



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

42 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XLII No. 93 - 10 a.m., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1993

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 30, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member (Mr. Ashton). It complies with the privileges and the practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? [agreed]

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth that:

WHEREAS there is a very serious solvent abuse problem in northern Manitoba; and

WHEREAS according to the RCMP over 100 crimes in Thompson alone in 1992 were linked to solvent abuse; and

WHEREAS there are no facilities to deal with solvent abuse victims in northern Manitoba; and

WHEREAS for over three years, the provincial government failed to proclaim the private member's anti-sniff bill passed by the Legislature and is now proposing to criminalize minors buying solvents even though there are no treatment facilities in northern Manitoba; and

WHEREAS for nine years, the 25 Chiefs who comprise the Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak, supported by medical officials, police and the area Member of Parliament, have proposed a pilot treatment project known as the Native Youth Medicine Lodge; and

WHEREAS successive federal Ministers of Health have failed to respond to this issue with a commitment; and

WHEREAS the Manitoba provincial government has a responsibility to ensure that there is adequate treatment for solvent abuse.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba may be pleased to request the Premier to consider making as a major priority, the establishment of a solvent abuse treatment facility in northern Manitoba.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I have the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for 1993-94 for Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, for Manitoba Status of Women and for Community Support Programs.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to file Supplementary Information for Department of Government Services for '93-94.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to revert to Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees? [agreed]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Edward Helwer (Acting Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections presents the following as its Second Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, June 22 at 7 p.m. in Room 255 and Tuesday, June 29, 1993, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to hear public representation on The Freedom of Information Act.

At the June 29, 1993, 2:30 p.m. meeting, your committee elected Mr. Penner as Chairperson.

Your committee heard representation as follows:

Rod Lauder - Private Citizen

Sherry Wiebe - Liberal Research Office

Russell Wychreschuk - Private Citizen

Eric Marshall and Rick Walker - Manitoba Library Association

Gordon D. Gillespie - Private Citizen

Michael Nickerson - Private Citizen

Written Submissions:

Ken Rubin - Private Citizen

Dave Taylor - Concerned Citizens of Manitoba Inc.

Bill McGaffin and Vic Fron - Private Citizens

Gordon Earle - Ombudsman of Manitoba

Your committee reports that it has concluded the public hearing process for the review of The Freedom of Information Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

Motion agreed to.

* (1005)

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this morning from the Royal School twenty-two Grade 5 students under the direction of Mrs. James. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Assiniboine River Diversion Environmental Review

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

For the last three years, we have been asking the Deputy Premier and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) questions about the lack of data on the Assiniboine River diversion. We asked in the Premier's Estimates as late as '92: Can we have a basin-wide review and have all the factors included in the study? The Premier at that point said very clearly in Hansard: Well, we have all the information necessary to make the decision on the Assiniboine River.

We further asked on April 29 to postpone the hearings, Mr. Speaker, because not enough data was available. Again, the government said, oh, they are ready to go. We asked again on May 21, 1993. We quoted the Shellmouth Dam report, which stated that it is difficult for water managers to make informed operating decisions or to develop rational water management plans because there is not enough factual data on the overall water usage

on the diversion. The federal government said the same thing just recently in a report. The City of Winnipeg said the same thing.

I would like to ask the Deputy Premier: Given that a former Conservative cabinet minister says that the project will go ahead because of the political will in the cabinet and with the federal Conservative government, what action will this government take to ensure that finally the information will be proper and adequate and be basin wide so that the decisions made can be fair and thorough in terms of this major project?

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition talks about former ministers, I want to remind the people of Manitoba and this House that he sat with a government as a former minister who developed one of Manitoba's largest projects on the Nelson River without consideration for the environment, not even the least bit of an environmental hearing from the province, an impact on many communities that we are now paying millions of dollars for the damages that were, in fact, incurred by decisions made. By the way, that was when he was looking, I guess, for a political party to run with. That is really what the timing was.

Mr. Speaker, as far as our Premier's comments, let me refer to what he said in Hansard on May 21, and I will read it for the member so that he knows. This is the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of the province speaking very straightforwardly: "If there is not sufficient data, then the Clean Environment Commission will make that judgment as to whether or not they have sufficient data upon which to make a decision.

"That is the way the process is. That is the way that it was put forward in the legislation that was passed by the New Democratic government, and we are following the process."

That is what the process is, something that he never understood as a member who went ahead boldly, trampled over the rights of the people of this province as a New Democratic government.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I guess I should not expect an answer from the Deputy Premier about government matters. He cannot answer any questions dealing with his own specific department.

I asked him what action would they take to ensure that the information is basin wide and thorough. The Deputy Premier did not answer that question today, and obviously they do not have a strategy to deal with that issue.

I want to ask—I know they are touchy over there. Just relax. The warm and cuddly Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) perhaps could keep his comments till we ask some Health questions later on in Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the Pembina diversion project have predicted that the population in the area will grow from 39,000 to 109,000 people by the year 2040. Manitoba Bureau of Statistics has predicted that the population over the next 25 years for the same area will grow 4,800 people.

How will the government ensure that we are dealing in this project, in terms of the economic side of this project, with accurate demographic statistics and projections and not figures that are wildly inaccurate in terms of the projections for population in that area?

*(1010)

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, let me just at the outset try to muster all the rationale I can to try to respond to the Leader of the Opposition. First of all, the member stands up and he wants growth, and now he is standing up saying he does not want growth.

Next, he is asking this Legislature to answer questions that there is a process in place under the Clean Environment legislation that is being handled. Thirdly, one has to really look at the sincerity of the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

I am not sure whether it took place under the former Conservative government or under the New Democratic government, but this is not the first diversion that is being talked about. There is a La Salle diversion, that we did not hear a thing about from the New Democrats. In fact, I may remember correctly, I think they were in government when it in fact took place, and I do not remember whether there was an environmental hearing or process involved at all.

So here we have the Leader of the Opposition playing politics, rather than leaving the process that has been established by legislation to handle the kinds of answers that he is looking for from this Legislature.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, again, when we consider the fact that Ed Connery has said today, from a perspective of straight politics, great support from the Conservative Party in the Pembina Valley, and also from Charlie Mayer—so that is why we are trying to ask questions from the Deputy Premier about how we are going to deal with this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier did not answer that question. You have one department of government saying that the population will grow by 4,800. You have another proponent, through the Department of Natural Resources, saying it is going to grow wildly more than that. I just ask the Deputy Premier: How are you going to resolve that?

Another question, Mr. Speaker, a question we have raised before in this House. The upper Assiniboine has an entitlement for the province of Saskatchewan of 50 percent water flow. Saskatchewan is now only using 10 percent of that water flow that they have allocated. On our side, we are also entitled to the 50 percent water flow and we are using, right now at this point, 75 percent of that water flow allocation.

A question we have asked before and I think is appropriate now: How will the government determine the proper water flow impacts, and will they consider the worst-case scenario with the province of Saskatchewan using their full allocation of 50 percent of the upper Assiniboine River in their calculations on this project?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, there is a process in place to answer the questions to which the member refers, but let me respond to the earlier preamble and question which was how we were going to square with different departments of our government.

