



Second Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 84 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

LIB - Liberal; ND - New Democrat; PC - Progressive Conservative

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, July 12, 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Jack Reimer (Chairman of the Committee on Law Amendments): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report on the Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as their Second Report.

Your committee met on Wednesday, July 10, 1991, at 8 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee considered:

Bill 8—The Vital Statistics Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil;

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 12—The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine;

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

MOTION

THAT the proposed subsection 12(3) be amended by striking out the words after "unless" and substituting "leave to appeal is obtained from a judge".

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 36—The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société d'aide juridique du Manitoba;

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 52—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire

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

MOTION

THAT the French version of the proposed subsection 57.2(3), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be amended by adding "au" after "visée".

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 60—The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

Motion agreed to.

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairman 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 Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I table the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditures of the Department of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs for 1991-92.

* (1005)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Judicial System All-Party Task Force

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we applauded the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) in establishing the Hughes Inquiry dealing

with the allegations that were going back and forth in the media, primarily since the staying of the charges in December of last year and the sort of politicians and other people in the criminal justice system making all kinds of accusations, so we thought the Hughes Inquiry and the appointment of former Chief Justice Hughes was an excellent choice of the minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Hughes Inquiry is not even completed yet, and we already have politicians taking shots back and forth across the bow—all types of politicians. We have two very important inquiries that are now scheduled for release very shortly, the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry and the Hughes Inquiry.

It is incumbent upon all of us, I believe, to work in a nonpartisan way to help restore the credibility of our criminal justice system in Manitoba. Yes, the Minister of Justice has unique responsibilities as the chief law enforcement officer of this province, but I think all of us who are working with our constituents in crime prevention programs and other activities also have a responsibility.

I would ask the Minister of Justice today: Would he be willing to review and look at the idea of having an all-party group to look at the recommendations of those two inquiries and to look at the idea of all of us working in a nonpartisan way to work together to restore the credibility and the integrity of the criminal justice system that we hold so dear in our democratic society?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the preservation of confidence in our system of justice for everyone, including aboriginal people in our society, is a daily preoccupation, I suggest, of my department and of me personally. The events of the last few years—the last number of years, if you go all the way back to the tragic situation involving Helen Betty Osborne—call out for the kinds of inquiries that we are undertaking. It is extremely important that those inquiries be allowed to do their work.

I have been asked, notably by the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), to inject my own opinions, my own feelings, about one issue or another in the midst of a judicial review of what has been going on, and I consider that highly inappropriate. The way that the honourable member for St. James raises issues in this House

makes an all-party nonpartisan approach to these problems somewhat more difficult.

I appreciate the honourable member's concern and his offer. I take that seriously, and at this time, I am not in the position to be able to respond to a suggestion like that. We have, as the honourable member knows, made significant arrangements in order to attempt to be prepared for the report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. A lot of work is going on, not only in my department but in other departments, that might be affected by that report.

I appreciate the honourable member's attitude, and I will keep his suggestion in mind, but I find it very hard to accept at this moment, considering the way that things have been handled by the honourable member for St. James.

Point of Order

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the minister misrepresents again what I said and what I intended. If the minister would have done his job—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for St. James does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice and I sat on the Meech Lake task force along with the Liberals and, I think, did some good work together. The minister now sits on an all-party task force with the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Carr) and the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) dealing with saving the Shilo base, so I would suggest that our experiences of working together are more positive than they are negative.

Mr. Speaker, the minister is correct. There is a senior interdepartmental committee now in place to deal with the recommendations of that report, and that is as it should be, appropriate administrative considerations. Surely we need co-ordination between all of us in an all-party way. We should not just rely on the very necessary work of people in government administration, we should also be using all of the resources in this Chamber, because all of us, I know, are deeply concerned about crime and the criminal justice system. We hear it every day from our constituents.

So again I would ask the minister, when he takes this under consideration, will he consider the positive work that has been done in other forms of

all-party task force—the Meech Lake task force that we participated in, the Shilo task force—in bringing a recommendation forward to government to have an all-party task force for our criminal justice system?

* (1010)

Mr. McCrae: I will take what the honourable member is saying as a representation. I say that in the light, for example, we just finished recently a review of my department's Estimates. I think we spent some seven or so—I do not know how many hours, but about that number of hours working on that. I worked, I think, in a very co-operative and, for the most part, nonpartisan way with the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) in my discussions on my Estimates. I cannot say the same thing about the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), and that is what is the problem with the Leader of the Opposition's proposal, the honourable member for St. James and the way he has handled himself.

I will keep in mind the spirit of the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and I will keep that in the back of my mind as I try to work through these difficult, difficult matters.

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Report Release

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I hope the emotions of the Estimates that concluded yesterday afternoon will not interfere with a very good idea for all Manitobans, because, Mr. Speaker, we all have fights across this Chamber and disagreements, but I do not think we have any disagreement about the strong public need that is crying out for restoring confidence in our criminal justice system. The public, I do not think, should or cannot tolerate just politicians and others taking shots every day on our criminal justice system. I really would urge the minister to review that again on behalf of Manitobans.

A final question. When can we expect the public release of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry report and the Hughes report? Is the Hughes report on time, and is the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry going to be reporting late July or early August as we have heard?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Certainly, with regard to the criminal justice system, what the honourable

member says is correct, and probably very, very fundamentally, when we in this country are attempting to resolve aboriginal issues, I am going to be making pleas day after day when the time comes, and it is approaching, for a nonpartisan approach to resolution of aboriginal issues. They are extremely important for aboriginal people and for our whole country. I make that plea today for a nonpartisan approach so that we can get together and work together to get some of these things working so that aboriginal people can feel that systems, especially in the justice system, are appropriate to their needs.

The honourable member has asked about timing for the two inquiries. It is our hope and expectation that I will have a copy of the report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry on or before July 31, and release to come at some point thereafter. Printing arrangements have not yet been completed. I cannot give the honourable member a definitive date about that, but certainly it is the intention to make that report public and to work together with others and work on the recommendations. With regard to the Hughes Inquiry, my indications are that the date of August 15 still stands.

Community Colleges Restructuring Costs

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, continuing on the same theme that my Leader (Mr. Doer) raised, every so often in this House members come together in a unanimous sense to do something very positive for all Manitobans. Last night was such an occasion when members of the government and the other opposition party accepted an amendment which provided that all the employees of the community colleges under the new governance system would continue under the government superannuation plan. For that we are very pleased, and I am sure all the 1,500 employees are quite pleased. We still have our differences.

My question to the minister is: Will the minister confirm last night the figures that he indicated to the committee which outlined what the government's estimates were of the cost of moving the college governance?

* (1015)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, indeed, I was pleased that we were able to proceed through second

reading on the bills that were presented to the House on Education yesterday, and there was a good level of co-operation in terms of presenting the amendments and getting through with our work.

With regard to college governance, there is going to be an additional cost, one that we have talked about before. The first-year cost of implementing board governance would be about \$960,000 and from that point on, the annualized cost is estimated to be something in the neighbourhood of \$800,000 per year.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the minister's press release, and there was no mention of those costs in it, something I had assumed.

I wonder if the minister will table in the House the government's figures and estimates of what those costs entail and what the breakdown is so that we on this side of the House can be certain as to how the matter is proceeding.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that breakdown with me this morning, but, indeed, that is the estimate that has been put together by the conversion team and by the department that has worked over a number of months to try and determine what some of these costs are. Of course, we all know that if we have a board of governors, there will be some cost. If you move to an arm's-length form of administration, there will be some costs associated with that.

In an overall sense, I have to indicate that in almost every other province in this country colleges have moved away from government to be at arm's length from government, so that they can be more flexible, they can be accountable still and they can truly represent the needs of the communities where they are situated. More importantly, they can react to training needs much more quickly that are prevalent in our society today. As we know, the training needs today are very important and society is changing so quickly that colleges do have to adjust very rapidly.

Mr. Chomlak: My final supplementary to the same minister is: I am wondering if the minister has any idea of how many instructors, how many students, how many ESL students could be taken care of in the long waiting list for ESL by that \$960,000 that the minister is spending, the million dollars the minister is spending to set up a new system when every indication is the other system was working

well. How many more students could be helped by that million dollars a year, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that one must look at when you move to a new structure is to ensure that the dollars that are being spent are being spent effectively and that the results that are achieved from that change will be ones that will help students in the long term. That we firmly believe. I believe that, by moving to college governance, our colleges will be able to provide more training for more students in this province. We will be able to provide the proper type of training so that students who graduate from our colleges will be able to maintain a high quality of work in this province and will be able to get jobs for the long term.

Substance Abuse Public Consultations

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health.

In a news release issued by this government on December 11, 1990, the Minister of Health announced a province-wide consultation process with respect to the extent of drug and alcohol abuse. They called it their attack on the war on drugs. In the June 1991 edition of *News Action*, a publication produced by the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), who chaired the task force, stated that she did not know what would be done with the findings.

Mr. Speaker, given that more than four months after the consultation process was completed the chairperson still does not know what the government is going to do with the findings, would the minister in the House today like to tell all of us including the chairperson what he intends to do with it?

* (1020)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this is one of those anomalies that honourable members in the opposition get into, because yesterday afternoon I would have been delighted to get into a full explanation of the tremendous job that the four MLAs on this side of the House, the member for Fort Garry chairing the process, did in taking a full consultation process to the people of Manitoba. Unfortunately, due to "time restraints," my honourable friends did not have the opportunity to ask a single question on the AFM on

our efforts on war on drugs, including my honourable friend the Liberal Leader who was not even there.

