

Third Session - Thirty-Eighth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
Official Report
(Hansard)

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

Vol. LVI No. 61B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, June 9, 2005

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Eighth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AGLUGUB, Cris	The Maples	N.D.P.
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CULLEN, Cliff	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
CUMMINGS, Glen	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
LOEWEN, John	Fort Whyte	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
MURRAY, Stuart	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack	Southdale	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Carman	P.C.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SALE, Tim, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Wellington	N.D.P.
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
SMITH, Scott, Hon.	Brandon West	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 9, 2005

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Please be seated.

Order. The honourable Member for Inkster, on a point of order?

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I rise on a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. The honourable Member for Inkster, on privilege.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do rise on what I believe is a very important privilege, something that occurred a little bit earlier today, and I truly believe that I am owed an apology from one of the government's ministers. If I may, I would like to give a little bit of a backdrop to it.

The Manitoba Liberal Party does not expect very much of the government in the sense that we do expect that the government would sit 80 days a year as an example. A part of that, Mr. Speaker, is that when we are sitting inside this Legislature we expect to see the government here participating in a very real and tangible way.

One of the ways in which we ensure that occurs is through the issue of quorum counts. Earlier today I was concerned in terms of the lack of government members during private members' hour. I think that most members of this Chamber appreciate the value of private members' business and are here in attendance to debate the different issues. Earlier we were talking about the importance of health care to rural Manitoba. I was, once again, disappointed with the lack of attention coming from the government side in regard to private members' hour so I stood up, as the rules allow for me to do, and requested a quorum count, Mr. Speaker.

Immediately following the quorum count, as I had sat down in my chair, I was looking over to the government side and, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to see a minister of the Crown that was sitting in his seat in a very angry, visibly angry way—[interjection]

Well, you can call it body language. It was more than just the body language. In a very real sense this member, and because we have kids in the Chamber as we did earlier today during private members' hour, we have children that are quite often in the gallery, we have all sorts of people. You know, I was surprised. You know, I am a bit at a loss for words of how to describe the incident. Suffice to say, we had a minister of the Crown using poor discretion in the selection of his finger and gave, in essence, put quite frankly, he gave me the finger from the seat of his chair.

Mr. Speaker, I did not feel that was appropriate. I stood up on a point of order, and I do not know exactly what it is that I had said during the point of order because I was upset at the time. The minister had the opportunity to apologize and chose not to do that.

Again, I stood up on a second point of order and made it a little bit more clear, Mr. Speaker, because I was offended by this minister of the Crown and the actions that he had taken. I provided him another opportunity to apologize, and, once again, the minister, for whatever reasons, chose not to.

* (13:35)

It is not like this is a minister that has only been in this Chamber for a year or two. This is a minister that has been around for a number of years. This is someone that has the confidence of our Premier (Mr. Doer) to the degree in which he is made a minister, Mr. Speaker. The government talked about classroom bullies and how it wants to deal with that issue. In fact, there is a conference that is being planned, and I reflect in terms of what sort of message is this particular minister sending when he chooses to take the type of actions that he has taken. If he disagrees, if he feels that the government does not have a responsibility of being inside this Chamber when the business of this Chamber is being debated, whether it is opposition or government, well, then say so. The member can stand up in his place and say that he disagrees and we should not have to be here and listen to other members debate. That is an option that minister had.

The other option, the minister, if he felt uncomfortable, he could have left the Chamber. The option, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the minister does not have is to make the type of gestures that he made from his seat. I do not believe that was proper. I am amazed that this is a minister of the Crown. I expected a whole lot more from one of the Premier's appointments. Once again, I would appeal to the minister to do the right thing, the honourable thing, and to apologize for his actions. I personally would be content with that apology personally even though still somewhat disappointed. Failing that, and I am not going to talk at length on this issue, but if he is not prepared to apologize, I recognize the fact, as you had pointed out during my point of order, that you did not see it.

Mr. Speaker, I clearly did see it. I saw when I had glanced over a minister that was angry and upset. I suspect because I called quorum, he chose to take those actions that were not becoming of a minister. I think there should be some sort of an apology. If the minister is not going to apologize, I would suggest and I would move, seconded by the member from River Heights, that this matter be sent to a standing committee of this House.

Mr. Denis Rocan (Carman): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate somewhat in entering into the debate, if you will, on this alleged matter of privilege. I hope that we are not reflecting on your earlier ruling this morning when the matter was raised on a point of order by the particular Member for Inkster, who believes in his mind that he had seen an action coming from the minister of northern native affairs, at which time you ruled that indeed you had not seen anything.

At that point in time, I have to tell you that I had to agree with your ruling, Sir, because if you can recall, Sir, I was standing right here at that time and I was having a personal discussion with that particular minister. I was the one, Sir, who was talking to the minister. The minister and myself were engaged in a conversation and at no time, Sir, the Member for Inkster, albeit he believes that is what he saw, Sir, I am telling you my discussion with this minister all during that period of time in my heart, Sir, I did not see this particular action.

If there was such an action, Sir, it was not meant for the Member for Inkster. So, I throw that in, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want to criticize the Chair. I believe you have already ruled on this particular

issue that there has been no point of order, and, as I indicate now, Sir, my support to you back then when you made that particular ruling. That is all I have to add to this particular matter.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I thank the Member for Carman for his observations or clarification to what took place. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding then that the matter was raised as a matter or order on a timely basis and you dealt with it at the time and, in fact, there may be some significant discrepancies in terms of what actually took place.

Mr. Speaker, though it is our view that in light of the definition of privilege in *Beauchesne* that it would not constitute a prima facie matter of privilege in any event. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: A matter of privilege is a serious concern. I am going to take this matter under advisement to consult the authorities and I will return to the House with a ruling.

* (13:40)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONS

Ambulance Service

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These are the reasons for this petition:

In May 2004, 46-year-old Peter Krahn suffered a heart attack while exercising in East St. Paul and was pronounced dead just under an hour later after being transported to the Concordia Hospital in Winnipeg. Reports show that it took nearly 18 minutes for an ambulance to arrive for Mr. Krahn.

The Interlake Regional Health Authority claims that 21 minutes is an acceptable emergency response time, whereas the City of Winnipeg uses a benchmark of 4 minutes.

Ambulance coverage for East St. Paul is provided from Selkirk, which is almost 25 kilometres away.

The municipalities of East St. Paul and West St. Paul combined have over 12 000 residents.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the provincial government to consider providing East St. Paul with local ambulance service which would service both East and West St. Paul.

To request the provincial government to consider improving the way that ambulance service is supplied to all Manitobans by utilizing technologies such as GPS in conjunction with a Medical Transportation Co-ordination Centre (MTCC) which will ensure that patients receive the nearest ambulance in the least amount of time.

To request the provincial government to consider ensuring that appropriate funding is provided to maintain superior response times and sustainable services.

Signed by W. Kastes, S. Gibson, D. Kastes and many, many others.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with our Rule 132(6), when petitions are read they are deemed to be received by the House.

Fort Garry Hotel

Mr. Denis Rocan (Carman): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background of this petition is as follows:

In 1987 the City of Winnipeg seized the Fort Garry Hotel from its owner, Harvard Investments Limited, a family-owned Manitoba corporation, in what has been characterized as a miscarriage of justice.

Due to deliberate actions of the City of Winnipeg, errors by the Municipal Board of Manitoba and a lack of clarity in provincial legislation, Harvard was denied the due process and natural justice that are fundamental to the property tax assessment and appeal process in Manitoba.

As a result, the company was unfairly burdened with a grossly excessive assessment and tax bill that in turn precipitated a tax sale and mortgage foreclosure, effectively bankrupted the company and caused Harvard's shareholders to be dispossessed of their business and property.

The background to this petition was outlined more fully in a grievance presented to this Assembly by the honourable Member for Carman (Mr. Rocan) on May 18, 2005.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Trade (Mr. Smith) to consider conducting a review of the circumstances outlined and to consider making a recommendation for redress to the Government of Manitoba.

Signed Matt MacDonald, Howard Fogel and Matt Schellenberg and many others.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave to present the petition on behalf of the member of River East.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to present the petition on behalf of the honourable Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson)? *[Agreed]*

Wuskwatim Project Development Agreement

Mrs. Driedger: I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background of this petition is as follows:

The Government of Manitoba and Manitoba Hydro have stated publicly that a referendum vote including all NCN band members will be held as part of the approval process for the Wuskwatim Hydro Project.

The Government of Manitoba and Manitoba Hydro have stated that the Wuskwatim Hydro Project and associated hydro transmission lines will not proceed without the support of the majority of NCN band members through the Wuskwatim Project Development Agreement Referendum.

NCN band members were not properly informed and consulted concerning the terms and implication of the Wuskwatim Agreement in Principle.

The partnership agreement to be approved by the Wuskwatim PDA Referendum will largely determine the economic future of NCN First Nations.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro (Mr. Chomiak) and the Government of Manitoba consider ensuring an informed, appropriate and fair Wuskwatim Project Development Agreement Referendum vote, and a vote overseen by an independent qualified third party such as Elections Manitoba.

Signed by Valerie Linklater, Katherine Linklater, Marianne Linklater and others.

* (13:45)

Teachers' Pension Plan Pension Adjustment Account

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I wish to present the following petition.

The background to this petition is as follows:

After contributing to the Teachers' Pension Plan Adjustment Account (PAA) which funds the Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) since 1977 until the year of retirement from the profession of teaching, we find ourselves facing the future with little hope of a meaningful COLA, and with the resulting severe loss of purchasing power.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the provincial government to consider funding the PAA to ensure that we receive a reasonable COLA, and that any loss of purchasing power we will face will be minor.

Submitted on behalf of Doris Hunter, Patricia Arbuckle, Lois Alpers, Gloria Penner and many, many others.

Crocus Investment Fund

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

The Manitoba Government was made aware of serious problems involving the Crocus Fund back in 2001.

As a direct result of the government ignoring the red flags back in 2001, over 33 000 Crocus investors lost over \$60 million.

Manitoba's provincial auditor stated "We believe the department was aware of the red flags at Crocus and failed to follow up on those in a timely fashion."

The relationship between some union leaders, the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the NDP seems to be the primary reason as why the government ignored the red flags.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to consider the need to seek clarification on why the government did not act on fixing the Crocus Fund back in 2001.

Signed by G. Bhar, Meryle Lewis and André Thibeault.

Education Support Levy and Special Levy

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These are the reasons for this petition:

All Manitobans are concerned about providing a high quality of education to students.

The current model of funding education through property taxes no longer works.

Education is a provincial responsibility and provincial funding of the operation of Manitoba's public schools has fallen every year under the current

Doer administration to the most current level of 56 percent.

Residential property tax bills continue to rise as local school divisions are forced to turn to property owners to offset decreasing provincial government funding.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Bjornson) has shown little action in finding a long-term solution to providing school divisions with predictable, stable and appropriate funding for public education.

Manitobans pay among the highest property taxes in all of Canada.

The elimination of the Education Support Levy and Special Levy on residential property and farmland would reduce property tax bills by approximately one-half and enhance transparency and accountability in the funding of public education.

We petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

To request the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Doer) to consider accepting that the funding and delivery of public education is exclusively a provincial responsibility.

To request the Premier of Manitoba to consider eliminating the Education Support Levy and Special Levy from all residential property and farmland in Manitoba.

Signed by Yvan Bedard, Jim Dale, H. D. Latter and many, many others.

Teachers' Pension Plan Pension Adjustment Account

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

After contributing to the Teachers' Pension Plan Adjustment Account (PAA) which funds the Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) since 1977 until the year of our retirement from the profession of teaching, we find ourselves facing the future with little hope of a

meaningful COLA, and with the resulting severe loss of purchasing power.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the provincial government to consider funding the PAA to ensure that we receive a reasonable COLA, and that any loss of purchasing power we will face will be minor.

Signed by Roger Hurst, Donna Wright, George Trowell and many others.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth): I am pleased to table the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund Annual Report for 2004.

* (13:50)

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Order. Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us today Betty and Josh Giesbrecht who are the aunt and cousin of the legislative page, Amos Wiebe.

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

I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us today firefighter representatives from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Manitoba, and Mr. Alex Forrest, the president of the United Firefighters of Winnipeg. Also present are Mrs. Debbie Woodman, Mrs. Brenda McAdam, Mrs. Gerry Schedler and Mrs. Lillian Farrington. These visitors are the guests of the honourable Minister of Labour and Immigration (Ms. Allan).

Also in the public gallery we have with us today Grade 5 students from Souris School. These students are under the direction of Theresa O'Brien, Glenn Wallmann and Carol Turner and are the guests of the honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mrs. Rowat).

Also in the public gallery is Cameron Rowat, the son of the honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mrs. Rowat).

Also in the public gallery from Rivers Collegiate we have 39 Grade 9 students under the direction of Mrs. Lesley McFadden and Mr. Jim Peirson. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mrs. Rowat).