There is a process in place which all the information from government departments—unlike the New Democratic Party, when he has the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) and her group strongly opposed to the development of Conawapa, he has his former member who quit on him from Churchill, the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) strongly supporting Conawapa.

How is he going to square with the public where he stands on the development of hydro in northern Manitoba? On one hand, he wants to be with the environmental groups. On the other hand, he

wants to be with the environmentalists. He cannot have it both ways.

* (1015)

Home Care Program Housekeeping Services

Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, when I arrived this morning at the office I had a letter on my desk. This letter was not from the NDP. It was not from the media. It was not from everyone else that the Minister of Health views as opposed to his plan. It was from someone who is an occupational therapist.

This person said the government's decision to take away the equipment supplies from people and to take away the Home Care support program will be the difference, quote, between time and discharge home and ability to remain independent in the community for thousands of Manitobans.

This is from an occupational therapist who works in the field.

My question for the minister is: How could he make such a decision, which goes totally contrary to his own health care reform, that could result in people staying in hospitals longer or going sooner to nursing home beds?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, no doubt my honourable friend will share that letter and we can provide the information to the writer, because I am quite sure that we can answer the concerns that my honourable friend is stating are part of that letter.

Mr. Speaker, let me just correct my honourable friend slightly when he is talking about and alleging that the Continuing Care program is being cancelled, as he would leave the impression in his preamble.

The Continuing Care program has increased in budget from the defeated budget of the NDP in 1988, increased in the reintroduced budget in 1988 from a figure of \$34 million in 1988 to \$68 million today. Inclusive in that program have been successive years of increase in more intensive medically required services in the Continuing Care program to maintain independent living of seniors in their homes and in their apartments for far longer period of times than ever before in the history of the Continuing Care program, Sir, because of a doubling of the expenditures in the Continuing Care

program, not its cancellation and discontinuation as my honourable friend the New Democrat—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, how can this minister stand here and say the program is being expanded when he has closed hundreds and hundreds of hospital beds? The minister has laid off hundreds of health care workers, and now he has taken away the supports that are provided in the community to help keep the people in the community and out of those hospital beds.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, you know, my honourable friend simply does not provide accurate information when my honourable friend says we are taking away services in the Continuing Care program.

Let me indicate to my honourable friend, the increase in home care services in 1992 over 1991. It was, Sir, in home care attendant services, up by 7.2 percent. In registered nursing, 1992 over 1991, it was up by 15.5 percent. Licensed practical nurses increased by 20.7 percent, 1992 over 1991. Victorian Order of Nurses services was up by 4.7 percent, 1992 over 1991.

This year, we expect home care attendant services to increase by 11 percent, registered nursing by 9.5 percent, VON by 3.6 percent—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, of course the minister forgot to say if you need crutches and wheelchairs and if you need home care equipment, you have to pay. If you need those services in your home, you have to pay.

My final supplementary to the minister: The minister is now charging people for those homemaking services. People will now have to go out and hire these services. We phoned the We Care service, and they said they will do it at \$10.75 per hour, minimum two hours. It is going to cost someone \$22.50, some on fixed or low income, to receive the same service that was provided before.

What is the minister's solution to that?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, obviously, if the cost is that high from a provider, that provider does not have to be hired, does it? Is that not the case?

Now, Mr. Speaker, for my honourable friend, the solution is in the program, and I reiterate this for my honourable friends the New Democrats who want to attempt to rewrite history. In 1985, New

Democrats in government, under Howard Pawley as Premier, Larry Desjardins as Minister of Health, created Support Services to Seniors Program, the purpose of which was to provide in the community housekeeping services, meal preparation services, laundry services at a cost to the consumer so that the Home Care Program on behalf of taxpayers would no longer provide them.

That alternative was created by the NDP, was advanced by the NDP and is being continued by this government because it makes sense, because, Sir, it allows us to make that investment into more medical needs provided in the home, as has been done up to 20 percent—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1020)

Child Protection Centre Budget

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): We have had read to us this morning a copy of a letter which was hand-delivered to the Minister of Family Services by Dr. Charlie Ferguson from the Child Protection Centre, a world-renowned specialist in child abuse and well respected throughout our community.

Mr. Speaker, that letter indicates its Child Protection Centre clawback and reads that the potential human cost and long-term dangers are such that the very survival of the centre is at stake. The letter goes on to indicate: The way I see it we were relieved of \$417,000 of our surplus funds virtually overnight by the Treasury Board.

It goes on to say that this was in spite of agreements and commitments that they had for its partial use, mainly in training projects for native workers and health nurses. It goes on to conclude that Dr. Ferguson interprets these swift and serious incursions on our staffing as a significant vote of nonconfidence in our unit, now accomplished and complete, that it has been an extremely disillusioning experience, and that with all due respect, Dr. Ferguson indicates that the continuance of his association with the centre must now come under close review.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister: Why is this government totally unable to do anything in our health care, in our child protection system, but alienate the best and the brightest and those who are contributing the most to our system?

Dr. Ferguson is a world-renowned expert whom we have to be proud of, and this minister is alienating him and everyone in the system. Why can he not retain these people for the good of our people in this province?

Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family Services): We have brought a variety of reforms to the child welfare system that the system has been crying out for for a number of years. We have put in the Child Advocate. We have put in a Quality Assurance Program. We have implemented the high-risk indicators.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that we are working with the Child Protection Centre over some budget issues. We met with the administration and staff there last week to discuss budget. Our commitment is to maintain our budgeted amount for the Child Protection Centre. There are some issues regarding the surplus from previous years. We are working with the centre and we will fulfill our commitment to them.

Mr. Edwards: I will choose my words carefully. This minister has been dishonest to the best and the brightest people working in our system in this province, and the result is, Mr. Speaker, that we will lose their services and we are going to lose them again and again and again.

My question for the minister: Two weeks ago he told me in this House that, we are working on many fronts to improve the abilities of child welfare agencies.

How does this improve the ability of the Child Protection Centre to deal with child abuse in this province, which this government has waxed eloquent on time and time again, and this is the result of their actions?

Mr. Gillieshammer: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that we have worked on a number of fronts. We have brought in an information system that the child welfare system has for many years been crying out for, at a cost of millions of dollars to government. We have put in place a Child Advocate that was first brought forward in the early 1980s.

We have made other important changes. We also have a Native Affairs task force working on them.

We do have some funding issues with the Child Protection Centre. We have indicated that there are some discussions going on about the level of the surplus they have. Our commitment to the

Child Protection Centre is in our budget, and we will live up to that commitment.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars the government is spending on American experts to tell us how to run the system, and they cannot afford to allow a surplus to cover a \$120,000 deficit which that centre had been told would be covered out of their surplus funds. They have dealt, in Dr. Ferguson's words, with a heavy hand.

