anybody else.

In this bill, we have more protection built in than was ever in place under the New Democratic government. We have more protection in place currently and will have more again, once this bill passes, than was in place under that government when that member, in 1985, made recommendations to the NDP to bring in provisions they did not bring in in '86, '87, '88—waited for us to bring them in in 1990. We are now improving upon them in 1993.

I think he is a hypocrite to raise the question.

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the honourable Madam Minister's response, she used some unparliamentary language.

I would ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mrs. McIntosh: I do not wish to use unparliamentary language, and I withdraw the unparliamentary word.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the honourable Madam Minister.

Consultations

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs

if she expects Manitobans to believe it is just coincidence that this Bill 47 is being introduced now, under pressure from landlords, or did she consult with tenants—

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the honourable member's preamble to the question, the honourable member is asking an opinion of the honourable minister, so I would ask the honourable member to rephrase his question.

Rephrase your question, please.

* * *

Mr. Martindale: I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs: Did she consult with tenants' groups, and if so, today, could she name the tenant's group and tell us what their view was on withdrawing all the protection for tenants around security deposits, or did she just listen to her Tory landlord friends?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is also being unparliamentary and is imputing motives.

I would indicate to him I am doing exactly what I indicated I would do when this act, which was a massive restructuring, was brought into place. [interjection] If the members opposite would be quiet, I would be pleased to answer the question. I cannot answer when I cannot hear.

When this act came into place, we indicated we would review all the aspects of it, as it was put in place. With that in mind, I instructed the members of staff at my branch to talk to tenants, landlords, property managers, everybody who came before them in that first six months. They talked to literally thousands of tenants.

Specifically, the member knows as well, of course, because the Winnipeg Housing Coalition, of which he is a member, is one group we did talk to. They have indicated they were pleased to be consulted. I have that in writing.

Mayfair Place Accident Investigation

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier (Mr. Filmon).

The tragic fall of a young child from Mayfair Place in Winnipeg yesterday deserves a serious investigation. Will the Premier order an inquest into the matter in particular, and have Manitoba Housing explain why the screens were not put on in the unit, as requested by the family?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, we are all shocked at the tragic happening of yesterday.

Upon learning of the incident and upon learning it was a Manitoba Housing project, I had my staff conduct an investigation that is ongoing at the present time.

Maintenance Procedures

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, will the government put in place and explain to the tenants procedures for quicker action on behalf of the tenants who have maintenance problems?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I did not catch the very end.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Point Douglas, kindly repeat your question, please.

Mr. Hickes: I was asking the minister if he would put in proper maintenance procedures to get quicker action on behalf of tenants.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, presumably, that is the purpose of the investigation, to determine what happened and why. Once we have that information, then we will be able to determine what needs to be done.

Mr. Hickes: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Housing personally investigate this tragic accident and put in place the safety measures—personally?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Housing employs a great many experts in a number of fields. We have specific divisions within the Manitoba Housing Authority that deal with tenant problems.

Once the professional people who have had an opportunity to review the matter bring that to my attention, then we will make the appropriate changes if any are necessary.

Gretchen Family Romanian Adoption

Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased that the province has stated they are

willing to be flexible in the matter of the Gretchen child.

We discussed the matter in Estimates yesterday, and I am wondering if the minister can provide this House with an update as to the status of the Gretchen matter from the departmental standpoint.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a meeting with the sponsors, and I believe a physician is accompanying them to explain their prospective management of the medical needs.

I think that meeting either took place this morning or is going to take place today. I have not, as of yet, received any further information from that meeting.

* (1430)

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, I believe the family doctor, Dr. Leibert, will be providing the department with his estimates as to the probable or possible costs associated with potential medical care for the girl, if she is as sick as may be the case. I understand these costs will be considerably below what the minister has asked for in a bond.

Can the minister advise how flexible he anticipates he will be in terms of setting that particular level?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, since my honourable friend has indicated we discussed this issue yesterday, my honourable friend will know that he made an inaccurate statement in his preamble, and I know my honourable friend's agenda is to do that.

I did not set the medical requirement assessment. That was done by expert physicians consulting with specialists in Manitoba who provide the services to meet the medical conditions as identified by the physician assessment of this child. It was not I who set that, as my honourable friend would want to allege. It was professionals.

That is being reviewed, Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements made by another physician. That is exactly the intent of the meeting.

If my honourable friend's statements in terms of lower costs are appropriate, very good, but my honourable friend surely must await the opinion of experts who know the cost of medical care and provide that kind of advice to the ministry.

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

Nonpolitical Statements

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Minister of Family Services have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise before the House today to extend congratulations to the city of Brandon and the entire Westman area on being awarded the 1997 Canada Summer Games.

The province of Manitoba is once more delighted to be the host province of Canada's largest multisport event and particularly pleased to be host in 1997. It will be a milestone year for the Canada Games, as they will mark their third decade of sporting excellence in 1997.

Manitoba looks forward to this opportunity to contribute to the development of sport in the province and throughout the country to promote the value and benefits associated with sport and fair play and the opportunity to contribute to Canadian unity through sport.

The legacy these games will provide will be plentiful. I have already mentioned the development of Manitoba athletes. We will also be the recipient of new and improved facilities. Our volunteer base will be further developed and economic benefits will be provided.

Brandon will be the smallest city to host a Canada Summer Games, but what the city lacks in population will be more than made up in terms of spirit, enthusiasm, the pride of its citizens and the organizational experience and volunteer base that already exists in the community.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague the minister and MLA for Minnedosa in congratulating the great city of Brandon and particularly the organizing committee—

An Honourable Member: Good job, Len.

Mr. Leonard Evans: That is right. I participated in this—and those dozens of people who worked very, very hard. I would also mention Vic Brown, the recreation director of the City of Brandon, the

staff. The committee has done an excellent job. They have worked very hard.

It will be a challenge, as the member for Minnedosa, the minister stated. It will be a challenge for the community. Apparently 6,000 volunteers will be needed. I know it was a great challenge when the city was awarded the Canada Winter Games back in 1979. It was a great challenge and people met the challenge in that area.

There are going to be 4,000 athletes and officials attending. It is going to be a very, very busy time, but I know the city can handle the challenge, Mr. Speaker.

I mentioned the 1979 Winter Games. The 1991 World Youth Baseball event was a tremendous success and also the 1992 Women's National Curling Championship.

So I know all members will join us in wishing the community every success. Indeed, Brandon is gaining national prominence as a host city for major sporting and recreational events. As such, Mr. Speaker, it is a credit to the entire province.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Leader of the second opposition party have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to join comments of the members from the other two parties in congratulating the Westman region and, in particular, the city of Brandon on their securing the Canada Summer Games. I have stood in this House before as other members have and congratulated those communities on their successful hosting of other major events.

I think of the world Little League baseball championships some time ago. I think of the curling championships which this community has hosted very successfully in the past. I think that they have indeed proven themselves and, obviously, that saw them through when they were participating in competing for these games. They have shown time and time again that despite the size of those communities, they can sponsor and can host events well beyond what their numbers would perhaps suggest. They have done it with character. They have done it bringing pride to all Manitobans, that these events can be hosted in this fashion.

I am certain that not only will the Manitoba team do exceedingly well in those games, but that Manitobans generally will be proud again of the job that the people from the Westman region do when these games indeed do come to Manitoba.

Congratulations to the team that sought these games, on their success. Thank you for, I think, all Manitobans for making the effort and for, in fact, successfully getting these games to this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether or not there is a willingness for the House to waive private members' hour so that we can continue to debate bills.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to waive private members' hour?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. No. Leave is denied.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, would you call adjourned debate Bill 29.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 29—The Minors Intoxicating Substances Control Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), Bill 29, The Minors Intoxicating Substances Control Act; Loi sur le contrôle des substances intoxicantes et les mineurs, standing in the name of the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes). Stand?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

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

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call Second Readings, Bill 47, please.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 47—The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: Bill 47, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2) Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation.

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 47, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mrs. McIntosh: I am very pleased today, Mr. Speaker, to introduce for second reading Bill 47, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2). I hope that my critics are listening via television.

The Residential Tenancies—[interjection] In the official opposition. The second party I see listening diligently here in the House.

The Residential Tenancies Act has been in effect for about 10 months, and I am happy to report that overall this very large and complex act is working well. In particular the various decision-making powers of the director and the Residential Tenancies Commission, which have become known in slang terms as the "housing court", have proven to be a tremendous success.

Through these provisions, landlord and tenant disputes regarding security deposits, possession and various claims for compensation, which would previously have been heard in Small Claims Court or the Court of Queen's Bench, are now determined by the director of Residential Tenancies. Decisions of that director can be appealed to the Residential Tenancies Commission, which consists of a panel representing tenants, landlords and a neutral chair. The commission can uphold or change the director's decision on appeal.

The provisions commonly referred to in the housing court are effective. For example, of the 6,000 cases, and I really hope that the critics from the official opposition are listening somewhere, excluding rent regulation matters determined by the director from September to May, only 330 of those have been appealed to the commission.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions are also effective in terms of being informal and low cost to both tenants and landlords. They are not intimidating, they are not costly. Landlords and tenants who first choose to appear before the court using lawyers no longer use them. They come on their own, reflecting the user-friendly style of the procedures.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the legislation in this regard is working extremely well. However, landlords, tenants and the Residential Tenancies Branch have identified several improvements that will make the act work even better. The most important of these provisions is one that has been raised twice in Question Period, and that is the protection of security deposits and the procedures landlords are required to follow in returning or claiming security deposits.

Of course, unfortunately, in Question Period there is not enough time to go into the detail that we will go into here and in committee as to why the improvements we are making are in the best interests of the entire marketplace despite the statements to the contrary of the one member of the opposition, not my critic, but the one who had a vested interest in the 1985 recommendation which was never accepted or put in place by the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, the act requires landlords to protect security deposits received since September 1, 1992, through one of three ways. Currently these are the three ways: they must place security deposits in a trust account used exclusively for security deposits; they must provide the director of Residential Tenancies with a bond or other financial instrument acceptable to the director; or they must send the deposits to the director. That is what is in place currently. That does, indeed, offer far better protection than was ever available prior to 1988.

* (1440)

Mr. Speaker, while trust accounts seem to be a good method of protection, and they are fine, their effectiveness depends on frequent auditing in an attempt to ensure that the deposits paid by tenants are in fact being held in the trust account. Even if there is no assurance the funds will not be removed from the account between inspections, there is no assurance that will happen. If you consider the thousands of landlords and deposits in Manitoba, an attempt at effective auditing is proving to require

a very large staff and a correspondingly large budget.

The cost to government has been greatly increased, and I will indicate to you in fact, Mr. Speaker, that the increase is in the order of 300 percent. I know that is of no concern to the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), it may be to the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that when you increase the cost to government in that size to reclaim a possibility of about \$1,000 a year, which is all the problem is, that to say you are taking a sledgehammer to kill a mosquito is an understatement; you are taking a cannon to kill a mosquito.

That large cost that would be required in an attempt to enforce the trust accounts and to audit has to be weighed against the benefits in terms of security deposit losses prevented. According to the records of the Residential Tenancies Branch, Mr. Speaker, security deposit losses have historically been very low. We are talking about less than \$2,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, the changes proposed to Bill 47 would require landlords to either hold security deposits or send them to the director. If they choose to hold the deposits, and I know the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) is interested in this, and if they fail to return a deposit as required under the act, they would be subject to the usual recovery procedures such as a redirection of rent revenue, garnishment of income, you could put a lien against property. All of those are very strong, strong disincentives to doing anything other than what should be done with security deposit money. Indeed, that has proven to be true.

Indeed even without those provisions, when under the NDP there was no provision of that sort, landlords were returning the money with the exception of \$1,000 to \$2,000 per year in total across the entire marketplace. Those provisions will not change. We are saying the landlord can hold the money or send it to the director. If he holds the money, he is subject to those disincentives and those punitive measures should he fail to return the money to his tenants.

Mr. Speaker, in those rare cases where a landlord does fail to return a deposit to a tenant, where the landlord has not provided a bond or other financial instrument, and where there are no reasonable and appropriate procedures available

to recover the deposit, the tenant would have the deposit returned from a security deposit compensation fund created through these amendments. That is the best protection ever offered to tenants in the history of Manitoba on this particular issue. The compensation fund would be established and maintained at no cost to government, because seed money for the fund would come from the current unclaimed security deposit and rent refunds normally forfeited to the Crown after a two-year period of attempting to locate the vanished tenants.

These changes in the methods of protecting security deposits would, Mr. Speaker, provide several benefits. They would ensure that tenants are able to recover their deposits, and they will avoid the high cost of auditing trust accounts. I know my critic for the Liberal Party is familiar with these and has gone through them and understands them, and I will try to explain them to the official opposition party which seems to be having a little more difficulty.

The procedures landlords are required to follow in returning or claiming security deposits have substantially increased the workload of the Residential Tenancies Branch. Since the act became effective last September, the branch has opened 4,300 security deposit files compared to the 1,300 opened during the same period of time in the previous year. This is an increase, as I pointed out earlier, of 300 percent in workload in the last short period of time since that act was proclaimed.

Since the bulk of deposits come in in the fall, the workload they would be put under at the branch would absolutely necessitate the hiring of several more staff, increasing the cost and size of government considerably to the taxpayer, many of those taxpayers being tenants who would have to pay increased taxes for us to put out more money, far, far in excess of the \$1,000 to \$2,000 that goes missing in any annual period, to tenants. So it is spending inordinately in order to reclaim a very small amount.

The large increase in the number of security deposit files, Mr. Speaker, is causing two problems. It is creating a backlog of files which cannot be cleared without additional staff and is resulting in much staff time being spent on unnecessary determinations, determinations that are wanted neither by tenants nor landlords. In reducing the number of unnecessary determinations, the

changes proposed in Bill 47 will enable the branch to spend more time on those disputes that require third party resolution and to determine such disputes more quickly.

The changes would not affect landlords' rights to claim against deposits or tenants' rights to the return of their deposits. In other words, when we have people lined up outside our door with broken wagons asking us to fix them, the answer we do not want to have to give them is I know you have brought your wagon here for us to fix it, but we cannot fix your wagon, because we are running all over town searching out people who may have broken wagons they do not want us to fix. That, to me, is not a very logical way of doing things. I can understand why the official opposition might want that kind of legislation, because it does build an empire in government; it does enable staff to grow.

An Honourable Member: Your wagon is stuck in the mud.

Mrs. McIntosh: If I hear one more time—I have to interject here, Mr. Speaker. [interjection] Pardon me? I have to say something. I have not talked to Arni whatever-his-name-is who that member opposite keeps mentioning about this bill, because I cannot pronounce the name. But that is beside the point. What you keep raising is false. I will not hear it. There is supposed to be honour among members, and I would like to see some from that side.

As previously mentioned, Mr. Speaker, Bill 47 would make housekeeping-type improvements to several aspects of the legislation. Some of these pertain to the dispute resolution system, the regulation of rent and related charges, notices landlords are required to give tenants and orders the director can make.