Also in the public gallery from Phoenix School we have 43 Grades 4 and 5 students under the direction of Mrs. Heather Adams and Mr. Scott Thomson. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Member for Morris (Mrs. Taillieu).

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Oral Questions. The honourable Member for Russell.

Point of Order

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Official Opposition House Leader): No, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order?

Mr. Derkach: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable Official Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and what I consider a very serious point of order. It is the obligation of members of Executive Council to keep members of the Legislature and Manitobans informed when disasters do strike. That is a common courtesy that has always been given to this Legislature by governments over the course of time.

Mr. Speaker, I recall very vividly when we were facing the flood of 1995, the fires of 1988, the flood in Swan River in 1989, the flooding in 1997 and the disasters in 1999, ministers of the Crown always kept individuals informed in this Legislature as to the current situations unfolding in the province. They were also issuing press releases and statements about what was going on.

In this House, I have stood on at least two occasions now to ask the government to provide for us as legislators the current status of matters as they

relate to the flooding in western Manitoba, and indeed, now extending to all parts of this province. Mr. Speaker, it is my view that privileges of this House, in fact, are being breached because I think it is a very serious issue when ministers of the Crown who have at their disposal Emergency Measures people, people who were working in the field with Manitobans, with reeves, with councils to avert any further disaster and any further hardship to report to members of this Legislature about the situation as it exists in this province.

We have called on the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures (Mr. Smith) to report to this House not once, but on a number of occasions. He has yet, Mr. Speaker, to make himself available to those people out there in Manitoba who are struggling and suffering under these circumstances.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this House ask this minister to stand in his place today and to report to this Legislature and all Manitobans the current situation as it exists with respect to the excessive rainfalls and disasters in this province.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, on the same point of order?

*(13:55)

Hon. Scott Smith (Minister responsible for Emergency Measures): On the same point of order. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the situation is under control. I think the members opposite know I have had communication daily with the critic from the party opposite. Starting on Friday, the Premier of the province was out there immediately after the event. On Monday, there was—*[interjection]* I am on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, on Monday, obviously the members were given the opportunity to go out and see the situation. Again, on Tuesday, we continued to communicate with the critic and asked him if he wanted any further information to supply to his caucus. Maybe they did not speak to the caucus, but certainly continual updates. We have had the Premier out on Friday. We have had ministers, Minister Lemieux of Transportation out on Monday. I was out yesterday—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Addressing members should be done by constituencies and points of order are to be

pointed out to the Speaker of a breach of a rule of the House. It is clearly that ministerial statements are entirely up to the government.

So the honourable member does not have a point of order and this is turning into a debate. I am making a ruling that the honourable member does not have a point of order, because ministerial statements are entirely up to the government if they want to bring them forward or not.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Health Care Services Supreme Court Ruling

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, today's historic Supreme Court ruling has significant implications for the delivery of health care services across Canada. The key message for this Premier is that his policy of putting his ideology ahead of the needs of patients is wrong for patients, it is wrong for health care and must come to an end today.

Mr. Speaker, because of people like this Premier and his NDP Health Minister, who refuse to introduce innovation and meaningful reform to our health care system, patients are now being forced to wait, not months, but years, in agonizing pain waiting to access urgent care.

Will this Premier now agree to set aside his NDP ideology and agree to use the number of contracts or clinics and meet with those who would like to put timely access to care in Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, this Premier is aware of them. Will he meet with them?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to welcome all the firefighters from across Canada. I think it is a real honour.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the question dealing with the Supreme Court decision. The Supreme Court decision does not provide for a model that the member opposite has proposed and promoted. It does not, for example, propose that we have a system of private health care paid for by the public. I think the member opposite should be careful to interpret the decision correctly. It does have implications for patients in Canada and I think it certainly reinforces our view that there, and this individual had a challenge on and a delay on his hip and knee

operation. We have acknowledged in this Chamber that the hip and knee procedures of waiting lists are way too long. Most senior citizens we—*[interjection]*

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: Most individuals we talked to want to see the waiting list decrease. They do not want to wait unusual amounts of time, which they are doing across this country for hip and knee procedures, Mr. Speaker. We have acknowledged that in this House. Most people we know also want to have this procedure paid for in a timely way by a public system. So our challenge still remains the same today as it did yesterday, to reduce those waiting lists for procedures that are way too long.

* (14:00)

Maples Surgical Centre Meeting Request

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in their legal decision, Chief Justice Beverly McLachlin and Justice John Major stated, and I quote, "access to waiting lists is not access to health care." Because this Premier and his NDP Health Minister prefer to fearmonger instead, rather than taking the steps needed to improve health care, they are forcing patients to go out of province and pay out of their own pockets to get timely access to care. It is this Premier's fault that Manitobans are being forced to pay for medically necessary health care services, and it is this Premier that has the responsibility and can do something about that.

Will this Premier agree today to put aside his ideology and finally sit down with the Maples Surgical Centre and any other private clinic, Mr. Speaker, who puts forward a proposal to deal with timely access to care for patients in Manitoba? Will he do the right thing and meet with them today?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Well, Mr. Speaker, you are not going to see the Maples clinic in Virden, in Deloraine, in Melita, in Minnedosa—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is basically a one-trick pony with the one clinic. The

issue is not the operating rooms. We have 111 operating rooms in Manitoba.

The issue for us is dealing with the issue of human resources. Now we have made great progress on the issue of nurses. We have 1200 more nurses today than we had a few years ago. We have 160 more doctors, but we do not have enough doctors in rural Manitoba and that is a challenge that we have admitted. Fifty doctors more than '99, but not enough.

We have, in the various reports, increased significantly the number of specialists but, Mr. Speaker, there are more specialists that we still require. Anesthetists are a major problem for Manitoba. It is major problem for every province in Canada, and we believe that success is required, particularly with hip and knees. We have announced, and I will be at Concordia tomorrow, where 500 more procedures are on the way in Concordia Hospital, but the waiting list for hip and knees is too long.

Mr. Murray: Well, Mr. Speaker, once again this Premier is famous for making these announcements, but nothing gets done. We have heard the announcement at Misericordia in terms of pediatric. We hear nothing that is getting done there.

Clearly, this Premier has the courage when he is outside of Manitoba to sit with an editorial board at the *National Post* and talk about how he is open to work with private clinics but does not have the courage to come back into Manitoba and say the same thing, Mr. Speaker. I guess he does not think that people in Manitoba get the *National Post*.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the Supreme Court ruling today, will the Premier put aside his ideology and consider proposals from the private sector? These private facilities, all they are trying to do is under a publicly funded system provide timely access to care for patients. If he believed in that he would meet with them.

Mr. Doer: The example cited in the *Post* is an example where, when we came into office the waiting list for cancer care treatment was eight weeks long. Mr. Speaker, the member opposite may not recall, but in November of 1999 the then-Minister of Health announced that we were going to pay for that procedure to be decreased, with

investments on two fronts. One is on our own front, to increase the capacity in cancer care to reduce the waiting lists, but while we were doing that, we basically had a system to deal with the patients that were on those waiting lists and waiting eight weeks.

What are the results? Well, Mr. Speaker, the results are that the waiting list has gone down for—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: The waiting list has gone from eight weeks for that procedure for cancer care treatment, down to one week. That is the result. The wait-list for elective cardiac surgery has gone down 50 percent. Having said that the number of cardiologists has been identified as being deficient. We are in the process and have hired three more cardiologists for Manitoba who are starting this summer.

So all of these lists present challenges. The 1200 more nurses is definitely progress, but the members opposite were going to put 2 percent and 1 percent into health care in their alternative budget. That would have resulted in the layoff of doctors, nurses, specialists. Their proposal would have had hundreds of health care professionals laid off, and the waiting list would be three times greater today than they are, Mr. Speaker.

Health Care Services Timely Delivery of Care

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice McLachlin stated in today's Supreme Court ruling that section 7, protection of security, under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms protects patients from serious psychological and physical suffering as a result of long waiting times.

Today, in Manitoba, thousands suffer both psychologically and physically as a result of those long waiting times. Will the Minister of Health adhere to Chief Justice McLachlin's ruling and ensure that all means are used to deliver care in a reasonable time frame?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the list of things that we have accomplished in Steinbach, in Boundary Trails, in Brandon, in Portage la Prairie, in Selkirk, in Thompson, in The Pas, in Flin Flon to shorten waiting lists, to increase access so people will get better care, sooner, closer to

home, I am proud of those actions. All of us when we have a medical need face anxiety and no life is without some level of pain. That is the real world.

We are working to reduce these waiting lists to an acceptable level, a medically acceptable level. That is why my colleagues, other Health ministers and I will be discussing this ruling very shortly to redouble our efforts, to make sure that people do not wait an unacceptable amount of time for any necessary medical procedure.

Public/Private Partnerships

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, so the Minister of Health is aware, there are people in Steinbach who are waiting years for a hip and knee replacement as well, and that is not acceptable.

Chief Justice McLachlin said that the breach of section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms could not be justified under our charter. Psychological and physical suffering from long waiting times could not be justified and violated the security of person, of Canadians. This is a clear warning for this government. They must act now to address the long waiting times as the Chief Justice stated in her ruling today. Why will they not act to find innovative solutions such as the use of private delivery in a publicly funded health care system?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is misrepresenting Justice McLachlin's finding. First of all, let us be clear. This was a 3-3-1 split in regard to the rest of Canada. Three judges said yes, three judges said no, one judge did not rule on the application of this finding to the rest of Canada. So this is a court that struggled very hard with this question.

Let us remember what was at stake. What was at stake was whether Mr. Zeliotis had the opportunity to buy insurance, to have that insurance pay privately in a private facility for a procedure that could be provided under medicare but was not provided in a timely fashion. The member opposite is wrong when he says that the findings suggest that the public sector is supposed to pay for private facilities or private insurance. That is not what the finding is; that is not what the ruling is.

Mr. Goertzen: Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the Minister of Health has not read this ruling. I quote

from the ruling from Mrs. McLachlin, the Chief Justice, "Where it can result in a serious psychological and physical suffering, the section 7, protection of security of the person, is triggered." That was the ruling. You need to read it. A clear warning has been sent to this government by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Will the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) go to his Premier (Mr. Doer), go to his Minister of Health and tell them to adhere to this warning and ensure that the delivery of health care services is provided in a reasonable time frame by assuring that private delivery is used in a publicly funded health care system?

* (14:10)

Mr. Sale: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, you could never do anything with 1 percent which was their solution.

Secondly, the ruling does not call upon Québec or any other jurisdiction in Canada to pay to a private facility for privately provided services in addition to what the public sector pays for all the publicly provided services. That is not what the ruling is all about. So the member is wrong in that regard.

What has been offered by Maples is three operating rooms. We have 111 now. We are not short of operating rooms. We do accept that we need to bring down waiting lists, but to do that we need more orthopedic surgeons, we need more anesthetists, we need more opportunities in our cataract side to have more people to do the volume that needs to be done. It is not a shortage of ORs, it is a shortage of people. We are addressing that by expanding the medical college and by increasing our retention and recruitment efforts, Mr. Speaker.

Crocus Investment Fund Request for Public Inquiry

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the more that this Premier speaks on the Crocus issue, the more concerned and troubled unitholders and taxpayers become. Incredibly, yesterday when questioned by reporters about the need for an independent public inquiry and about his former Industry Minister Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk's admission last week that her department was working on legislation to improve

accounting and to improve reporting measures at Crocus, this Premier responded, and I quote, "I am only dealing with the Auditor's report. That is all I can deal with." Well, that is not all he can deal with, it is all he chooses to deal with.

Why is this Premier refusing to address the issues that were not covered in the Auditor's report when he knows full well that the Auditor said in his investigation when it was concluded, it was concluded with a number of questions still outstanding and it emphasized that a more in-depth review was needed? Why, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, one will recall the six occasions the member opposite called for a public inquiry before the report was even issued, so we know his call was more political than substantive. We also know that—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We also know that there have been about nine or ten requests over the last period of time for inquiries, so it stretches the credibility of the member opposite.

The issue in the report, all the matters have been referred to either an implementation team, to legislation, to the Securities Commission which has the powers of the Court of Queen's Bench, to independent, outside-province counsel. We are certainly dealing with a number of the issues here in the legislation.

The Legislature passed a law dealing with the fuzzy rate-of-return issues that were in the original report. The Legislature dealt with the issue of monitoring and promotion in the same department. The legislation deals with the ambiguity between a board member that is appointed by the government but has fiduciary responsibilities to shareholders. It deals with the ability of shareholders to elect more board members. It deals with a lot of issues that are in the report.

Obviously the report also deals with other matters. It says the staff at the fund that were found wanting, were hired— *[interjection]*

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: —hired from the inception of the fund. Members opposite would know full well when that took place.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, this Premier talks about credibility. Well, I do not think that the Auditor General has been as busy in the past six years under this NDP government, and that speaks directly to his credibility.