My final question for the minister: What is he going to do now to deal with the loss of this world-renowned expert to our community? How is he going to give any confidence to the people of this province, the people working in this sector that he can adequately deal with child abuse in our province, which is an extremely serious problem? He has acknowledged that. What is he going to do?

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party has not listened to the answer. I have indicated that we have been in discussions with the Child Protection Centre over the surpluses that they have had over the last few years. There are some discussions about the level of that surplus. We have made a budget commitment that we will live up to.

* (1025)

Home Care Program Housekeeping Services

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): The Minister of Health has cleverly tried to disguise his elimination of the home support program under Home Care. He has tried to do that by suggesting that this will only reduce access to Home Care support services for those who do not require medical services or who do not have physical or mental ailments. He has conveniently left out the fact that you cannot get into the Home Care Program unless you have a physical or mental ailment.

I want to ask the Minister of Health if this will mean, as one of his own advisers has suggested, one of the members of the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy and Evaluation, Evelyn Shapiro, who suggests that in fact, and I quote for the Minister of Health, since we have to be very careful about using other people's information: that it probably means that physically or mentally impaired or frail elderly who clearly have a physical or mental ailment such as arthritis or dementia will only get

support services if they need a medical service. Otherwise, they will have to buy support services from private providers, and this will not only affect the elderly and their caregivers, many will struggle by themselves or pay money they cannot afford for services they were getting and should be getting.

I want to ask the Minister of Health if this will be the impact of his cutback of the home support services.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, no, it will not be. Nor was it when the NDP and my honourable friend the questioner sat around the cabinet table and approved a program called Support Services to Seniors in 1985 that would establish those housekeeping, those laundry and those meal preparation services for seniors, for seniors to pay for them and not receive them free of charge as part of the Home Care Program.

That was a policy my honourable friend thought was good for seniors in 1985 when my honourable friend sat around the cabinet table approving that policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the ability to access the Continuing Care program is the same today as it was in 1985, and the circumstances my honourable friend lays out about denial of service will not exist today, nor did it exist in 1985 when the NDP brought in this change in policy and approach and program. The assessment will be made professionally. The individuals referenced to by my honourable friend, should they have those needs, will receive those services.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed in the approach of Support Services to Seniors, the 1985 policy of the New Democrats, except now they are in opposition and they want to manipulate the decisions they made in 1985. That is the only thing that has changed.

In the meantime, Sir, since we came to government, the budget has increased by 100 percent. It has doubled in Home Care from \$34 million in the defeated NDP budget of 1988 to \$68 million today, hardly the cutback my honourable friend continually harps on.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, the minister continues to put misleading information on the record. I would like to table a letter that went to the minister's department in 1989 from McBeth House indicating quite clearly that the home maintenance program was undertaken as a supplementary

program for Home Care, and the minister knows that.

Let me ask the minister if he will follow the advice of a reputable organization, the Manitoba Association on Gerontology who indicated some time ago that housecleaning is a basic service and necessary to maintain a clean and safe environment.

Will he do as they recommend and provide these services and ensure that all clients are professionally assessed and the services are used judiciously based on those assessments?

* (1030)

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is correct. The Support Services to Seniors Program that she was part of at the cabinet table to pass, to bring into reality in 1985, was to supplement the Home Care Program. What my honourable friend also should have said was that the seniors who were being so supplemented would pay for it.

Will my honourable friend have the honesty to say that to the people of Manitoba today because—[interjection] Oh, my honourable friend the New Democrat Leader (Mr. Doer), Mr. Slick, says, oh, this, that and the other. My honourable friend—

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would remind the honourable Minister of Health that we refer to all honourable members as honourable members. He is the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The honourable Minister of Health, to withdraw that remark.

* * *

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for calling the Leader of the Opposition Mr. Slick.

I want to indicate to my honourable friend that my area, the constituency of Pembina that I represented in 1985, was one of the first constituencies to start Support Services to Seniors, and it was through that process that a number of seniors in my constituency in 1986 and 1987 had their homecleaning, the household cleaning service, removed from them that was paid for by Home Care, and they were referred over to pay for the service as provided by the Support Services to Seniors Program, exactly in compliance with the

policy that my honourable friend the New Democrat sat in cabinet and approved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1986, '87, '88, I could have raised that as a cutback, but I agree with it because even then the New Democrats reinvested those dollars into more intensive care for seniors to live independently, just as we are doing today, Sir.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, let it be clear. This is a fundamental shift in policy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have been extremely lenient with the honourable member for St. Johns. Now would you put your question.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: I would like to now direct my final question to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women since almost 70 percent of home care clients are women and since women still maintain major responsibility for caring for their elderly family members and who will now have to pick up the pieces from this government's cutbacks.

I would like to ask the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) if she will step in, review this matter and try to stop this grave injustice against the women of Manitoba.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I want to try and provide some fact to my honourable friend the member for St. Johns. My honourable friend is not being very honest with those Manitobans to whom she is communicating, because those very same women that my honourable friend advocates for in her question today have been able to access in 1992, for instance, 7.2 percent more home care attendant services, 11 percent more this year.

In terms of registered nursing, in 1992 they were able to access 15.5 percent more services from registered nurses. This year it will be 9.5 percent more services to those very same women on Continuing Care Programs. In 1992 they were able to access 20 percent more LPN services in the Home Care Program. In 1992 they were able to access 4.7 percent more services from VON. This year the increase will be 3.6 percent—more services to those very people my honourable friend advocates for, rather than less.

Free Trade Agreement Impact on Agricultural Industry

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, each day we see further evidence that the Free Trade Agreement which this government

supports is not working, as the Americans put up block after block against our Canadian farmers. Hog producers are losing. Last week we saw an attack on our wheat sales to Mexico, and now our sugar beet industry is at risk.

I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he will admit finally that the Free Trade Agreement that he supports is failing farmers and what steps he is taking to assure farmers and workers in Manitoba that the sugar beet industry will survive this attack by the American government.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the member does not do her homework on agriculture and where Manitoba exports to.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Swan River has put her question. The honourable Minister of Agriculture will respond.

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, I want the member to listen very carefully. In 1988, 14 percent of our global exports went to the United States. It is now over 33 percent. It has more than doubled to that market. So that market is very important to us. It is very important that trade disputes that come up between us and the Americans on whatever issue, whether it is barley, whether it is pork, whether it is wheat, whether it is durum, whether it is sugar, that we use the due process of the Free Trade Agreement.

Before the Free Trade Agreement was in place, we had no way to argue disputes. Now we have. In the hog industry, we won the first four disputes that were brought before that panel. We lost the fifth one.

On the sugar industry, it is a very serious issue. I want the member to know that the U.S. exports more sugar to us than we export to them. It is an issue we have to make very clear to them, that if they do action against us we have an opportunity to retaliate that would hurt them more than they can hurt us, but that is not productive for either the Americans or the Canadians and particularly for western Canada.

We will continue to use the trade channels and the Ministers of Agriculture channel to put our point of view across that fair trade across that border is important, and over 90 percent of what we trade across that border is handled in a fair trade relationship.