I should indicate, Mr. Speaker, it is very important I think to note, given the comments of members opposite who have a one-track mind and cannot get their mind off it, that most of these changes were brought to my attention by administrative staff. These changes, in terms of lessening the workload on the branch and decreasing the cost and size of government, were brought to my attention by landlord and tenant staff people who have been working in that branch for some 20-odd years and have gained a measure of experience, bringing to my attention the flaws and the wrinkles that need ironing out in this particular bill.

With respect to dispute resolution, Mr. Speaker, two main changes have been made. The first is in regard to the awarding of interest and costs where the director determines a tenant's or landlord's claim for compensation for losses caused by the other's breach of the tenancy agreement or the act. The director would be able to award the landlord or the tenant up to 10 percent of the award for legitimate costs incurred. Maybe he had to take a day off work, something of that nature. That would be of the judgment.

* (1450)

In addition, the director will be able to order interest to be paid on the amount awarded from the time the loss arose until the payment of the amount awarded. These changes regarding costs and interests are consistent with Small Claims Court and Court of Queen's Bench which we parallel in many ways.

Regarding the regulation of rent and related charges, Mr. Speaker, several changes would be made. One such change is that they will no longer be required to have a separate rental agreement for a furnished rental unit. This separate agreement increases the administrative costs to the Residential Tenancies Branch without providing any benefit that can be identified to us by landlords or tenants.

Secondly, landlords would no longer be required to apply to the director for permission to add a tenant-requested service. Landlords would, however, continue to be required to file for a rent adjustment in such cases.

The third change, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to situations where services are removed. Landlords would continue to be required to file for a rent adjustment. As well, tenants would now be able to determine their tenancy on application to the director and where it is determined that the removed service is fundamental to the tenancy.

Through the bill the orders the director can make would be increased. For example, the director would be able to order landlords to pay an administrative fee where rents are redirected.

We are very pleased this complex legislation is working as well as it is, Mr. Speaker. We are also pleased to be able to suggest the improvements that have been brought to our attention by tenants, by landlords, by property managers and by those

men and women who work daily with the act, those employees at the Residential Tenancies Branch.

The improvements proposed for the protection and return of security deposits are important, because they will ensure that tenants receive deposits are important because they will ensure that tenants receive deposits they are entitled to in a way that previously could not be ensured.

In giving landlords and tenants more time to resolve security disputes on their own, Mr. Speaker, in allowing more time for tenants and landlords to request a determination, to send notices and a number of other forms, changes and notices that the administration and director of the branch handle, we hope to streamline procedures, reduce unnecessary paperwork and smooth out the wrinkles that come when any new act is put in place.

We have received indications from tenants, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of things in this act that they really are pleased to see. They are particularly pleased about the security deposit compensation fund. I am disappointed the members of the official opposition do not want that compensation fund for tenants because it seems to be important to them.

We are also allowing the tenants to terminate a tenancy when a landlord withdraws or reduces a service—something else that is very good for tenants. Reducing the appeal time where a landlord has violated an order to return a security deposit to a tenant, and allowing tenants to be reimbursed for overcharges in rent through redirections of rents should the landlord fail to pay, and to ensure that a rental unit that is unfit for habitation—[interjection] I am nearly completed my remarks, about two more minutes.

An Honourable Member: Make it five.

Mrs. McIntosh: Five more minutes you want. You want me to increase my time of speaking, truly. I have never heard the opposition make that request of me before. It is kind of interesting. I would be pleased to stand up here and talk all day about the benefits of these changes because I think that they are going to be a good improvement in the marketplace.

We also have as a new opportunity for tenants the ability to ensure that a rental unit that is unfit for habitation is not re-rented until the relevant orders are complied with. We also have new provisions

that ensure that a writ of possession is obtained before a tenant can be evicted from the residential premises. We allow tenants to be reimbursed for overcharges in rent through redirection of rents should the landlord fail to pay. None of these were available in the previous drafting of the act.

I would indicate as well, because the matter has been raised twice in Question Period and I think it is something that we would like to be talking about in committee—I certainly would like to be talking about it—but the question that needs to be answered has not been asked, as so often does seem to happen.

The director is allowed to order that all deposits held by a landlord who is constantly contravening the act must be turned over to the director's control. So while we say that landlords will no longer be obliged to send their security deposits in to the director, in cases where landlords have an extremely bad track record, that provision will be there and that will be a decision of the director to make based upon the record of the particular landlord.

Mr. Speaker, in the seven or eight months since this act has been in place, we have had the opportunity to dialogue with literally thousands of people involved in the marketplace, the majority of those, of course, being tenants because there are more tenants than landlords. We have talked to a number of people in all of the different jurisdictions and stakeholders affected by this act, and based upon the input and feedback they have given us—not necessarily through formal presentations although we have had those, but also and primarily through the informal feedback that comes in our daily working, we have brought in these changes in response to three things: being conscious of the cost and size of government and the impact upon the ratepayer; being conscious of the streamlining of procedures for greater ease of operation; and for the needs of both tenants and landlords to be protected and to be freed from cumbersome procedures.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks and look forward to my opposition's statements.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): I move, seconded by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

**Bill 13—The Manitoba Employee
Ownership Fund Corporation
Amendment Act**

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, may I please have leave because when I introduced Bill 13 (The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba) for first reading, I did not table the message from His Honour and I would like to table that message at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism have leave to table the message of His Honour? [agreed] I would like to thank the honourable minister. The Page will pick it up.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill 38 followed by Bill 41.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

**Bill 38—The City of Winnipeg
Amendment, Municipal Amendment,
Planning Amendment and Summary
Convictions Amendment Act**

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), Bill 38, The City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, la Loi sur les municipalités, la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire et la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires, standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that the matter remain standing? Leave?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. Leave is denied.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak today to Bill 38, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act. This particular bill has just been introduced in the last few weeks into the

House. [interjection] We have attended to it as quickly as possible. We have met with the minister.

I want to deal with the comments that the Agriculture minister is making, because what we have seen with this bill is the minister coming to us just last week, just a few days ago in fact, telling us that this bill has certain deadlines to it and must be passed in a matter of days because some people are going to be affected in a development they are involved in. We have attended to this as quickly as possible.

I want to remind the House that the minister has been aware of the plight of these young people for some months now. He had every opportunity to separate their concerns and his concerns into a separate bill and bring it through this House, and we could have passed it in a matter of days. But instead what he chose to do was bury their concerns into this bill which has a lot of ramifications to it, and he has presented it to us as a case of where we have to accommodate these people and pass the whole bill immediately. Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to do that. We are prepared to accommodate the minister to the extent that I will make my remarks on the bill today. We may have another speaker today and perhaps we can send it to committee within the next few days and take it from there.

* (1500)

Let us deal with what this bill does. It does a couple of things that we like. It does a couple of things that we do not like, but one of the things that we—[interjection] Well, I will tell the member what we do like about this bill. We like the ability that this bill gives the city to collect on the \$4 million in unpaid parking fines that are currently available to the city once we pass this legislation. I understand that there is about \$90,000 in parking fines available through the City of Brandon, and the City of Portage la Prairie will be in a position, once this bill passes, to collect about \$70,000 in unpaid parking fines.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this issue is not something that has just come up. It has been around for some time, and I a few years ago was in favour of the solution that would prevent a car from being registered unless all parking fines and so on were taken care of. The minister has explained why this is a better idea, because on the surface of

it, it does not seem to me that going out and towing cars, seizing cars, was the proper way to do it, but his explanation seemed reasonable enough. So on that basis this is probably the most sensible way to proceed, and we are prepared to support that.

Mr. Speaker, there is a major area of this bill that we are not happy with and that has to do with allowing the city to charge library fees. That is, in my opinion, a very regressive step. The member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) spoke on this subject the other day, and it seems to me that after 100 years of having an open library system in this province we are now changing to a system that is going to disenfranchise certain people in our society from the use of the library system.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

We are setting barriers here. We are setting barriers on new Canadians. We are setting barriers on people on social assistance. In fact, we are putting barriers on education, because the library system in the core area of Winnipeg, where we have a lot of poorer people—it is very vital that the library system remain open and accessible to all the people. You know, the government can argue that perhaps in the suburbs and so on that people can more ably afford library fees, but certainly in the area of the core area of the city, the areas that we have traditionally represented in this party, it is incumbent upon us to defend their rights to maintain an open and user-friendly environment as far as the library system is concerned. We are quite upset about the fact that the province would allow the city to charge fees.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, there are some other areas of the bill that we will be looking at for further clarification, and we will be looking for some changes at committee. I would expect that we will be wanting the committee to look at an amendment that would change the portions dealing with the library fees, because it is not something that we would support.

We are also reasonably happy with the new provisions dealing with the airport protection area. That is something that members will recall that we supported back during the Rotary Pines fiasco of a couple of years ago, so we are happy that the government has finally done something to deal with airport protection. That is something, of course—I believe the Minister of Highways at the time was

supporting our position that something should be done, something should be done to make certain that the airport remained viable.

Madam Deputy Speaker, just before I conclude my comments on this bill, I believe the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) has a few comments to make, and at that point that may conclude certainly our comments for this day on this bill.

But I did want to address comments made by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) who may have stepped out for a moment. She wonders why we are concerned that the bills that the government brings in appear to be bills that are authored by and supported by certain groups and individuals.

It is very simple. In almost each and every initiative that this government makes it seems that there is one of the Tory bagmen not far back there. There are at least a half a dozen initiatives that this government is making right now that directly benefit these Tory bagmen. So we wonder sometimes who is really writing these bills? Are these bills being written by the Legislative Counsel, or are they really coming through these bagmen who want certain things?

I remember the Tories talking about the bail-out-Bernie bill. All of us remember here how it went on and on about the bail-out-Bernie bill. Well, if this is not the bail-out-Arni bill, I do not know what it is when it comes to the residential tenants act.

The questions that the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) asked today were quite relevant. We are concerned that this government allowed Mr. Thorsteinson \$50,000 a month in rental payments for two years before they stepped in. It is not without reason that if the landlords collect rental deposits, and there is \$25 million in rental deposits, that a big landlord in this province if they run into financial problems may start using major league money here for other operations.

What they are doing is taking money out of—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would just like to remind the honourable member that he is debating Bill 38, The City of Winnipeg Act, not The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act. On second reading debate is to be relevant to the principles of the bill.

Mr. Maloway: Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, I have many other things to talk about in terms of this bill, but in the interests of brevity and

the recognition that I am going to have many more opportunities to expand further on this topic of influence and help to friends by this particular government, I will cease and desist at this moment and carry on at the next opportunity.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Madam Deputy Speaker—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): No, your right is gone. You blew it. You ran when your name was called.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Indeed, the honourable government House leader does have a point of order. The bill was indeed standing in your name and leave was denied. Therefore, you have forfeited your right to speak on this bill.

* * *

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Point of Order

Mr. Reid: I was unaware, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the bill was about to be called. I thought that there would have been leave to allow the critic the opportunity, that I was going to close debate on this. I do not think that we were aware that leave was not going to be granted. I am not sure that my colleagues had granted leave on this, but I believe that was the intent.

* * *

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak on this particular piece of legislation today, because I think it does some positive things in terms of what we want to see accomplished as far as our capital city is concerned.

It does replace the tendering process with broader provisions covering other forms of proffering goods and services, and I think that that for the most part is good. It does permit the phasing in of business tax decreases, and I think that in some cases that is very warranted, because what has happened in past years has been that those tax decreases and increases have affected small companies, small owners, particularly poorly.

It also reinforces the city's ability to operate solid waste and refuse services as a utility, and I think that that is a positive thing.

One of the issues that does concern me, however, is Section 23 which reinforces the city's immunity from liability for sewer backups except when the city has been negligent. I am concerned there because negligence on the part of the homeowner is often very, very difficult to prove, so it seems to in fact give the City of Winnipeg undue power in this particular issue.

I am also concerned that there has not been enough airport protection in this particular piece of legislation. I think that there is some, and that is very positive, and for that reason, certainly, we will support that section of the bill. But it still seems extremely weak in terms of what could be done as far as airport protection is concerned in the province of Manitoba.

The amendments to The Summary Convictions Act, however, are very interesting ones. I think that many of us have been very concerned that citizens who had outstanding parking tickets—and many of them so-called prominent members of our community—were in fact flouting their ability to break the law. If this ameliorates the situation and makes it now possible for the City of Winnipeg to in fact get those people flaunting the law to pay their bills, then I see it as a positive thing.

* (1510)

Like so many things today, it remains to be seen whether it will live up to court challenges as far as our charter is concerned, but I think that certainly it is a step in the right direction to make it clear to citizens that only those who are prepared to abide by laws in the province of Manitoba will indeed get the respect that they deserve in our community.

So I look forward to this bill going to committee, and I look forward to presentations being made by citizens of the province of Manitoba, and particularly the city of Winnipeg, in order to indicate whether this indeed meets their aspirations and needs as citizens within this province.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Reid: Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe I would require leave to address my remarks to this particular piece of legislation. I am asking if there is leave to address this legislation.

Madam Deputy Speaker: That is indeed accurate. Is there leave to permit the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) to put a few remarks on the record on Bill 38? [agreed]

Mr. Reid: I wish to thank the members of the House for giving leave to allow me the opportunity to add my comments on Bill 38. I will be the last speaker from our caucus that will be adding our comments on second reading of this bill, and we look forward to it going to committee to allow members of the public to add their comments to the legislation as well.

I note, looking at some of the comments that the minister had made when he introduced it for second reading, he gave an explanation of the intent of the legislation itself. We find that with this legislation there are several things we can agree with in this legislation, and there is at least one item in this legislation for which we cannot agree. I will get to that in a few moments to make members opposite aware of what my concerns are.

It seems that during the course of the government's introduction of bills in this Chamber, they invariably add poison-pill sections in here, so there are sections that you can, and most members would, accept for the betterment of our society. Then there are sections that you would not agree with, so the government waters it down in the sense that if you want the good parts, you have to take the bad parts with it. That seems to be their position on various pieces of legislation.

This bill is no different in that concept, in that with this they have certain aspects of it with respect to protection of the City of Winnipeg 24-hour airport operations, the ability of municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, to collect unpaid parking ticket fines—two areas, which we think are to the betterment, and we would support that type of initiative.

There are sections with respect to libraries that we cannot accept because of the fact that it will have a detrimental impact on the people that we represent. I note that with respect to the airport operations, the City of Winnipeg airport operations, the government has taken steps to protect the Winnipeg International Airport, and indeed other airports such as St. Andrews as well and the Selkirk Airport, which would be in the Winnipeg region. That is a good step, I believe, because it will give Winnipeg International Airport the

opportunity to continue its 24-hour operation, something that other airports in this country, in the major cities at least, do not have.

I know in my own experience in flying into cities in eastern Canada, in particular into Montreal, into Dorval Airport. That airport does not have a 24-hour operation, and they have to shut down their operations I believe it is at 11:30 in the evening. From that time until the early hours of the morning, that airport is closed, and it has a detrimental impact upon the city of Montreal.

This legislation will provide that protection for the Winnipeg International Airport and will allow them the opportunity to hopefully grow and expand in their business opportunities for us in the city of Winnipeg and indeed the province of Manitoba.