My honourable friend wants to know what this government will do with the consultation process—is act upon recommendations that come forward from that task force. Now, Mr. Speaker, that will build upon action already taken, for instance, with the construction, commissioning and opening of Kirkos House at St. Norbert Foundation, the first adolescent women's treatment centre for drug and alcohol abuse in the province of Manitoba and western Canada. That is part of the program.

Mr. Speaker, when we receive the advice of the consultation process by my committee on the war on drugs, which has sought advice across the length and breadth of this province, we will no doubt receive good and valuable suggestions on how to make our programs better for those people who are in need of that kind of service.

Public Consultations Report

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): We have no idea on this side of the House whether it was a wonderful dialogue that took place, whether it was a wonderful piece of work done by the members, because the minister will not table it.

Will the minister now table the report of this consultation process which he tells us is so wonderful?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I think the operative words in the preamble of my honourable friend the Liberal Leader's questions is, we have no idea as it applies to the Liberal Party of Manitoba and particularly to her when she gets into Health issues. As I have said to her before, if she would leave the analysis, the suggestions, the criticism of the health care system, to her critic who knows the system and understands its workings far better than she, we would have better suggestions emanating from the Liberal Party, which never gets reported in the press. Where they make good suggestions, as has been done by the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), we have followed them in a nonpartisan fashion, because at least he has an understanding of valuable suggestions to the system.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, the consultation paper was to have been completed by February 15, 1991. On Monday, it will be July 15, 1991.

Can the minister tell the House why he will not table it in this House, and why he will not take action instead of a make-work project for Tory backbenchers overlooked for cabinet positions?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, it is Friday, and my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party is changing her wonderful goals that she expressed to Manitobans three years ago that she was going to change the whole approach in this House. She was not going to get into personalities and character assassination as she has done lately. So much for the new policies of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my honourable friend that, when we started this consultation process, we did not know the amount of interest there would be in the public. We had 350 presentations at the hearings. In addition to that, we had 350 written replies. It is interesting to note that not one Liberal showed up at any of the hearings or made any presentation back to the—none of the caucus of the Liberal Party showed up and took even a notice.

Point of Order

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the minister would not like it to be shown on the record that people who appeared before his consultation process had to produce their party card.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable Leader of the second opposition party did not have a point of order.

* (1025)

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Minister of Health, to finish his reply.

Mr. Orchard: I would like to finish my answer, Mr. Speaker. Not one of the remaining seven Liberal elected members showed up at any of the hearings to show any interest in the process whatsoever.

Brandon General Hospital Summer Bed Closures

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question for the Minister of Health.

The Brandon General Hospital has closed 56 beds for the summer, and various Brandon doctors,

including Dr. Mel Roberts, Dr. Friedlander and Dr. Silverman, have complained publicly as well, as to the administration of the hospital, that surgery has had to be cancelled or postponed because of the lack of beds. Dr. Silverman explained to me late yesterday that on June 26 he was available to operate on a patient who was dying of cancer, but it had to be postponed because of the lack of beds.

Will the minister now follow the recommendations of the Peer Review Committee, which the minister himself established, which recommended against closures, seasonal closures, as an inefficient way of keeping costs down and was very disruptive of normal hospital activities? Will the minister now ensure that there will be sufficient hospital beds this summer at the Brandon General Hospital?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in a letter that I gave to my honourable friend, the member for Brandon East on Tuesday of last week, which was signed by the medical director and the executive director of the hospital, dealt with the issue raised by Dr. Silverman.

I can appreciate from time to time physicians raising their concerns publicly, but when a physician raises a case as Dr. Silverman did about the cancellation of a surgery to make a point in public, the individual surgeon ought to mention that the cancellation of that patient was done by the surgeon, the physician himself. Dr. Silverman was not available. He was doing other things on the day that surgery was scheduled, and it was Dr. Silverman himself who caused the delay of that surgery.

That was corrected by the medical director and the executive director, because it left the impression, as my honourable friend is trying to create, that summer bed closures which have been something that the Brandon General Hospital has done for many, many years, many, many years, Mr. Speaker, is not a new phenomenon. Surgeries will go on. That is indeed what the executive director, the medical director have indicated in that letter not only to the staff in the hospital but to the media in Brandon. So the fears allayed by cancelled surgeries complained in public by the physician that cancelled the surgery will not raise undue alarms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the Peer Review Committee, there are a number of points in there, and we are working with the administration of Brandon General Hospital to assure that we can

bring those recommendations to the better management for the patient's sake in the Brandon region.

Meeting Request

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I would tell the minister that I read that memo to Dr. Silverman, and he says categorically that he was available for operations, and he totally disputes that memo and the assertions made by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister: Will the minister meet with those concerned Brandon doctors and listen to the problems being created by government underfunding, because there are fears among the medical staff that the 56 bed closures will escalate to 98 beds, and that some of these closures may be extended to March 31, 1992? That is the fear of many of the medical staff.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, when my honourable friend quotes from the Peer Review Committee, and he says that there ought not to be summer closures, he also fails to quote the recommendation either immediately before or immediately after which says that the number of beds in the Brandon General Hospital ought to be permanently reduced—in other words, not temporarily to close but permanently closed.

Mr. Speaker, that has not been done, and until the arrangements around that issue as agreed to by doctors, nurses, administration, commission staff in the Brandon General Hospital, in the Peer Review Report, that management in summer closures, because of lowered patient volume, as stated in the letter by the executive director, by the medical director at the Brandon General Hospital, until the larger issues are come around, which I have indicated to my honourable friend we are working on with Brandon General Hospital, naturally, they are using a longstanding tradition of summer closures on excess beds when patient volumes and staff, et cetera, are on holidays.

* (1030)

Funding

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister my third question.

How much of the \$19 million that the urban hospitals were supposed to eliminate from their current collective budgets has been allocated to the Brandon General Hospital, and in view of the concerns expressed by these doctors, will the

minister now review this decision, reverse this decision, hopefully, of budget reduction, so that the services at the Brandon General Hospital will not deteriorate any further?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I reject categorically the phraseology that services at Brandon General Hospital are deteriorating. That is wrong. My honourable friend knows that. The services are improving at Brandon General Hospital, despite my honourable friend's wish that they did not.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the \$19 million, there has been no reduction as my honourable friend would allege, in the Brandon General Hospital budget. In fact, the Brandon General budget is increased, but it did not increase by the amount they would want to request for this year. The traditional decisions that have always been made, even when my honourable friend was in Treasury bench.

Mr. Speaker, the difference is this year. This year, we told the hospitals that their request added together were \$19 million above what government would fund. That has been the case every single year that budgets for hospitals have been established, including when my honourable friend sat around the cabinet table.

Bill 20 Amendments

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture introduced changes to The Animal Husbandry Act on April 15 for second reading, on April 9 in this House for first reading. His spread sheets that he provided upon request were dated March 18, 1991, so he had been planning this for some time.

I want to ask the minister why he said that he had consulted widely on these changes when he did not even raise the possibility of these changes with the Manitoba Sheep Association when they presented their brief to him on March 12, only six days before the spread sheets were dated, particularly since it is the Manitoba Sheep Association who are most affected by the changes. Why did this minister not tell them what he was planning?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we have consulted quite widely with rural Manitobans, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, have passed resolutions requesting these changes.

My staff have discussed these changes with the various associations, the sheep growers and the cattle producers over the last period of time. These resolutions have been in front of the government for the last two years, and we have decided to act at this time.

We have sent letters to the Sheep Association telling them, and staff have talked to them over the course of the last two years about what options are available to them. We have told them sheep producers have the right to shoot the dog that is attacking their sheep. It is in the act now. It will stay in the act. They also have the right to obtain private insurance available from private insurance suppliers.

Mr. Plohman: The fact remains the minister did not inform the Sheep Association only one week before he prepared those spread sheets, and his devious trail continues. I want to say this, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the minister introduced for second reading this bill, Bill 20, on April 15, why did the minister deliberately mislead the Manitoba Sheep Association—

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the honourable member for Dauphin to withdraw the remark "deliberately mislead" and then kindly rephrase his question.

Mr. Plohman: I will let him decide for himself, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Dauphin, to withdraw.

Mr. Plohman: I will withdraw it. I have withdrawn "deliberately mislead."

Mr. Speaker: I thank the honourable member for Dauphin. Rephrase your question, please.

* * *

Mr. Plohman: Why did the minister mislead the Manitoba Sheep Association by telling them on April 22, in the letter that he wrote to them, that I will be introducing changes to this act, when in fact he had already spoken in second reading on April 15, one week prior?

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, I have met with the Sheep Association probably twice a year for the last three years—the previous chairman. We have discussed the issue both formally and informally, so the Sheep Association was aware. They were

aware also of the recommendations from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities. There has been ongoing dialogue between myself, the association, my staff and other Manitobans.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister stated on July 9 in this House, just three days ago, that the Manitoba Sheep Association was in support of this bill—and it is in the Hansard—will the minister now admit that he has misled this Legislature and the Manitoba Sheep Association to achieve his own ends of destroying progressive legislation that was put in place in 1987 and putting the interests of farmers last on his priority list once again?