Ms. Wowchuk: The minister is talking about how much our trade has increased, but he is saying nothing about what has increased of the American products into Canada.

I want to ask him if he is going to continue to support the Free Trade Agreement. When is he going to stand up for Manitoba farmers? Has he communicated—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put her question. One question at a time.

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, I can tell that member we have communicated to the federal government exactly what I have just said, verbally, by letter to at least two different ministers.

At a Ministers of Agriculture meeting next week it will be a major issue on the agenda. We stand up for Manitoba farmers continually, rather than trying to prevent us from accessing the best market in the world like that member would like to do.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, will the minister admit that the policies he is supporting are failing? Moving toward a contract system that the Wheat Board has been forced to move toward is only going to hurt Canadian farmers, and the barley producers in this province are going to lose by moving to a continental market. He has done nothing to support Manitoba farmers.

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, I am just surprised that member would put that comment on the record, saying that the Wheat Board is forced to move to contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the Wheat Board voluntarily introduced contracts in the mid-1980s for barley, and for the last two years they have had six contract series for barley. The Wheat Board did that voluntarily, because they know that if they are going to sell a product they have to know what they have in the system that they can have access to sell. They have done that for farmers on a continuous basis. More and more, they have done it in several varieties of wheat also as they access this market.

That is the way the industry has gone, and farmers like the choice of being able to do that. I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that farmers want the choice and they support the process. This started in 1985. The member is totally wrong in her statement this morning.

Assiniboine River Diversion Environmental Review

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment.

Mr. Speaker, the Clean Environment Commission has now been forced to recognize the fact that there has never been a full-basin study of the Assiniboine River—[interjection] The same thing I am saying now.

Mr. Speaker, back when this government was content to sell us down the river on Rafferty-Alameda, and again today, what the province needs, what the people who live in this province in that water basin need is to know what the consequences of drawing water from that river will bring.

Will the minister make a commitment today to doing a full-basin review of that waterway, given that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) is not sure whether or not this province—

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

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, what I find so disturbing about questions from the Leader of the Second Opposition is that this is the gentleman who questioned the very veracity of the Clean Environment Commission. Now that the Clean Environment Commission has demonstrated its independence and it is prepared to seek answers to all questions that they believe are relevant, all of a sudden now he wants to tell them how they should do their work.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is tell the minister how to do his job. What is also disturbing about this decision is why it took so long to make this decision.

My question for the minister: Is he prepared to do a full-basin review of this waterway? Is he prepared to do that, given that we have now had two major projects come forward which have shown that we simply do not know, the minister certainly does not know, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) does not know, the people involved do not know what the consequences of drawing—

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

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, he totally ignores the fact that we have said continually that this process will be clean, unfettered, and the commission will be able to determine any facts that they consider relevant to making a decision.

If he now wants to interfere in that process, let him stand up and say so.

* (1040)

Mr. Edwards: What the minister fails to recognize is that the Clean Environment Commission said it was the government itself that did not come forward with sufficient information. It was the Department of Natural Resources itself that did not have the facts before it, despite the fact the minister stands up and tells us how this is going to be so wonderful.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister: When is he, when is this government going to recognize that it is important to think first and act second, and do a full-basin review of the Assiniboine River, so that we know, and the people who are drawing water from that river and want to draw more water, know what the consequences are? Will he commit to that review?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the commission has not yet released the questions that it wants additional information on.

Mr. Edwards: I am asking you, Glen.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, well, the Leader of the Second Opposition says he is asking me. Does he want me to take over the work of the commission, and politically direct the decision? That is the kind of foolishness he is asking for. The commission will have access to any information that it needs, and it will make the decision in an unfettered way when it is satisfied with that information. [interjection]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable Leader of the Second Opposition party, you had an opportunity to put your questions. I believe you have your answer. Now, we are going straight to the honourable member for Transcona.

Vehicle Inspections Fee Schedule

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of Bill 36, this government has shifted policy away from mandatory, publicly

operated vehicle inspection programs to private for-profit vehicle inspections.

Since the Minister of Highways and Transportation is setting the user fee on this for-profit program, what will be the maximum allowable charge that Manitobans will have to pay for vehicle inspections, resulting from Bill 36?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, the opportunity has been there to debate and hear the member's comments on the record during the bill process, but the member is raising the question, and I thought I had supplied all the information with my spreadsheets, exactly as to what was going to happen.

In the case of the mandatory vehicle inspection, the vehicles would have to be safety inspected before they can be registered. Under the regulations, it is our intention to take and put a maximum that can be charged—not a fee—just a maximum that can be charged. We have not established that. It will be done under regulation. We are looking at between \$35 and \$40 as a maximum.

Bill 36

Regulations Tabling Request

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Since the minister has indicated that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation vehicle inspection program will be eliminated with the passage of Bill 36, have the regulations been drafted for this bill, and will the minister table a copy?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): No, Mr. Speaker, we have not finished drafting the regulations yet. Once the regulations are drafted, I am prepared to make them public.

Vehicle Inspections Employee Status

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Since there are 23 jobs at stake currently in the MPIC inspection program, will the Minister responsible for MPIC indicate if these employees will be redeployed within government departments, or will they be laid off?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): Mr. Speaker, the

member is making some rather sweeping assumptions.

First of all, he has forgotten to look at the fact that MPIC, because of the wearing out of some large portion of its equipment, has been forced to run their program at a slightly reduced rate. He should not assume that anything is going to occur overnight as a result of these changes.

The movement to a different system, which will catch many more vehicles—and I think the member should be supportive of the fact that a far larger number of vehicles will, in fact, be inspected for road safety. This system will provide a lot more assurance to the public, and he should not be getting ahead of himself in terms of where the MPIC process will go.

Human Resources Opportunity Centre Parkland Office Closure

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, today is a dark day for Dauphin and the Parkland because today is the day that the Parkland Human Resources Opportunity Centre is scheduled to close. As a result of the decision of this minister and this government, this service will be lost to the people of the Parkland where it has provided thousands of Parkland residents with a valuable service over the last 17 years. This minister has not even provided an explanation to the people of Dauphin.

I want to ask the Minister of Education whether she will now travel to Dauphin, meet with the people and explain to the people of Dauphin and justify the decision that she made to close the Parkland Human Resources Opportunity Centre. Will she at least give them the courtesy of that explanation?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this issue for a number of hours in the Estimates process. I explained to the member the difficult decisions government had to make. I also discussed with him the alternate way in which services will be provided to the Parkland area.

In addition, I also have spoken to the member and explained to him that we have retained the Single Parent Job Access Program in the Parkland area to assist those individuals, and we will be making alternate arrangements from the Westman area to also assist the people of the Parkland area.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: I am asking for leave of the House to revert to Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. Is there leave to table a report? [agreed]

TABLING OF REPORTS

(continued)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House, I inadvertently forgot to table something that members would want.