The Auditor General has said that, because he cut his investigation short in order to report to the Legislature in a timely way, that it is, indeed, possible that there was other legislation being worked on that was not mentioned in his report, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, when asked by reporters if he would guarantee that all issues around Crocus would be resolved through the Securities Commission and the Department of Justice, this Premier stated, and I quote, "it will resolve all the issues the Auditor General's report identified." The Auditor himself says there could have been other legislation being worked on. He acknowledged this in his report and there were a number of outstanding questions and issues that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier stop hiding the truth from Manitobans and do the right thing today and call for an independent public inquiry into this Crocus scandal?

Mr. Doer: The member has cited the report I would also point out, and he talked about the Auditor General. Yes, we have given the Auditor General a lot more power. We were very concerned when we came into office about the various co-investments that were taking place, particularly with MIOP loans from the Province of Manitoba. We were very concerned and we were concerned when we were making MIOP decisions ourselves.

The due diligence, Mr. Speaker, we tried to have as much due diligence as possible when we were dealing with the Flyer bus company and when we were dealing with Motor Coach. I think when you put Flyer bus company and our MIOP risk and the Motor Coach company against Westsun, against Winnport and Isobord, I remember the press release. How many former Cabinet ministers were on the Isobord press release when they promised they were going to turn straw into gold? Well, they turned

Isobord into a \$20-million loss for the Province of Manitoba. That is why we need the Auditor General in on these reports.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, this Premier should not be hiding from those things that are not included in the Auditor's report. Unbelievably, he also said yesterday, and I quote the Premier, he said, "the public should draw the conclusions that are in the report." He told *The Winnipeg Sun* in a quote, "I believe many of the outstanding issues can be resolved, if not most, without a public inquiry."

Mr. Speaker, Crocus unitholders and all Manitoban taxpayers deserve the whole truth, not just part of it. This Premier and his ministers owe it to them to be held accountable for the red flags that were raised to this government. It is in the report. This Premier knows it.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier stop hiding the truth from Manitobans, and will he come clean and do the right thing and call for a public independent inquiry today? That is the right thing to do. If this Premier has nothing to hide, do it.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the member opposite when he was calling for an inquiry before the report was issued, over six times—

An Honourable Member: I was right then, and I am right now.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable First Minister has the floor.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, he also pointed out, he alleged on a number of occasions that the politically appointed board member was reporting directly back to the government. You now have the Auditor General's report which basically states that the person that was in that position was reporting to the shareholders. The member opposite made a claim that that person was a political appointee of the government. I have gone back over six appointees that were made by the provincial government. Three of them donated to a political party. All of them were under the Conservative regime. The three we appointed never contributed to the NDP.

Crocus Investment Fund Government Monitoring

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): Mr. Speaker, members opposite—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable Member for Fort Whyte has the floor.

Mr. Loewen: Mr. Speaker, members opposite would do a lot better to serve the interests of the unitholders if they would actually deal with the facts at hand as opposed to trying to continually rewrite history. One glaring observation that remains unanswered is why the Minister of Finance ignored the red flags that were raised by his officials. He said he did not go after the red flags raised by the Department of Industry because, well, it is not my department, he said. He claims he did not see the warnings from his officials in his own department, but he will not tell us why.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is too much to expect fair government from members across the way, but at least we could expect competent government. In the interest of shedding some light on how this minister missed the red flags, would he please table the memos referred to in the Auditor General's report?

* (14:20)

Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the members persist in confusing the facts. The Auditor General's report makes it very clear that the government is not responsible for performance. The prospectus makes it very clear that securities administrators and governments make no recommendations concerning such an investment and assume no liability or obligation to any investor of the fund.

We have always said that there was a problem by locating the promotional and the monitoring responsibilities in 1997 in the same department and that we have to resolve that problem by splitting those functions off into two separate operations of government. We accept that recommendation with respect to the public policy objectives. The valuation responsibility was the responsibility of the fund and the disclosure requirements monitoring was the responsibility of the Manitoba Securities Commission.

Request for Public Inquiry

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): Well, once again, misinformation. The government, the Auditor General clearly points out, was responsible for

monitoring the fund to see that it acted according to the legislation which includes five or six clauses on valuation. They failed. They let the unitholders down.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to find out about this memo within the minister's department. He refused to answer questions and then at 5:30 one day he comes out in the hall and says, "Oh, by the way, I did not see it." It took him four weeks since he had the report to get that story straight. The former Minister of Industry says she was aware of red flags and was working on solutions. The Minister of Finance says, "Well, news to me. I was not doing anything. I did not know anything." He contradicts everything she said publicly.

I would ask the Minister of Finance today, former Minister Mihychuk said she is willing and quite able to step forward in the form of a public inquiry, put her hand on the Bible and tell the truth. Is he willing and will he welcome the same opportunity?

Hon. Greg Selinger (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we have always been very clear that we accepted that the obligation to monitor the public policy objectives suffered from role conflict and an overreliance on trust. We have accepted that. We are going to correct that problem. We also accept what the Auditor said with respect to valuations, and it is very clear that in all provinces, securities of any type, including labour-sponsored venture capital securities' disclosure requirements, are monitored by securities commissions. That is the way it has been done all across the country for many years.

The member opposite knows that. He deliberately tries to confuse those two roles. He calls for a public inquiry saying that it will benefit shareholders. Shareholders themselves have said they do not think a public inquiry would necessarily be to their advantage. They think The Class Proceedings Act offers them a tool unique in this province since 2003 to protect consumers.

Mr. Loewen: Again, Mr. Speaker, the minister continues to make up answers on the fly that bear little or no relationship to the questions that are asked by myself or by any unitholders. In the meantime, the unitholders are stuck with paying their legal bills so that the people that have been part of fleecing them, of causing this fiasco, can hire the best and

most expensive lawyers and ask the unitholders to continue to pay for them. Soon it will be the taxpayers who are paying lawyers to defend this government for their inactions and that is clearly spelled out in this Auditor General's report. The only solution that will provide the truth, and this government should be interested in getting to the truth, was to hold a public inquiry.

I would ask the Minister of Finance why is he so afraid of putting his hand on the Bible and swearing to tell the truth. What is he hiding? Who is he protecting? Does he have to be served with a lawsuit in order to get all the facts out?

Mr. Selinger: Mr. Speaker, once again, I think the member would benefit by reading the legislation that has been passed by this House. The Class Proceedings Act provides—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Selinger: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The legislation passed in this House, proclaimed in 2003, provides unique protection to consumers in this province by organizing in an efficient way before the courts where damages can be awarded, where compensation and redress can be provided, and also controls the cost for the lawyers in that legislation. Certification could be required from the courts as to the legal cost. All of these protections are there for the first time since 2003. Members opposite want to spend taxpayers' dollars when we know there are 120 recommendations in here and they will be followed up by all the members involved.

Health Care Services Ashern Hospital Emergency Room Closure

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Mr. Speaker, the emergency room at the Ashern hospital has closed, leaving more than 10 000 Manitobans without emergency services in their local community. Once again, this government's inability to manage health care is forcing Manitobans to travel the highways to access health care services. In fact, a recent CIHI report that came out indicates that the NDP government of Manitoba continues to spend the most money per capita on health care in Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the NDP motto is alive and well in Manitoba. Spend more and get less. It is the

NDP way. When will this Minister of Health take action to ensure that the health services will be restored to the Ashern community?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Health): We do have a great deal of concern for the services for citizens of that part of our province. We have been working very closely with the physicians, the doctor husband and wife team have returned to Ashern to run the out-patient clinics which now are functioning fully and are covered, Mr. Speaker. We have increased the transport support. There are two physicians writing the CAPE exam in June and two more writing in September. We hope they will be successful, at which point we would be back to a full complement in Ashern. The time in between is an anxious time, but we are all working very hard to make sure that coverage is there.

Rural Hospital Closures

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Mr. Speaker, people's lives in rural Manitoba are being placed at risk as a result of this minister's failure to manage health care in this province. Since taking office, this government has closed or converted hospitals in the communities of Rivers, Erickson, Ashern and many others, not to mention the exodus of doctors from Brandon, too.

When will this minister live up to his government's promise not to close rural hospitals?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Health): First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have not closed any of those hospitals. The ARHA and other RHAs have been unable to provide physicians for the emergency rooms for full coverage. So, as a matter of patient safety, they are temporarily closed. They are not closed by this government. They are closed by the actions of a government that preceded us that cut the enrolment to the medical college, cut nurses, cut the resources of this system and with their 1% solution that they put forward to the people of Manitoba in 2003, we would have really closed more than Misericordia Hospital, which is the one hospital that was closed under their time in office.

Mrs. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, residents of Ashern are being forced to sell their homes and leave their communities in order to be closer to health care services in Manitoba. Ashern residents fear the community is becoming a ghost town, yet their own

MLA for Interlake (Mr. Nevakshonoff) had the nerve to stand in the House this morning and pat his government on the back for the great things they are doing for health care. That is unbelievable, and he is the MLA for Interlake.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Stefanson: Only this government would have the gall to sit in this House and clap themselves, clap the fact that they are closing rural hospitals. That is disgusting, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health to stop treating rural Manitobans as second-class citizens and ensure that the residents of Ashern and all other towns in rural Manitoba are not forced to move in order to access health care services in this province.

Mr. Sale: Let me tell the House about the honourable member that was referenced. When there has been a concern in Ashern, he has been in my office saying what are you doing about it. How are you working to solve this problem? How are you working to make sure that my citizens get the health care they deserve?

He has advocated—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

* (14:30)

Mr. Sale: Mr. Speaker, the member of the Interlake has been persistently concerned about the health care as we have been, and he is a very fine member who has represented his people well.

Mr. Speaker, we have repatriated services to Selkirk, to Steinbach, to Boundary Trails, to Portage. We have made sure that rural health care is strengthened, but what we cannot do is provide doctors from colleges whose enrolments were cut in the 1990s and have only been recently restored in 2000, and now in 2005, to 100. In years to come, we will have enough doctors trained here in Manitoba to serve Manitobans.

Flood Damage Minister's Awareness

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa): The Minister of Health's comments are quite interesting and remarkable.

The Minister responsible for Emergency Measures has completely dropped the ball in dealing with the crisis in rural Manitoba by not providing a statement in this House on a daily basis so that Manitobans know what exactly is happening and how he is taking control of this issue. After more than a week, Mr. Speaker, of continued rain and flooding, the minister has yet to visit the area and the municipal officials. This is irresponsible and most objectionable.

Why has the minister not made himself available to the municipal leaders and families in western Manitoba, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Scott Smith (Minister responsible for Emergency Measures): The question gives me the ability to commend our EMO staff here in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, for completely having this situation under control.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was there on Friday. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Lemieux) was there on Monday. The Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) is there today. The Minister of Health (Mr. Sale) and I will be out there tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you the situation reports have continued to come in and have identified each and every one. The municipalities have been contacted by the EMO. Each and every one of the municipalities is getting information back, and each and every one of the municipalities completely knows the process. It is too bad the members opposite would not talk to the municipalities and know that we are completely on top of this situation.

Mrs. Rowat: Yesterday the member of Brandon West, the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures, smugly congratulated himself on an ongoing program in Manitoba and did not see fit to update Manitobans on the disaster in western Manitoba.

I was offended, as any member in this House should be and especially the members from rural

Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, in a time when our rural communities are facing an enhanced crisis, when a crisis is occurring in western Manitoba in the backyard of the Member for Brandon West, all he can do is offer self-congratulatory remarks.

Mr. Speaker, why has the member of Brandon West, the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures, ignored the plight of citizens in western agricultural Manitoba in a time of significant crisis? Absolutely do something.

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you the member that is being questioned is an excellent, excellent leader on Emergency Measures. I would say a person who has had that many years in emergency services, I will take a firefighter to deal with this issue over anybody across the way.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The clock is ticking.

Health Care Services Management of System

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, we learned today that Manitoba is the worst province when it comes to having a heart attack. It is one of the worst provinces if you have a stroke. Manitoba has the very dubious distinction of a rapidly growing HIV infection rate, the highest infant mortality rate of any province and the second-lowest overall life expectancy. The number of doctors in rural areas is far below the national average. In places like Ashern, the emergency room has had to close all together because of a severe shortage of doctors.

I ask the Premier: Why is the Premier doing such a poor job of managing our province's health care system that he is leaving the system open to a legal challenge as happened in Québec?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, let me just quote Dr. Alan Menkis, the WRHA cardiac program head, "We are making strides really on a weekly basis. You know it is a big endeavour and it is one of the few if not a very unique opportunity in all of Canada, to put all of cardiac care under one umbrella. It really doesn't exist anywhere else to the same extent that we have here." May 30, 2005.