I just wish that in hindsight the government had taken the steps some two years ago, when we were going through the Rotary Pines debate here in this Legislature and in this province, when we had called for it. In fact, my colleague the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) had introduced a private member's bill that would provide airport protection for the Winnipeg Airport, and it was based on the Alberta model.

The members of the government at that time could have chosen to support a private member's bill, and indeed the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) showed his support by the steps that he had taken in opposition to what his colleague, the minister responsible that was involved with the Rotary Pines project, the Minister of Housing, had taken. The minister of transport had a difficult battle, I am sure, within his own cabinet in his own caucus trying to defend the Winnipeg Airport interests.

We were happy to see that the Minister of Highways and Transportation was showing some principled position on that particular issue, and indeed it was leadership. We thought it was a good position for him to take. I am sure all members in the House know the value of the airport to the province.

It is unfortunate though that we did not have the opportunity to have UPS courier service come to the city of Winnipeg. We thought that we were going to get some 500 jobs out of that. Those jobs have disappeared. They are no longer coming here, obviously by what we have seen in reports. That is unfortunate because that would have given

us greater opportunity to improve the economic picture of the province. I am sure they would have added greatly to our province, but those jobs, from my understanding, are not coming to this province now.

The minister stated in his comments that by this legislation the City of Winnipeg would be required to, first, amend Plan Winnipeg to define the development boundaries. We have seen how the housing developments in particular can encroach upon the airport's operation, and we know and obviously share some of the concerns of the residents with respect to the operation of any type of vehicle, whether it be aircraft, trucking, trains, whatever, affecting their quality of life. So I think it is important that we restrict in some reasonable fashion the expansion of developments, housing developments in particular, that would encroach upon the airport's operations.

The minister indicated in his comments that the City of Winnipeg would be required to adopt development by-laws or zoning provisions to regulate the land use in the airport vicinity in respect to height of buildings, the orientation, the noise attenuations standard and so forth. Good steps. We think that should have been done with the Rotary Pines. We wish that, in hindsight, the minister had taken those steps during the Rotary Pines debate in this province, where I am sure it would have saved him a lot of headaches as he was attempting to answer questions.

The Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), it shows, will also be allowed to designate other airports for which airport vicinity protection could be provided by local municipal governments. As the province hopefully grows and expands, that may be a step that would be necessary for the future, allowing the municipalities to define the boundaries in the airport vicinity.

Another aspect of this legislation and one that had caused us concern—I know I had several calls to my offices over the course of the last year and a half with respect to unpaid parking tickets. The City of Winnipeg has indicated that they have some \$4 million in unpaid parking tickets, and that it has created a considerable amount of problem for them. I have had the opportunity to discuss this matter with City of Winnipeg Police to determine the impact upon their operations when they have to go out and try and enforce and collect on these individuals who have failed to pay their parking

tickets. It was a considerable waste of their resources to have to chase down these individuals who have not paid their parking fines.

* (1520)

This legislation will now give the municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, Brandon, Thompson, and other municipalities, the opportunity to collect on the unpaid parking tickets. The municipality first must make sure that there is a second notice of the ticket that was issued sent to the individuals for which the original ticket was issued to that vehicle to ensure that they were aware that they had a parking ticket affixed to their vehicle.

The question I have with this legislation at this point, and the minister did not give an explanation on it, is: Will the second notice with respect to the unpaid parking fines be sent to the individuals by registered mail? There is the possibility that if it is not, that the individuals then could have their mail misplaced or misdirected or indeed lost and not even receive the second notice. So I draw that to the minister's attention as well.

After that point, upon receiving the second notice, the individuals would have to, if they do not pay their parking ticket fines or they fail to pay or they take some action to the contrary, the municipality may register in The Personal Property Registry a lien against any vehicles that the owners own that are registered to them in the amount of the unpaid parking fines. In that sense, if one particular vehicle has fines registered against that particular vehicle, of course, other vehicles in the possession or registered to that individual may also be seized. At least that is my interpretation of the minister's comments.

After a period of time and after having been given notice of the registration of a lien, the vehicle can be seized by the municipality for the outstanding parking fines that are due and payable. After that point, the vehicles can I believe be sold to recover any monies that would be due. Of course, first there are exceptions to that, that the payment of wages would be required to be fulfilled in The Personal Property Registry and The Garage Keepers Act. So anybody who has any monies due and owing to them as a result of the ownership of this vehicle would receive first payment and then any monies left over would go towards the parking fines.

Unfortunately with this legislation, the vehicle owner with the outstanding parking fines, if they have the ability to sell their vehicles prior to these fines being paid, then the individual who purchased the vehicle will then become responsible for any liens. So I hope that members of the public will become aware that they have an obligation to check for any liens that may be registered against the vehicles in question.

I know that opportunity is available. I took that opportunity myself once when I made a purchase of a used vehicle. I went down to the vehicle registry to find out, just to make sure there were no liens on the vehicle. There were no liens, of course, but it was the protection that I took as an individual, and it was a safeguard for myself. I hope members of the public realize that they will be required to take those steps now because with this legislation, there may be more liens registered against more used vehicles in this province.

With this legislation also, the government has indicated, and I know municipalities have stated a strong interest on their part, in particular, the communities of Brandon and Portage la Prairie which have outstanding parking fines. Brandon, in particular, has \$90,000 in unpaid parking fines, and Portage la Prairie has \$70,000 in unpaid parking fines, in addition to Winnipeg's \$4 million. So there is a significant amount of money that certain Manitobans owe to their various municipalities. I think in that sense it was a step that is due to allow these municipalities to collect on these, and it should not be up to the municipal police forces to enact on that and to collect those unpaid parking fines.

With this legislation, I know when the debate was taking place in this House with respect to the Pines project, the Rotary Pines project, that the Transcona Legion project which is now being called Transcona Place was involved in the sense that they were not in receipt of any monies towards or in support of this seniors housing project in my own community of Transcona. That was a question we had raised with the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst), made him aware that the Pines project was being taken out of queue and that indeed Transcona Place, or the Transcona Legion project at the time had been ahead of that, and should have received the funding support from the provincial government Housing department and CMHC, I believe.

If this legislation goes forward, there is a section in it which is what I believe to be the bad section of this legislation. It will allow the City of Winnipeg to prescribe any fees or charges for the use of public facilities, including swimming pools, arenas, leisure centres, gymnasiums and libraries. I have some strong concerns. I do not think it is necessary for the municipality to have the ability to charge fees for those of our community that wish to use libraries.

I know in attending my own library there are a lot of families, a lot of young children who go to the libraries. If this legislation goes through and the City of Winnipeg decides they want to charge fees, then it is the children that you are going to be hurting by this legislation. They will not have the opportunity to pay those fees. A lot of them come from not-well-to-do families, and of course money is scarce. Library services are there to assist them with their learning.

If the municipalities are going to be charging fees for library usage, I think it is a bad step. I think it should be removed from this legislation and that section scrapped altogether. I believe my colleague the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) when we move to committee on this bill will be proposing such an amendment.

Madam Deputy Speaker, going back to the Transcona Place seniors housing project, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) for giving approval from his department to allow the sod-turning ceremony to take place last June 12. We had been inquiring of the minister's department for some time, and we were happy to see finally that sod turning took place on June 12. Now construction has commenced, and that will allow the seniors of my community to remain in Transcona.

The problem with this legislation allowing the municipalities, including Winnipeg, to charge for library fees is that this Transcona Place is now being built directly across the street from the Transcona Library. So the seniors that are going to reside in this facility, at least 50 percent of them I believe will be subsidized units, so the income is going to be very tight for many of the seniors who are going to reside in Transcona Place.

If this legislation goes forward and the City of Winnipeg imposes fees for library usage, of course these seniors are going to have to pay that. It is

going to be a hardship upon them, I am sure. As all members in this House know that for many of the seniors of our community, the income is scarce, very tight. They do not have the extra money to put to what some might consider to be frills. This legislation, by allowing library fees to be charged, will impose a hardship upon the seniors and the children of my community as, I am sure, it will other communities around the province.

I ask the minister who introduced this legislation to withdraw that particular section. If he does not withdraw that particular section of the legislation, we will be prepared to introduce amendments to that legislation to withdraw the library fee section and other public use facilities. We hope that the government would listen to that request and the amendment, if it becomes necessary to introduce one from our side, the government would listen to that and withdraw that section.

* (1530)

Overall, the bill itself does present some positive steps for us in the province with respect to the city of Winnipeg airport protection and the collection of the unpaid parking fines, but the library section is, I think, a negative step and I hope the government will listen and withdraw that.

With that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity and thank members for leave to allow me to conclude our comments on this bill.

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): I would like to put a few remarks on the record in regards to Bill 38. We certainly, as a caucus, are prepared to see this particular bill go to the committee stage. My remarks will be brief, Madam Deputy Speaker. I do not believe it takes 40 minutes to say what needs to be said in regards to this bill.

This bill deals with a number of housekeeping issues which the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) certainly dealt with in his remarks, and I will not spend time going through those.

I would also like to thank the Minister of Urban Affairs for giving myself and my colleague from the NDP a briefing on this particular bill.

One of the major issues presented in this bill relates to the protection of use of the airport, and we are certainly very pleased to see this in Bill 38. Again, whether in fact these amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act actually go far enough, I think that remains to be seen, but certainly this bill is dealing with some amendments which will allow for

vicinity protection. It is more clearly defined what the airport vicinity is, and it also includes some areas beyond the city's boundary which I think is important as well.

It also indicates in these amendments that land use and development within the airport boundary area must be compatible with airport operation. We support that. We think that is important, and we were certainly pleased to see that hopefully the airport will continue on to function as a 24-hour operation and that in fact we may even see some expansion of what occurs at the airport. So we are pleased that we have seen this particular amendment in Bill 38.

One of the other areas that this particular City of Winnipeg Amendment Act deals with is, of course, how do municipalities, and in this case the City of Winnipeg and other cities, deal with the payment of outstanding parking fines?

The Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) and his staff and his government have certainly chosen one particular way to deal with the payment of unpaid fines, and they are looking at basically trying to place a lien on vehicles of individuals who have not paid their fines.

We certainly have no difficulty with the intent of what this amendment is attempting to do. We are concerned however whether in fact this bill will survive the scrutiny of any type of court challenges that there might be, No. 1, which will remain to be seen—we may hear more about that at the committee stage; and secondly, whether in fact there may not be some administrative glitches which will have to be worked out should this particular piece of legislation, or when this legislation is put in place.

I know that there may be some time frame differences between when someone goes to check to see if there is a lien against a vehicle and when they might actually purchase the vehicle. If there was that space of time, let us say four to five days as an example, potentially there could have been liens placed on a vehicle after the person had checked, yet before they had actually purchased the vehicle, and they may not know.

So I am hoping that some of those administrative details may be able to be worked out. Certainly the intent of allowing cities to be able to collect unpaid fines is a worthy one, and whether in fact this will

work remains to be seen. But we certainly support the intent of that piece in the legislation.

One of the other areas that The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act deals with is something that I suppose came to the attention of the cities and the municipalities when there was a possible sale of land, and that was the error in the boundaries between the City of Winnipeg and, in this case, the Rural Municipality of Ritchot. With this particular piece of land, it now is listed actually as a legal description in both the City of Winnipeg and the rural municipality, and this particular amendment will deal with that particular dispute. Certainly, we have no difficulty with that as well.

We hope this legislation will move forth to committee and will be dealt with so that in fact the individuals who were involved with the sale of land will be able to conclude what they need to do and to also deal with the City of Winnipeg.

The other area I did want to speak to was the amendment in regard to allowing the city to basically charge fees for various activities within the city. The examples that have been used are leisure centres and libraries.

I appreciate the comments of the New Democrats and the comments that I have received from individuals who are concerned about the fact that there may be library fees imposed. I believe, however, that is an issue that individuals need to take up with their city councillors.

I certainly do not have difficulty with the fact that the City of Winnipeg and City Council be allowed to make decisions on the charging of fees. I feel that those councillors then need to be held accountable to their taxpayers for those decisions that they make.

I personally may have some concerns about the charging of fees in certain centres, particularly libraries, but that is separate and apart from, I believe, this particular amendment.

In The City of Winnipeg Act, it actually gives some authority to the City of Winnipeg to actually make those decisions and once they are allowed to make those decisions, they, in turn, will be held accountable by the taxpayers of the city. So those are my comments in regard to that particular amendment.

There are actually a couple of other provisions in this act, such as replacing the tendering process so that there are now broader provisions covering

other forms of goods and services. This was a request from the City of Winnipeg. This bill also deals with permitting the phasing-in of business tax decreases.

As well, this particular City of Winnipeg Amendment Act also deals with the city wanting immunity from liability for sewer backups, except where the city feels they have been negligent.

I think again it remains to be seen what type of issues may come from this particular amendment, but suffice it to say that we are certainly pleased with the provisions in The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, particularly in relationship to the airports and certainly with the ability of the city and the province to correct the dispute in the area of the parcel of land in whether it is in Ritchot or whether it is in the city of Winnipeg.

We are prepared to see this bill go on to committee and be discussed at that point.

With that, I will leave those few remarks on the record. Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Madam Deputy Speaker, I will not take long. I want to address the issue of the library fees, which seem to have caused some concern with some of the members opposite.

This issue was raised by the City of Winnipeg. They requested permissive legislation to allow them to charge fees and to bring that section of the act into the 1990s. Madam Deputy Speaker, it is permissive only, but quite frankly if there is concern, then the City of Winnipeg will have to make the case before the committee that this should actually be included.

So, between the time that the bill leaves the House and the time it arrives at committee, I will consult again with the City of Winnipeg in this regard, and if it is still their view that adamantly that is what they want, then they will have to come forward in the public forum and make the case before the committee that that is necessary for the good and valued conduct of the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I will undertake to do that between now and the time the bill arrives at committee, and I thank members opposite for their co-operation.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

* * *

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is second reading of Bill 38, The City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, la Loi sur les municipalités, la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire et la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires). Agreed?

All those in favour, please say ye.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

The motion is accordingly carried.

* (1540)

Bill 41—The Provincial Parks and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), Bill 41 (The Provincial Parks and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant les parcs provinciaux et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), standing in the name of the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

* * *

Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader): I would ask to call Bill 34, please, The Public Schools Amendment (Francophone Schools Governance) Act.

Bill 34—The Public Schools Amendment (Francophone Schools Governance) Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey), Bill 34, (The Public Schools Amendment (Francophone Schools Governance) Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques (gestion des écoles françaises)), standing in the name of the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader): If I may just indulge the House for a moment, I would ask if you could call Bill 29, please.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Bill 29 has been called and was left standing in the name of the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes).

The House has already made the decision, I am informed, that there indeed was agreement to leave Bill 29 standing in the name of the honourable member for Point Douglas.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am prepared to speak on the bill. I believe that the matter was held standing in the name of Mr. Hickes earlier, the member for Point Douglas.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to revisit Bill 29 to resume debate on second reading? Agreed?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, there is a great deal of interest in this issue by all members of this House. During Question Period, I put the offer to the New Democrats as to whether they wanted to pass this bill this afternoon to get it to committee so that it would become law in the Province of Manitoba as soon as possible.