Mr. Findlay: We have had numerous discussions with the Sheep Association, as I have previously told the member. Our discussions are not on record, Mr. Speaker, but I am reporting to the House what the discussions have been in our committee meetings.

To say that we have put farmers last on our record, we have put in place a GRIP program, some \$43 million. We put in tripartite stabilization programs, which that member spoke against on numerous occasions. We have done it for the Sheep Association particularly, and we have helped the sheep industry. The sheep industry is growing in this province. Those members of that association have the right to private insurance in the province of Manitoba from at least six different insurance companies.

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Report Release

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I gave some answers earlier to the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). I do not want anything I said to in any way mislead the House, so I thank you for the opportunity just to add a little something to what I said earlier.

I said that I expect the report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry by July 31 of this year. I think the answer to that can best come from the judges themselves as to precisely when that report will be made available to me as the legislation calls for. We are in the process of making final arrangements for printing and so on, but I did not want to leave it on the record that it was precisely July 31. It may be give or take.

ACRE Storage Site Total

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Environment.

Mr. Speaker, some two years ago, the government set up the Association for a Clean Rural Environment, also known as ACRE, to deal with the problem of farm pesticide container disposal. ACRE is to work with municipal government to establish specially licensed containment facilities within municipal landfill sites. These facilities require special security arrangements and engineering measures to prevent leaks, et cetera. Initial estimates indicated there would be at least 130 of these special facilities in the province.

Can the Minister of Environment tell members today how many of these 130 sites have in fact received a licence to operate the collection facilities? How many applications are presently pending?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the member has correctly identified a concern that we have in terms of getting better collection sites set up across the province. There has been some considerable amount of discussion between ACRE and the municipalities in terms of co-operation and setting of standards. There are a large number of them out there that we have not licensed yet, that we are working toward licensing.

I want to indicate to the member that through the work of ACRE and co-operating with our officials, that we do now have a large number of much-improved sites. When we get the proper conditions in place at the sites, we will license the balance of them.

Storage Site Standards

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, we recently surveyed five sites in which there were containers being stored. In each and every one of those five sites, we found that the containers were not being dealt with in a proper fashion. I can indicate to the minister what those five sites were.

However, for the sake of brevity, let me just tell him that the problems included a lack of security, lack of prepared base, improper separation of containers, containers not being rinsed, containers not being shredded or crushed, containers not being burned and a tardiness generally on ACRE's part in picking up containers.

Can the minister tell the House why so little action, so little progress, has been made by ACRE to ensure that containment sites are in fact meeting standards in this province?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the problems that the member identifies were in fact multiplied several times over before the ACRE program went into place. I am sure that the next question the member will have will be related to the removal of the material. The fact is that this material is classified material, and either shipping for destruction or for re-use requires some considerable amount of regulatory work on our part and on the part of federal authorities.

Mr. Speaker, the second year's supply of containers are there, and the positive aspect of this is that the Crop Protection Institute of Canada, the producers of the pesticides, have made arrangements that in the future they will begin to take the material and recycle it back into pesticide containers.

So, in terms of environmental protection and in terms of good use of the material for its longest life, we believe that we will successfully close that loop very shortly.

* (1040)

Storage Site Fires

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that in five out of five, chosen randomly out of the 130, the standards were not being met in any way, shape or fashion. The minister has not denied that. I accept that he has not denied that.

Finally for the same minister: It has also come to our attention, I am sure the minister will be aware, that in a number of these sights, there have been fires recently. There has been a spate of problems with fires on some of these sites which of course spew potentially dangerous fumes into the air.

Mr. Speaker, can the minister give members of the House a report on this recent spate of fires at the sites that store containers with toxic residue, and, in particular, whether or not he has any answers as to who is setting them and how that is being allowed to happen at some of these very dangerous sites?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): This type of regulation of a product that is handled in this manner involves a number of co-operating agencies, and one of those groups that is going to

have to and is in fact co-operating fully with ACRE is the municipalities who are responsible for the operation of the waste disposal grounds.

We have recently moved to implement new waste disposal ground regulations, and this will lead to much more control at the various sites across the province. I would only indicate to the member that I am well aware of the fact that there are vandalisms that occur. The fact is that the percentage of materials that are burned either intentionally or accidentally these days has dramatically reduced, and the opportunity to get this material out of the waste stream is much more advanced than it was a year ago at this time.

I think that with the co-operation of ACRE and the municipalities and the regulatory authorities federally and provincially, within a year we will have all of the sites properly licensed. With the co-operation of the municipalities, we will have much improved supervision at the sites, because the fact is, Mr. Speaker, unsupervised sites very readily lead to vandalism and therefore the problem the member has identified.

St. Lazare Train Derailment Environmental Testing—Clothing

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I truly appreciated the opportunity the other day to travel to the St. Lazare emergency measures operation site, and I would like to say that the disaster cleanup operation there seems to be doing an impressive job.

The concerns I have that I would like to raise though is that there are going to be problems that go beyond just the cleanup of the materials and the spill, that the contamination has already reached an area about a kilometre wide and that the contaminants permeate clothing or other materials, and it is not going to just be a matter of residents being able to move back into the community once the spill is cleaned up.

I would like to ask the Minister of Environment if any of the clothing or other household materials from the St. Lazare community have been tested, and when will that be done?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the precise detail of that question, but the member was at the same briefing that I was at, where the health officials raised that particular concern and that this was one

of the factors that they would be looking at in terms of contamination of houses and personal belongings. It is a legitimate question, but I would expect that they have anticipated some of the problems that would be associated with that because it was raised at our briefing.

Environmental Testing—Livestock

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radlsson): Mr. Speaker, I also understand that some livestock had to be evacuated but that there still are some chickens and pets that are in the village. Have any of these animals been evacuated and tested, and when will this be done?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Measures people undertook to make sure that those animals that remained in the village were being taken care of. Those that were considered to be within a dangerous range of the spill were removed. Undoubtedly there is some difficulty in identifying whether or not there were animals that may have been overlooked, but I have been assured that EMO has taken care of any animals that they are aware of and those that were in the danger zone were evacuated to my understanding.

Community Repopulation

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radlsson): Mr. Speaker, the people who are involved in the cleanup of this area have had to wear gas masks and breathing apparatus. The animals in that area have not. I am concerned that the contamination would affect them and that in event could be passed on to people who would come in contact with them afterward. The effects on the animals could provide valuable information to the possible effects on people.

My question for the same minister is: What system has been set up to keep the residents informed so they are aware of the realities of the situation in terms of the realities of the situation when they want to move back to their community?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, all of the responsible regulatory authorities have established a working group that meets regularly. On the repopulation of the community, one of the reasons that they have indicated they want it delayed is to make sure that they have all of the information and can assure everyone that it will be physically safe to return to the area.

As the member indicates, all information that is available, including whether or not there have been effects on animal life in the area will be something that they will take into consideration. Primarily the fumes that are available are anhydrite and would attack mucous glands, that sort of material. The health officials will obviously have to make that assessment, and we are relying on our regulatory authorities to make a clear assessment before they allow the people back into the village.

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

Nonpolitical Statements

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave? Agreed.

Mrs. McIntosh: The members in this Chamber are all well aware of the excellent work done by our pages in this Chamber and have some knowledge as well of some of their accomplishments outside the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I would like today to extend congratulations to one of our pages, who is on duty today, Arlan Gates, who in addition to his extracurricular activities and duties here, has been the recipient of the Governor-General award, the St. James-Assiniboia School Award, the W. S. Scott Memorial Award, the St. James Collegiate French Award, the University of Winnipeg \$1,200 Special Entrance Scholarship, the Member of Parliament award, and other recognitions as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that our pages have high scholastic standards, and I am pleased to have this one example on the record.

* * *

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the members of the House to commemorate with us the life of Grace MacInnis who was born in Winnipeg

in 1905, died July 10 in British Columbia, one of the founders of the CCF in Regina.

In 1941 to 1945 she was a member of the provincial House of British Columbia, and from 1965 to '72 was the federal M.P. for Vancouver East, who was in fact the first woman from British Columbia to serve in a federal House. In 1974 she became an officer of the Order of Canada and received honorary degrees from many Canadian universities, including her alma mater the University of Manitoba.

As the daughter of J. S. Woodsworth, and the wife of Angus MacInnis, a long-time B.C. M.P., she was born into a life of public service, and I think from both within Legislatures and outside of them she fought continuously for the disadvantaged and the disenfranchised.

* (1050)

In recent years she suffered a great deal of pain, but she continued her interest in public life and in Manitoba. She was very supportive and very helpful to those of us in Wolseley who were creating The Woodsworth House Centre in her former childhood home on Maryland.

She was born at a time when women did not have the vote and she died at a time when women across Canada have made enormous gains, and she played a tremendous part in that.

I had the opportunity to know Grace MacInnis briefly in the early 1970s in Ottawa when she spoke for me in an earlier election. She gave great encouragement to women candidates, I think of all parties, and I hope that women in Legislatures across the country today will be paying tribute to the foundation that she laid.

Mr. Speaker, many of us knew Grace MacInnis as a great and gracious Canadian. I think that she would want to be commemorated for her lifelong struggle for social justice.