Mr. Speaker, our cardiac waiting list is below what Doctor Koshal said it should be. He said 130. We are at 100 or less. The number of people who are waiting longer than acceptable time is mostly people who have co-morbidities, that are too sick for surgery.

We have reduced our cancer waiting list to below national averages. We have increased the medical college so that the damage done in the 1990s, when he was a federal minister cutting payments to provinces, can finally be reversed, Mr. Speaker. We are repairing a lot of damage and we are making a lot of progress.

Mr. Gerrard: The Minister of Health can give us all these statistics, but the fact remains that we are the worst province in Canada if you are going to have a heart attack.

Why is this government so disorganized? We are one of the worst provinces in Canada when it comes to having a stroke, and we learned today that things that should have been put in place years ago have still not been put in place so that we can have rapid treatment of stroke.

We have, day by day, people coming in having to wait huge, long times for hip and knee surgery. The Premier (Mr. Doer) himself says waiting lists are too long. The health care system is being managed so poorly that we are being left open to legal challenge just as it happened in Québec, because this government is not doing its job.

Mr. Sale: Mr. Speaker, the member is a physician and understands statistics so I will give him a couple. We do have a problem in regard to cardiac care, and we are addressing it by centralizing our care and hiring more cardiologists this summer. Manitoba's rate under this report is not statistically different from Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, P.E.I. or Nova Scotia. B.C., Québec did not report so we do not know where they are. So, of the provinces that reported, we are no different than four others. We are below Alberta and Ontario. Maybe the member should do some homework on statistics before he makes these assertions.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, the numbers are quite clear, and when it comes to the care of people who have a stroke in this province, as the minister himself knows, the use of treatments like tPA is very

important, and yet he has not been able to organize the health care system so that we can get people identified, diagnosed and treated promptly with modern therapy. The result is our patients who have a stroke here are not being treated optimally.

We are, once again, putting the system under threat, not only because it is not performing, but now we find out from what is happening in Québec that we could be under threat from legal challenge because the minister is not doing his job.

Mr. Sale: Mr. Speaker, we accept the challenge of making our system stronger and better and providing better care sooner, closer to home and faster. We accept that challenge. But let me tell the member that, in regard to stroke, we do have the third-highest provincial rate behind Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. As I said, Québec and B.C. did not report. Our rate is not statistically different from Saskatchewan, New Brunswick or P.E.I. Yes, it is higher than Alberta or Ontario. So, yes, there is a challenge, but to represent this as somehow worst in Canada, first of all, it is third at worst, and it is statistically no different from four others. So let the member get his facts straight before he makes wild assertions.

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

* (14:40)

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Geri Weir

Ms. Marilyn Brick (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Geri Joyce Weir, who recently passed away on May 26, 2005.

Geri Weir was born on March 27, 1940, in Libau, Manitoba, and was the daughter of Andrew and Kate Sobovitch. Geri also attended school in Libau and was a former member of HMCS Chippawa.

Mr. Speaker, a memorial service was held on Wednesday, June 1, and I, along with 200 other people from the community of St. Norbert, attended.

Geri was a very special person who dedicated her life to the people of Manitoba. For the past 32

years, Geri worked with the Behavioural Health Foundation in St. Norbert and founded its court communicator system. Geri was instrumental in helping thousands of Manitobans resolve their addictions issues. She was also instrumental in interviewing people entering the foundation's programs and advocated daily to help get offenders assigned to the foundation. The court communicator system remains a strong part of the Behavioural Health Foundation, with Geri's contributions being both highly regarded by the judicial system and by her co-workers. The foundation was started 35 years ago with the hard work and dedication of Lorne and Geri Weir, and it continues today ensuring that Manitobans continue to lead productive and addiction-free lives.

Geri is survived by her mother, Kate; husband Lorne; and daughter, Tobi; son, Bob, and his wife, Sharon; and many friends. Her life will fondly be remembered by her many friends and fellow co-workers at the Behavioural Health Foundation.

I extend my sympathies to Geri's family and friends. I also want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the good work that she has done and thank her on behalf of Manitobans whose lives she has helped. Geri will be remembered fondly as a caring and a very loving person. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. For members that are having conversations, could you please do it in the loge. It is very hard to hear the member that has the floor.

Golden West Broadcasting

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of people and an organization that is second to none, in my view, for serving the public. Golden West radio, last year after the tsunami disaster started and we all have seen and heard of the huge disaster there, publicly announced that they would be very involved in trying to raise funds for that tsunami disaster. They, in co-operation with the Mennonite Central Committee and a number of other charitable organizations in the province of Manitoba and indeed Western Canada, put out the word that the disaster in fact deserved and should be recognized worldwide.

They showed leadership in demonstrating that they, through public announcements and as a public service affiliate with other stations across western Canada, could in fact raise an amount of money that was precedent setting; \$1.3 million was raised by Golden West Broadcasting, their staff and all the people that were involved through Mennonite Central Committee and others to ensure that they would recognize direct and make sure that the money would go towards ensuring that the people in the flood-ravaged areas were helped and supported.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pride, on behalf of the colleagues on this side of the House and indeed all of government members, to congratulate Golden West Broadcasting for a job that is second to none in serving the people of the world.

Kendall Kostur

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kendall Kostur, a 14-year-old constituent of mine who was awarded the Chief Scout Award at the Dauphin First United Church on May 17, 2005. The Chief Scout Award is the highest award bestowed in the scouting movement. This award requires Scouts to gain skills badges and undertake community service projects. A formal ceremony and certificate presentation will be occurring this fall for Kendall.

Kendall has been involved with Scouts since he was six years old, progressing through the Beavers, Cubs and Boy Scouts. In earning this award, Kendall has received 20 skills badges, two of which include the first aid badge and the year-round camper badge. He also has received nine awards, one being the World Conservation award. This award demonstrates a scouter's concern for the environment. To receive this award, Kendall has also tasked to organize a local community service project. Kendall's project was a food drive held last November for the Dauphin & District Food Bank. Kendall's efforts helped bring in 484 pounds of non-perishable food items. No small feat, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Kendall's award is significant since he is the first scout to receive this award in the Dauphin area in approximately 30 years. Kendall attributes his success to the support and encouragement he receives from his parents, Allan and Maryann Kostur, his family and his own personal

determination to complete this award since joining the scouting movement.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kendall Kostur for receiving the Chief Scout Award. Kendall is a remarkable young man who has set his goals high and has succeeded. Kendall is a fine example for today's young people. I congratulate him and wish him continued success in the future. Thank you

Phoenix Flames and Science Fair Participants

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): I am pleased to put a few words on the record today offering congratulations to some remarkable young people in my community of Headingley and in neighbouring communities.

The Phoenix Flames Pee Wee boys hockey team won the Winnipeg Minor Hockey Association Pee Wee 12A1 City Championship over 14 other community club teams on March 24, 2005.

Players on the team were Bobby Asham, Evan Coy, Lanny Flaman, Kenzie Fraser, Taylor Gobelle, Michael Grossi, Garth Killbery, David Lafleche, Kai Luinenberg, Kyle Little, Jack MacDonald, Keegan McGonigal, Mike Peroff, Kyle Smith and Dylan Townshend. The team was led by Coach Jim Peroff and Assistant Coaches Dennis McGonigal and Neil Gobelle and managed by Rob and Cheryl Grossi.

The success of the team is further accentuated by the fact that the team was made up of players from three different community clubs: Phoenix, Roblin Park and Varsity View, and most of the players had never played together before.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize the accomplishments of a few young students who excelled in their science fair project and heritage projects.

On April 13 at the Divisional Science Fair, Kyle Capri won a Bronze for his project, "The Science of Rock Candy," and Brittany Karam and Shai Wood won a Gold Medal for their project, "What's Blowing in the Wind." These two young ladies went on to win the Gold Medal and Best Biological Project at the Provincial Science Fair April 21 to 24. Jade Wood also won a Gold Medal for her project, "Food or Fuel." Jesse Capri and Bryan Leathwood won Best Manitoba Project at the April 27 Divisional

Historical Fair for their project, "Manitoba's Third Legislative Building."

Other students who participated in this science and heritage fair were Erika Horvey, Kelsey Rosentreter, Bethany Scarff, Randy Thomson, Lenay Walger, Melissa Parker, Justine Allard, Danielle Nowosad, Derek Parker, Hugh McGrath Flemington and Colin Toews. Congratulations to all these young people.

Seniors of Radisson Constituency

Mr. Bidhu Jha (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have had the pleasure of attending several events in my constituency of Radisson where I had the opportunity to meet and speak to seniors.

I highly value these events. They give me a precious opportunity to sit down with the seniors in my constituency and talk face to face about their interests and concerns. It was a privilege to listen to many fascinating stories and insights the seniors shared with me. Many of their views echo those of my mother who is 94 years old.

Manitoba's seniors contribute greatly to the well-being of our society. The knowledge they have to offer is priceless and deserves everyone's respect. Manitoba's seniors have lived through many hard times, surviving the Great Depression, a world war, as well as many personal tribulations. Our government believes Manitobans benefit from the guidance of our seniors. Seniors are remarkable people, and our government respects them.

We are committed to helping seniors in their efforts to live as independently as possible. That is why our government provides funding for the 98 community resource councils and 14 multipurpose centres that provide support services to seniors. That is also why our government announced a \$500,000 increase to the Support Services for Seniors' programs.

Along with having the means to live independently, seniors also deserve to enjoy a high quality of life. To help seniors with this, our government is providing the necessary resources for 100 more hip and knee replacement procedures each year in the newly consolidated facilities at Concordia Hospital. In addition, we have expanded Pharmacare coverage to include new palliative drugs.

* (14:50)

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our government, I would like to thank Manitoba's seniors for contributing so much to their communities. Also, I would like to thank the members of Prendergast Centre and the Transcona Legion for allowing me to participate in their events. Thank you.

* (14:50)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet Monday, June 13, at 6:30 p.m., to consider Bill 207, The Medical Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker: It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet on Monday, June 13, 2005, at 6:30 p.m., in order to consider Bill 207, The Medical Amendment Act.

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, today would you please call concurrence and third readings, Bill 25, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act, to be followed by debate on report stage amendments, Bill 22, Water Protection?

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 25—The Workers Compensation Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Concurrence and third reading, Bill 25, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act, as amended in committee.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour and Immigration (Ms. Allan), that Bill 25, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Human Resources, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I will keep my comments somewhat brief in speaking on Bill 25. I did get opportunity in second reading and really enjoyed the process of going through the committee stage where we were afforded the opportunity to listen to many Manitobans express their thoughts and opinions about what is actually happening.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is actually doing a first in terms of recognizing our firefighters and the type of compensation that we believe that firefighters in the province of Manitoba, the type of benefits that they should be receiving. I do not believe that there are very many issues that come before this Legislature where you get such support, and what I see today is the unanimous support of this Legislature in terms of recognizing what is so very important to our firefighters but, obviously, equally important to each and every one of us inside this Legislature.

So I look at Bill 25 as a very powerful and strong statement. I only hope that other provinces across Canada will recognize the value that we, as all political parties have recognized, in terms of our firefighters, and adopt similar legislation. There is really an effort, a tireless effort, that has been put forward by our firefighters in the province, both paid and volunteered, to ensure that we are at the stage in which we are today.

I would like to, on behalf of the Manitoba Liberal Party, commend their efforts and acknowledge that it is, in good part, through the lobbying and providing the statistical and factual information to all members of this Chamber that they have better educated us to the degree in which we have recognized the value of seeing this particular bill passed.

In listening to the testimony from individual presenters, there were a number of them that I know, myself, were personally touched. One individual in particular that I had known first-hand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the late Jim Woodman, was someone that I had classified as a friend of mine and someone that is, I believe, the model fireman. There were personal pictures that were circulated, not only from Mr. Woodman's family, but other members, and it was very touching. When I had first saw the picture of Jim, I thought of the poster boy for our firefighters.

I think that we all wanted to send a very strong and favourable message as to what we were actually participating in. For me personally, this is a special tribute to those firefighters that put their lives on the line, and they continue to do that on a day-in, day-out basis and they have garnered the respect of all Manitobans.

You know, I think it was really the disaster of 9/11 in good part that made the public that much more aware of the issues of our firefighters in a very real and tangible way. Unfortunately at times, it is through disasters of that nature or the story that might appear in a paper on the odd day that the public will refocus its attention on those in society who actually do put their lives out on the line, whether they are the firefighters or our police agencies across the province, Mr. Speaker, and I bring them to Workers Compensation.

For those individuals who do what it is that I am talking about, I think that it is important upon all of us to do our job. Our job is to recognize the need for change and we are doing that in Manitoba. I am a very proud Manitoban today because I know that we are going to be giving Royal Assent to a Workers Compensation bill that is really going to be the first of its kind in Canada. So that makes me proud first and foremost as a member of this Legislature, as all of us support this, Mr. Speaker. I applaud all members of this Chamber in the way in which the bill has been presented, the way in which a committee meeting was held to ensure that we heard from presentation and ultimately, the way in which it is going to be receiving Royal Assent.