With that kind of commitment from the House leader of the NDP (Mr. Ashton) who is just about to stand, we will give leave to pass this bill this afternoon, to revisit it and pass this bill so it goes to committee.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to revert to second reading of Bill 29, because there is already on the record a previous decision of the House?

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: No? Leave has been denied.

* * *

Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader): I would ask if you could please call Bill 30, The Vulnerable Persons Living with a Mental Disability and Consequential Amendments Act.

Bill 30—The Vulnerable Persons Living with a Mental Disability and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: Debate on second reading of Bill 30 (The Vulnerable Persons Living with a Mental Disability and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant les personnes vulnérables ayant une déficience mentale et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), on the proposed motion of the honourable minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

* * *

Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader): Yes, I would ask that if you could please call in this order, please, Bill 39 followed by Bill 3, followed Bill 5 and then all the remaining bills as they appear on the Order Paper.

Bill 39—The Provincial Court Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 39, (The Provincial Court Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), standing in the name of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) would carry on their conversation outside the Chamber or in the loge.

Is there leave to permit Bill 39 to remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Wellington? No? Leave is denied.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am rising to speak briefly on Bill 39, The Provincial Court Amendment Act. Basically, as the Minister of Justice stated in his second reading of the bill on June 9, this act is designed to close some loopholes that have been discovered in The

Provincial Court Act. In 1988, The Provincial Court Act was amended to establish a clearly defined process for the appointment of judges to the Provincial Court.

However, when this act was amended in 1988, part-time judges were not included in the appointment process. In 1991, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that there are Charter requirements that must be met as far as part-time judges are concerned. So consequently Bill 39, according to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), is designed to meet those Charter requirements and to close that loophole in The Provincial Court Act dealing with the appointment of judges to the Provincial Court.

According to the Minister of Justice, and I am going solely by the Hansard by the Honourable Minister of Justice on second reading on June 9, because the Minister of Justice has not seen fit or has not provided me with a spreadsheet detailing the changes to The Provincial Court Act.

So all of my comments on record today, and any other comments that my caucus colleagues may feel compelled to put on the record regarding Bill 39, are done so with the caveat that the government has not done what it has certainly by practice done in the past, which is provide either a spreadsheet or some consultation to the opposition so that we do know exactly what the legislation before us is intended to accomplish.

With that caveat, I will say that basically we are in support of this piece of legislation. It would appear to be, on the surface, a fairly small bill dealing with quite a small part of the judiciary in the province of Manitoba.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, like many other bills that we debate in this House and that have been passed by this province, by these governments in this province, narrowly defined pieces of legislation can have broadly based impacts, and we believe that this is such a bill. It will set, as the minister stated, clear guidelines and limitations to ensure the impartiality and independence of part-time judges.

The independence and impartiality of our judiciary is one of the basic tenets that we as Canadians hold most dear in our judicial system. We have had discussions in this House and outside this House on how exactly you maintain the independence and impartiality of the judiciary. I am

glad to see that this particular piece of legislation broadens that independence and impartiality by talking about part-time judges.

There are some requirements that the bill lays out for part-time judges, that the appointments must be based on a demonstrated need of the court. Because we do not have a spreadsheet and I have not had an opportunity to talk to anyone in the Justice department about this, I have a question that I will put on the record now, and perhaps the minister or certainly in committee we can have a further discussion of this. How is the demonstrated need of the court demonstrated? What are the indicators that tell the government that there needs to be additional part-time judges appointed? What is that checklist of need?

Where are these part-time judges likely to be appointed, what parts of the province? Are there particular areas of the province that now have a dearth of part-time judges or dearth of judges in general? I would suggest perhaps that rural and northern parts of the province might see the impact of Bill 39 more extensively than, perhaps the city of Winnipeg, for example. This is an issue and a question that we feel the need to have explained in greater detail.

* (1550)

It says that future part-time judges can only be recruited from judges who have previously been appointed out of The Provincial Court Act. I would anticipate that this provision means that you cannot appoint someone as a part-time judge who is not potentially eligible to be appointed a full-time judge. If that is in fact the intention of this part of the legislation, we wholeheartedly support that.

We are in favour in not only judicial appointments but in all areas of work. We are in favour of part-time work being seen as important and as necessary as full-time work, and that people who provide services on a part-time basis should be hired and appointed using the same criteria as full-time workers and should have benefits that are prorated to those benefits available to full-time workers. We do not have that to the greatest extent we feel necessary in other areas of work in this province. So we are glad to see that, I assume, part-time judges will have the benefits that accrue to full-time judges on a prorated basis or some other fair system of remuneration.

Again, back to the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, I think it is important that the judges who are appointed part time be judges who would have been able to be appointed full time had they so requested. The appointments will be nonrenewable and must not exceed a five-year term. I am assuming, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the impact of this part of the legislation will be the understanding that the best system would be full-time judges, but that in some cases it would be necessary to appoint a part-time judge and that a judge can only serve in a part-time capacity for five years.

Also, Madam Deputy Speaker, while this next area of the legislation may seem self-evident, I think it is important that it be clearly stated at this point that, again, to ensure impartiality, the part-time judge is prohibited from practising law in the Provincial Court, as well, they are prohibited from hearing cases involving people they have worked with when practising law as a council party or a witness. I think it is essential that that part of the legislation be very clearly outlined and delineated to maintain the impartiality of these judges. You can imagine the potential for perceived lack, if not a natural lack, of impartiality with part-time judges if they were allowed to practise law at the same time that they were acting as a Provincial Court judge. So I think this element of the legislation is essential. [interjection]

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has just informed the House of something that we have all been—an event that we on, at least, the official opposition benches have been waiting for for nine, almost 10, years, and that is the fact that tomorrow is the final day of the tenure—there are other words I could use, but I would be unparliamentary—of the Prime Minister of the country. I normally do not like to engage in across-the-floor discussions on record, certainly not with the Minister of Natural Resources, but I must put on record the fact that while he says the Prime Minister's last day will be a sad day for Canada, we on this side of the House will be singing hosannas and just wishing that his last day had taken place much earlier. [interjection]

Madam Deputy Speaker, the people of Canada have certainly had a special relationship with the Prime Minister, one that I think the vast majority of the people of Canada would have been more than willing to close, if you will, far earlier than almost 10

years. Certainly the million and a half people who are unemployed in the country of Canada are looking forward to not only the Prime Minister's last day in office but very shortly to the elimination of his party's majority government in the House of Commons.

After that brief message from my side of the House, that brief diversion, I would like to again say that we support in principle—and I know we are dealing basically with the principle of this legislation—the outlines of Bill 39, The Provincial Court Amendment Act.

Madam Deputy Speaker, because we do not have a spreadsheet I cannot be sure, but I am assuming, as I stated earlier, that perhaps the major impact of these part-time judges will be felt outside the urban centres. I base that on the fact that it is in many areas, many professions, more difficult to get people to practise outside the urban centres in this province than all of us in this House would like.

I am assuming that the ability to appoint part-time judges within the parameters of this legislation perhaps will help provide additional services to rural and northern parts of our province. I hope, Madam Deputy Speaker, that this is one of the reasons behind this piece of legislation and that the less heavily populated parts of our province will see increased service as a result of the enactment of Bill 39.

We have seen in many areas where services to people outside the major population centres have been curtailed by this government. Their much flaunted decentralization program has been largely a miserable failure and has been an exercise in partisan party politics. If you take a look at the parts of the province that have received the few decentralization jobs that have taken place, you will see that they are concentrated in a major fashion in the parts of the province that are supported and represented by members of the government rather than necessarily in areas of the province that need them.

There are many areas that we could talk about in the Parkland where services have been decreased in Family Services, in Education. The cutbacks to psychologists and other counsellors through the Department of Education will have an enormous impact on rural Manitobans and northern Manitobans.

The infamous decision of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to eliminate the Children's Dental Program from rural communities in this province is probably the single most illustrative event and explains most clearly to the people of Manitoba what this government's real agenda is.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would just like to say that I was talking to constituents in my area just last week, and a woman who has never lived outside the city of Winnipeg, who has no children, who is herself a senior citizen, when I asked her if she had any issues or concerns, she said not for herself. What she was really very upset about was the cancellation of the Children's Dental Program. She said, what are those children in rural and northern Manitoba going to do when they do not have access to local dentists and local dental care?

Madam Deputy Speaker, that one single comment spoke volumes to me and showed that the people of Manitoba, unlike this government, understand the importance of services to be provided to every Manitoban no matter where they live, services as equally and as qualitatively provided as is possible. This government has made those not difficult decisions, those easy choices, those simple choices and those stupid choices that will come back to haunt them.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in closing on Bill 39 I would like to say that I hope in this particular instance the government is not following in the same footsteps as the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey), the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and, most specifically, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in eliminating services to people who live outside the major urban areas.

I hope that Bill 39 will lead to an increased and an improved level of service, certainly in the judiciary for those people in the province of Manitoba. I look forward to our discussions in committee. With those comments we are prepared to pass this Bill 39 to committee.

* (1600)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is—

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 3—The Oil and Gas and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 3 (The Oil and Gas and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant le pétrole et le gaz naturel et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), standing in the name of the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 5—The Northern Affairs Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 5 (The Northern Affairs Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les affaires du Nord), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), standing in the name of the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli).

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am glad to put some comments on the record on Bill 5, The Northern Affairs Amendment Act. This act is hopefully in keeping with the intended nature and purpose of the act, which is to ensure that communities in northern Manitoba are going to have some more control over their own affairs.

With this bill not having there be any consultation with respect to renewing of leases of Crown land surrounding northern communities, there could be some concern that in the effort to speed up procedures and not have things bogged in bureaucrat process, there could be some problems. That is one of the things that we are concerned about. We certainly want to have more autonomy and more respect, I would say, for the councils in northern Manitoba. They have gone through a period of development, and we want to ensure that their involvement is not going to be negated or ignored in any way.

We would like also that there would be streamlining of government procedures, but there are some concerns that when there are changes in leases, that communities would still be notified. If there are general permits on leases that are allowing one kind of development, and when that lease is taken over, another lessee could change the use of that land—and concerned that those

councils in northern Manitoba would still be notified and would still be able to have some input and control over the kind of operations that could be right in the centre of their communities. That is one of the areas that we are concerned about with respect to the legislation.

We are pleased to see that the government is undertaking to rid any legislation of sexist language. This bill has a number of sections that are endeavouring to make the legislation more inclusive in terms of gender. I think that also shows more respect for councils which we know now could have members from both genders involved in them. The same could be said for a number of the lessees which would be referred to in the bill.

I think generally we would just want to ensure that any legislation from the government would, as the minister has indicated, merely be to make operations in northern Manitoba more efficient and to not take away any authority and any ability for the councillors in northern Manitoba to participate in overseeing the kinds of undertakings and activities in their communities.

I think all of us want to see more and more local control when it comes to any kind of decision making. We have legislation in northern Manitoba in this act that is supposed to do that. It will be interesting to see if this kind of legislation is going to support that.

I think that we are going to be supporting the legislation. We want it to go to committee. We want to see if there are going to be members from communities in northern Manitoba that would be affected by this bill that will have a chance to come out and speak at those hearings. I hope the government also will be allowing an appropriate amount of time for notice of people in those communities, so they could have a chance to travel to Winnipeg to make presentations on this bill.

I do not know if the government has in mind, in fact, to have some of those hearings in northern Manitoba, but those are the kinds of allowances that we have to make if we want to ensure that people in northern Manitoba have a say in the activities that are affecting their home communities.

With that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I would conclude my remarks, and we would be prepared to have this bill go forward to committee so that we can hear from members of the public. Thank you very much.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 5, The Northern Affairs Amendment Act.

All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it. The motion is accordingly carried.

Bill 2—The Endangered Species Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 2 (The Endangered Species Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les espèces en voie de disparition), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), standing in the name of the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 10—The Farm Lands Ownership Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 10 (The Farm Lands Ownership Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la propriété agricole et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), standing in the name of the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickey).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 17—The Crown Lands Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 17 (The Crown Lands Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

* (1610)

Bill 20—The Social Allowances Regulation Validation Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 20 (The Social Allowances Regulation Validation Act; Loi validant un règlement d'application de la Loi sur l'aide sociale), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), standing in the name of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 24—The Taxicab Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 24 (The Taxicab Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les taxis et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 25—The Public Schools Amendment Act (4)

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 25 (The Public Schools Amendment Act (4); Loi no 4 modifiant la Loi sur les

écoles publiques), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. Vodrey), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 26—The Expropriation Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 26 (The Expropriation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'expropriation), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 27—The Environment Amendment Act (2)

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 27 (The Environment Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 28—The Manitoba Intercultural Council Repeal Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 28 (The Manitoba Intercultural Council Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur le Conseil interculturel du Manitoba), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mr. Mitchelson), standing in the name of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) and standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 31—The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 31 (The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), standing in the name of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 32—The Social Allowances Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 32 (The Social Allowances Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), standing in the name of the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), who has 19 minutes remaining.

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to take the opportunity to speak on Bill 32 today, The Social Allowances Amendment Act, which is having a very devastating effect on many Manitobans.

Over the months of this government's administration, we have seen them take various steps that will eliminate supports and we have seen them cut back in a number of programs that are very important to our young people in this province and are particularly important to those people who are on low incomes.

We see this government take steps that will make it more difficult for many of these people to get off the poverty cycle that they are trapped in. It is really difficult to understand, Madam Deputy Speaker, when you hear a government speak about the importance of education.

I have to say that I believe education is one of the keys to our society. We have the responsibility, as a government, to give each and every resident the opportunity to get the best possible education so that they can take their role in society. Not

everybody will achieve the same level of education, but we have to allow them those opportunities and put the supports in place that will make it less difficult for them to achieve their goals.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

The step that this government is taking is indeed a step backward and a step that will hold people in the poverty cycle much, much longer. I cannot quite understand when a government talks about the value of education, why they would take this position. To see the elimination of a program, such as the Student Social Allowances Program, just shows that this government is reneging on its responsibility to provide the opportunities to everyone and, in particular, to the least fortunate in our society.

Mr. Speaker, all people start out going to school, but many of them, through no fault of their own and sometimes through choices they make, make a decision to drop out of school at a very early age. Then, after seeing that life out in the real world is not all that easy, and they recognize the value of education, many make an effort to get back into the school system, but there are many people who dropped out of school early who do not have the finances to get back into school on their own.

The Student Social Allowances Program gave many people the opportunity to get that education, but this is a very callous move by the government to eliminate this program. I would hope that they would reconsider and would look at ways that they could bring back this program.

I find it disappointing, Mr. Speaker, that this government says that they eliminated the program because we are the only province that has such a program. Well, it seems strange. I think we should be very proud of the fact that we are leaders in our country, that we have opened the doors, given opportunities to those people who want to better themselves, who want to take their place in society, who want to get off the welfare roll, who want to take a job, but because of unfortunate situations, they are not able to do that. We have to give them those supports.

For the government to say, well, no other province has this program so we are going to eliminate ours is indeed a very short-sighted, narrow view and does nothing to improve our credibility. It does nothing to help our young people and our young adults to take their place.