I am required, under The Legislative Assembly Act, to report yearly on the amounts paid to members of the Legislative Assembly. I am tabling that schedule right now.

Nonpolitical Statement

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for St. Vital, does she have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mrs. Shirley Render (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw attention to a teacher at Glenlawn Collegiate. He is Robert Cordingley, an industrial arts supervisor, who was just awarded the very coveted Dr. D.W. Penner Award.

Robert Cordingley has contributed to the enrichment of both students and teachers in a variety of ways. Among other things, he co-ordinates the division's Partners in Education program, which provides students with work experience. He is also involved with the Gordon Foundation, which is a new student program that is going to be brought in at Glenlawn Collegiate.

St. Vital, indeed, Manitoba, can be very proud of Robert Cordingley. Thank you.

Committee Changes

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development, June 29, 1993, effective 7 p.m., be amended as follows: Broadway (Mr. Santos) for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli); Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar).

I move, seconded by the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), that the composition of the

Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk); Transcona (Mr. Reid) for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Monday, July 5, 9 a.m.

Motions agreed to.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) for the member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach); the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) for the member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer); the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) for the member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae).

I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) for the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey); the member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer) for the member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gillshammer); the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) for the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner).

I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for Monday, July 5, 1993, at 9 a.m., be amended as follows: the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) for the member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer); the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey) for the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose).

Motions agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will sit today at 4 p.m. and Friday at 9 a.m., if necessary, to consider Bill 22.

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

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, Report Stage, would you call the bills as shown on the Order Paper.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 4—The Retail Businesses Sunday Shopping (Temporary Amendments) Act

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill 4, The Retail Businesses Sunday Shopping (Temporary Amendments) Act (Loi sur l'ouverture des commerces de détail les jours fériés—modifications temporaires), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 5—The Northern Affairs Amendment Act

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 5, The Northern Affairs Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les affaires du Nord), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* (1050)

Bill 6—The Real Property Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 6, The Real Property Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 7—The Builders' Liens Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 7, The Builders' Liens Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le privilège du constructeur), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 8—The Insurance Amendment Act

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 8, The Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 11—The Regional Waste Management Authorities, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 11, The Regional Waste Management Authorities, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi concernant les offices régionaux de gestion des déchets, modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

I move on behalf of the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach).

Motion agreed to.

Bill 12—The International Trusts Act

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 12, The International Trusts Act (Loi sur les fiducies internationales), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Attorney General, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance, that Bill 12, The International Trusts Act; Loi sur les fiducies internationales, reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in. Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No? The question before the House is that Bill 12, The International Trusts Act; Loi sur les fiducies internationales, reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

* (1100)

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

* (1200)

The question before the House is that Bill 12, The International Trusts Act; Loi sur les fiducies internationales, reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carstairs, Cerilli, Chomiak, Cummings, Dacquay, Dewar, Doer, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Edwards, Enns, Ernst, Evans (Brandon East), Filmon, Findlay, Friesen, Gaudry, Gilleshammer, Gray, Helwer, Hickes, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Laurendeau, Maloway, Manness, Martindale, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Orchard, Pallister, Penner, Plohman, Praznik, Reid, Reimer, Render, Rose, Santos, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey, Wasylcyia-Leis, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 50, Nays 0.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I may have risen too early. Did you want to officially declare that bill—

Mr. Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

Mr. Manness: Okay, thank you. I am sorry.

Would you continue then Report Stage, Bill 13.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to calling Bill 13, I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the loge to my right, where we have with us this afternoon Mr. George Henderson, the former MLA for Pembina.

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

Bill 13—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), that Bill 13, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), that Bill 13, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in. Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No?

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

The question before the House is that Bill 13, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carstairs, Cerilli, Chomiak, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Dewar, Doer, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Edwards, Enns, Ernst, Evans (Brandon East), Evans

Interlake), Filmon, Findlay, Friesen, Gaudry, Gilleshammer, Gray, Helwer, Hickes, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Laurendeau, Maloway, Manness, Martindale, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Orchard, Pallister, Penner, Plohman, Praznik, Reid, Reimer, Render, Rose, Santos, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey, Wasylycia-Leis, Wowchuk

Madam Deputy Clerk (Beverley Boslak): Yeas 52; Nays 0.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the House agreed yesterday to sit special hours today, and we are infringing upon that time; however, I am wondering whether or not I might ask leave of the House to consider a particularly important bill that needs some attention before the end of June.

I think the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) has had discussion with the various opposition critics, and I would therefore ask whether or not there is leave of the House that we can do report stage on Bill 38 and also third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to do report stage on Bill 38, and also leave would be granted for third reading? Is there leave of the House?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is denied. Okay, leave has been denied.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that leave would be granted if in fact the minister is quite prepared to say that we will be receiving Royal Assent on this particular bill today. Then we would be more than happy to give it leave.

Mr. Speaker: Well, leave has been denied. Okay, let us try again. Do you want me to ask for leave again?

Mr. Manness: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member is saying that Royal Assent has to be a condition—gladly. As long as we can find Lieutenant-Governor Dumont, we certainly will do Royal Assent.

Mr. Speaker: His Honour is ready.

Is there leave of the House now? We need unanimous consent for report stage, and also we

need unanimous consent for third reading of Bill 38. Is there leave on both occasions? [agreed]

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

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), (by leave) that Bill 38, The City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, la Loi sur les municipalités, la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire et la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS—AMENDED BILLS

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

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move (by leave), seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill 38, The City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, la Loi sur les municipalités, la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire et la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, can the Lieutenant-Governor be summoned?

I would like then to make one announcement of House business.

House Business

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that it is my understanding that we probably will not require the sitting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development to deal with Bill 22 on Friday. I will though call that committee to begin clause by clause on Monday morning at 9 a.m.

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

While we are waiting for His Honour I believe the honourable member for Gimli wants committee changes. We will do your committee changes.

* (1310)

Committee Changes

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for Monday, July 5th, 9 a.m. sitting, be amended as follows: the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) for the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey).

Mr. George Hickey (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: Burrows (Mr. Martindale) for Thompson (Mr. Ashton); St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli); Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

Motions agreed to.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am advised that His Honour is about to enter the Chamber. All members, please rise.

His Honour Yvon Dumont, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House at 1:12 p.m., and being seated on the throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:

May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed a bill, which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour, and to which bill I respectfully request Your Honour's assent:

Bill 38—The City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, la Loi sur les municipalités, la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire et la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this bill.

(His Honour was then pleased to retire.)

Mr. Speaker: Please be seated.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, as agreed to by the House yesterday, I will be moving the motion to go into Supply. The two sections of Supply will convene and will stay in session until four o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a grievance.

Mr. Speaker, in my seven years in this Legislature I have used my grievance very rarely. Having had a fall yesterday in the Legislature which has left me bruised from my neck down to my feet, I can tell you that the last thing I needed to do today was to stand up and grievé.

I am standing on a grievance today on an issue that concerns me deeply.