Having said that, obviously there were some other concerns that we had in regard to Bill 25. You know, when government asks for input and you strike a committee in which you get labour, management and government sitting down at a table in which they want to make workers compensation better for all Manitobans, one of the things that is really important is to recognize their efforts so that when you get a unanimous report that comes in, and I believe it is a hundred recommendations, that there is some need for us to be sensitive to the negotiations and the discussions that took place behind those doors. After all they, too, listen to Manitobans and through that listening and through those discussions and those negotiations, what we saw was a report that then came before this Legislature that, in fact, was that of a unanimous nature. Labour, management and government participation, that is the

message what we would have expected for the government to have acted upon.

So there is some sense of disappointment that the Minister of Labour (Ms. Allan) did not follow through, Mr. Speaker, on other aspects of the workers compensation bill. I think that the minister now has the unenviable position of having to go back to try to appease some of those individuals that would have felt that we could have done better yet. But I will tell you, and make it very, very clear, that there is absolutely no mood within this Chamber to prevent the passage and the Royal Assent of Bill 25 for one reason, and that is because we are, in essence, making very clear that Manitoba is going to be setting new groundwork by allowing us to have recognition in certain areas of workers compensation for our firefighters. We support that and want to expedite and allow that to take place. For that reason, it does receive the support of the Manitoba Liberal Party.

* (15:00)

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to see it go through. Thank you.

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I, too, want to rise today to speak in full support of Bill 25. Particularly, I want to pay tribute to those firefighters who have travelled across Canada to be in our Chamber today to be a part of something very historic. I am delighted that they are here. I want to welcome them here and, I guess, in my own small way, if I could say thank you for what you do for our country to make our country safe, to provide our communities with the kind of services that we so much depend upon, each and every one of you. I humbly say that I am not sure, frankly, that I could do your job.

So I wanted to say, and I want to pay particular attention to Alex Forrest, who is in the gallery today, who is a strong, strong advocate on behalf of firefighters across Manitoba and Canada, but I wanted to also say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that, as Mr. Forrest has, from time to time, mentioned in these discussions, when we talk about the presumptive legislation, which was the first of its kind in Canada, I believe, it is being rolled out throughout other provinces, that our party supported that. We also, at

that time, felt that we believed that there was an opportunity at the same time to ensure that volunteer firefighters had the same opportunity because, in our eyes, a firefighter is a firefighter is a firefighter. They are all heroes, regardless of where they work or where they help to make our community safer.

I wanted to, also, just, and I know that this is somewhat difficult, Mr. Speaker, in some respects, because I have had an opportunity to attend some very emotional funerals, I want to just make comment on the last funeral that I was at, the firefighter, Mr. Bruce Kitching. It was a very moving service. I was there with the Minister of Labour (Ms. Allan) and others in this Chamber, and, having an opportunity to meet that hero here in this Chamber when this legislation was introduced, I am only sorry that he is not here in person to also be a part of this historic opportunity, but I know that he is here in spirit, as is his family.

I just wanted to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we very much support this initiative to support our firefighters to ensure that as they, on an ongoing basis, put themselves at so much risk for the public. As we always say, how is it that when people are trying to run away they run towards the tragedy.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus, I want to pay my tribute and I want to pay my humble respects to those in the gallery, because I know they represent all of the firefighters throughout Canada. The people in the gallery are their representatives here today. I want to just say that we support this legislation. We wish it speedy passage and we are very, very thrilled, frankly, that there is so much representation here in the gallery today to be a part of this very, very important day.

We support this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and we thank the members for being in the gallery today. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do want to speak to Bill 25, whereas I would call it a bill, basically, in two parts.

The first bill that I want to speak to, the first Bill 25, is the bill that deals with firefighters. An individual who represents a suburban rural seat views firefighting capability, perhaps, differently than in the city of Winnipeg, where the newest

equipment, the latest training, where full-time firefighters are there 24 hours, 7 days a week. It is a little bit different in suburban and rural areas where we are basically dependent on volunteer firefighters who risk an awful lot for us as the citizens that they serve.

I have, over the years, gone to locations where there have been fires, and I have heard some of the stories of what they face. I know in the case of East St. Paul, they went to a home and two firefighters stepped into the home. The third firefighter, sensing that the situation did not look right, was of grave concern, grabbed the individual in front of him by the jacket, and by that triggered a reaction that that individual grabbed the first firefighter that went in just as the floor started to collapse. If they would not have held on, for sure two would have slid right down into the basement where the main fire was. So we know that these individuals sacrifice a lot. The pay is pathetic. They do it because they love what they do. They love their community and they have a real appreciation for life.

To the volunteer firefighters of East St. Paul and the Rural Municipality of Springfield who respond not just to house fires but to fires on the highways and byways, especially now as we go into cottage-country time, I would like to point out to the House that in the case of Springfield and East St. Paul, they respond to any accidents on the Perimeter, on 59 heading up to cottage country, a lot of different access roads that people use trying to get to their cottage properties. When and if there is a need for service, these volunteers respond, and they respond readily and do so with incredible professionalism, a lot of gusto and they just bring a lot of enthusiasm. Luckily, for us in Springfield, we have had very few fatalities because of the professionalism of both of those fire departments.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

I particularly point out to the House that now volunteer and part-time firefighters are supposed to be covered, I can remember years ago when we went through the first round of debate. Interestingly enough, the former Member for Turtle Mountain, Merv Tweed, who has now moved to the big House in Ottawa, stood in this House and placed the argument in front of government that the volunteer and part-time firefighters be covered in legislation. At that time there was not appetite for it.

So, certainly, we are really pleased on this side of the House that they are also going to be covered. We believe that individuals who are called upon to run into a situation which absolutely everybody else is fleeing from should and must have protection because it is not like any other profession. Be it ours, be it medicine, education, manufacturing, anything else, the job by and large does not have as its No. 1 job description, danger. That is why we single out firefighters as a group of individuals that get special consideration because, again, as most of us would flee a chemical fire to get out as quickly as possible, they put on their equipment and go into the situation.

I appreciate the fact that now they are going to be covered off. As much as I always admired the shiny trucks and all the noise they made, interestingly enough it was never a job that I felt that I had the kind of strength to do because you have got to have an awful lot of grit; you have got to have an awful lot of stamina to look at some of these situations which we recoil from and they just go to it.

So I want to be clear that we on this side of the House support the firefighters and the sections of the bill dealing with firefighters and, as our leader has said and the new Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Cullen) will be indicating later on, we will be supporting the entire bill.

*(15:10)

I do feel, however, that I have to make some comments on the other Bill 25 which deals with the Workers Compensation Board. It is an attempt by this current NDP government to Americanize our political system, whereby you roll something very positive into something very sneaky and devious. That is the Workers Compensation Board component of it. It is a concern for a lot of Manitobans, and it would be unbecoming of a member of this House to not point out that there were a lot of concerns about the Workers Compensation Board part of it. I want to touch on a few of those.

There was a committee struck that did come to a lot of conclusions. These conclusions were reached by negotiation, they were reached by compromise and by consensus. It was labour and business sitting together and saying, fine, if these are all going to go into legislation, we are willing to give on this side if you are willing to give on this side. The feeling was that the entire package, the consensus report or the

compromise that was brokered, the entire piece would be put into legislation.

What business feels with this bill is that they have been betrayed because the compromise was broken. Basically, what the government, through the minister, did was they cherry-picked various components and left others on the table that should have been part of this. I will only mention one of them. If individuals feel that they want to know more about it, they can go into Hansard in committee.

The fact that the Workers Compensation Board is paid for by employers, and it is an insurance company that all employers have agreed that they are in, those that are in pay a certain fee into their insurance company that actually insures their workers. Basically, the board of the Workers Compensation Board is there to represent the workers and the business community, and has done a very good job.

What we find with the other Bill 25, it strips the board of the right to decide who is in and who is out of the Workers Compensation Board. That is now going to be done by the Premier (Mr. Doer) and by his political advisers. We heard it time and time again and that is very unfortunate. It is not good for healthy relations between business and labour in this province, and it has introduced real cynical politics into legislation.

We know that the Premier has brought on to his staff an individual who cuts more of his teeth on American-style politics. I suspect we will see a lot more of that kind of legislation where they will take something very positive and hide under something very untoward that is not good for the province and slip it through the Legislature. Basically, I would suggest that it really does put members of the opposition in a very tough spot because we see components of the other Bill 25 that are not good for this province.

However, because of the good things that it is doing for those individuals that we care about, we will end up supporting this legislation. However, we must put on the record that there are parts of this legislation that are of great concern, and I just want to refer anybody who might be looking at this later on, it was the Manufacturers' Association that made it very clear in their presentation that the Workers Compensation Board component of Bill 25 will harm

their competitiveness in this province, and that is unfortunate.

Today we have before us a tale of two bills. One is dealing with firefighters that we have pushed for years, support and think is a very courageous move. It is the right thing to do, and it is the timely thing to do. Then there is the other Bill 25 which should have had more work, should have had amendments done to it which the government turned down. We, however, feel that because of what is all included in this bill, we will be supporting Bill 25 and would like to see it go on to Royal Assent.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, just to comment briefly on this bill. Certainly, we are very supportive of the measures that will address the needs and the concerns of the health of firefighters. I think from a position of a physician that one of the positive steps that we are seeing, both with the previous legislation and this legislation, is that it is starting to address how workers compensation programs can adequately deal or can deal better with the development of cancer, which is based on exposures or other factors present in the workplace.

The previous legislation identified that there were areas where firefighters experienced a greater than two-fold risk over the normal exposure in the workplace, and that this had to be attributed to their exposures as firefighters, and that it was right and appropriate, therefore, to make the presumption that these cancers were due to exposure in the workplace.

As a result of that earlier legislation, we have now had further studies. This legislation extends the coverage for firefighters into other conditions and extends this to part-time firefighters. This is useful not only for firefighters where it is good to have this there, it is also good for employers to know that they have to better deal with the risks and to bring those risks down of exposures so that we are going to reduce the incidents of cancer to the extent that we can.

We hope that this extends to other workplaces where cancer risks can be identified and that as a result, we will have the ability to better have workers covered for compensation programs and have employers better dealing with those risks because they have been identified clearly. They know that their premiums will vary according to what the risks of health hazards, including cancer, will be.

As I have said, we will clearly support this and move it forward, and look forward to it being in law very soon.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to be in the House today on this rather historic event as we do move this important piece of legislation forward. I, first of all, do want to welcome firefighters from across the country to Manitoba. I think the firefighters across Canada will recognize this very valuable piece of legislation, and we hope that your jurisdictions will recognize the important piece of legislation that is being brought forward and will bring it forward in your respective jurisdictions as well.

We appreciate what all firefighters do. I know in Manitoba we have approximately 3500 volunteer part-time firefighters. We also have approximately 1000 full-time or career firefighters in Manitoba. Clearly firefighters encounter various circumstances, just a tremendous array of different incidents that they may encounter, and clearly their special training really helps them deal with those special issues. I think it is very important that we recognize the special needs that firefighters have. I think Bill 25 represents a very important aspect of protecting our firefighters, and it is a very important piece of legislation in protecting those important members of society.

I personally have been involved in the fire service for a number of years as well. I realize the situation we all feel when we lose a member of the family. I think this legislation goes a long way into protecting our family and also the family of firefighters. So I think it is a very important piece of legislation.

In Bill 25, there were a number of other issues brought forward. There are a large number of changes to the workers compensation legislation, and I think again we have to reflect back on the process that was gone through here to bring forward Bill 25. I think it was good for the government to bring together the Legislative Review Committee, and that committee, of course, represented the employers, the employees and the public interest at large. That particular committee met for several months and they had over 200 submissions provided to them. From that point in time, that group put forward 100 recommendations to the government. Those recommendations were unanimous again, on behalf of the employers, the employees and the public at large.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

I guess it is a little unfortunate that the government did not take all those recommendations to heart and bring them forward in Bill 25. They certainly looked at most of the issues to some degree, and, just to clarify, about 22 of those 100 recommendations are policy initiatives. So we certainly hope that the government will follow through on those particular policy initiatives so that the Workers Compensation Board does address those in the near future.

* (15:20)

Clearly, we did hear some claims issues at committee, so I think it is important that the government have a hard look at how Workers Compensation handled those particular claims issues. I am hopeful that those recommendations that are brought forward will certainly be looked after at the board level.

I think it is something too in Manitoba, it is rather unique, is we do have the committee process where we have an opportunity for the public to come and provide their comments on proposed legislation. We did have this process just in the past week. We had over 50 presentations brought forward to the committee. It will allow us an opportunity, too, to make any revisions we thought were necessary to the legislation.