I think that government has to recognize, just as young people recognize that along the way they did make a mistake by dropping out of school, but because they want to get back into the system and carry their fair share of the load that we should be there to support them, because, Mr. Speaker, this is going to in the long run cost the government much more money.

We are going to see people staying on social assistance for many, many years rather than upgrading themselves and taking on a job, contributing their fair share through income tax in this province, offering their skills. In the long run, by keeping them on welfare, as this government seems to be wanting to do because that is the only place they are willing to increase spending, rather than increasing their spending in job creation and in educational opportunities for people who want to upgrade their education, I think their focus is wrong. That is the opinion of many people in rural Manitoba, and those are the people who I represent. I am sure it is the opinion of people in urban centres.

Some of these members should get out into the rural community and listen to what the impacts of this program are. We hear the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) saying, well, there are many other assistance programs that are available to people out there. I have a constituent in my area who dropped out of school, who is trying now to finish off her Grade 11 this year. She is on the Student Social Allowances Program—or was up to this year. She has no other sources of revenue. She has been told to go onto municipal assistance. Well, unfortunately she will qualify for municipal assistance, but she will not be able to go to school because she has to be available for work.

People are also told, and we heard this in Estimates, that students can go to night school. Again, that indicates how this government, this Minister of Education and other ministers have a lack of understanding of rural Manitoba. There are no night classes in many of the schools. In my constituency there is no place that there are night classes.

So what are the opportunities for these people? The only opportunity for them is to stay on welfare. There are no supports there. Also, Mr. Speaker, this government has taken away many of the other supports. They took away the high school student bursary program. They cut back on ACCESS.

Very few people can get ACCESS supports right now.

There is a complete lack of understanding or a complete lack of will to allow those people who have had the misfortune of dropping out of school early to take on—government feels they have no responsibility to help these people. It is indeed shameful that they would consider that we would be eliminating a program just because other provinces do not have such a program.

Mr. Speaker, some of these members should get out into those communities where there are no jobs. In many cases there are no jobs because of action by this government. There are no jobs because this government has broken their promises, and I think particularly of my constituency. There will be more poverty in the rural community because of issues that this government supports, particularly in the agricultural industry. They are supporting policies of the federal government which will reduce farm incomes and reduce services in the rural community. We are going to end up with more people on social assistance. We are going to end up with more rural families who cannot send their children to universities, or young people who cannot.

* (1620)

The minister, in one of his statements, said that these young people should go home. Well, I think that again he has to recognize that there are many young people who cannot go back home. They have ended up on social assistance at a very early age. They have dropped out of school because they could not get along with their families. They do not have the support of their families.

And the audacity to say that these people should go back home, either to an abusive situation or other difficult situations, again shows the lack of understanding of this government when it comes to recognizing the needs of young people and when it comes to recognizing the value of education.

We are heading towards a two-tier system very quickly under this government's administration where those who are wealthy will have every opportunity to get an education. If they drop out of school they will have the resources to get back in. If they want to go to university, they will have the resources. But unfortunately in our society, all people do not have that opportunity. This

government, by removing the social assistance program, has reduced that opportunity even more.

I wish that they would give serious consideration—

An Honourable Member: Okay, Rosann. We will.

Ms. Wowchuk: Just as the minister across the way said that they will give serious consideration to this, then I wish that they would give serious consideration to other matters that rural Manitobans are raising to them, but are raising it on a deaf ear. Members of government across the way are not recognizing the concerns that rural Manitobans are raising and there are many of those in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated earlier, this government is supporting many issues that are causing stress in rural communities, issues that will make it more difficult for young people and young adults who are supporting a family, young adults who are forced out of farming and must now get an education to look for a different career, but the supports are not there to help them because this government is pulling back on its supports.

There are farm organizations and the Women's Institute have recognized that the stress that the family, farm families and rural families are under because of lack of action by this government. They recognize the difficulties and poor services in rural communities. They have called on this government to support putting in a stress line in rural Manitoba, but this government refuses to take action on that as well. The other provinces have recognized the value of these kinds of services, but this government will not.

Mr. Speaker, education is the key to opportunity in this province and it is time that this government recognized that they have to put aside their rhetoric of not being able to afford. They have to put aside that everybody must share the pain because, by the actions of this government, those people at the lower end of the income scale are the ones that are carrying a much greater portion of the pain.

Action that this government is taking is doing nothing to help those people get off the poverty cycle so that they can contribute to the economy, and also lessen the amount of burden that they are carrying. The majority of these people want to work. They want jobs. They recognize that they need a better education to improve their status, to

be able to access many of these jobs. But this government is not taking action on that and I find that difficult to understand.

I think that this government has to look at the other things that they are doing. One of the concerns I have is the removal of the Children's Dental plan. This is one of the very serious mistakes that this government has made.

They remove supports for families and then they take away a program. They have taken a program away that brought some equality to rural Manitobans, but instead they say again that they take this program away because rural Manitobans have an unfair advantage. What a foolish statement. We have long known that rural Manitobans do not have any advantages. Our children have less advantage in the education system, and because this government is moving so slowly on Distance Education and first-year university education, they are widening that gap and putting rural Manitobans at a further disadvantage. They are not offering those opportunities.

Here we have one program that is giving rural Manitobans a bit of an advantage. They are giving them the opportunity to have healthy teeth, something that fits in with the Health Reform program, but they pull that away, too.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this government has very much of an understanding. They have no understanding of rural Manitoba, and they have no understanding of how cost-efficient the Student Social Allowances Program was. Through this program, people are given the tools to use their talents. You give young people hope; you give them faith in the future; you give them hope that they may have some opportunity, but this government has pulled the rug out from under these people. Along with the other supports that they have taken away, they have hurt many, many people tremendously.

I think that they have to recognize that a basic education is a right of all people, and they have the responsibility to provide those opportunities for a basic education. As a result of this, we are going to see the amount of social assistance this government is paying increasing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order regarding decorum in the House, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) is pretending to shoot an imaginary gun at our members. We find this quite offensive. He has done it on a number of occasions in the past, and we would like you to ask him to desist and not do this anymore. I think it is inappropriate and offensive. This government has spoken many times on the issue of nonviolence, and we think that it would be consistent he should refrain from these actions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised, I did not see what—oh, okay, the honourable Minister of Natural Resources to help clarify the point of order.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): On the same point of order, I want to make it very plain that I was in no way doing what was being described by the honourable member. Advancing age has caused some arthritic problems in my elbow and from time to time I have to extend it rather rapidly. That may connote something to honourable members opposite, but you, Sir, will have an understanding about what happens to us as we get on in years. I just want to put on the record that was in fact the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the honourable minister for his explanation. Therefore, I believe the honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

* (1630)

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, this is not a very long bill, but just by introducing a very short bill, this government has taken away and left hundreds of students who want to improve their education, students who were enrolled in schools, students who have started to finish off their high school diplomas. This government, by this legislation, is leaving them high and dry. They are taking away all hope for young people.

Now, we look at the amount of violence that we have in our communities. Of course, what are these young people going to turn to? They have no hope, and this government is causing them to have less and less hope. There are no job opportunities.

Those who want to go back to school are having that opportunity taken away from them. They are told to go back home and get the supports of their families, when we know that many of these children do not have homes to go to. They do not.

There are many members across the way who apparently do not understand that there are young people who do not have families to return to. Some of us are very lucky that we have the supports of our family, but when we do not have the supports of family, we have a responsibility as government, as a province, to help these people.

This government has failed in that respect. Mr. Speaker, they have failed in many respects when it comes to dealing with people and particularly in the rural community. I am surprised that a caucus with as many rural members as we have across the way would not have an understanding of the difficulties that the rural communities are facing and pull away a program like this that is used by many people, not only in the urban centres but all of the rural centres as well.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this government would not have recognized the value of the Children's Dental Program in rural Manitoba. They did not recognize the value of the high school students bursary program. They pulled that away too. Now they have cut back on ACCESS supports. [interjection]

Mr. Speaker, the member across the way wants to know if we want to pay more taxes. The point is that we have a responsibility, and we have to share. Many of those people, if they had the opportunity to get the education and started to take jobs, would also be able to—if more people were working, they would be sharing the tax load. If we had more jobs, we would have more people paying tax, and the load would be distributed. But this government does not believe in getting more people to work.

They would rather have them stay in poverty where they can have control over people. That is really what they want, and that is why they are pulling this legislation. The minister talks about sales tax. They have increased sales tax, because they have spread it over a wider base, and this is having a more serious impact on those people on lower incomes. But this minister does not care. He would rather have those people stay on the poverty cycle where they will not speak up for them, and we will continue to speak up for those people who want

to work, who want to improve their education and pay their fair share in society. This government does not care. They would rather keep people on welfare. They do not want to do anything about jobs, and that is why we will oppose this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because this government does not understand. They do not understand poor people. They do not understand the concerns of people.

In other provinces, they are looking at helping their students. Just as with the Children's Dental Health Program, they say Saskatchewan cut it. Saskatchewan understands much better than this government ever will understand, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand and speak on The Social Allowances Amendment Act which, as the member for Swan River pointed out, is a very short bill. In fact, it is three lines long, all of which are clauses which are being repealed. In fact you can sum up this bill in three words, repeal, repeal, repeal.

I would like to begin by talking about the importance of education. Today I went to a graduation ceremony at Aberdeen School in the north end, filling in for my colleague the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes). This week, I know that members on all sides of the House, the government and opposition parties, will be attending graduation ceremonies. I am sure that as members present awards they will probably be given the opportunity to speak, and if not given the opportunity, will probably take the opportunity to say a few words, not only to congratulate the graduates, but probably many of us will be talking about the value and the importance of education. I think that when we say that, regardless of our political party, that everyone is sincere, that people here sincerely believe that education is important and necessary, and that it is good to get as much education as you possibly can.

However, we have a problem, and that is that this government is unwilling to back up all those nice words and thoughts about the importance of education with their action, because what they are doing is denying an education to a significant group of people for whom there are many barriers to getting a good education. We know that education is valuable in broadening people's minds and making them see the world better and better able to analyze the world and events that go on. The best

way to do this, that we know of, is through our educational system, although I would have to say that there are many different ways of learning, and that we should not confine how we learn to the formal education system.

Mr. Speaker will be interested to hear that at one time I was a student chaplain in a provincial jail, and they used to put us in the dormitory with about 40 inmates and lock the door behind us, and we would spend a couple of hours going from bed to bed talking to inmates. One day I went up to a couple of young fellows who were sitting reading a book, and I said, what book are you reading? It happened to be a book of philosophy by Jean Paul Sartre. I said, what page are you on? They said, we are on page 2. I said, well, how long have you been reading it? They said, well, for a couple of days. I said, oh, well, how are you reading it? How are you studying this book? They said, well, what we do is we read one sentence and then we discuss it and see if we can understand it, and when we agree on what it means, then we read the next sentence.

Now, that, I believe, is an excellent way of learning, and it was peer learning. They were learning from each other. There was no teacher. Those people probably had very low educational levels, but they were learning and studying and bettering themselves in a jail, and I commend them for it. It was quite a wonderful thing to see.

So you do not have to confine yourself to a formal educational institution in order to study or in order to learn or in order to better yourself. However, when you go out into the work world employers want to see a piece of paper. They want to know what your educational attainment is, what your qualifications are. Certainly in this day and age, Grade 12 is really an absolute minimum for almost any kind of employment that you can get except of course for low-paying jobs in service industries like fast-food restaurants who do not really care what your level of education is.

I would say that really Grade 12 is not very adequate for getting any kind of job that pays above minimum wage and that really we should be encouraging every possible student who is capable to get post-secondary education, whether that is at Red River College or a business college or at university or any kind of post-secondary institution, that 100 percent of students who graduate from high school, who are capable of getting post-secondary education should be there, should

be getting that additional education for employment.

We know, of course, that there is a very close correlation between levels of education and income and that the more education people have, generally speaking, the higher their income. So eventually there is a payoff.

Now, sometimes people go into debt to get an education, and usually people from middle-class families and upper-class families are willing to do that. They are willing to see their sons and daughters or individuals themselves are willing to accumulate \$10,000 or \$15,000 worth of debt, possibly more, in order to get an education, because they realize that it is an investment and that when they graduate they will be able to pay off that debt.

Now, this is becoming increasingly difficult, and many students are unwilling to do that because the jobs that used to be there almost automatically when you graduated from university, which was the case when I graduated, just are not there. In fact, I remember when I graduated from Brock University in St. Catherines in 1976 that recruiters from companies would come to campus, interview students and offer them a job all in the same week. One of the employers was General Motors because General Motors had huge assembly plants in Thorold and St. Catherines, and some university graduates went to work in their offices in those communities. So it was much easier then to get employment.

Still, I think what I am saying still stands, and it is still reasonable that education is the key to employment.

Now why is this government repealing sections of The Social Allowances Act. Well, they have given, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) has given a number of reasons, because certainly we went over and over this in Family Services Estimates.

One of the rationales, which I thought was a very, very poor excuse for the Minister of Family Services to give, was that Manitoba is the only province in Canada that has a Student Social Allowances Program, and I think that is an absolutely ridiculous reason to repeal a program. If you are the only province and it works and it is a good program, you should be proud that you have it, and you should be ashamed that you are taking

it away. They should be a leader. They should be encouraging other provinces to institute something like the Student Social Allowances Program.

Now, we have been doing research on this and found out that it is not true, and one of these days we are going to raise this in the House and point out which other provinces actually do provide a similar kind of program and ask the minister to retract his remarks.

* (1640)

The other reasons the minister gives for cutting any kind of program are, of course, fiscal reasons, that we cannot afford it, and therefore we have to drop this program. Well, I think that reason is also misleading. I mean, we understand the budgetary limitations of this government, but this government makes choices, and we think in this case they made the wrong choice. What they failed to recognize, first of all, is that education is an investment, an investment in young people's future. I would say it is an investment that pays off in the present. I believe it is better to have students going to school than to have these same young people sitting at home and on social assistance, because we know that the jobs are not there.

They are also going to have to pay out money in any case. In fact, I understand that it costs \$30 a month less to have students in the Student Social Allowances Program than to have them on welfare. So how are they saving money? If, as they allege, they cannot afford this program and they want to save money, why are they doing it? The only reason that is plausible is that they are offloading some of this expense to the City of Winnipeg because the City of Winnipeg pays for 20 percent of social allowances expenses.

I wish that the minister would just be honest and admit that that is the reason, that they are offloading this program or these students, not to the City of Winnipeg to pay for their education but for the City of Winnipeg, because that is where most of them are—to sit on social allowance and let the city pick up 20 percent of the cost.

Many members opposite were city councillors in the city of Winnipeg, like the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), and they know that. He knows that. He knows how the welfare budget is divided up and cost-shared by the city and the province and the federal government.

He knows that the province shares and pays for 50 percent of welfare and that the federal government shares the other 50 percent under the Canada Assistance Plan, but that people on municipal assistance, the municipality pays 20 percent. So the government is saving some money by offloading this expense to the City of Winnipeg.