In the Estimates process of Family Services, I specifically asked the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) about the cutbacks to the Child Protection Centre. I was assured by the minister that the Child Protection Centre at the Health Sciences Centre would not receive any more cutback than the 3.8 percent that has been afforded to every other branch of government.

I took the minister at his word. I believed, because every member of this House knows how passionately I am concerned about child protection, that the minister would not betray the members of this House. I have to assure this House today that I feel betrayed. I feel betrayed on behalf of every child who has ever been abused in this nation. I feel betrayed because children are not going to get the kind of protection they deserve, because this government has chosen to cut back well beyond the 3.8 percent that this minister assured me in Estimates would be the bottom line. Well, it is not the bottom line.

I do not know how members of this House feel about child abuse, but I know how I feel about it. I know how I felt as a child when someone close to my family chose to take me into his bed. I know how it felt to be betrayed by an adult that I had trusted and had faith in as a child. I know what it has felt like to live with that abuse all of my life.

I was one of the lucky ones. My abuse was not severe and my abuse was not long term. I was not beaten to a pulp. I did not have my hands put on stoves. I was not hit with belt buckles. I was sexually assaulted. Yes, it affected my entire life and still affects my life. As I write in my book, I still have flashbacks. I remember when I least expect to remember the betrayal that I felt as a child.

We had an individual at the Health Sciences Centre, Dr. Charlie Ferguson, who spent his life advocating on behalf of children, children who were abused to a far greater degree than I was ever abused.

* (1320)

This man has an international reputation for identifying, for advocating and for working on behalf of children who have been betrayed. This doctor has now told the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) that he will no longer serve on an advisory committee because he feels such a sense of betrayal for the work that he has done on behalf of children in this province.

This is a man who, to my knowledge, is not a member of any political party, who has attacked the New Democratic Party when he was in that position, when he felt that they were not representing children adequately, who has attacked the Conservative Party when he felt that they were responding inadequately. I have every confidence would have attacked the Liberal Party if we had had the power and we had been behaving inadequately. More power to him, because it was by his remaining above the political mainstream that we was unquestionable in his role of advocate on behalf of children.

That is where he felt that he could make his contribution to society. So what has happened? Well, if facts are to be believed, the situation was that when we saw the Estimates line for the Child Protection Centre, it had an enormous decrease. When I looked at the grants to external agencies as part of my function as the critic, I targeted in on that

one, because it was very quickly obvious it was not 3.8 percent.

So I asked the minister, and the minister said they had a surplus. I checked with the Child Protection Centre, and I was assured by the Child Protection Centre that they indeed did have a surplus.

So knowing they had a surplus, I specifically said to the government, if you took that surplus and the decrease in your funding, can I be assured that there will be no less than the 3.8 percent that has been afforded to every single other agency? The minister assured me that that is what the case was, that it would 3.8 percent and no more. Well, it is more. It is significantly more, and we are, as a result, jeopardizing those who need the greatest amount of protection in our society. Those who are betrayed by adults when they are their most vulnerable.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, justify under any circumstances that kind of betrayal. I did not like the 3.8 percent, but I accepted that that is what the government was doing with every department, and they were going to do it with this one, and they were going to do it with that external agency. I could not stop that.

But I can assure you that if I had known it was more than that amount of money, we would still be in Child and Family Service Estimates, because I could not have lived with that kind of betrayal.

I think it is important, on the record, to read exactly what Dr. Charles Ferguson has had to say to the minister:

Dear Mr. Gilleshammer:

Re: Child Protection Centre Financial Clawback.

I hesitate to write this letter, but feel compelled to inform you directly of what has transpired, the potential human costs and long-term dangers for the very survival of the centre. The numbers are very confusing and have been related to you by Dr. Agnes Bishop. The way I see it, we were relieved of \$417,000 of our surplus funds virtually overnight by the Treasury Board, or so your Support branch claims, this in spite of agreements and commitments we had for its partial use mainly in training projects for native workers and health nurses.

Once this retrieval of funds got underway, an additional 4 percent was sliced off making a total of

8 percent, resulting in a serious deficit forcing us at the hospital's direction to choose to delete \$120,000 of staff. As a result of this maneuver, we have now lost our nurse co-ordinator, our nurse in charge of education and training, as well as over half of one physician's time. I interpret these swift and serious incursions on our staffing as a significant vote of nonconfidence in our unit now accomplished and complete.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

This has been an extremely disillusioning experience, distracting us from our work and demoralizing the entire hospital. Please be informed, and with all due respect, that my association with the centre and members of the Support branch has to come under close review as to its continuance. The heavy hand of government has fallen. I state this with great sadness and concern given the cause we are all attempting to serve. Yours truly, Charles Ferguson, M.D., C.M.

At the same time, he sent a letter to Mr. Ron Fenwick, Executive Director: For several months now, well before the current series of profoundly disturbing events, I have contemplated resigning from the provincial advisory committee. Please accept this letter as notice of resignation as of August 31, 1993. As you are aware, I have at least two areas of interest remaining relevant to this body, both of which I will attempt to discharge. You will receive communications on these in the near future.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we are as a result of this action not just losing Dr. Charles Ferguson from the advisory committee. We are, if his letter to the minister dated June 18, 1993, is to be believed, and I have no reason to not believe it, seriously jeopardizing the strength, the very existence of the Child Protection Centre.

Mr. Acting Speaker, just who goes to the Child Protection Centre? Children who have been abused, that is who goes. They are referred from the Child and Family Services agencies. They are taken there by police. The pictures that they have in their files are not to be believed by human beings who care about children. We simply reject what they show us, because we do not want to see examples of that kind of physical abuse. We do not want to hear that three-month-old babies have

been sexually assaulted. We do not want to hear that kind of thing.

Dr. Charles Ferguson works with that kind of thing every single day of his life. He lives with it. We want to turn the newspaper as we see it, because we do not want to deal with the horror of it, and he lives with it every single day. But he is not alone. All of the staff of that centre deal with it every single day. Individuals who have been with the staff for years have been laid off. They have been given layoff notices. The nurse who has been deeply involved in education and training has been laid off. Who is going to educate the medical residents and the interns? Who is going to educate the nurses? Who is going to go into the inner-city schools and help teachers to identify a complaint that is legitimate, give them the process that they should go forward, the documentation evidence that needs to be gathered? Who is going to work with our native Child and Family Service agencies, because tragically many of the children who come to the Child Protection Centre are native?

Who is going to provide the support to families, because often the abuse is not apparent? It can be a babysitter, it can be a friend, it can be a relative. Can you imagine the agony of knowing that your child has been abused? Almost everyone in this House has children. Can you imagine what it feels like to discover that your child has been abused, and that you want to get support and you want to make sure that support is the correct support, that you get that child into appropriate counselling? The family learns what techniques they have to use to make that child feel like a worthwhile human being.

* (1330)

Because abuse is not a momentary thing. It does not happen and then is forgotten from the consciousness of the individual. It rests with that individual forever, and unless that person has the strength and is given the support to obtain that strength to help them overcome that abuse, then we can see a negative effect upon them for their lifetime. It is not a short-term thing, and that is what Dr. Charles Ferguson and his staff provided for these people.