I guess the fundamental issue that I heard from throughout those presentations, and it is the fundamental way we are dealing with workers compensation, basically that issue is that the Premier and the Cabinet will now have say who has coverage under that particular legislation. We are wondering why that would have to be. We propose that The Workers Compensation Act, Bill 25, be amended to allow the Workers Compensation Board the right, the authority to decide who is going to be covered, which industries will be covered under that particular legislation. However, that amendment was defeated.

We certainly were happy that the government, though, did bring in the consultation amendment so that at least there will be a process involved there where the employers, employees and the public at large will have an opportunity to consult with Manitobans before they do make changes to the

legislation, to the act. I guess the one drawback that I have is why the Premier and Cabinet would have that authority, the heavy hand to control and what industries would be covered under the legislation. That certainly is a concern for us, and we just want to have that on the record.

Clearly, we support the firefighters across Canada. We think there are a lot of good things for all people, for all workers in Manitoba in this particular legislation. Of course, on behalf of our party, we look forward to having this bill pass to Royal Assent. I think that is important on us all, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the valuable role that all employers and employees play in the economy of Manitoba.

Again, I thank all the firefighters from across Canada for being here with us on this very momentous occasion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Nancy Allan (Minister of Labour and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to respond to Bill 25. Bill 25 will improve the workers compensation system in Manitoba. We are taking action on the issues that were raised by the review committee, and I am pleased to note that we are implementing the major recommendations in the review committee's report. The result will be major improvements in nearly every area of the legislation.

Bill 25 restores many benefits that were reduced during the 1990s. We are very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that there will be no reduction in wage replacement after two years from 90 percent to 80 percent. That has been restored. The elimination of age-related reduction of benefits for workers over 45 years of age, that will be eliminated. Another area of the legislation that is very important to us and that was long overdue is increasing the awards for permanent injuries. I would also like to say how pleased I am that this legislation strengthens the return-to-work provisions. They will be modelled on consultation with employers and workers. We will look at best practices, and we all know that injured workers, it is best when they get back into their jobs and they get working again. That is really what is best for the Manitoba economy.

Presently, 70 percent of workers in Manitoba are covered by workers compensation. The Legislative Review Committee told us in their report that they would like to see more workers covered. I have said

over and over again, and made a commitment to employers, that we will consult with employers and workers and that that consultation will be initiated by the Workers Compensation Board. We do not want to have the lowest coverage in Manitoba. We cannot be proud of that. We want to move the coverage of workers in Manitoba forward.

There is a significant body of evidence in the scientific and medical literature that links firefighters to occupational diseases because of their exposure to the numerous carcinogens and substances that they are exposed to in their line of duty when they are protecting our citizens.

Bill 25 expands the presumptive coverage for firefighters, including colon, ureter, lung cancer for non-smoking firefighters and heart injury, within 24 hours of attending an emergency response. Bill 25 also extends firefighter presumption to part-time and volunteer firefighters. We are pleased that this legislation will once again show leadership and provide the most comprehensive coverage for firefighters and their families in North America.

I would like to dedicate this legislation in memory of Bruce Kitching, in name, and all of the Manitoba firefighters who have paid the ultimate price with their lives in protecting our citizens.

Employers told us that they wanted a well-governed and financially sound WCB, and we have made many recommendations that went beyond the Legislative Review Committee recommendations in regard to governance, and I am pleased to say that Bill 25, the legislation, will make our governance structure in Manitoba the strongest in Canada.

I would like to thank the Legislative Review Committee for their hard work, the chair, Mr. Wally Fox-Decent, Mr. Pete Walker, Mr. Chris Lorenc, and Ms. Susan Rogers. I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with the stakeholders, the employers, labour and, of course, the firefighters who have championed this bill.

Today is a very proud day for our government. We believe that this legislation reflects modern realities and will serve employers and workers well for many, many years in the future.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 25, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Mackintosh: I can advise the House, Mr. Speaker, that His Honour has been summoned to the House, and if we can just wait for a few minutes, I understand he will be arriving for Royal Assent.

* (15:30)

ROYAL ASSENT

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Blake Dunn): His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

His Honour John Harvard, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in the following words:

Mr. Speaker: Your Honour:

At this sitting, the Legislative Assembly has passed certain bills that I ask Your Honour to give assent to.

Madam Clerk Assistant (Monique Grenier):

Bill 2 – The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Child Protection Penalties); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille (peines applicables en matière de protection des enfants)

Bill 3 – The Recreational Trail Property Owners Protection Act (Occupiers' Liability Act Amended); Loi sur la protection accordée aux propriétaires de biens à l'égard des sentiers récréatifs (modification de la Loi sur la responsabilité des occupants)

Bill 6 – The Real Property Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels

Bill 7 – The Personal Investigations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les enquêtes relatives aux particuliers

Bill 9 – The Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation Act; Loi sur la Société du Centre du centenaire du Manitoba

Bill 11 – The Provincial Court Amendment Act (Justices of the Peace); Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale (juges de paix)

Bill 12 – The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

Bill 13 – The Milk Prices Review Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le contrôle du prix du lait

Bill 14 – The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le permis d'électricien

Bill 15 – The Emergency Measures Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les mesures d'urgence

Bill 18 – Le Collège de Saint-Boniface Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Collège de Saint-Boniface

Bill 20 – The Life Leases Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les baux viagers

Bill 23 – The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act (Needles in Medical Workplaces); Loi modifiant la Loi sur la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail (aiguilles utilisées en milieu médical)

Bill 24 – The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (Cost of Credit Disclosure and Miscellaneous Amendments); Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur (communication du coût du crédit et modifications diverses)

Bill 25 – The Workers Compensation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail

Bill 26 – The Margarine Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la margarine

Bill 27 – The Horse Racing Commission Amendment and Horse Racing Regulation Repeal Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission hippique et abrogeant la Loi sur les courses de chevaux

Bill 32 – The Rural Municipality of Kelsey By-law No. 5/02 Validation Act; Loi validant le Règlement 5/02 de la municipalité rurale de Kelsey

Madam Clerk Assistant: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour assents to these bills.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Mr. Speaker: Please be seated.

DEBATE ON REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Bill 22—The Water Protection Act

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, we will move on to resume debate on report stage amendments to Bill 22, The Water Protection Act. We will now deal with the subamendment to clause 33.1(1) standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck). What is the will of the House? Stand?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No? It has been denied.

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, the bill that we have before us today is, of course, a bill that has seen 36 amendments and subamendments brought before this Legislature. Clearly, it is evident that when this bill was first read into the record in this House, as to how little thought must have been given to what the real need of Manitobans—*[interjection]*

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Penner: Thank you very much, and as to what the real need of Manitobans really was in regard to the protection of clean water and drinking water in this province, I want to reflect on a few of the amendments that we have dealt with, and specifically deal with clause 33.1(1) and what the effect of the amendments to 33 will be.

I would suspect that if one looked at the whole application of the intent of the bill, and then looked at even the subamendment to the amendment that we are going to have to deal with, I would believe that it clearly again demonstrates how little thought was

given by the minister and his staff, and indeed the Cabinet, before they would attempt to bring an important piece of legislation such as this to the House, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that it is imperative that one must recognize the importance of good, clean water to society in all countries. But, probably, nowhere more is the importance of it underrated sometimes than in the so-called developed countries. We have in many instances used our lakes as reservoirs for the distribution and dilution of human waste. We have used our rivers and our streams as transportation vehicles to ensure that the communities in which we all live, all of us, are used to transport our effluent to the dilution basins such as Lake Winnipeg.

* (15:40)

I just received this last week documentation from an Aboriginal community in northern Manitoba, where a water treatment plant had been installed, and the community clearly indicated in its brief to me, its presentation, and the documentation that they sent with it, that this water treatment plant had not functioned as it should have from day one of its installation. This letter that I received, document that I received, said, "Here we are. A treatment plant that has cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to install in our community is not functioning. Therefore, we are dumping our raw sewage out of one end of our community into the lake, and at the other end of the community we have the pipes that draw water out of the lake for the use of the people in our community."

I think, clearly, that is an indication as to how little attention we pay to any communities that are sort of out of the way. Even though they live in a large body of water on an island, it is we do not deem it important enough that when the dysfunctioning of a mechanism that is used to take the effluent, take the pollution out of the water before it is dumped back into the lake, dysfunctions, this Province of Manitoba, this Ministry of Water simply turns its back on it and says, "We do not care," because that is what the letter said. They had complained time and time and time again about the effluent. This person put it very directly, "The sewage is being dumped into the lake at one end of our community, and we're forced to draw water out of that lake because we have no other water to use, out of that lake and recycle it, and for drinking, we

boil it, and therefore have to drink our own sewage." I think it is unfortunate that we have a bill before us and it will be touted by this government as a vehicle that will drive the protection of water and ensure that all communities in this province and other areas have clean water.

This government will try and portray itself as the heroes in putting forward legislation. Let us look at this legislation. When you look at section 33.1(1), a regulation under Part 2, it says "other than section 7, or under any of clauses 33(1)(a) to (d), may provide that an owner or operator of a commercial operation . . ." Then, there is a subamendment to this, which we will deal with, which says we should take the word "commercial" out of it and use "existing operations affected by the regulation may apply to a director for an order."

This community that I speak of in northern Manitoba has applied for an order, has applied through this government to come and fix the water treatment plant in their community. That letter also states that there were 33 similar plants installed in the province of Manitoba over the last decade or so, and none of these plants, this letter says, are functioning properly. Therefore, we have all these communities dumping raw sewage right into the lake, and those people are then forced to drink the water out of that lake. And here we have a minister that will hold this bill up high once it passes this House, will hold it up high and say, "This is our model. We will say this is our model for clean drinking water. This is how we will protect clean drinking water."

The reason I make these comments is we can pass all the laws in the world. We can draw regulation and we can try and force people, but if you do not use the tools you have at your disposal, nothing changes. That is what my fear is, Mr. Speaker. Here we have spent better than a year, two sides of this Legislature have joined forces and drafted 36 amendments, I should say 32 amendments, I am sorry, and a number of subamendments to make this a workable document. There has been significant co-operation between the previous critic, the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Faurichou), the minister, the department and myself and numerous colleagues on this side of the House that have helped in drafting support mechanisms, in other words, amendments to this bill to make it function, or functional.

I believe once we have dealt with this bill properly, we will have a workable document, although it will have a lot of areas in it that are simply so vague that we will have to depend on the Cabinet to draft large numbers of regulations before this bill can be made truly functional. The basis will be here, but it is sadly lacking in any kind of functional kind of direction in this bill.

Therefore, I say it saddens me that we have had to spend better than a year trying to draft a piece of legislation that I think, if the minister would have taken the time, would have taken that year and gone out and consulted with communities around this province such as we did when we did the land and water strategy in this province in 1988-89. I was so pleasantly surprised by the willingness of the people to come offer their advice, their counsel and, indeed, help draft the policy in that matter. We had better than 1200 people offer their advice through that process.

Would it not have been, you know, a clear signal by this government, if they really wanted to be serious about engagement of the general public in making sure that legislation was done in such a way that it could, in fact, be useful and a useful tool, if this government would have just indicated to those people, we need your help, we need your support and we need your counsel and advice? If they would have done that, I think you would have had a better bill.

I believe it is unfortunate that we have developed an attitude, or that the government has developed an attitude that they are the superiors. They are the all-knowing and the all-wise. I say to the government, I say to the minister, never assume that wisdom is simply your own authority or your own view of the needs. The people that you serve know what they need, the people that you serve know what kind of direction, incentives they need to make this a functionable process and a functionable orchestration of rule and law.

I find it very interesting, and I had put some of these comments on record yesterday, but I found it so interesting that, when a group of us met with legislators from south of our great country, Americans—North Dakota, South Dakota and Minnesota—Minnesotans showed us what their new direction was in assimilating processes or regulations and legislation, and how different it was from ours,

how drastically different. They used the carrot approach. They are using incentives, the incentive approach. They are engaging their communities. They are engaging their individuals. What I see there is that those individuals in communities and the various communities are taking ownership and taking pride.

* (15:50)

We are using this piece of legislation to demonstrate that this New Democratic government is using, again, the stick. When you use the stick, you chase. When you use the stick approach, you do not engage. I think it is time that we, as legislators, on both sides of the House, realize that we are not only here to make laws, we are here to assure that the very people we serve have a role to play in what we do, and when we do make laws, and when we draft laws, that we do it in such a manner that we will engage and encourage engagement in the whole process. If we would do that, if we would ask people to take ownership and provide a bit of a carrot, provide a bit of incentive, then I think you would see a drastic turnaround and change in how we deal with matters such as our effluent discharges and water protection and those kinds of things.

So, when I look at the amendment, the final amendment, the one that the minister himself is bringing to this Legislature, I say it is a clear indication that this bill, in itself, when you read the last clause in the bill, in the actual bill, and you compare it to what the minister is changing, it is, clearly, an indication that there was a severe oversight in how this bill could, in fact, be made to work.