I would like to talk about the importance of the Student Social Allowances Program. We know that approximately a thousand students—I do not have the exact figures with me—take advantage of this program. Many of these students are young people who have been out of school and have gone back to school. I think that is very commendable because it is very difficult to go back to school if you have been out of school even for a year, or two or three years. It is even harder to go back to school and to sit in classes with students who are much younger than you are.

So it takes a lot of a courage and a lot of initiative for these young people to go back. I would suggest that they make better students because they are better motivated. I am told by teachers that I have spoken to that these students are better motivated and they want to finish their high school more quickly, that they want to take as many courses as they can, as quickly as they can and graduate from high school.

At one school in the inner city, Argyle School, 30 percent of all the students, approximately 36 to 40 students, are enrolled in the Student Social Allowances Program, the program that is going to terminate as of July 1. As the principal of this school said to me, returning to school is an emotional decision for these young people, that they find it difficult to come back, but they find the motivation, and they do come back. They are better students because they are motivated to move faster through high school, and that is a good thing.

What is this government doing? It is discouraging them from going back to school, because there are limitations when you are on municipal assistance, and the government and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) well know this. He knows that when you are on municipal assistance, you are deemed employable and you must do at least two things. You must be looking for work, and you must available for work.

If you are in school all day, you are not available for work. You cannot possibly be going to school full time and be available for work. So there are stipulations that say you can only take two courses at a time if you are on municipal social assistance in the city of Winnipeg.

The City of Winnipeg said to the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), well, will you grandfather the students who are already there and let them graduate? The Minister of Family Services said, no, would not even let the students who are already enrolled in the program finish their course of education—shameful.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Where are you going to get the money from, Doug? Who are you going to take it from?

Mr. Martindale: The Minister of Northern Affairs asks, where am I going to get the money? Well, if this government would stop giving handouts to their corporate friends, there would be money for the Student Social Allowances Program. I would also say that this is one of the least expensive programs. We are only talking about a thousand students here. We are not talking about a huge budgetary expense.

An Honourable Member: Stop training cashiers for golf courses.

Mr. Martindale: This government has money to train cashiers for golf courses, but they do not have money for students to stay in school. This government always talks about choices. This government talks about choices and having to make difficult choices. If there is a choice between training cashiers for mostly profit golf courses and keeping students in school, they should have chosen to keep the students in school and let the golf courses be responsible for training their own cashiers.

An Honourable Member: What have you got against cashiers?

Mr. Martindale: I have absolutely nothing against cashiers, but let their employers train them at their own expense and keep the students in school.

Perhaps this government could collect their mortgage payments from Arni Thorsteinson. Then they would have some money to spend on education.

An Honourable Member: Bail-out-Arni bill.

Mr. Martindale: Yes, we have a bill on the Order Paper now. It is being known as the bail-out-Arni bill.

An Honourable Member: Lucky Arni.

Mr. Martindale: Lucky Arni.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Blackjack, why do you not spend your time reading sermons of grace and moral ethics instead of the garbage that you give us in here?

Mr. Martindale: The Minister of Health would like to talk about ethics. I would challenge the Minister of Health to get up and give his own speech on this bill and talk about ethics.

Well, I think the minister raises an important issue. Ethics are important. It would be interesting to know how this minister would define this issue in terms of an ethical issue. What is right and what is wrong? What is the moral good? I would be very interested in hearing the minister's sermon on this topic.

I believe that one of the saddest things about this bill is that it is consistent with the cutbacks of this government, because the cutbacks of this government are targeted at the poor and women and children and aboriginal people. Most of them live in NDP constituencies, so this government thinks that they can do that with impunity and get away with it.

An Honourable Member: That is imputing motives.

Mr. Martindale: I would not like to impute motives, however I had someone phone me whose friend worked for a polling company. This person was not willing to talk to me because she was afraid she would lose her job, but she said that she was working for a polling company and one of the questions they asked was: If the government has to reduce their deficit, if they have to cut expenditures, which of the following organizations could be cut? I believe that is a very cynical way for this government to make budgetary decisions, to hire a polling company and not admit it and ask people where they should cut.

I do not think that has anything to do with what a proper role should be for making budgetary decisions. I think there are many, many other ways that you can weigh the pros and cons of programs and weigh whether or not the government can afford a certain program or service or not, but to do

it on the basis of polling, which of course would be done on the basis of constituency, I believe is an extremely cynical way of drafting a budget. It is unfortunate the government will not even admit it.

If you look at the kinds of cuts, for example, Child and Family Services, where are the majority of families who are involved with Child and Family Services? Well, they happen to be in the inner city of Winnipeg and in northern Manitoba. What about child care? Who are the people who have probably the majority of children enrolled in child care? Well, certainly, the ones who are affected by this government's decisions are the ones whose children are eligible for subsidy, because subsidy is based on income.

But this government does not really seem to understand or get the connection between child care policy and employment, because the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gillshammer), for example, has decreased the number of weeks that a parent can be searching for work and have their children in child care from eight weeks to two. When I asked the minister in Estimates if he did any studies or any research on that, the minister as usual was involved in his usual baffle gab, would not answer the question.

* (1650)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martindale: Well, I can show you the Minister of Family Services' answers, and his answers to that question were nothing but baffle gab. He would not admit that his staff had not done any research, had not done any studies on the number of weeks that people look for work.

Our research staff got in touch with Canada Employment and we got statistics. How long is the average person on unemployment insurance in Manitoba? The most recent figures show the average person in Manitoba is on unemployment insurance 23 weeks. What does this Minister of Family Services do? He does not do any research, he does not have any studies to back it up, but he reduces the number of weeks from eight to two.

How many people in Manitoba during a recession are going to find employment in two weeks? Not very many. And what are they going to do? They are going to take their children out of child care, and then if they get a job, they will not have a child care space because this same government, this same minister capped the number

of spaces at 9,600. So the spaces are not there. People are going to go on a waiting list; they are going to wait two or three years. They are not going to get a space, but this minister would rather have them collecting unemployment insurance or collecting welfare instead of being employed and being in the workforce.

I can understand that, because this government does not believe in child care anyway. Many of the ministers in cabinet do not believe in it, and we know that because daycare centre directors are meeting with the member for Morris (Mr. Manness) and the member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard), and we hear what they say in these meetings. They phone us, and they tell us what these cabinet ministers are saying in those meetings.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe it is incumbent on all members of the House to speak the truth, and it must be more incumbent on members of the House who happen to be members of the clergy to speak the truth. I would ask you to bring the member to task.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised, I can honestly say that I did not hear the remarks the honourable minister is referring to at this point in time, and I will review—I will peruse Hansard and I will come back to the House with a ruling.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have already advised the House that I will peruse Hansard and come back with a ruling.

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health seems to be quite offended and thin-skinned. I am a little surprised at that, but I would be happy to paraphrase.

I would be happy to paraphrase my remarks and instead say that this government lacks in a serious commitment to child care, which is slightly different, I admit that. The proof is in their policies, in their cutbacks, in their capping the system and increasing the fees from \$1 a day to \$2.40 a day. The result of these policies are that numerous children are not going to be in child care. I think that really reflects a lack of commitment to child care on the part of this government, some of whose ministers do not believe in child care at all, but they

would never say that on the record. They are willing to admit it when they need with parents from their constituencies.

An Honourable Member: Put it on the record.

Mr. Martindale: What?

An Honourable Member: Put it on the record, 53 million. Come on. Then I will read your speech.

Mr. Martindale: Fifty-three million what?

An Honourable Member: That is what we spent.

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Speaker, the organizations that this government has cut the budget to, most of whom are service organizations, are in our constituencies and this government used the excuse that they were advocacy organizations in spite of the fact many of them provide valuable services.

I think if you look at those organizations, the ones that we spoke about in the House, we certainly did not defend all 56. We certainly talked about the 13 Indian and Metis Friendship Centres whose funding was eliminated by this government, all of whom are providing services to their people, to the Manitoba Child Care Association, the Manitoba Foster Family Association, and particularly the Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization.

I think those were the main ones that we raised in Question Period and in Estimates. If the government says, well, look, we withdrew the funding to the Manitoba Association of School Superintendents, do you agree with that, I would have to say that they probably should be self-financing. Nobody here defended the school superintendents because their grant was withdrawn. It was the organizations that serve low-income people, and they were providing a valuable service to their community. Those were the organizations that we objected to having their funding eliminated, and this government chose to call them advocacy organizations.

If this government had a plan and if this government could get the economy going again, which apparently they cannot do, then their income tax revenue would be up, but instead this government does the opposite. What they do is they cut every department but they raise one, Family Services, one part of that budget, the welfare budget.

The only increase of this government's budget was the welfare budget and they had to. They

were forced to budget millions and millions of dollars more for welfare in spite of the fact that they could have had students in school instead of on welfare, but because of this Bill 32, The Social Allowances Amendment Act, they are going to be spending money on welfare instead of on keeping students in school.

I cannot think of anything that is more stupid than that. This is one of the stupidest decisions of this government's entire budget for 1993 and 1994. In fact, the Winnipeg Free Press pointed out the stupidity of this decision in an editorial, because it makes absolutely no sense to have people sitting at home on social assistance when they could be going to school, but this government does not see the choice. [interjection]

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) wants to say, we are not denying them the right to go to school. This government is putting a severe restriction on their right to go to school because the City of Winnipeg says they can only take two courses, they can only be a part-time student.

I was talking to a young man named Larry Walton last night. It is going to take him eight years to finish high school. He is going to be 26 years old by the time he finishes high school if he can only take two courses a year. That is the kind of restriction that this government is putting on young people.

This government has a choice. Whether you pay to have the student in school or you pay to have him on welfare, your government would rather pay people to collect welfare and sit at home doing nothing than pay them to go to school—

An Honourable Member: What government helped you get your education, Doug?

Mr. Martindale: The government of Ontario helped me with my education. I think it was a Conservative government the entire time I was there. I did not have any student loans, the minister will be interested to know that I had no student loans. I paid my own way through university, but certainly elementary and secondary school, the government paid for my education. I have no quarrel with that. I do not know why that is of interest to the members.

But this government had a choice. They could spend money to keep students in school or spend money to have students sitting at home, not

students any more, but welfare recipients, and they would rather pay them to stay home and collect welfare. I cannot think of any choice that this government had to make in their budget that was stupider—

An Honourable Member: Did you pay your debt back to Ontario?

Mr. Martindale: I had no debt when I graduated from university. I had no student loans. Well, here is an interesting story. The members opposite will find this interesting. After I failed a year of university, my parents cut me off, the United Church cut me off, and I had to be completely self-supporting. I went out and got three part-time jobs and I worked for three years and I put myself through school. I know, since all Conservatives think that they are all self-made people, they are all self-supporting and they are never supported by government, that will meet with approval, which it did.

The reality is many students cannot do that, and we are talking about a very different country and a very different economy today where the jobs are not there to put everybody through school. Many of them are minimum wage. Many of them pay terrible wages and—

An Honourable Member: Yes, there are. There are jobs. Look in the want ads.

Mr. Martindale: Yes, this minister thinks that people can live and pay the rent and their food and go to school at the same time, and it is absolutely impossible for the majority to do that.

But this government lives in a different reality. They are in a different world. They do not understand these things.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) will have 14 minutes—13 minutes remaining. Okay, 13 minutes remaining.

Order, please.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, House business. With leave of the House, I would like to call a Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to meet Friday, June 25, at 11 a.m. in Room 255 to consider Bill 38 and Bill 5.

Mr. Speaker, remove that, strike that off the record and let us put Bill 5 with Law Amendments, Thursday night, Standing Committee on Law Amendments that is sitting Thursday night, tomorrow night.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, I would like to thank the honourable government House leader for that information.

* (1700)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 36—Renewal of Core Area Initiative

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry),

WHEREAS Phase II of the Core Area Initiative Program has wound down without new funding commitments; and

WHEREAS the first two phases of Core began the process of revitalizing Winnipeg's inner city; and

WHEREAS the Core Area Initiative contributed to significant advances in training residents of Winnipeg's inner city to achieve improved standards of living in harsh economic times; and

WHEREAS such training of individuals is the key to building a Manitoba economy with a high level of prosperity and social justice; and

WHEREAS further work must be done to solidify the advances made in the first two phases of the program; and

WHEREAS among the inner cities of five comparably sized Canadian cities, Winnipeg is the only one to have registered a decline in median family income over the past 15 years; and

WHEREAS 55 percent of Winnipeg inner-city families earned less than \$20,000 in 1985; and

WHEREAS any improvement is contingent on continued emphasis on the social and economic needs of the community; and

WHEREAS programs which have received widest appreciation and support from residents are those related to meeting their special needs for support services, education, training, housing and neighbourhood improvements.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the government of Manitoba to consider renegotiating the Core Area Initiative for another five-year term, with particular emphasis on job training, education and social services for core area residents.

Motion presented.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to sponsor this resolution which deals with renewal of the Core Area Initiative. As I know that we are all aware, in the 1960s and '70s in the city of Winnipeg, it certainly became obvious that there was a need for inner-city revitalization, and that revitalization was certainly very comprehensive in terms of the economic, physical and the social disparities that we have seen developed in the inner city over the past number of decades.

Although it is over 10 years ago now, Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1980, representatives of Canada and Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg met, and there was an agreement that there should be a tripartite arrangement to basically provide a series of resources and dollars, entitled the Core Area I. That particular initiative basically was there to provide dollars in which there would be planning and implementation of a series of programs and projects.

These particular projects, the specific intent of them was that they would revitalize the inner city in Winnipeg, so that in fact we would see basically better economic opportunities for the residents of the inner city, we would see some improvements in regard to some of the structures within the inner city, and that we would see some development of some social services and some support programs which would lead to a better quality of life for residents within the inner city.

That was considered to be the Core Area Initiative Program begun in the 1980s and was called Core Area I. Again, there was agreement of the three levels of government that this program would proceed.

The second phased Core Area was another negotiated program with the three levels of government, and that process began after the first five years. Its job was again to continue on with the similar goals that Core Area I had dealt with to look at revitalizing the inner city.

What this resolution is today, Mr. Speaker, is to basically encourage the government of Manitoba—

and I know that there has been some discussions with the federal government and the City of Winnipeg in looking at a Core Area III. We are here, as a Liberal Party, to encourage this government to continue on to negotiate with the federal government, particularly in light of the fact that there now is a new Prime Minister, and there may be some changes in terms of the ministers of the various federal departments. We would like to see this government actively negotiate with the City of Winnipeg and particularly with the Government of Canada to renegotiate a Core Area Initiative, a Core Area III, for another five-year term, and that there should be an emphasis on such areas as job training and retraining, education and social services for the inner-city residents.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at the city of Winnipeg and the inner city, we have certainly seen, over the last number of years, a decline in family incomes of individuals who live within the inner city. When you look at their income levels in comparison to income levels of families in other geographical areas of the city, there is no question that they have the lowest income levels per area of the city.

When you look at the high school dropout rate of children living in the inner city and you compare that dropout rate to the dropout rate in the suburbs of the city of Winnipeg, you see that in fact it is a higher rate.