* * *

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to make a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Mr. Enns: Yesterday an historic piece of legislation was enacted in another Legislature, that of the

Soviet Union, introducing massive privatization measures to that country. I take this occasion to make the statement that many in this Chamber, indeed many Canadians, particularly those of Ukrainian descent, are only too well aware of the massive suffering and social consequences of that failed experiment in that great republic. It should be noted, and should be encouraging, indeed, to the democracies, although it took 50 to 70 years, that acknowledgement is now being made by Soviet parliamentarians. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Does the honourable member for St. Johns have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to make a nonpolitical statement to recognize another incredible achievement in my constituency, and to boast about a contribution of a group of students. On behalf of all members, I am sure, I would like to congratulate the students at Victory School in the Seven Oaks School Division who picked up the two top honours at this year's School Safety Patrol Awards, which were held recently at the R. B. Russell Vocational School.

Victory School and the students involved placed first among 11 school divisions in the city for best overall school patrol unit in Winnipeg. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, there are 230 school patrol teams in the city. We are very proud of this achievement.

Furthermore, in addition to receiving the overall school patrol award, patrol captain at Victory School, Candace Szczepanski walked away with the Louise Staples Plaque for the most outstanding patrol captain in honour of the Winnipeg teacher who founded local school patrols in 1936.

With the indulgence of the House, I would just like to commend the following individuals: Jamie Griskevich, Eastlyn Phipps, Joey LaRue, Candace Szczepanski, Andrea Coombs, Blaine Harder, Alicia Moskal, Edward Kemash, Kevin McCaughan, Curtis Latham, Guanfranco Cassano, Terrance Machalek, Genevieve Cameron, Mandy Bunyan, Kerri Simpkin, Paul Sanderson, Stephanie McCune, Vincent Vanderdoncht, Jennifer Coombs, Jennifer Boitson, Tamara Fischer, Karen Creasy, Courtney

Tinck, Mara Milian, Candace Liebrecht, Tara Wojciechowski, Robert Sokolewsky, Garr Kukura, Cory Huth, Adam Glover, Stephen Bohn, Melissa Hardie, Mary Au, Nicolé Balla, Maria Au, Tracy Pongracz, under the leadership and direction of vice-principal Murray Otter, principal Louise Evaschesen and Constable Rick Kosowan.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying, I am sure all members in this House recognize the important contribution of school safety patrol teams. They help ensure that our children and students everywhere are safe. They watch for careless drivers. They also watch for strangers in neighbourhoods and report them accordingly.

On behalf of everyone, I would like to congratulate Victory School and all the 230 school safety patrol teams in the city of Winnipeg.

Committee Changes

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): May I have leave to make committee changes?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for St. Norbert have leave? It is agreed.

Mr. Laurendeau: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose), that Industrial Relations Committee, July 12, 1991, be amended as follows: the honourable member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) for the honourable member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson).

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Turtle Mountain, that Public Utilities and Natural Resources for Friday, July 12, 1991, be amended as follows: the honourable member for Ste. Rose du Lac (Mr. Cummings) for the honourable member for Emerson (Mr. Penner).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Concordia (Mr. Doer) for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), for Thursday, July 11, 1991, at 8 p.m. This is the one that we made last night. I am sorry, but I had to read it into the record.

I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Broadway (Mr. Santos) for Swan River

(Ms. Wowchuk), Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Transcona (Mr. Reid), for Friday, July 12, 1991, at 1 p.m.

I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) for Broadway (Mr. Santos), Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), for Saturday, July 13, 1991, at 10 a.m.

I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources be amended as follows: Concordia (Mr. Doer) for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), for Friday, July 12, 1991, at 1 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, with a committee change, I move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources be amended as follows: St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) for St. James (Mr. Edwards), for Friday, July 12, at 1 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call bills in the following order: Report Stage, Bills 18 and 19, and then Debate on Second Readings, first call Bill 68 and then the bills as shown in order on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable government House leader to continue.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce some committees and give clarity to announcements I have already made.

I am pleased to announce that Bill 47, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act will not be considered by the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources today. Industrial Relations is again to consider Bill 70 today at 1 p.m. in Room 255 and tomorrow beginning at 10 a.m.; Public Utilities and Natural Resources to consider Bills 46, 48, 57 and 58; Agriculture next week to consider Bills 20 and 53.

Mr. Speaker, I will give instructions next week dealing specifically with Bills 47, 45, 64 and any other bills that may pass this morning.

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

* (1100)

REPORT STAGE

Bill 18—The Municipal Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer),

THAT Bill 18 be amended by striking out the French version of section 28, renumbered as section 29 by the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, which section amends clause 713(3)(d) and substituting the following:

Modification de l'alinéa 713(3)(d)

28 L'alinéa 713(3)(d) est modifié par substitution, à «maximal de 100\$», de «ne dépassant pas le montant que le lieutenant-gouverneur en conseil fixe par règlement:».

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable government House leader on behalf of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer),

THAT Bill 18 be amended by striking out the French version of section 28, renumbered as section 29 by the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, which section amends clause 713(3)(d) and substituting the following:

Modification de l'alinéa 713(3)(d)

28 L'alinéa 713(3)(d) est modifié par substitution, à «maximal de 100\$», de «ne dépassant pas le montant que le lieutenant-gouverneur en conseil fixe par règlement:».

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I move (on behalf of the honourable Minister of Rural Development), seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), that Bill 18, The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités, as

amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 19—The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move (on behalf of the honourable Minister of Rural Development), seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 19, The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élection des autorités locales, reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 68—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), Bill 68, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand. Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Leave? Agreed.

Bill 2—The Amusements Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), Bill 2, The Amusements Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les divertissements, standing in the name of the honourable member for Wolseley.

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

Bill 4—The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), Bill 4, The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act; Loi

modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Stand? Is there leave—

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I already adjourned this on behalf of our Health critic, the member for St. Johns.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the honourable member for Thompson.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the opportunity to put our comments on record with respect to Bill 4, The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act. I will speak briefly, because I think this is a bill that needs to be addressed in detail at committee stage, and I believe there will be some presentations being made on the part of the community with respect to several concerns pertaining to this amendment act.

I find it most interesting that we are debating The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act at the very time that this government and our Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is busy deinsuring many of our medical services.

This government has presented to us amendments on that whole area of health services insurance and tried to suggest to us that it is doing so to tighten up the system, to make our insurance system more effective, to put in place better controls, to protect a very important system. These amendments, those expressed intentions, certainly fly in the face of this government's real agenda, an agenda which is gradually becoming apparent to us with each day that passes.

With every action that is taken by this government, it is clear that this government is not interested in maintaining and preserving and enhancing our comprehensive insurance system that is founded on the principles of universality, accessibility, portability and nonprofit administration.

Mr. Speaker, in the budget introduced by this government in the House in April, the government, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) made their intentions clear—that they were prepared to start eating away at the edges of our universal health care system, our medicare program that has held us in good stead over decades, that has achieved recognition and acclaim worldwide and which, interestingly, is now being looked upon more and more as a model by one of the two industrialized

countries in our world that does not yet have universal medicare coverage.

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

The United States, as members know from news reports over and over again, is looking very seriously at the Canadian health care model, our medicare system, a system that was put in place after years of pioneering work on the part of people like Tommy Douglas and others who recognized the absolute importance of putting in place a system that was the same for all citizens regardless of their background or their region or their wealth. It is a system that rejected the notion of different access, different services and different systems depending on one's wealth and position.

We have worked hard as a country and as a province, Madam Deputy Speaker, to preserve and maintain our universal health care system. We have of late, in the last year or two, seen how that whole tradition, this national gem is in jeopardy, is in crisis, because of actions on the part of Conservative governments everywhere to dismantle, to disentangle, to displace. We are very worried about the future of medicare given the actions of our federal government, the Mulroney government in Ottawa, which has over the last number of years changed the formula, changed the funding arrangements in a very subtle, clever way to ensure that federal involvement in health care, federal financial participation, will disappear. It will disappear before we know it.

In just a few short years, unless this policy of federal Conservatives can be stopped, unless the formula, the original formula that ensured a partnership in health care can be restored, we are on a course of action that will lead to the death of medicare and the end of a system that is the same for everyone and does not depend on your ability to pay.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, we recognize the difficult situation that this has put a province like Manitoba in. It has put enormous financial pressures on the province of Manitoba and the government of Manitoba in terms of any hope or aspiration to maintain and preserve a universally accessible medicare system.

* (1110)

Rather than fight and challenge and take on the federal government in such a way as to change the

Mulroney agenda, in such a way as to reverse the devastating course of action we are on, this government has been silent, has been understanding of the federal government's agenda, has been accommodating in terms of spewing out the same rhetoric that we hear from Mulroney and his cohorts in Ottawa.

Whenever we have raised the question of insurance and medicare, the universality, our Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and others in his caucus and cabinet have pointed to the deficit, have pointed to our difficult financial times and have, by implication, suggested that our first priority will be to reduce the deficit, our first priority will be to cut programs, our first priority will be to offload wherever possible, and after all of that, we will look at what is left of our health care system.

We find that reprehensible, Madam Deputy Speaker. We believe the provincial government should be providing the leadership on this issue along with the hundreds and thousands of citizens and community groups who have expressed concern on this issue. Manitoba has a proud history and a proud record when it comes to medical insurance, when it comes to a universal health care system, when it comes to the principles underlying medicare.