When you look at 33.1(1), then, all about—

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

I will just go through the speaking order for the previous speakers on subamendment to clause 33.1, and I just recognized that the honourable Member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) had already spoken, so in error—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. In my error, I would like to ask the House for leave, because he has already spoken.

Is there agreement for the honourable member to have spoken? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

Any more speakers on the subamendment?

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the last amendment proposed by the minister in regard to Bill 22 and just recall that it is eight months, nine months, since the public last had opportunity to comment, and, still, we are debating this bill, and the bill was introduced more than a year ago. I think that the time that this bill has been before the House speaks for itself, insofar as the inadequacy of thought and preparation that went in to the Bill 22 and its introduction into the House.

More than 20 percent of additional verbiage has been added to this bill since the public had opportunity to comment, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that is not doing justice to our system of legislation here in the province of Manitoba because we believe that the public's input is vitally important to the legislation that we pass in this Chamber on behalf of all Manitobans, especially in regard to this bill, Bill 22, The Water Protection Act.

I think that all of us in this province of Manitoba regard water as our most important natural resource and I remember a number of years ago lobbying this government to see that water had a greater prominence in the role of Cabinet, and I was very pleased to see that the portfolio of Water Stewardship was created within the Executive Council.

But, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed as to how the Ministry of Water Stewardship has evolved in the last couple of years as to the conduit of communication to other portfolios that also have an interest in water.

I believe that there is mounting unrest, if I will, amongst persons in various sectors of our province's economy. I speak with first-hand experience from that of an irrigator and looking to the problems that remain not easily solved because they are in the hands of multiple ministries. I had hoped that the creation of the Ministry of Water Stewardship would facilitate the decision-making process, and to my dismay, it has not.

I look to a small dam project on the Rat Creek just west of Portage la Prairie to which we have

properties adjacent and just trying to determine as to whether or not this intermittent stream, as to whose jurisdiction the decision making is, whose responsibility the decision making is left to, and asking whether it is Crown-owned lands or whether it is privately owned lands. Would you believe I cannot get a definitive answer from this government as to who owns the property and who actually is responsible for the decision-making process.

Right now, we are engaged with the Department of Water Stewardship, as I say, but we are also engaged with the Department of Conservation. We are engaged with the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. It is really perplexing that we cannot have the communication between departments so that we can resolve an issue as to ownership and jurisdiction. I hope that we can resolve this issue in the not-too-distant future, because I am not the only one that is trying to have this question answered.

A neighbour of ours is, in fact, unfortunately engaged in a dispute with another neighbour where a dam has been put in place, then removed, then reinstalled, then removed, and as one can appreciate, we always do not get along with our neighbours. Maybe the old adage that "the higher the fence, the better the neighbours," but it is something that remains unresolved. I think it is in part because of the lack of communication between departments in understanding logistically how a decision involving water, irrigation, agricultural production here in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take much more time. In fact, I believe that we are going to concurrence in just a few short minutes, but I want to, first off, compliment all those persons that took a great deal of their personal time to evaluate this legislation, to make presentation in an effort to enlighten the minister, department staff and, in fact, all legislators as it pertains to Bill 22. This effort in trying to improve and to make this legislation workable has taken a great deal of time, and I believe that we are nearing the end of the debate.

I believe that House rules will see the passage of this bill, although I still believe that the bill has significant gaps, if you will, in the legislation. I am dismayed that a lot of the legislation will be left to regulation. I know the minister has agreed to have certain sections of regulation brought to the public for public scrutiny and input, but the amendment that

I personally proposed that would see all sections of this Bill 22 and the respective regulation brought before the public, was defeated by this government.

* (16:00)

I am at a loss as to why the government believes that the public should not have opportunity to have input. I am always amazed at the amount of information, the amount of knowledge brought forward from Manitobans when we give the opportunity, when we provide the opportunity for participation as it pertains to legislation here in the province of Manitoba. I wanted to say that this province having that opportunity is the envy of others from other jurisdictions, but I am dismayed that not all sections of this act will have the regulations put before the public.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the minister, though, for recognizing the importance of science in the decision-making process and the adoption of one of the amendments that I put forward that recognized that decisions regarding water should, in fact, be based on science and not on hearsay or public perception. That is not as informed as those that choose to make themselves informed.

So, Mr. Speaker, the legislation as we see it here still has deficiencies, but I do believe that it is a heck of a lot better than when it was first introduced into this House even though not having the public input on the additional 20 percent of verbiage added to this bill through amendment. So, with those comments, I thank you for the opportunity to participate in the report stage and the proposed amendments to Bill 22.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the subamendment to clause 33.1 to Bill 22.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this subamendment? [*Agreed*]

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you please call Supply for concurrence at this time.

Mr. Speaker: We will now move into concurrence. The House will now resolve into Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Concurrence Motion

Mr. Chairperson (Conrad Santos): Will the committee please come to order. The Committee of Supply has before it for our consideration the motion concurring in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2006.

The floor is now open for questions.

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): Mr. Chair, I think the minister had indicated that she had placed an interim manager at Aiyawin, and I believe she said that this manager reported back to her. I am just wondering if the minister can say whether this interim manager has reported if there is anyone living in the Aiyawin Corporation homes that is not eligible to be there.

Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Family Services and Housing): What I had said is we had put a professional property manager into Aiyawin in a monitoring capacity, not a decision-making capacity, not a control capacity. That is quite different from an interim manager, as the member from Morris inquired about. I have not been made aware of anyone living in Aiyawin who would not be, I cannot remember the exact term that the member used, but who would not be appropriate to be living there.

Mrs. Taillieu: Mr. Chair, is it right, then, for me to understand that this interim manager, would part of her tasks be to look at that? Those are some of the allegations that were made, that some people that were living there had jumped the queue to get in there and, in fact, did not qualify to be living there. So I am just wondering if this interim property manager, if it was one of her tasks or her mandate to look at the appropriateness of people being there.

Ms. Melnick: Again, I said that we had put in a professional property manager to monitor, so I am not sure if that is the same title that the member from Morris is referring to. Before we had put in the professional property manager to monitor, to our knowledge there was the brother of the executive director who we had heard had been living there. We have also heard he had moved out rather quickly. That was the only incident that I have heard of, and

that, to my understanding, had been taken care of before we had put anyone in there to monitor.

Mrs. Taillieu: Mr. Chair, can the minister briefly outline what the job description would be, then, of this interim property manager? Was it part of her mandate to look at the people that lived in Aiyawin to monitor who actually came into the corporation, if there was any queue jumping or anything like that? Was that part of her job to do that, to monitor that?

Ms. Melnick: Again, it is not an interim property manager. She is a professional property manager who is there to monitor. So she is there in a monitoring, not in a decision-making capacity. She is not in the position to say yes or no to decisions that are made. Her job is to go in and to advise the management of Aiyawin as to what would be appropriate and non-appropriate decisions, et cetera, but she is not in a position to make those decisions. I have not been made aware of anyone jumping any queues.

* (16:10)

Mrs. Taillieu: Does this professional property manager have permanent status then at Aiyawin?

Ms. Melnick: She is there on our behest to monitor Aiyawin according to our determination of what would be an appropriate time. She is hired by the department and not by Aiyawin Corporation.

Mrs. Taillieu: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. Did any senior officials in the minister's department receive bonuses last year?

Ms. Melnick: I am not aware of that.

Mrs. Taillieu: Would the minister check on that and provide me with that information?

Ms. Melnick: I can check on that. I can provide information as would be appropriate.

Mrs. Taillieu: Can the minister tell me what the current funding is for Osborne House?

Ms. Melnick: I understand that Osborne House, I do not have the exact number in front of me, but that funding has continued with Osborne House as it has in past years, but I do not have the exact number in front of me right now.

Mrs. Taillieu: Can the minister provide me with that at a later time?

Ms. Melnick: Yes, I will.

Mrs. Taillieu: Can the minister tell me if there have been any staff cuts at Osborne House?

Ms. Melnick: I believe that there was one position that has been—I do not know that the position has been cut. I think someone has moved to a different job, but I do not know that the position has actually been cut so I do not think any positions have been actually cut at this time.

Mrs. Taillieu: Okay, just to clarify. The position may not be cut, but there may not be a person occupying a position. Are there less people working at Osborne House now than there were six months ago?

Ms. Melnick: Again, I do not have the staffing information in front of me. I think it is important for the member to recognize that the department does not run Osborne House. Osborne House has a board, and they are the individuals who make the decisions around the staffing of Osborne House, around the policies of Osborne House. The department does provide funding, but we are not in a position to be making the sorts of decisions that actually pertain to the running. Again, that is the board of Osborne House itself.

Mrs. Taillieu: Can the minister tell me if her department is currently in negotiation for new office space?

Ms. Melnick: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that there could be negotiation going on. I do not know of anything specifically. It is a department that has many locations. I know that there have been moves in the past. There will be moves in the future, but I am not aware of anything in particular at the moment.

Mrs. Taillieu: Just a few more questions, actually. Recently, there was in the newspaper a problem with an apartment block on Sargent Avenue with infestation of bed bugs. That has been an ongoing problem there. It is public housing and was also newsworthy, I guess, a year or so ago. What action is the minister taking to address this?

Ms. Melnick: In the interest of privacy and protection, I will not speak specifically to any location but, certainly, when issues such as bedbugs, we will just use that example, arise, the department takes this very seriously. We know that this is an issue that is of grave concern. It is an issue, unfortunately, that is universal. There was in, I believe it was either the *National Post* or *The Globe and Mail*, roughly a month or a month and a half ago, concerns around bedbug infestations, certain areas of Toronto. I think the Steamship Lines might have been named in that as well.

So this is an issue that we know would be quite serious. My understanding of the procedure that would be followed by the department in any unit, in any of our housing complexes, would be to first determine where we believe, and we would bring in professions, to determine where we believe the source of the problem is and to work around that, the area that we think is the source first of all, to contain and then to eliminate. If that did not prove fruitful and if there was the need to expand to the entire complex, we would then go through a methodical method of working either from the top down or from the left to the right or what have you, so that we would be able to first of all be working with the tenants and make them aware of the problems and ways to curb the problems within their own units, but also working with the tenants to make sure that we are able to get in and do as thorough a job as possible, again, in an attempt to eliminate the problem.

I believe that, even after the problem appeared to be eliminated, there would still be monitoring, there would still be communication with tenants, certainly to the effect of, if there appears to be a reappearance of the problem, there would be a quick contact to be made and that the department, I believe, would move in quite quickly and then, hopefully, be able to contain and eliminate. So we are going through that kind of pattern wherever a problem such as bedbugs might occur.

Mrs. Taillieu: Mr. Chair, in regard to employment income assistance, if a person is receiving employment income assistance and they are to pay rent, is that rent money paid to the person who then pays the rent, or is that rent money paid directly to the landlord?

Ms. Melnick: Well, that would be a decision that the individual who would be receiving EIA would make.

In certain instances, a decision can be made for the individual to receive the money directly and then make the payment. It is not uncommon to have requests by individuals on EIA to make through direct deposit payments, as an individual might make, for example, on their mortgage or other regular monthly payments. So that would be a decision that would be made on the basis of the request by the individual who would be receiving the social supports.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Family Services and Housing, and this concerns comments that the minister made with regard to the two individuals who were laid off by Aiyawin after they raised concerns at Aiyawin. I have a letter from one of these individuals and she says, "I have been reviewing Hansard, and I have a few issues with the Minister of Family Services and Housing. On June 7, 2005, the Minister of Family Services and Housing said, 'We did chat with the women who were concerned about their job loss. . . . The certainties that we were able to provide were that the women could go either the legal route and get legal counsel; otherwise, they could go to I believe it is the Employment Standards of Manitoba and seek the path there.'"

* (16:20)

This individual writes, "Firstly, I have not had any contact with the Minister of Family Services and Housing or anyone from her office. I invited the Minister of Family Services and Housing to contact me several times by e-mail and telephone, and I am still waiting. Every time I try to speak to her, I always get the run-around, so I basically gave up trying to talk to her. She does not care; it is not her problem. Just like this whole Aiyawin issue, she hopes it will just go away.

"As of June 9, that is today, this is about five months now, and I still have not been able to speak with her regarding my concerns about my dismissal and Aiyawin. Maybe there is somebody else she has been talking to, but it is certainly not myself.

"Secondly, the legal route; does she forget that I am unemployed? How does she expect me to get a good lawyer? Maybe she can pay for my lawyer since she is spending taxpayers' money frivolously.

At least we will know where this money is going, and it will be put to good use.

"Thirdly, as for the Employment Standards route, I have been in touch with Employment Standards, and their answer to me was, if I have received my vacation pay, there is nothing else that they can do."