When you look at the crime rate within District 1, within that part of the city, certainly break-and-enters are the highest. You see a number of the crimes much higher in that part of the city.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the inner city—that we have seen some positive changes over the last number of years, whether those changes have been in the areas of Business Improvement Zones—we have seen the Exchange District; we have seen some improvements in that area. We have seen some programs and services that have been developed over the last number of years to basically assist with young people within the inner city, but since Core Area, the Phase II, has completed, some of those programs and services have been dropped.

I think it is very unfortunate that we have not seen a continuation of the three levels of government feeling that they should be concerned about what goes on in our inner cities across this country, and

certainly in this case we are talking about the city of Winnipeg.

When we look at the Core Area Program and some of the projects that were there, Mr. Speaker, I think as I mention some of them, it will give you an idea and give this Legislature an idea of the types of worthwhile projects that were developed in some of the support services that were put in place. One of the programs, of course, was the SKY program, Street Kids and Youth. It was a pilot project that allowed for outreach and advocacy, counselling and employment-related services for the high-risk youth in the downtown area.

Certainly, when we look at that particular example, you cannot really go a week in this city without reading through the paper and at least seeing one article or one story about some of the youth problems in our city of Winnipeg. Certainly, those problems are not exclusive to the inner city. They are also throughout the suburbs and in all areas of the city, but they also are downtown.

In fact, it was this particular pilot project, SKY, that was there to specifically look at what could be done with the youths who were hanging around the downtown areas, who were oftentimes causing problems, what could be done with them to give them some support, some advocacy, and this is done, of course, in co-operation with a number of organizations in Manitoba but also included the Downtown Business Improvement Zone, who have done really a lot of work in terms of looking at the problems of the inner city, not just social problems, but also looking at economic difficulties that businesses have. That is where the Core Area Initiative Phase II gave some assistance to organizations, such as the Downtown BIZ, because they assisted in providing some funding to these projects.

As well, there are a number of summer recreation projects, Mr. Speaker, that were funded with the assistance of Core Area dollars. These are very important as well, because in the summertime, when schools are closed, what oftentimes families in the inner city—they do not have the resources. They are not out at the cottages at the lake. They do not have those resources, so they are basically in the city throughout the summer. There needs to be developed recreational and support services for children. This is where the Core Area Initiative Phases I and II were very helpful in this respect.

* (1710)

I think, when you talk to people who work within the inner city, whether they are school teachers, principals of schools, whether they are individuals who work through the Social Planning Council, work at the child-care centres downtown, work through the local churches in the downtown area, whether they are leaders of the various ethnic organizations who oftentimes have some of their community centres within the inner city, whenever you talk to a number of these groups, you will find that they are supportive of the fact that we do need a number of social services, a number of programs that are developed specifically in the inner city.

Of course, I think what has to be kept clear with something like the Core Area Initiative and the fact that we should be renegotiating for a third Core Area is that we want to look at projects that will be long term, that they can be sustaining projects perhaps on their own, but there is no question that there were criticisms of the Core Area I, there were criticisms of Core Area II. Of course, we need to look at modifications. We need to look at some changes so that in fact we would be getting the best value for our dollar.

But I think it is very important that we need to look at a Core Area Initiative because what is going to happen over the next five years with the downtown area? We have the City of Winnipeg that might be prepared to put in some dollars if there was agreement from the other two levels of government. We have a Province of Manitoba, as indicated by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), who has certainly put on the record in the past that he is prepared to support a Core Area III. So we have some positive comments from those two levels of government.

The question is, how do we encourage the Government of Canada to agree that in fact a Core Area III is vitally important for a city such as Winnipeg, and how do we convince the Government of Canada that in fact it would be a good investment of their dollars to be involved in this type of a project? In this type of a Core Area III, we would want to see an emphasis on job training and certainly retraining in these times of economic difficulties, where we are seeing people being laid off from all types of businesses and services. It is going to be so critically important that we have specific retraining programs that are available. It is very, very important that we ensure that we have an

excellent education system within the inner city, within the core area, that in fact specifically meets the needs of the students, of the children who are attending those schools.

Certainly we know that our education system right now within the province of Manitoba oftentimes feels overtaxed. They feel burdened by all of the issues and the problems that are facing the education system. We know that even within Winnipeg No. 1, which services the core area, in fact, they feel that there are so many services and programs they need to provide that they are oftentimes having difficulty deciding what is the balance between providing those kinds of extracurricular, necessary support services and providing basic education.

That is where programs in a Core Area III would be very worthwhile, that could be organized, could be developed to assist the education system, to assist the schools in developing some specific social services.

We have also seen over the last year or so really a change in how the social services are delivered through the Province of Manitoba. As much as the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gillshammer) likes to portray to this House and to Manitobans that there has not been a significant decrease in service available through Child and Family Services, I would challenge him on that statement because I believe in fact we have started to see a change.

We have the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) today in the House who mentioned how the domestic abuse cases had doubled over the last year or so. Now there are over 3,000 cases that have come forward that are domestic abuse cases that have come to the courts' attention.

If that is the case, and we have no reason to not believe those statistics, then that means that the cases and the workload of social service agencies in general, whether they are Child and Family Services, whether they are nonprofit groups and organizations in the inner city or wherever in Winnipeg, that means that their workloads have to have had increased as well.

There is no question that those workloads have gone up, and yet we are seeing where the Child and Family Services agencies, as an example, are pulling back. They are not working as many days. They are now reprioritizing the children that they

are dealing with. Now the older children, age 16 and over, are not necessarily getting those support services.

So if we are starting to see this type of pulling back of services which affects all of the province—but it certainly affects and impacts probably even more on the inner city. If we are starting to see that, it is going to be even more important that we have a series, a continuum of social services that are available to ensure that we are going to see some positive changes in the inner city.

We want to see the dropout rates decreased. We want to see children educated in the school system. We want to ensure that those kids that are going to school are nourished and that there are programs for them. We want to be assured that the youth who are finished high school have opportunities to go into a vocational program or have opportunities for jobs. We want to ensure that those families that are living in the inner city and where the husband or the wife becomes unemployed, that there are opportunities there for retraining.

These are some of the programs and services where there could be an emphasis in a Core Area III. It is a responsibility, not just of the Province of Manitoba, and not just of the City of Winnipeg, but of the Government of Canada, our national government, to ensure that these kinds of services and programs are there. The Government of Canada still has an involvement in the area of health and welfare and social services. They have an involvement in infrastructure. They have an involvement in ensuring that there is economic development that occurs across our country. Those are the types of issues that we would want to be looking at in a Core Area III.

Mr. Speaker, as I sum up, I know that the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) has talked about some negotiations. I would urge him again to continue to negotiate and to try to seek some assurances from the federal government that in fact they are prepared to look at a Core Area III Initiative. It is vitally important to the citizens of the city of Winnipeg, not just to the citizens in the inner city but to all of us in the city of Winnipeg, because of course the positive impact within the inner city would be felt within the rest of the city of Winnipeg.

It is important that we encourage this government not just to say yes, we support this

program, and we will talk to the federal government, but we want to see some real action on the part of this government in the area of Core Area III.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): First of all, it is a pleasure always to speak in regard to the Core Area, both I and II. I carefully listened to the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) and many of the things that she is mentioning on the record right now. Many of the things were discussed when we discussed this particular project and the first Core Area back in 1980 or '81 at City Hall.

I did speak in regard to the Core Area Initiative when there was a proposal in '92, a resolution. I spoke on it in February of '92. I will not go back to that particular speech but maybe add some other items that give you some foresight into why the original Core Area was established and why the Core Area principally was very, very successful.

However, I would like to maybe get the point across of why it has been difficult to renegotiate a third Core Agreement. I would like to stay away from, and I guess it is going to be difficult, because I always talked about Core, Core, Core through my life at City Hall and my work with the Core Area at that time not to call it the Core III.

Just to give some particular information, and I do not disagree with the member's resolution, however, there are parts of it I do not agree with. I think probably it has to be mentioned at this time that one of the most key reasons why the Core Area Agreement was successful was that it was a third-party agreement with equal shares of monies, regardless of what level of government. So when they sat at the table and discussed programs, the programs were dealt with equally, and this was probably the hardest thing to sell at City Hall at that time.

* (1720)

People at City Hall would say to you, well, why would you support a program when the federal government is only giving a third, provincial is only giving a third and you are giving a third, where the levels of government are not equally available in funds?

That is probably what made this particular agreement very, very unique, and probably very unique, and I must say, when I met with 12 or 14 countries in France in 1983, it was very unique

when we made our proposition to them, unique that three levels of government were involved in such a program.

Also, the original intent of the Core Area Program was a kick-start type of program, not to be an ongoing type of program. What had happened over quite a large time was that, when the first one came out, it was a kick-start. Then, when it finished, all of a sudden we had these groups at City Hall making presentations saying, hey, we can no longer operate and the pressure was put on probably more at the City Hall level than it was at the federal, where they could not make their presence felt, and then also there was no opportunity at the legislative level to make their wants, so they came to Executive Policy Committee, they came to Finance Committee and expressed their concerns about, what are they going to do now, they no longer have these monies to operate and they have been doing it for five years.

When II was arranged, it was suggested that a different type of program and a different way of accumulating the monies come through. Also, the reminder, there were also different assurances put in that maybe there was a fund set up to help these people at the end of the Core Area Program.

Then, when I was minister and I suggested to the federal government to wind down and take a year to wind down, that was the reason why I suggested we extend it for a further period, use up the monies and take our time to wind down that last year so you would not experience what you did in the first Core Area Agreement.

A little bit of history was put into the record by the member for Crescentwood. However, she failed to mention, and I guess she maybe just did not have enough time, because I know I am going to run out of time. I think the original intent and the people that were at the table was the Sterling Lyon government. The Lyon administration under the guidance of Mr. Mercier at the time was the one who sat down. As you probably could recall, Gerry Mercier at the time was a previous councillor. He was on Works and Ops and he dabbled at EPC, and he understood the problems of the core area.

An Honourable Member: I did not mention Lloyd Axworthy.

Mr. Ducharme: The member across the way said she did not mention Axworthy. I will mention

Axworthy. I mean, give credit where credit is due. Mr. Axworthy also was one of the prime people at that particular table and, along with the city government, established the first Core Area Program.

Mr. Speaker, also down the road maybe I will mention some of the people who were responsible for The Forks and the other programs in the second Core Area Agreement—Mr. Epp and Mr. Mazankowski, who probably were the people, not Mr. Axworthy, who got The Forks program going along with Mr. Norrie at City Hall level. So I will give credit where it is due. I had no problem once I was able to sell it at City Hall along with my colleagues. A lot of us had our doubts about the original Core Area Program.

When we looked at the Core Area Program, we were a little concerned in regard to once it got to City Hall, and once it got to the federal government, and once it got to the provincial government, that people would take sections out of the project funding when we allocated monies, that they would use those monies and shake it around a bit. However, that is the reason why you ended up with your P.A.s that were established, and then also the City Hall had the final say in when you did move, and those shareholders did move the money over.

We must mention though at the time of—and the member mentions employment. She mentions different events, different things that went on as a result of the Core Area. We can go on in regard to the—people can go through the stats report book that was established and finalized on December 31, '91. You can go through, and people can talk about the good programs. They can talk about the entrepreneurial programs that were established that included many, many businesses that started up.

There was a grant to start up small businesses within the core area, repayable funding. There was also a business established that did not have to have any repayable funding. There was a large investment in that program. I remember attending the first graduation class of that particular program, and you could see people from the many, many walks of life who wanted to, who saw finally in there their opportunity to establish a small business, the same as I was given that opportunity in 1959, or almost over 30 years ago at a very young age was able to establish a small business.

For me, it felt that these people finally had a chance, no matter what it was. You had people that would start baby products out of their homes, people making cakes, fashion—that was their idea, that was their dream. Sure, a lot of them were not successful, but it gave them an opportunity to establish the small business that some of us had the good fortune to do with not a lot of money at hand.

When you saw the light in their eyes when they came up, boy, they were on their own. They were now going to be the business of tomorrow. It was really a nice feeling to see these people from the core area come up and say that they completed their first phase, and they were now going to start a business on their own. Those are the parts that I remember mostly of the Core. When she talks about employment and training, you can go and you can talk about the employment training of the second Core. That was the training program that I know we put through, people participated in the base. We put through some 2,200 people, and I think the total program altogether was in the vicinity of around \$11 million or \$12 million. The people that were involved were from many, many aspects. Sure, there were stumbling blocks. There were the aboriginal people who took the police program. You would see them come and graduate, and then also they would have a stumbling block at City Hall that finally, I think, at least started to be resolved that you did not have to be blonde and blue eyed to join the Winnipeg Police Department. These are things that came out of that employment and training.

You can go on and on with many, many things that were established as a result of that. You saw the groups, when they came forward, would each have their own valedictorian that would speak on behalf of the class. I was told that, and introduced to a lot of them, when they started the program, they did not have the command of the English language, they had the command of their own language. However, it gave them that opportunity to come forward and participate with others who had similar problems. They finally had an opportunity. The banks took them on, large companies took them on, small companies took them on. Many consultant firms took them on, and they found it was a really good way to involve the people in the Core Area Program.

I can only briefly talk about the Core Area Program, and probably some people I know on the other side of the House would remark about some of the flaws of it. They would also knock you for some of the things that you did introduce. There were things that we could not get introduced. Probably not all the colleagues on this side of the House would be in support of everything that you introduced in the Core, but it was a great learning experience. It was probably six years or 10 years, I would say, in ups and downs. I know that when you sit down, some of the things that were established back in 1980 or '81 are no longer in the picture, no longer in the picture at all.

There were many, many projects involved in housing. The grant program that was introduced was a great stimulus in the core area. It also had its disadvantages when all of a sudden you released these monies overnight and then all of a sudden people went out in the buying of houses in the core area and, whoop, up went the market value of their houses. It made it unfortunate for those people that were in the core, wanted to buy in the core, they were ready to put their 5 percent down on the house, get their government help in repairing the house and then, boom, the price of the house went up \$10,000 overnight.

* (1730)

So those were some of those difficulties that you went into. I know the last one that we introduced ate up the monies within six weeks. I think we accepted 200 or 300 people involved in it, and we could have probably doubled that, but unfortunately it was at the end of the Core Area Agreement and those monies were used up.

Another program, the result of it is now being very, very talked about, is Habitat for Humanity. Habitat is probably world renowned. When I was Housing minister, we talked to President Carter, when he was around working in Chicago, New York, all through, and we said we would like you to come to Manitoba. He said, well, I will come to Manitoba, however, you have to promise me at least 15, 20, 25 lots and show to us, indicate to us that everyone is involved in it. As a result of the working of Habitat and the people involved and Manitoba Housing, we got involved in it, and I must say it is a good project.

I would like to go on and on and on, but I have a resolution that I would like to introduce. I move,

seconded by the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh),

THAT Resolution 36 be amended by deleting all words following the first WHEREAS and replacing them with the following:

The Core Area Initiative Agreements I and II provided major support to vulnerable families and communities during the last 10 years; and

WHEREAS federal resources are vital in the renewal of the city of Winnipeg and the redevelopment of our economic base and labour force; and

WHEREAS the needs of urban aboriginal people remains a priority of the Manitoba government.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba support the continuing efforts of the Minister of Urban Affairs and the Manitoba government to obtain and new tripartite agreement to deal with inner-city needs.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable minister's amendment is in order.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to the resolution put forward by the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) and the amendment put forward by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme).