Why would the government have acted this way? Well, I have to say that in the first instance the information I was given was that it was a mistake, that they had not meant to claw back at all, that they

had only meant to claw back the reserve above what was necessary for the functioning of a Child Protection Centre, and somebody made a mistake and they clawed back too much. So they met with the minister. I understand the meeting was sometime on the 24th of June in order to—

An Honourable Member: No.

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, if it was not the 24th of June then I am incorrect about that date. Maybe it is another date. I do not care what the date was. It is irrelevant.

An Honourable Member: It is next week.

Mrs. Carstairs: The date was supposed to have been, according to the information I was given, the 24th of June.

There is only one way for the minister to deal with this matter. If, in fact, Mr. Acting Speaker, it was a mistake and it was meant with no desire to in any way impact upon the Child Protection Centre beyond the cut afforded to every single other agency, then the minister has a very simple chore to do. He simply has to admit the mistake and restore the funding immediately.

But the reality is, these people have already been given their layoff notices. So why was the mistake not corrected, if indeed that is what it was. And if it was not just a simple mistake, Mr. Acting Speaker, then it is even more serious because it means that this government, with intention, has betrayed the children of this province.

I would prefer to think that is not the case. I would prefer to believe that it has been a simple mistake and that it will be rectified by this government and that the Child Protection Centre will indeed be able to continue to function. Obviously Dr. Ferguson no longer believes that, because if he did believe it was a simple mistake, and if he did believe that mistake was going to be rectified, then I am convinced that he would not have submitted his resignation from the advisory committee.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Why else would he have done this, because I do not think I am betraying his confidence when I tell you that it was Dr. Ferguson himself who told me he honestly believed it was a simple mistake and that it would be rectified. He did not want to believe the government was acting in such a manifestation of lack of concern for children who had been abused.

He did not want to believe that, but I can only believe, since his resignation has been sent on the 27th of June, that between the time I spoke with him earlier and the 27th of June he now does believe that, for whatever reason.

It is true. The Child Protection Centre has been a thorn in the side for every government, every single one of them. That is exactly what they should be, a thorn in the side. No government, no matter how well intentioned, is probably ever going to be able to deal with every single abuse that is out there. I do not have unrealistic expectations for governments. I know they work within the confines that they are allowed to do, and that is exactly why you have a centre like the Child Protection Centre that says you are still not doing enough. They say it over and over again, so that we continue to make strides, so every time we make a little bit more effort. That is what they should be doing, Mr. Speaker. We should not take offence as politicians because they criticize us in that way, but that is what we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us wanted to go into Estimates today. All of us wanted to pass some bills today. All of us, I think, with perhaps some exceptions, would like to start winding down this session. I, for one, would like to wind down this session. I have moved on to another stage of my life, and I have made it very clear that one of the things I want to do is to advocate on behalf of children. I want to do it in a nonpolitical way. I do not want to do it as a Liberal any more than I would want to do it as a Tory or as a member of the NDP. I want to do it as somebody who has suffered abuse and who has something to offer.

In my years in politics, I have acquired a certain amount of skill. I, for example, learned how to raise money, and that was one of the issues that I felt that I would be able to do, that I would be able to put together a foundation for which I was prepared to give a considerable amount of proceeds of my own book to prevent child abuse, because governments unfortunately tend to put very little money into protection.

They are forced—this is not an attack on this government—governments are forced to address things that happen. They are forced to look after people who have been hurt, but when governments have to cut back, it is traditional that they cut back on prevention programs because it is hard to prove any tangible benefit from a protection program.

This applies to all governments of all political stripes no matter where they are located. When you sit at Treasury Board and you say, well, I cannot cut this program because it delivers a specific service and I serve 1,000 people and this is what happens when I serve those 1,000 people, it is very hard to cut that program. When you look at prevention programs and you say, well, I think it serves this many people, and I think it has this result, and I think maybe it will have this benefit, but you can never prove the effectiveness of a prevention program.

* (1340)

As a result, prevention programs are almost always the first to be cut. Yet, until we get to the root cause of abuse and until we start dealing with those things which can prevent that root cause of abuse, i.e., through prevention, then we will never stop the scourge of abuse within our society.

The Child Protection Centre, indeed, does have a mandate for prevention, but what has happened as a result are those programs which might be considered in any way, shape or form to be prevention programs are now all going to be eliminated. They are no longer going to exist. So how are we ever going to deal with the perpetuity of this abuse? How are we going to teach our young people that not only should they not be abused, that it is their right as a citizen living in this country not to be abused, mentally, physically or sexually? How are we going to prevent those children once they have been abused from abusing their own children?

Unfortunately, that is the tragic cycle. A child who has been hit, demeaned, beaten and assaulted sexually all too often ends up as an adult who assaults and beats physically, sexually and mentally. That is the pattern. We know that is the case. Here we had a centre, a centre where people from all over the world came to say, show us your methodology, show us your treatment modality, show us your prevention programs, because Dr. Ferguson had such an international reputation—has such an international reputation—that they wanted to know what he was doing so that they, too, could take that information and put similar plans in place in their parts of the world and in other parts of this country.

Now we are in jeopardy. We are in jeopardy at the present moment from losing him from an

advisory committee. But is that a first step? I do not know. It is part of what he does. Does he now back off of other activities as well? I hope not. I hope that this minister will act in such a way that we will not lose either the centre or the incredible capacity of Dr. Charles Ferguson, because, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford it. We cannot afford to lose the strength of this individual or, more importantly, the strength of the centre. We cannot afford to treat our children in what appears to be an absolute act of betrayal.

When you are a child, you sometimes exaggerate the things that happen to you. Shortly after my birth, my mother was very ill, and so my 12-year-old sister—I was born the day after her birthday—became my substitute mother. I had in those days extremely thick hair. I still have a pretty good head of hair on me, a little grayer. But she used to stand me every night between her legs, and she used to put my hair in ringlets. I had big fat ringlets, if the pictures are to be believed. I do remember standing there and having her whip them around her finger and putting rags to tie them together.

I am convinced that that was the reason, as a child, that I was chosen at the age of four to present flowers to the princess royal, because I probably had fatter ringlets than anybody else, and ringlets were the thing in that particular day. When I was in Grade 2, I remember leading the first holy communicants in as the angel because, again, I am sure, of my ringlets.

When she was married when I was only seven years old, my mother had my hair all cut off. I thought as a child that was the worst thing that had ever happened to me. Here my beautiful hair had been, in one fell swoop, all cut off. I thought they had cut my hair to look like a boy's. Now that I look at the haircut in pictures, it really did not look like a boy's, but I was convinced it looked like a boy's because I had had such wonderful ringlets before.