We would like to see the government representing those concerns and defending those principles. Instead, we see a government that is relatively silent, inactive and, even worse, aiding and abetting the federal agenda. I think the decision and the announcement of this government to deinsure a number of medical services is a very serious one, puts us on a disastrous course of action and will actually deny Manitobans medical services. Their deinsurance plans will in fact put in place a two-tiered system requiring Manitobans to pay for certain services which, of course, Madam Deputy Speaker, we all know will mean a denial of such services to a significant number of Manitobans.

This Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has been very clever at presenting his list of items for deinsurance. He is probably, as we have noticed in the House before, a master at obfuscation. He is a supreme spin doctor. He is clever in his political strategy, and that is very apparent in this decision to deinsure medical services.

That is apparent, Madam Deputy Speaker, when you consider that, whenever this issue has been

raised, the minister has only referred to tattoo removal and coloured contact lenses. We might be able to even give some serious consideration and offer some co-operation if we were talking simply about deinsuring tattoos or tattoo removal, or deinsuring coloured contact lenses, but we have to always remember that the inclusion of those items and in fact the misrepresentation of those items, in terms of the deinsurance plans of this government, are a deliberate attempt to ignore, to avoid, to draw public attention away from some very serious medical services which this government is deinsuring.

The list includes, as we have discussed in this House before, surgery for "asymptomatic varicose veins." It includes the reversal of sterilization. It includes psychoanalysis. It includes the removal of such things as warts and nevi.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, the minister again has been clever throwing in such words as asymptomatic and cosmetic without reflecting the reality in the medical field, the dilemma and the issues facing our medical professionals. First of all, there are very few people who get their varicose veins removed just because it looks nice, because they want to look better, who do it for cosmetic reasons.

One has to wonder if this is not again another attempt on the part of this government to single out women for cutbacks and to put the brunt of this government's cutback agenda on the shoulders of women. Let us be frank, Madam Deputy Speaker, who are the primary clientele in terms of people with varicose veins and in pain and suffering because of varicose veins? They are women who have been through childbirth, and furthermore, they are women who have been working in areas that require them to be on their feet a great deal of time. This is very much a women's issue and for the minister to suggest that there are sufficient number of women out there requesting removal of varicose veins simply because they want to look nice is absolutely ridiculous.

The minister has not been forthcoming in terms of cost pertaining to this item and what it has cost our system to date. Perhaps he does not have those statistics. Perhaps—and this is most likely the case—this government has done no scientific research or medical analysis of their deinsurance plans. One could only conclude, since women do not go out and get their varicose veins removed for

the heck of it, that we are looking at small dollars. This is not a big-ticket item. In fact, we are certainly wondering how all of these procedures will add up to the \$2 million price tag that the minister has given it.

* (1120)

More importantly, Madam Deputy Speaker, given the small price tag we are talking about in this area and others, one can only question why is the government doing this. It is not for the money. Is it to make life miserable for our physicians who are put in horrible positions about making judgment calls about what is asymptomatic or not, about what is real pain or not, about what is suffering or not? Given the tendency of late of this government to get into battles with the MMA, perhaps we should not rule that out of hand, or is it a step in terms of a long-term agenda?

Is this deinsurance list an attempt to set the stage for something down the road? Is this government intent on the direction taken by the Alberta Conservative government, an attempt, I might say, that was tried and largely failed due to public pressure. The Conservative government in Alberta in 1987 was forced to reverse many of its decisions on deinsurance and to restore full coverage for a whole long list of medically required procedures.

Madam Deputy Speaker, speaking of the subtle attack on women through this deinsurance plan, let me mention this government's decision to deinsure the reversal of sterilization. I think no one will question, will quarrel with any statement that suggests that this is again directed at women. It is certainly, without question, an attack on the family, and it is again another rejection by this government of full choice in reproductive health matters.

Madam Deputy Speaker, people do not make decisions around sterilization easily. They do not make decisions around reversal of sterilization quickly or easily. Having families, having children in this day and age, given our economic situation and the financial burdens facing families, matters like these are not treated lightly or frivolously. People make very thoughtful decisions. We, on this side of the House, believe that those decisions should be respected, and that government and politicians should not be in the business of making judgment calls about what is a legitimate reversal of sterilization or not.

I would dare say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that if one was able to analyze all decisions, all requests put before Manitoba Health Services Commission about reversal of sterilization, we would see that in just about each and every case there is a real, serious, legitimate reason. I imagine we would find out that those reasons include the death of a spouse, and a decision by an individual, who had had some children and decided that it was time for sterilization in terms of their family planning. A spouse dies, and one may make the decision to have a child with a new partner and a new family situation. I would imagine we would find that their family breakup is a factor in terms of decisions being made around sterilization and reversal of sterilization.

Are we to question the motives in terms of divorce and breakup, and deny an individual who has come together with another individual, created a new family unit and made a decision to have a child, or more than one child? Why is this government in the business of making family decisions, of intervening in family planning, in questioning the judgments that women and families make when it comes to having a child or not to have a child?

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are many other circumstances that, no doubt, we would find if we analyze such a list of clients who requested reversal of sterilization. It might be that a young person, most likely a young woman, went through an almost compulsory sterilization, was to some extent forced into sterilization because of pressure from family members based on sexual activity, based on mental capability, based on juvenile activity. This government is indeed questioning the right of an individual, forced into such a situation, to change her life, to change her circumstances and request that she, too, have the right to have a child, have a family. The list could go on and on.

I simply make the point that this government has no business making those kinds of judgment calls. This government has no business when it comes to reproductive health matters. It has intervened far too often with its ideology, with its narrow view of what a family is. I think it is time for that kind of ideological, blinkered intervention in the decision making of women and in the decision making of families to stop. We have seen it.

I guess we should have understood where this was all going back in 1988 when this government—its first move when it came into office

in 1988, the first decision of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) was to deinsure therapeutic abortions at the Morgentaler Clinic. More than that, Madam Deputy Speaker, part of that decision was to deinsure the examination of the products of conception, which is absolutely essential for determining cancer of the uterus. Here we have a perfect example of where the ideology of this minister and this government, when it comes to reproductive choice matters, is clearly harming the health and lives of individuals in our province today.

We have been over and over in this House the issue of psychoanalysis and the minister's long and protracted explanations about how psychoanalysis is not now insured. He has again been a master at obfuscation—

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Do you agree with the principles in the bill? You have not addressed—

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Obviously, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am getting to a bit of a sore spot here for the Minister of Health, because this is all related to the bill. We are talking about The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act and some amendments that pertain to a much more definitive, firmer, clearer approach around the Medical Review Committee, which clearly impacts upon physicians and their practices, which clearly impacts upon some very difficult decisions that they are being forced to make because of this government's decision to deinsure a number of services.

We would hope that this government has some second thoughts about its plans to deinsure some very medically necessary services in areas where it should not be intervening because women and their families can make those decisions, and in areas where physicians and health care professionals are best able to make the judgment calls and make the decisions and, you know, Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not think many physicians are putting in frivolous claims.

* (1130)

The minister mentioned, he keeps mentioning coloured contact lenses. It was interesting. I talked to the ophthalmological association and practitioners in the field and came to realize that the minister had almost pulled one over on me, suggesting that he was only deinsuring coloured contact lenses. In fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, he is deinsuring all contact lens fittings unless, of

course, individuals have a very particular, very specific, medical condition. That has been outlined by the minister in the past, but notwithstanding all of that, he has deinsured, this government has deinsured contact lens fitting.

Now there are only, on an annual basis, 450 or so claims put in, amounting to less than \$20,000 a year. So, again, our question is: Why is the government doing this? It is not for the money. It is not for the savings. It can only be that this is part of an overall long-term plan. It is the slippery-slope phenomenon. It is the thin edge of the wedge. It is the eating away at the edges of medicare and an intention on the part of this government to move from contact lens fitting today to eye examinations tomorrow.

That is what Alberta tried. Public pressure stopped them from accomplishing eye examinations and the deinsurance of eye examinations, but it is clear that kind of agenda is actively being pursued here in the province of Manitoba. As a result of this decision, many people would be denied access to services that are necessary for their health status.

Madam Deputy Speaker, keep in mind that we are all operating from the same definition of health, at least according to the printed materials of this minister and his department. He may not be following them in spirit, but it is certainly part of the written philosophy and policy of the Department of Health. I do not know when Conservative ideology overrides that kind of philosophy of health or how that all works.

Madam Deputy Speaker, a definition of health that is pursued by this minister and believed in by all of us on this side of the House is emotional, psychological and physical. In other words, when you are looking at health status and wellness, you cannot simply look strictly at physical medical per se conditions. One has to look at emotional well being. One has to look at psychological well being as one of the members just suggested, a holistic approach to health care. That is my point. That is the kind of definition that must guide us in all of our decisions.

So when it is clear that when a minister and a government decides to deinsure reversal of sterilization, it has chosen to ignore the emotional, psychological aspects of health status. It has intervened with its ideological notions of family and reproductive health where it should not be

intervening. Madam Deputy Speaker, this bill, Bill 4, The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act, also draws to attention the lack of action and the lack of willingness of this minister and this government to bring its actions in line with legislative parameters and a legal framework.

In April of this year this minister announced, this government announced, that it was reorganizing the Department of Health and made a great deal to-do about its integration of Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Department of Health and, indeed, that integration has begun, changes in the department have been made, and more changes will be made.