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what we have heard for the last 15 minutes from the minister is a lot about past history and certainly not about the future. In fact, this government, by making the amendment that it is, is suggesting somehow that we should pass an amendment that says that the government is doing a good job here, and that they should be encouraged to strike a third Core Area Agreement.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this is the government of Manitoba. The federal government is a Conservative government of the same party affiliation, and this government has prided itself over the years in being able to pick up the phone and communicate with its counterparts federally. The point is that we find ourselves now just months before a federal election in this country, almost two years now after the second Core Area Initiative had run its course, and what we find is this government simply dragging its feet.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

I find it absolutely unbelievable that the minister could stand in his place just before me and make a case that somehow this government was committed to Core Area III. The fact of the matter is that it is a joke for this government to believe, or to say that it believes, in the continuation of the core area. I can tell you what it does believe in; it believes in helping its federal cousins win the next election. So what it has done deliberately, I believe, is drag its feet along with its federal cousins. They have dragged their feet now for two years, and what we may see is just immediately in advance of the election, we may see something, maybe an announcement, a letter may be signed, but something to give a bit of boost to the Tories re-election campaign. That is all this is.

There is no commitment on the part of Conservatives, here or in Ottawa, to continue the Core Area Initiative Program, nothing more than an election ploy, nothing more than just something to put into the Kim Campbell re-election effort. That is what it is all about right now and that is what this government opposite is doing. They need not pretend to us, or pretend to the public that they are in any way somehow committed to advancing, and they are really concerned about people in the core area.

* (1740)

The member spent 15 minutes talking about what happened 10 years ago, and once again, Mr. Acting Speaker, what we have seen is the situation has gotten worse in the core. The problems are increasing in the core. They are not diminishing at all. While the previous programs, the Core Area I and the Core Area II, did their small part in helping to alleviate the problems of the core area, it was a very, very minor band-aid solution. The problems of the core area are unfortunately so major that we could probably have core area initiatives from now till the end of the century and still we would not make the dent in the problems that we would wish to.

I also want to make some comments about this government's approach to something like the core area in that—[interjection] The Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) is intervening at this point, but I think it is very clear that when the Conservatives approach a program like this, they are very interested in bricks and mortar over training programs. There is a real edifice complex on the part of Conservative governments, I find. They are very interested in

building monuments and monuments to themselves.

I know that at the core area, there are nice monuments down there with the Minister of Housing's (Mr. Ernst) name on them, the former mayor's name on them. The Conservatives particularly like, I find, to be seen cutting ribbons. They are a great bunch of ribbon cutters. There is nothing a Conservative likes more than to have his picture taken or her picture taken in the local newspaper with a pair of scissors, clipping a ribbon, or turning a little bit of sod, and pretending in their own mind that they have really accomplished something—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rose): Order, please.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): I wonder, Mr. Acting Speaker, if the member would subject himself to a question at this time.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Acting Speaker, I think that I have very limited time as it is, and my presentation normally takes far more than 15 minutes, so I think we could wait until after.

Having said that the Conservatives spend inordinate amounts of time dealing with bricks-and-mortar kind of issues and monuments to themselves, we on this side of the House tend to be more concerned with dealing with social problems and the training parts of the program.

I noticed also the political considerations that went into the Core Area I and Core Area II. I noted that the first Core Area, the boundaries ended up way out in Fort Rouge, in Lloyd Axworthy's area. All of a sudden, the complexion of the federal government changed in 1984. It came time to negotiate Core Area II, and the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) could bear me out on this. All of a sudden, the boundaries headed out in St. Boniface because Leo Duguay was now the minister.

So I wondered at the time, you know, what way out in Fort Rouge had to do with core area, and then I often wondered, too, what parts of St. Boniface had to do with the core area. What we saw was, we saw a program here being diluted, because the whole idea, I thought, behind the Core Area Initiative was concentrate the money in the area where it was most needed, into the area of the core, not to satisfy the political aspirations and the political desires of either Lloyd Axworthy or the Conservatives, and making themselves feel good

by drawing the boundaries out into areas that were certainly not core area. I mean, that was a major part—[interjection] Well, the minister is talking about Eugene Kostyra.

He, himself, brought into the equation here the advantages of having a tripartite agreement, that having three levels of government sit down and negotiate an agreement was somehow going to provide the best framework. But what you see when you set up a system like that is sort of almost like a committee. You know, it was designed to make a camel, and it ended up making a horse, because the federal political operatives decided that they wanted their boundaries taken into consideration, and the provincial people decided they wanted their boundaries taken into consideration, and the same with the city. So what you had was this strange configuration of what you called the core area. I suppose that is an observation on one of the down sides.

The lone member of the Liberal Party, the vastly diminishing, quickly diminishing Liberal Party here, fails to remember when his stripe of government, the Liberal Party, was in power federally and how Lloyd Axworthy had the boundaries running halfway to the University of Manitoba. How in the world would anybody see the core area running out to almost the University of Manitoba? That, Mr. Acting Speaker, is just an observation on the political considerations of how this was set up. That is not to say that the program was not a good program, because I think on balance it was, but it could have been better.

What I see here is basic just lip service on behalf of this government. For this government to stand up and say, and basically reminisce—it was a reminiscence. It was the member who previously spoke standing up talking about his time on City Hall, how I built the city. He does not deal with how he was part of the problem at City Hall, of how the urban sprawl developed under his tutelage down there at City Hall. All the major problems of the city expanded and increased while he was personally in charge down there at City Hall. He and his cohorts, the member for Charleswood (Ms. Ernst), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce were the ones running the city into the problems that it currently has for that whole 10 years.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Now they come here before the Legislature, and they say, that is not my problem anymore. It is somebody else's problem. I did not do it. Honest, it was not me that did it.

Then, they talk about, reminisce about their time at City Hall, those grand old days, the good old days of City Hall.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those may be grand old days for the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme), but they are not grand old days for the people in the core area, the real core area. Those people in the real core area are still suffering, still have problems that have to be addressed, and this government is not addressing those problems. It is simply waiting for the federal government to get launched into its re-election campaign, and then for window dressing, we will see some sort of an announcement being made.

So I say that this is a no-action government—[interjection] I am sorry. The member for Inkster has some comments that I am trying to—

An Honourable Member: What are the boundaries?

Mr. Maloway: Well, the member is asking me to redraw the boundaries. The fact of the matter is that the federal Tories and the provincial Tories are going to decide where the boundaries are, and the Conservatives at City Hall are going to decide where they are, so, for all I know, they may go out to the Perimeter Highway. Riel now may be part of the core area, or Charleswood. The member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) being a part of this, we are going to see Charleswood included in the core area. That is the kind of Core Area Initiative the Tories are going to negotiate for Tories. It is an effort to snafu the money and pull it into their political areas, so they can make themselves look better to their people.

But does it address the fundamental problem? Does it address the problem of the needs of the real core area? No, it does not do that. What we saw was just a delusion of the monies so that the impact of the monies then was not really felt.

* (1750)

I remember driving around through the second Core and looking at some of the areas that money was put into. I saw a dentist's office and florist's office and whatnot being redeveloped and whatnot by, once again, more financial assistance to private enterprise, all the stuff that the former member for

Rossmere would rail about here over the last couple of years, about why we are giving more taxpayers' money to successful businesses. So I do not have any problem with us putting taxpayers' money into people who need it, into people where it is going to do something for them. Stay away from bricks and mortar, and building monuments and edifices to Tories so that they can be remembered, and deal with the issues with real people.

I was going to bring this issue up at the time when I saw all these grants being put into areas that I thought were not necessarily appropriate. [interjection] Well, the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) asked me to put them on the record now, and I could only go from memory here. I had a pretty good list at the time. I still remember driving around, touring what was supposed to be the core area. I found myself out in St. Boniface, and I found myself out in the west end. I found myself everywhere but the core, looking at where all this money was going. It was going into Lloyd Axworthy's area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect a whole lot from this government. The minister also talked about the kick-start effect of this program, and the idea, I believe, behind it was to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I am pleased to rise and speak on this issue as one who has, as most of the members in this House do, a great appreciation for the inner core of our city—

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Not to mention Lloyd Axworthy.

Mrs. McIntosh: Pardon me? Oh, yes, the member for Inkster has put a witty comment before the House which the microphone maybe did not pick up. Actually, there is some truth in that comment from the member for Inkster, because he mentions a name of someone who also has cared greatly about this city, irrespective of our different parties. One must acknowledge that. There has been a lot of work done by the three different parties that have been involved in Core. A lot of that work has done a great deal to enhance Winnipeg's image, not just in our own province, but in terms of attracting people from other places.

One has only to look at The Forks and its continued development. It becomes a drawing

card more and more as each season passes. The marketplace, the beautiful riverbank walkway with the stonework and the statues that are now being placed there, the fact you can go down, as many do, and rent a boat and go for a ride down the river, all of those things make use of that very special place, the meeting place.

I love the expression, Mr. Speaker, because it was that and it is becoming that again. That is because of the interest and the work of the three levels of government that care about that part of our city.

We have seen co-operation in a number of areas that enhance the inner core of our city. We have seen it in housing. We have seen it in the desire of people to spread the word about the middle part of our city. We know it is important that we do all we can to make life better for the people who live in the inner core of our city.

We have seen initiatives put in place to attempt to attract people to do business there, to live there, to prosper there, to revitalize that part of the city and to maintain the atmosphere and the ambiance that is part of old Winnipeg.

I can remember, as a child, going down to the corner of Portage and Main—my grandfather worked in the big building behind the Bank of Montreal; we always just called it the big building with the marble—walking down the sidewalk drawing my hands along the side of that building which still exists and is part of that whole inner part of the city that is beautiful and has been preserved and is now attracting people from other places who are impressed by its beauty.

The Johnston Terminal is a really good example of the kind of renovation that can be done. For those of us who were privileged to attend recently—I think the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) attended with me at a very special event in the Johnston Terminal a few weeks ago, and we were most impressed with the pools, the little pool of water outside the walkways, the restoration of the building inside. That project is really a good one. They have the hall of fame.

That whole area is alive in the summer with festivals—the Children's Festival. You have the Fiesta Italia down there. You have something going on at all times. Now that the patios are open in the summer, you have people sitting outdoors, and they are looking at the history of Winnipeg,

everything from the waterways where the native people, the aboriginals, first came straight through to the lines along the wall that indicate the flood levels, and the digging that is going on there in terms of the archeology.

I love that area and it was strange, because I think it is the way it happens with a lot of people, Mr. Speaker. I had not had a particular interest in The Forks. My life was not drawn to go to that area of town, but the first time I went, I was impressed and waited a long time to go again. Now it is a place that is frequently visited, because there is a tremendous amount going on and because it is also continuing in development.

That riverway in the wintertime, we have skated it, my husband and I, from one bridge to the other. We have walked it on the ice, we have walked in the summer and we have gone down it by canoe. All of those things, when we do them, we find that we are in companionship with other people who have chosen to do the same type of thing.

That area before was not seen to be anything but a piece of property that had buildings on it and industry. There is nothing wrong with industry, I am a firm supporter of industry, but now it has truly become a meeting place.

The Children's Museum there is another drawing card. That type of revitalization and that type of ability to maintain and restore the old buildings is the type of thing I think those who care about the downtown part of Winnipeg would like to see happen throughout the whole inner core. Unfortunately, there are still areas that need that kind of attention. That will attract family businesses. We have seen a lot of old places being restored and becoming homes for business. You see old houses turning into restaurants and developing the downstairs. There is an old building there that was a house that is now an art gallery, and it shows very well.

Those types of things, Mr. Speaker, are ones I think all members in this House care about. We do not want to see our inner core deteriorate. We know that in order for the inner core, the heart of the city, to be strong and viable, it takes the support, the interest and the caring of three levels of government. It takes, first of all, the initiative of individuals, because where individuals do not care—I am talking about individual citizens, Mrs. Jones, Mr. Smith, Mr. Brown, whoever they are, who need to take care of the little area wherein they are. That means instilling pride in them.

We keep talking about Canada's best-kept secret. There was a one-and-a-half-hour video production featuring the core area of Winnipeg which was aired on Mountain TV and CBC TV. That was the Core Area Initiative. It was \$3,000. You know, we had others—Christmas at The Forks, to go back to one of my favourite downtown places.

Those indications that there is pride and there is the desire by individual citizens to opt into that pride and to grow with it are the fundamental things that need to happen before anything else can happen. I am delighted to know there are more and more people attending the downtown portion of our city and beginning to develop that pride, to start to look at the things that are there and to believe they have worth and that they should mean something.

You have seen communities spring to life because the citizens feel that way about their place. I know, Mr. Speaker, with the current minister, his having been not just a city councillor but a deputy mayor—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable minister will have six minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House now adjourns and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 23, 1993

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Committee of Supply
Dacquay 4623

Ministerial Statements

Western Governors' Association
Filmon 4623
Doer 4624
Edwards 4625

Tabling of Reports

Supplementary Information: Labour;
Civil Service Commission
Praznik 4625

Introduction of Bills

Bill 52, Manitoba Foundation Act
Manness 4625

Bill 53, Justice for Victims of Crime
Amendment Act
Manness (for McCrae) 4626

Oral Questions

North American Free Trade Agreement
Doer; Filmon 4626

U.S.—Canada Trade Tribunal
Doer; Filmon 4627

Family Violence Court
Barrett; Manness; Filmon 4627

MLA Salaries and Benefits
Edwards; Manness 4629

Substance Abuse
Hickes; Orchard 4630

Manitoba Hydro
Ashton; Downey 4631

Child and Family Services
Carstairs; Gilleshammer 4632

Arni Thorsteinson
Martindale; Ernst 4633

Bill 47
Martindale; McIntosh;
Speaker's Ruling 4633

Mayfair Place
Hickes; Ernst 4634

Gretchen Family
Chomiak; Orchard 4634

Nonpolitical Statements

1997 Canada Summer Games
Gilleshammer 4635
L. Evans 4635
Edwards 4636

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Second Readings

Bill 47, Residential Tenancies
Amendment Act (2)
McIntosh 4637

Tabling of Message: Bill 13,
Manitoba Employee Ownership
Fund Corporation Amendment Act
Stefanson 4641

Debate on Second Readings

Bill 38, City of Winnipeg Amendment,
Municipal Amendment, Planning
Amendment and Summary
Convictions Amendment Act
Maloway 4641
Deputy Speaker's Ruling 4643
Carstairs 4643
Reid 4643
Gray 4647
Ernst 4648

Bill 39, Provincial Court Amendment Act
Barrett 4650

Bill 5, Northern Affairs Amendment Act
Cerilli 4653

Bill 32, Social Allowances Amendment Act
Wowchuk 4655
Martindale 4659

**Private Members' Business
Proposed Resolutions**

Res. 36, Renewal of Core Area Initiative	
Gray	4665
Amendment	
Ducharme	4669
Maloway	4671
McIntosh	4674