So to me, this was the worst thing that had ever happened to me. My sister got married, she deserted me, and all of my ringlets were cut off. Two years later, when I was the target of an abuse, I could not believe that I had worried about my ringlets, because no child ever thinks that is ever going to happen to them. When you are raised, as I was raised, in a family with love and support, you do not think somebody is going to betray you like

that. That happens every single day, every single hour, every single minute in this country of ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed. I have a personal sense of betrayal. I feel betrayed by this minister and by this government, not only as the member for River Heights, I feel betrayed as someone who went through what some of these children are going through, but to a much lesser degree than the vast majority of them.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), that this House instruct the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) to restore full funding, including returning the accumulated surplus, to the Child Protection Centre.

* (1350)

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) has moved a motion before the House. I regret to advise the honourable member for River Heights that presently before the House we had a motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. The honourable member for River Heights has introduced another motion, not an amendment, so therefore the honourable member's motion is clearly out of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I must challenge the ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair having been challenged, all those in favour of sustaining the Chair please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Lamoureux: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

* (1450)

Order, please. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Orchard, Pallister, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey

Nays

Alcock, Ashton, Carstairs, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Edwards, Evans (Brandon East), Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Gaudry, Gray, Hickes, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Maloway, Martindale, Reid, Santos

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 27, Nays 19.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

* * *

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): I would like to rise on a matter of grievance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) would like to make a committee change, a quick one, and then I will recognize the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) on his grievance.

Committee Change

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I wish to rescind St. James (Mr. Edwards) for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) and change it to St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) for Broadway (Mr. Santos) for Economic Development for June 30, 4 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): It is very important for me to rise today to give some greater clarity to this issue, set the record straight regarding our funding relationship with the Child Protection Centre and, I think, in my remarks give some comfort to the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) that the information I gave her in Estimates is accurate and correct, and that the issue raised about the funding two weeks ago is one that our department is working on.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Child Protection Centre is recognized by myself, this department, and this government as providing an extremely valuable service in the continuum of care of child welfare in Manitoba. As we discussed in Estimates, the number of organizations were going to experience a 3.8 percent reduction in the grant funding that they receive from government.

In the Estimates discussion, we talked about the fact that an accumulated surplus that the centre had of \$200,000 was going to be used as part of our funding agreement with the centre in this current budget year. That was a figure that was presented to us prior to the Estimates process and a figure that we used as an accurate one in our deliberations over budget.

Subsequent to that and in the last few weeks, it has been reported to us by the centre that part of that surplus of \$200,000 in the last number of months of the last year had been spent on some other activities by the centre.

As a result, there is somewhat of a shortfall in that \$200,000. It was first reported to us that it was in the neighbourhood of \$30,000. Now it is reported to be in the neighbourhood of \$40,000 to 41,000.

Mr. Speaker, my officials met on June 23 with officials from the Child Protection Centre to review what has happened with our funding, to review this surplus, and those discussions were very valuable.

It appears—and the Child Protection Centre has indicated that this was a mistake, and probably that is not an inaccurate way of portraying this—that we were using information that was provided to us by the Child Protection Centre, and now they are indicating that because of the time lapse this funding figure is not accurate.

I make the commitment today to the House that my comments in Estimates were accurate. They will have a funding reduction of 3.8 percent, and we will work to establish the exact amount of the differential in that surplus and make the commitment today that those resources will be found for the Child Protection Centre. I would hope that is the comfort that the member is looking for. It is the information we gave in Estimates, and I reaffirm that today.

The member made some other comments. I know members of this House are well aware of her commitment and her understanding of child welfare

issues, and I know that she also is aware that others of us in the House have a similar commitment and an understanding.

A number of the initiatives that we have taken with the service information system, with the quality assurance program, with the Child Advocate, with the high-risk indicators, I think is a clear demonstration of the commitment of this government to enhance the delivery of child welfare in this province.

The member referenced that I met with Dr. Ferguson last week, and that is correct, but it was over a completely different issue. It was an issue to do with the Anne Ross day care and the Mount Carmel Clinic. Our discussions on that were on another issue, and I am pleased to say that we are moving to resolve that issue.

I have had a letter from Dr. Agnes Bishop who was asked to meet with me. I received that letter in the last few days, and we have made arrangements to meet with Dr. Bishop next week to discuss the funding for the Child Protection Centre. I will indicate to her the same information I have given to the House today.

Once we establish the exact amount of the shortfall in their accumulated surplus, we will identify funds to make up that shortfall, and the centre will be able to continue with their budgeting based on the information that was given to them when our budget was released.

So I say to the member that these discussions have taken place at the officials' level, and they are ongoing to establish an exact number. Our commitment is to remedy that problem as soon as we can, and we will be communicating that to the Child Protection Centre as soon as we possibly can. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is on the motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No, okay. All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

* (1500)

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

* (1600)

The question before the House is on the motion of the honourable government House leader, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Dacquay, Dewar, Doer, Downey, Ducharme, Enns, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Filmon, Findlay, Friesen, Gillshammer, Helwer, Hickes, Lathlin, Laurendeau, Maloway, Manness, Martindale, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reid, Reimer, Render, Rose, Santos, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey, Wasylycia-Leis.

Nays

Alcock, Carstairs, Gaudry, Gray, Lamoureux.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 38, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

The hour being after 4 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 30, 1993

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Reading and Receiving Petitions		Human Resources Opportunity Centre Plohman; Vodrey	4959
Solvent Abuse Treatment Centre for Northern Manitoba Ashton	4950	Nonpolitical Statement	
		Dr. D.W. Penner Award Render	4960
Tabling of Reports		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Estimates: Culture, Heritage and Citizenship; Status of Women; Community Support Programs Mitchelson	4950	Report Stage	
Estimates: Government Services Ducharme	4950	Bill 4, Retail Businesses Sunday Shopping (Temporary Amendments) Act	4961
Schedule of Amounts Paid to MLAs Manness	4960	Bill 5, Northern Affairs Amendment Act	4961
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees		Bill 6, Real Property Amendment Act	4961
Privileges and Elections, 2nd Report Helwer	4950	Bill 7, Builders' Liens Amendment Act	4961
Oral Questions		Bill 8, Insurance Amendment Act	4961
Assiniboine River Diversion Doer; Downey	4951	Bill 11, Regional Waste Management Authorities, Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	4961
Home Care Program Chomiak; Orchard	4953	Bill 12, International Trusts Act	4961
Child Protection Centre Edwards; Gilleshammer	4954	Bill 13, Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act	4962
Home Care Program Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard;	4955	Bill 38, City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act	4963
Free Trade Agreement Wowchuk; Findlay	4956	Third Readings—Amended Bills	
Assiniboine River Diversion Edwards; Cummings	4958	Bill 38, City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act	4963
Vehicle Inspections Reid; Driedger	4958	Royal Assent	
Bill 36 Reid; Driedger	4959	Bill 38, City of Winnipeg Amendment, Municipal Amendment, Planning Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act	4964
Vehicle Inspections Reid; Cummings	4959	Matters of Grievance	
		Funding for Child Protection Centre Carstairs	4964
		Speaker's Ruling	4969
		Gilleshammer	4969