We do not disagree in principle with that reorganization and with the need to integrate community-based and institutional aspects of health care. We are concerned about how real this reorganization is and if it is not just a matter of moving people around and changing boxes and drawing lines to different places. We are not sure if it is just a shell game, we are not sure if it is another attempt to try to obfuscate and bamboozle the opposition and the public in terms of getting at the dynamics and decisions that are being made in the Department of Health. However, in principle, we agree with it.

But we are also concerned that this legislation, Bill 4, does not insure that this new arrangement, that the change in the powers of the commission is reflected in the legislation, and that is important, Madam Deputy Speaker, because it is through legislation that our Manitoba Health Services Commission has certain powers.

Our legal and legislative framework now outlines responsibilities in terms of the Department of Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. There has been a fundamental shift, there has been a significant change, yet those changes and that shift is not reflected in legislation, specifically in Bill 4, the first opportunity that this government had to provide those amendments.

Now in Estimates the minister has suggested that time did not permit those kind of changes. It is certainly a question for us why time did not permit Bill 4 to reflect those changes, particularly since those changes were announced in April in the budget speech, no doubt have been in the planning stages for sometime leading up to the budget stage. Bill 4 was not introduced until, I believe, the month

of May, if I am not mistaken. There was time for this government to get its act together and ensure that all of these issues were dealt with in Bill 4 and we regret that is not the case, that we are not dealing with that very fundamental issue of reorganization and integration between Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Department of Health. Keep in mind, Madam Deputy Speaker, until such time that we have those amendments before us in another bill at some future time. The current arrangement is operating in the absence of a legal framework. It is not backed up by legislation and, to that extent, is on questionable legal footing.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are some specific concerns as well in terms of Bill 4 that we are anxious to pursue at committee stage. We appreciate the fact that there is enhancement to the Medical Review Committee. We believe it is always important to ensure that strong provisions are entrenched in legislation to protect patients against abuses of practitioners and to protect the government of Manitoba from abuses of physicians.

We would like, however, to have some questions answered during committee from our Minister of Health around confidentiality of patients' records. Some concerns have been expressed to us that the enhancement provisions of Bill 4 will actually jeopardize patient confidentiality. We are not sure of that, Madam Deputy Speaker. We have not gone out to get a legal opinion. We are wondering if the enhanced provisions will in any way, shape or form allow patients' records to get into the hands of the public and the press. It may be that a small amendment in this area might ensure protection of such confidential information being vetted in the public or in the press.

We are concerned and will be questioning the inclusion in this legislation of the word "unjustifiably" on several occasions in Bill 4. It is used in several places dealing with pattern of practice of the investigated medical practitioner and not departing unjustifiably from the average pattern of practice. There is no definition in the definition section of "unjustifiably." It causes us some concern, because it is not clear what that exactly means.

* (1140)

Let me also raise another concern, Madam Deputy Speaker, and that is the question of dealing with subrogation and what we perceive to be the allocation of rights to the Manitoba Health Services

Commission that in fact give them more powers and more benefits than a private insurance company. In all reading of this bill suggests that benefits and awards accrued to a patient after a judicial decision will be prorated and shared between the patient and the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

It seems to me that is a change, a fairly significant change from past practice. It seems to us that it puts at risk the ability and jeopardizes the ability of the patient, the client, to fully collect the award allocated by the court. We will be anxiously pursuing that particular concern in committee and hearing some explanation from the minister.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has been asking me in this debate to indicate my position on the principles of Bill 4. Madam Deputy Speaker, we support in principle Bill 4. We have some specific concerns. We will look forward to answers from the minister around those concerns. We look forward to any presentations that we may hear at committee about patients' rights and confidentiality of records. We are concerned also about the broader questions and will continue to raise them.

The notion of any deinsurance of medically required services is of grave concern to us. We are committed to preserving medicare and a system that is the same for all people, regardless of their ability to pay. I know that this will be backed up over time that this minister and this government's decision to deinsure a number of services will actually deny some important medical services to segments of our population, to individuals in our province. That is a major concern. It gets at the very heart of our national medicare system and the principles of universality, importability, incomprehensiveness and accessibility that have guided us and held us in good stead over a number of years.

While we support Bill 4 in principle, and depending on the minister's explanations in committee and during this debate, we will support the passage of Bill 4, but we will continue to raise wherever possible our vehement opposition and concern to the deinsurance plans of this government and the establishment of a two-tiered medicare system. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to.

Committee Changes

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): May I have leave to make committee changes?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable member for St. Norbert have leave to make committee changes?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Leave.

Mr. Laurendeau: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the composition for the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: the honourable member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) for the honourable member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson), for Saturday, July 13, at 10 a.m.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable member for Point Douglas have leave to make committee changes?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Leave.

Mr. George Hlckes (Point Douglas): I have a committee change that we made last night. I move, seconded by the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), for July 11, Thursday at 7 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce at this time that the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations will sit at 10 a.m., Monday, to consider further presentations on Bill 70.

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

Bill 35—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), Bill 35, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in

the name of the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Leave? Agreed.

Bill 50—The Liquor Control Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), Bill 50, The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools, standing in the name of the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand. Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. Agreed.

Bill 51—The Pharmaceutical Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), Bill 51, The Pharmaceutical Act; Loi sur les pharmacies, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Stand? Standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson. Stand? No, leave is denied.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few comments on record with respect to Bill 51, The Pharmaceutical Act, and I will try to be briefer than I was on Bill 4.

Let me say at the outset that we have looked at this legislation and will support this legislation. We have consulted with a number of individuals and organizations and believe that a thorough consultation process did take place and that the provisions of this act are supported by the Manitoba Pharmaceutical Association, as well as by the Manitoba Society of Pharmacists. In fact, we understand that this bill is the combination of many years of work.

The current act, Mr. Speaker, was passed in 1981 and by 1984, a number of serious shortcomings were apparent, particularly in the area of discipline.

As we have said on other occasions, we support efforts to tighten up provisions around discipline, around giving self-governing professional associations the right and the ability to deal with malpractice, to deal with incompetence, to deal with wrongdoing, and this bill will certainly, in our view, correct those shortcomings and we will support the changes.

* (1150)

Of particular note, something that the Pharmaceutical Association and the Society of Pharmacists have recognized to be a serious issue and is addressed by this legislation, is the right of the association to prosecute corporations holding a pharmacy licence, including nonpharmacist owners. That, Mr. Speaker, is significant, given the increasing ownership of pharmacies by large corporations, such as Safeway, Woolco and The Real Canadian Superstore, and it has been in the past extremely difficult to enforce The Pharmaceutical Act when the only persons who can be held responsible are pharmacists. This is an important development and an important provision, and we will anxiously support that provision.

Let me say in general, Mr. Speaker, that there are some remaining and outstanding concerns with respect to pharmacy and pharmacists in the province of Manitoba. As members know, we have seen over the years a significant net reduction in the number of pharmacies in the province of Manitoba, some 25 over the last two-and-a-half years.

That kind of trend line, that kind of loss of local pharmacies, of independent pharmacies, is of particular importance to members in this Legislature because, in fact, wherever we see the loss of a local and independent pharmacy, the impact of that is felt in communities within urban settings and in all of our localities throughout the province of Manitoba. In fact, the loss of a pharmacy can sometimes be the forerunner to the death of a community.

Oftentimes, Mr. Speaker, the pharmacy and the pharmacist is a central figure, a central gathering place and a critical service in terms of a community. When local and independent pharmacies are forced to close their doors, the community suffers. Perhaps the rural communities feel that more than anywhere in the province, in small towns and villages throughout Manitoba, feel that impact most acutely because their very community is at risk and at stake.

Mr. Speaker, that loss is also felt in a city like Winnipeg. In the case of my own constituency, Chapman Pharmacy has been a part of our community, is an institution, is a central gathering place in the north end and has been so for years and years and years, but that pharmacy, too, is threatened. It was threatened as a result of the federal government decision to remove the postal suboutlets and to concentrate that service in large corporate retail centres. We tried everything possible to pressure the federal government to change its mind, to recognize the absolute necessity of having active local, independent-based pharmacies in every part of our city and the province of Manitoba, but to no avail. The decision was made, and there was no changing the mind, as is so often the case with our federal Conservatives in Ottawa.

Other circumstances have impacted upon the health and future of local, independent community-based pharmacies, and if the trend line continues we are, in short order going to see the death of a significant number of additional local, independent community-based pharmacies. That will only harm the quality of life in our community and in fact, as I said earlier, threaten the very existence of some of our small towns and villages. It is an area that needs attention by our Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard); it is an area that needs some action, programs and policies. The minister is aware of those concerns, and we look forward to hearing his response to the requests made to him by the Manitoba Society of Pharmacists.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by indicating once again that as we understand Bill 51 and the provisions of The Pharmaceutical Act, we will support this bill, but look forward to an exchange, however brief it may be, at the committee stage and the consideration of any briefs or presentations that may be presented at that time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to.

Committee Change

Mr. George Hickers (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), that the composition of the Standing

Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources be amended as follows: The member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) for the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), for Friday July 12, 1991, 1 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 54—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 54, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991; Loi de 1991 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité, standing in the name of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). Stand?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

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

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. Agreed.

Bill 59—The Workers Compensation Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), Bill 59, The Workers Compensation Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail et diverses dispositions législatives, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). Stand?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

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

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. Agreed.

Bill 61—The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), Bill 61, The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Fonds de développement économique local, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Stand? Is there leave to remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. Agreed.

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand on Bill 61 to add a few comments.

The Tories have criticized the CEDF as being a pork barrel for the NDP administration. Accordingly, once in power the current government did a major review, audit of the CEDF which then still had the status of a separate Crown corporation. The report agreed that the CEDF needed reform, and we agreed that it needed reform but emphasized that the fund should not be discarded. From there, the Tories vowed to transform the CEDF from an organ of patronage into an effective business-like fund designed to give financial advisory assistance to entrepreneurs in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill, there are several points on which we ought to be wary. First, there is the issue of independence and business-minded approach of the proposed CEDF. In 1989, the Tories took CEDF from its Crown corporation status and put it in as a line in Northern Affairs Estimates. This was the first step in reducing mismanagement and political manipulation by the government.

In an effort to increase the monitoring of loans and accountability, the Tories have moved the CEDF very close to cabinet. This is acceptable only if regulations clearly spell out the criteria for determining whether or not to provide financial assistance to an applicant. Under the NDP, there were none. It is quite clear. -(interjection)- I will be nice today. I will not -(interjection)- Pardon? Larry Desjardins, a good man, except he was with the wrong party.

An Honourable Member: Provincially.

Mr. Gaudry: Provincially, right. I think it was proven also that he was with the Liberals federally -(interjection)- I do not know. They are not so sure now whether they want him back in the City Council -(interjection)- Is that right? There was a good man, too. They are all good people, all politicians.

Now the CEDF is subsumed under a government department. It is critical that clear guidelines are established. We are not interested in seeing NDP patronage replaced by Tory patronage in the CEDF.

Section 24 of Bill 61 says that such criteria may be established by the Lieutenant-Governor. We insist that these regulations be drawn up and quickly published, demonstrating that political interference will be impossible if regulations are followed.

* (1200)

Second, we are concerned that, in an effort to rein in past losses, the present government is going to make the acquisition of financial assistance under the CEDF unnecessarily difficult. Bill 61, for example, requires that the nature and amount of investment in an economic enterprise by any person other than the fund indicates that the person is committed to the economic enterprise. What exactly is the nature and amount of investment that is required, and on what basis will the CEDF decide if the economic enterprise is reasonably likely to be successful, bearing in mind that the entire role of the CEDF is to offer assistance to high-risk ventures, loans otherwise not available? We want to ensure that the stringent criteria do not seal the vaults against northern development, and it is very important for Northerners.

In short, this bill requires substantial regulation if fears of political manipulation are to be avoided, this particularly, the case with the current government, considering how close the CEDF has been pulled alongside Northern Affairs. Bill 61 can be supported if previous concerns are stated. I do not think the effectiveness of the CEDF has been undermined with Bill 61.

Much of the assessment will rest on their regulations and the record of how the Tories will administer CEDF. The last annual report suggests that the number of loans approved and the value therefore are increasing.

Two final things—first, the government is repealing Section 9(3) containing general consideration in making loans. It lists 12 points, among them, the effect of the development on the community, its effect on conservation, efforts to employ some disadvantaged persons and so on. This may be something to take issue with, and I think it should be addressed in amendments. However, if the criteria is supplied in the regulations, much of these stipulations may be considered unnecessary, vague and perhaps more likely to hamper the development. However, in terms of volume, it is a significant deletion contained in Bill 61 and it should be noted.

Also, Bill 61 permits the CEDF board to fix or vary interest rates, but it also deletes the following clause from the act which stipulates that such a resolution's interest rate may not have any retroactive effect. On this, we should object and offer an amendment to keep the old section intact.

Mr. Speaker, with these few comments, I will conclude and we will look forward to discussing in committee.

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, this matter will remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Bill 63—The Northern Affairs Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), Bill 63, The Northern Affairs Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les Affaires du Nord, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave? Agreed.

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, briefly, I would like to put comments on Bill 63, The Northern Affairs Amendment Act.

The honourable minister Downey said that this bill is intended to be a housekeeping affair on an act that has needed it for some 15 years or so. He spoke on the second reading on June 12, 1991. To date, no one from the NDP has said anything on this bill. I think it would be very important. They seem to think that they have all of northern Manitoba, and they are the only ones that support it. I beg to differ on that. Therefore, I think it is very important that they put their comments on this very important bill.

Much of the bill is concerned with taking relevant sections from the act, that is municipal act, and incorporating them in The Northern Affairs Act. An example of that is the stipulation that the municipalities and councils must not run on an annual fiscal deficit except by expressed permission of the minister. If the bill goes through, this subsection will be inserted directly into The Northern Affairs Act.

Mr. Speaker, there does not appear to be any single issue of real significance or importance. The Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities had nothing to say, and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities likewise had little comment. Nevertheless, ambivalence is not the ticket here. We should therefore make unhappy references to the bill, generally give the impression that our stand is supportive, look forward to amendments and discuss it in committee. We could make—

An Honourable Member: Conrad agrees all over.

Mr. Gaudry: Oh, I am sure the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) will support it, because he has a lot of interest in the northern—

An Honourable Member: We will let the member for Broadway speak for himself.

Mr. Gaudry: Pardon? Oh sure. He does. I do not think the honourable member is afraid to speak.

Mr. Speaker, subsection 20 of the bill repeals and amends Section 31 of the act by requiring a minister to review community boundaries within five years of incorporation. The old act requires this be done every five years. An amendment would combine the two and require the minister to conduct a review within five years and therefore at least once every five years.

Subsection 32 of the bill repeals that Section 50 (b), (g) and (i) of the act, meaning that the clerk of the community council no longer has to provide upon request tax rolls, papers referred to in the council or meeting agenda. The community members, and I think it is very important, have the right to these materials, and an amendment should and would repeal this subsection of the bill and leave the original intact.

Mr. Speaker, without further comments, I would like to conclude and say that we will support this bill with the amendments that will be brought forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, this matter will remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Bill 65—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1991

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), Bill 65, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1991; Loi de 1991 modifiant diverses

dispositions législatives, standing in the name of the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. Agreed.

Bill 69—The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), Bill 69, The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur les droits de l'Association médicale du Manitoba, standing in the name of the honourable member for St. Johns.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have a little time to put the views of our caucus, the New Democratic Party's caucus -(interjection)- I see a lot of interest across the way, and I want them to know that I will not be disappointing them. We are going to be presenting a very clear position on Bill 69. I want to indicate that my remarks are backed up by all members in our caucus, and we will express that concern by opposing this bill every step of the way.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) took some delight in the fact that he found that on an issue the NDP and the MMA were lined up together. He found that quite amusing and amazing. For someone like the Minister of Health, I guess it is quite an unusual thing or it is quite a phenomenon to have people and organizations coming together on matters of principle.

(Mr. Jack Penner, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The Minister of Health is so preoccupied with holding grudges and practising vindictive policies, because the Minister of Health, Mr. Acting Speaker, plays that kind of politics. He sees politics as a game. He sees that people cannot—he just cannot seem to understand that people from different positions, different backgrounds can come together on matters of principle.

* (1210)

I think what truly is more amusing and amazing than anything about this whole debate is the absolute acrimony, conflict and divisiveness that exists between the government of Manitoba and the Manitoba Medical Association. Historically, there

has been more of a relationship between the MMA and the Conservatives than between the MMA and any other political party.

Historically, there has been a similarity of positions on many fronts, so we have a hard time understanding why this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and this government is holding such a grudge, is being so vindictive, is getting back at the doctors for the strong position they took during their labour dispute with this government, because, Mr. Acting Speaker, there can be no other explanation for the repeal of The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Act. Well, I guess, yes, there could be another explanation, and that is just pure ideology, blinkered, blind ideology that does not recognize some very fundamental rights and freedoms in our society today.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we have talked about the fundamental rights and freedoms of free collective bargaining over the last number of days and that point, after hearing some 200 presenters at the committee stage of Bill 70, should have driven home the point to this government that free collective bargaining is a right to be upheld at all costs. It is part of our democratic society. It is basic and should not be tampered with.

Another important fundamental right, Mr. Acting Speaker, is the right of free association, and Bill 69 denies that right, the right of free association. Taken together, between Bill 69 and Bill 70, this government has chosen to exercise absolute power, authoritarian directives and has chosen to ignore well-established, entrenched and respected rights and freedoms in our society today.

(Madam Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has shouted from his seat some interesting things. He has suggested that -(interjection)- Yes, I will correct the record, Madam Deputy Speaker. He expressed himself energetically on this matter, but he is not correct. He is suggesting that Bill 69 respects and honours that long-standing tradition about free collective bargaining and free association.

In fact, our history books will tell him about the struggles and the battles to try to achieve this long-standing right of free association and the right to organize collectively and perhaps, by reading that history and understanding that history, he will come to appreciate the significance of—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have just assumed the Chair, but it is my understanding that the debate is on second reading of Bill 69, which is The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act. Is that correct?

An Honourable Member: That is correct.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I would just remind all members that their remarks should be explicitly relevant to the bill.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Madam Deputy Speaker, it is hard to address this act without addressing the history of this province and this country with respect to free collective bargaining, with respect to free association, with respect to collective organization. In fact, I was about to tell the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) a little bit of the history behind this hard-fought-for gain, this accomplishment, this achievement of the ability to collect mandatory fees from the individuals represented by that organization.

I do not know if the minister was at our debate or the hearings the other night when a number of presentations referenced this point. Just to keep my remarks short on this history, I will quote from a very good historical overview from Bill Featherstone who presented on the first evening of committee hearings on Bill 70.

There were other, he says, significant points of change in Canadian labour relations, but this brief is not intended to be exhaustive in that regard. Time nor space will permit such. One other point in the history of labour of Canada that is worthy of mention though must be shared. This occurred in 1945 and involved the lengthy and bitter strike between the UAW and Ford in Windsor, Ontario. Justice Ivan Rand was the arbitrator called in to resolve that dispute. The resulting Rand Formula from Justice Rand's decision that has been adopted by most of industry and labour relations acts provides that all employees covered by the collective agreement in force are required to pay union dues, but are not required to join the union. The employer provides a dues checkoff to the union, giving them the needed financial security with which they can participate as an equal partner in the labour process.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that historic decision, that break-through in terms of organizing workers and professionals in our society today must be respected, and it is for that reason that we will vehemently oppose Bill 69, because that bill takes

away the Rand Formula. It denies this historic decision of Judge Rand.

Even, Madam Deputy Speaker, if one does not want care about historic judgments and court decisions and hard-fought battles over the years, then surely this government would be sensitive to the wishes of the majority of an organization. The right to collect mandatory fees for the Manitoba Medical Association was put in place a number of years ago when the Honourable Larry Desjardins was Minister of Health and when an active co-operative consultative approach was in place between the MMA and the Manitoba government.

The legislation that came forward giving the MMA the right to have mandatory fee collection was as a result of a request from the doctors of this province, from the Manitoba Medical Association to have that right. Their wishes around that issue have not changed one iota.

The concerns they have still hold today. Their determination to act collectively, to represent their members as best they are able has not changed at all, yet this government has chosen on the basis of ideology and opposition generally to any kind of activity that looks like collective organization, that looks like trade union involvement, this government opposes.

Even more small-minded and petty than that is the fact that this government is obviously doing this to get back at the doctors, to get even. As the MMA itself said, this is the freedom of speech punishment bill. This is the Conservatives of Manitoba getting back at the doctors for speaking up publicly and expressing their concerns during a labour dispute with this government and that, Madam Deputy Speaker, is reprehensible.

* (1220)

We should not be playing that kind of politics in this Legislature. Legislation should be based on sound policies. It should be based on objective analysis. It should be based on community participation and collaboration. The doctors of the province of Manitoba, the Manitoba Medical Association have requested and asked that this government respect their wishes of a number of years ago that resulted in the legislation providing for the mandatory payment of MMA dues. That was done as part of an overall collaborative effort to move to work toward major changes in our health

care system, long, overdue changes that are even more urgent today.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as I have said many times in this House, we are at a critical juncture in the history of this province and in the life of medicare and a universally accessible health care system. We know changes have to be made. Health care reform has to be embarked upon in a serious way, and that will require some fundamental changes in the way in which doctors are remunerated, in the way in which services and products are tested, the way in which hospitals are evaluated, the way in which community services are supported in terms of dealing with the very costly institutional doctor-based system that we have today.

Madam Deputy Speaker, you cannot do that kind of serious work without the full co-operation of the doctors of this province and the association that represents those doctors, the Manitoba Medical Association. This minister and this government has just thrown a serious wrench into the ability of this government to move on health care reform.

This government has spent thousands, if not millions of dollars, on studies pertaining to changes to our health care system. That money will be wasted and time will be lost because this government is caught up in an absolutely vicious, vindictive campaign to get the doctors of the province of Manitoba.

It is not only Bill 69, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is also their deinsurance plans, all of which have been opposed by the MMA on medical grounds. On both Bill 69 and the deinsurance plans of this government, there was no consultation, there was no partnership, as the Minister of Health likes to talk about so often. As has been told by the MMA to the media, to myself and to others that so-called consultation was tacking on at the end of a meeting these two agenda items and walking out the door on the MMA. That was the approach of our Minister of Health. At the conclusion of a meeting, he says, by the way, we are going to repeal the MMA fees act, and we are going to deinsure all this, and give us your comments, but we are doing it anyway.

Well, I do not know since when anyone could describe that as consultation or collaboration or partnership. In fact it is the antithesis, it is the opposite of any kind of meaningful consultation and co-operative spirit.

So the gap has widened between the doctors of this province and the government of this province, and that spells disaster for the future of our health care system. Unless all sides are working constructively and collectively on these very serious issues, there is no way in the world that we are going to be able to get major changes to our health care system under this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and this government, because it is going to take some give and take. It is going to take a considerable amount of give on the part of physicians, and it is going to take a considerable amount of creative strategizing, good public relations and co-operative spirit on the part of the Province of Manitoba. We have seen nothing but vindictiveness and divisiveness on the part of this government.

I guess it was best put by one of the most recent press articles around the deinsurance issue with the headline that says: Orchard sneers at MMA hand wringing. That is precisely what he did, Madam Deputy Speaker, in this House. The MMA expressed serious concern about the health and well being of people in this province as a result of the deinsurance plans of this government, and indicated that from their perspective as professionals and with their background in medicine, they had very serious concerns about these plans and the resulting exclusion from medical services for many people in our society today. Yet the Minister of Health chose to take their words and mock those words and mock that concern and ridicule the MMA and the doctors of the province of Manitoba. That is destructive, that is irresponsible and that is reprehensible.

I guess it should come as no surprise that we have Bill 69 before us. The thought of any kind of collective organization or trade union development is seen as reprehensible by this government, particularly the Minister of Health. This kind of massive censorship that we see through Bill 69 is not unlike the kind of censorship we have seen on many other fronts, in many other ways by this government. Its dead-even approach with respect to Child and Family Agencies is clear. Its attack on child care workers who spoke out very strongly against this government is clear. The ferocious unforgiving attack on the public employees of this province is clear and without question simply because they chose to speak up and express their concerns.

This government is not a forgiving government; it is not in any way a co-operative government, and Bill 69 represents all of that. It shows in very clear and certain terms that this government is out to get even, to get back, not to build bridges, not to make partnerships, not to work collaboratively, not to respect the wishes of an association, but to be as vindictive and mean-spirited and nasty as possible.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of principle for us, the right of organizations to use the Rand Formula that was won through our court systems many, many years ago. The right of organizations to present the wishes of a majority of that particular association is one that we respect. It is one that formed the basis for this mandatory fee collection for the MMA back some five years ago. Their opinions have not changed, their wishes have not changed. We believe that this government should not interfere with that right of collective action, of free association, should respect those wishes, should scrap Bill 69 and get on with the more fundamental and urgent serious work with respect to health care reform today. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to speak at this time, but I believe the member across the way wants to make a committee change, so I will give him leave if he requires to make them at this time.

Mr. Speaker: We will make a committee change at this time and then we will recognize the honourable member for Inkster for Bill 69.

Committee Changes

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): I move, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the composition for the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) for the honourable member for River

East (Mrs. Mitchelson); the honourable member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) for the honourable member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) for July 15, 10 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I stand to speak to this bill this afternoon, even though I did not quite anticipate it. The MMA has done a lot of good work for a great number of Manitobans, I would argue all. In fact, our caucus, as I am sure all three caucuses have received presentations, have heard many of the different concerns that the MMA and the representatives of MMA have to say about our health care system, and they do have a vision in terms of what direction we should be heading in the whole health care field.

It is a responsibility that we should all take very seriously and listen to what the MMA is actually saying. The bill does surprise me somewhat, coming from the government, and one must ask the question, why. We have seen in the past where the MMA has been a very apolitical organization with maybe possibly the one exception which, I must say, from the onset I was surprised to see the NDP critic in a press conference with MMA representatives. I think many of the members of the MMA were also equally surprised to see that had in fact taken place. I would hope that there was not any deception given to MMA in terms of what was going on. I know our critic and the minister were somewhat surprised by it.

We feel it is important that we recognize—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Inkster will have 38 minutes remaining.

The hour being 12:30, this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, July 12, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Law Amendments
Reimer 4565

Committee of Supply
Dacquay 4565

Tabling of Reports

Departmental Estimates:
Co-operative, Consumer and
Corporate Affairs
McIntosh 4565

Oral Questions

Judicial System
Doer; McCrae 4565

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry
Doer; McCrae 4567

Community Colleges
Chomiak; Derkach 4567

Substance Abuse
Carstairs; Orchard 4568

Brandon General Hospital
L. Evans; Orchard 4569

Bill 20
Plohman; Findlay 4571

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry
McCrae 4572

ACRE
Edwards; Cummings 4572

St. Lazare Train Derailment
Cerilli; Cummings 4573

Nonpolitical Statements

Arlan Gates, Award Winner
McIntosh 4574

Death of Grace MacInnis,
a CCF Founder, Regina
Friesen 4575

Russian Privatization Measures
Enns 4575

Victory School, Safety Patrol Awards
Wasylycia-Leis 4575

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Report Stage

Bill 18, Municipal Amendment Act 4577

Bill 19, Local Authorities Election
Amendment Act 4577

Debate on Second Readings

Bill 4, Health Services Insurance
Amendment Act
Wasylycia-Leis 4578

Bill 51, Pharmaceutical Act
Wasylycia-Leis 4584

Bill 61, Communities Economic
Development Fund Amendment Act
Gaudry 4586

Bill 63, Northern Affairs Amendment Act
Gaudry 4587

Bill 69, Manitoba Medical Association
Fees Repeal Act
Wasylycia-Leis 4588
Lamoureux 4591