So it would appear that the reassurances the minister gave that she was on top of the situation really are a bit vacuous, shall we say. This individual who has worked so hard on behalf of the tenants of Aiyawin Corporation and was very highly respected by the tenants for the tremendous job that she did, has been let go and has been very poorly treated by the government and by the Minister of Family Services and Housing.

She has been put in an extraordinarily difficult situation because this government has done absolutely nothing for somebody who has been very badly treated and somebody who has come forward with important information and very much wants to have things operating better for people at Aiyawin Housing. I think it is a real tragedy that the minister has let this evolve in the way it has. So I would ask the minister if she has any comment or reply.

Ms. Melnick: Now, I would just like to ask the member to read my quote one more time that you read at the beginning.

Mr. Gerrard: The quote from the Minister of Family Services and Housing was, "We did chat with the women who are concerned about their job loss."

Ms. Melnick: Certainly, there were discussions and communications that I was made aware of through department staff around the concerns raised by the women. I have not seen the communication that the member is referring to that he received today or shortly, so I cannot speak directly to that communication, but there was communication through departmental staff. There were discussions with the women as to what had happened. It was an unfortunate situation for them, there is no doubt about it.

It was not an action by Aiyawin that we were pleased had happened. However, we must remember that Aiyawin is an organization that is functioning not as part of a government department, but as part

of what used to be the federal social housing agreement. In 1993, again when the member was a Cabinet minister, the federal government decided to walk away from social housing, and the urban native housing organizations were then downloaded onto the provincial area of responsibility. That is how the province inherited these organizations.

I just want to say that many of them are very, very well functioning organizations. I met with the MUNHA, the Manitoba Urban Native Housing Association a few months ago. They are a very well-run group. For the first time ever, this government has been providing funding for them.

However, Aiyawin is a concern and remains a concern. In the case of these women, I know that there was discussion had again by departmental staff. Unfortunately, we do have to stick within the realm of an employer-employee concern. The two routes that are available to them are, in fact, Employee Standards or the legal route. I am not sure who wrote the e-mail, like I say, or the letter. I have not seen it. I understand her concern at what happened. It is unfortunate, indeed, but, as the minister, I have to respect what would be the rightful procedure for someone to be following, whether it would be in this situation or in another employee-employer situation. Certainly that is outside of government. It is unfortunate that that had happened.

However, we are continuing to watch Aiyawin and certainly this remains a concern. We did not find that Aiyawin had followed a process that we really felt was adequate for the actions that they took, which is why we suggested the Employment Standards and then the other avenue of course being the more judicious route.

Mr. David Faurichou (Portage la Prairie): I would appreciate the opportunity to ask a couple questions of the minister.

I really appreciate yesterday having the opportunity to speak with a number of disabled Manitobans during their annual general meeting that was held last night in the legislative dining room. I know that a number of those individuals have very strong concerns about institutional care and also community living where care for persons with disabilities is provided.

But, having come from Portage la Prairie, I want to ask the minister about the availability of programs

that assist those persons that were former residents of the Manitoba Development Centre. Once they have moved into the community there seems, as it exists today, a complete severing of all relationships between the Manitoba Development Centre and the individual. Once you go out that front gate of the Manitoba Development Centre, then there is a total disconnect, and many of the services that are available at MDC, whether it be as simple as the repair of a wheelchair, are no longer afforded to the individual.

I speak very specifically. I will not name the individual, but very willing to move into community living and works as a greeter at the Wal-Mart and is very happy to be there. He has 24-hour care, but he found that he needed a repair for his wheelchair. No, he just could not go the couple of blocks north to the Manitoba Development Centre to get that wheelchair repaired. He had to arrange transportation all the way into Winnipeg to see a minor repair fulfilled, and that minor repair turned into a major repair because the places in Winnipeg that do this are not as skilled in refining the modifications of wheelchairs for disabled persons as is the staff at the Manitoba Development Centre. So, to me, as a layperson in looking at the workings of government, it does not make sense. I want to ask the minister about this scenario, this example, of the disconnect once persons are welcomed into the community as former residents of MDC.

Ms. Melnick: Yes, I know we have chatted about this before, and my understanding is that MDC does work with the community around care of individuals. For example, I do know that if an individual is in a community-living setting and becomes unstable for whatever reason, that MDC certainly will play a hand even into having that individual come back in and stabilize, whether it be through a pharmaceutical regimen, whether through a therapy regimen, et cetera.

* (16:30)

I think that when we chatted before, I said that I was wondering if it would be appropriate and, again, we will not talk about any individuals, but if a letter could be written. I do not remember a letter coming, but certainly I would encourage the member to, if he is wanting to write or have the individual, I would be very happy to receive that letter and see if some sort of compromise could be met. It is nice to hear that

there are highly skilled people at Manitoba Developmental Centre who are providing a very good service. Perhaps if a letter could be forthcoming, we could sort of further the discussion on what might be a resolution not only in this individual's case but other individuals who might be facing similar concerns.

Mr. Faurschou: Mr. Chairperson, I believe we also spoke, Madam Minister, in regard to the number of activities that are provided for residents of MDC and when persons move into community living, have a lot less social interaction than they had been previously experiencing as a resident of MDC. I am wondering whether or not continued association would be at all possible, or whether this is in perhaps contravention or contravenes the adjustment or psychological adjustment that is necessary when one moves from the Manitoba Developmental Centre into community living programming and whether this is possible. I do know a number of individuals that attend to our soup kitchen just for the sake of interaction, social interaction, not necessitating that they need additional food, but the social needs are addressed at the soup kitchen.

I am wondering whether the minister has any thoughts or whether this contravenes the particular program protocol, but I do believe that the social interaction that is afforded all residents of MDC is something that persons, once into the community living program, perhaps could still benefit from.

Ms. Melnick: I am assuming the soup kitchen is the community—okay, just for clarification there. Well, again, I think the member raises some really important issues. When we talk about people who are in the Manitoba Developmental Centre, there is an array of programming that would be made available to the individuals based on ability, based on interest, based, perhaps, on a sort of therapeutic basis for each individual. My understanding is that those programs are for the individuals in MDC and funding is provided for MDC based on those programming needs which, of course, are based on very specific assessments of each and every individual.

There is programming that does happen in the community-living setting, and I cannot name all the programs that are available in Portage la Prairie which would be available to people who are not in MDC, but I think a really strong message through the question is that it is very important to make sure, as

we accelerate the transition of individuals from MDC into the community, that we take into account concerns such as programming, particularly programming that is very, very helpful to residents in MDC, that might not be readily available in the community.

So my understanding is that right now we are funding for programming in MDC specifically for residents of MDC, that we are providing programming in community living which has increased by 130 percent since 1999 for the community living setting as a whole, part of which would be for programming in any individual community. Again, I would believe that it would be based on individuals who would benefit from those programs.

Mr. Faursehou: Mr. Chairperson, one final question in regard to MDC. I know the community welcomed the minister and the announcement which she brought to Portage la Prairie about the redevelopment of the Manitoba Development Centre. I just want to confirm with the minister that the progress towards redevelopment is one of engagement, engagement of staff, engagement of parent groups and residents for their ideas as to how the redevelopment of MDC would best proceed, and just looking to make certain that the minister is willing to engage and see all interested parties, stakeholders have the opportunity to participate before the final plans are set.

Ms. Melnick: Well, certainly, it is nice to hear a member of the opposition speaking positively about providing care for the residents of MDC and recognize the importance of the redevelopment in that care. The process that the member has asked about has already begun. As he knows, this is a seven-to-ten-year undertaking, and it is one that we will in fact be working with all the stakeholders, as the member has outlined. Again, just to say that we have already begun to do so.

Mr. Chairperson: No more questions?

Mrs. Taillieu: I have no further questions at this time. I just thank the minister for her time.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Official Opposition House Leader): By leave, Mr. Chairperson, I would ask that we now move to the Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton) for concurrence.

Mr. Chairperson: It has been requested by leave that we move now to the Minister of Water Stewardship. Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): I have a few concerns that I will want to, first of all, express about how the Minister of Water Stewardship has portrayed the Winnipeg floodway labour management agreement and how the labour management agreement is being rolled out and how the advertisements on the first contract of the floodway have been done and some of the concerns that have been raised with me in regard to the information session that was held, I believe, at the Winnipeg Convention Centre at the beginning of this week, I understand, and the lack of the ability of the board to be able to answer the questions that would be required to be answered in order for the construction industry to be able to properly do the tendering for the project.

I want to ask the minister whether he can explain to us how the discussions were held with the unions. I understand that there were a few other participants in the discussions that led to the drafting of the Project Management Agreement of the Manitoba floodway. I wonder if the minister could give us a bit of an overview as to how that happened.

* (16:40)

Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister of Water Stewardship): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it has been fairly well documented, and I appreciate, certainly, that the member opposite has a differing view, but the feeling of the Manitoba Floodway Authority and, certainly, the feeling of our government was that it was necessary to have a project management agreement for the floodway.

We felt that was important for a number of reasons, most importantly to negotiate a no-strike, no-lockout provision which would ensure that we did not see the kind of situation that developed in the 1960s, for example, with Manitoba Hydro during the construction of the Grand Rapids Dam in which case there was no project management agreement because it predated the project management agreements at Manitoba Hydro. In fact, there were at least two legal work stoppages, and this was in a worksite that initially, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was non-unionized. It was then certified, and then the workers made a democratic decision to take action under The Labour Relations Act.

So we announced that, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as is the case with any project management agreement, as is the case with Manitoba Hydro, you essentially had, in this case, the proponent of the project, the owners, if you like, of the project, which, in this case, were represented by the Manitoba Floodway Authority, you also had the various members of the Manitoba Building Trades Council, and they were part of those discussions. We also set up a process early on that involved contractors initially, that involved the Merit Contractors, Manitoba Heavy Construction Association and the Winnipeg Construction Association.

The Merit Contractors and the Heavy Construction Association were involved with meetings right up to and including the fall of last year and then chose not to continue as part of that process, and there was a project management agreement that was announced. I think the member is more than aware of that and, in fact, a project management agreement, too, that does ensure no-strike, no-lockout, and I think the process has been very clear right from day one. I appreciate that there are people who fundamentally disagree with the concept of a project management agreement and, in the case of the members of the opposition, fundamentally disagree with certain provisions of the Project Management Agreement but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were able to announce that and there was, I think, a very instructive press conference at which, in addition to the Manitoba Floodway Authority, there was, also, the Manitoba Building Trades Council and a representative of the Winnipeg Construction Association, an association, by the way, that represents both unionized and non-unionized contractors.

So there has been a fairly extensive process. There have also been information meetings. I know the member is aware. I believe he attended at least one of them. In fact, there have been a number of meetings that were held throughout the process. I should stress, too, that other stakeholders have been involved, including Aboriginal organizations, for example, because we are committed to employment equity. I think the process has been fairly comprehensive.

I should add, too, since I neglected to mention this, of course, that one of the key elements behind the Project Management Agreement was also the Wally Fox-Decent report. Mr. Fox-Decent, a well-respected Manitoban with a certain amount of

experience on the labour relations field, certainly well-known to many people in this province for his role in various significant arbitrations and various labour relations processes, presented what now has been dubbed the Wally Fox-Decent report, which really lays the template for much of the discussion for the Project Management Agreement. I am sure if the member was to read through the Wally Fox-Decent report, the essential elements of the Wally Fox-Decent report are in the Project Management Agreement.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Chairperson, again, the member is repetitive in much of what he has said. We have heard this many times, yet when I read the agreement, clearly there are some very significant questions that stare very glaringly out of this agreement. One must wonder where the equity that the minister has talked about is actually factual in this agreement. One would also wonder how the bidding process can, in fact, be a competitive bidding process under the terms of this agreement.

When I look at some of the provisions in the agreement, and then I look at the 14 addendums to this agreement which are simply the individual union agreements that are prevalent in this agreement, one has to wonder where the equity is and where the competitive bidding process will be allowed to function. I think that was some of the questions that were unanswerable, quite frankly, at the meeting last Monday that was held in order to give the advice and information that is required to the potential bidders on the contract at the Convention Centre.

So I do not know how one could determine fairness even under the management agreements that have been drafted and come to under the terms of an equitable kind of labour-management process. I just refer to the first reference in the agreement of the first union agreement which is reference No. 1. The following specific provisions of the current collective agreement between the CLRAM and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 343, will govern the applicable work on the Manitoba Floodway Expansion Project. Then it talks about hours of work and overtime, how that will be applied and the actual wage rates that are indicated here.

Then we come to the section that deals with the trust funds. I note that there is a difference in virtually every one of these union agreements on the

trust fund. Some trust funds, and I will read them clearly, some of these trust funds are very clearly and very different from the others. I believe that when one looks at the pension trust funds and the minister has made much to do about this when I ask questions on this, he does not want to answer the questions that we put so he constantly says that we are opposed to pension funds and, or health and welfare.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how, under the terms of this agreement, we need health and welfare trust funds when, in fact, health and welfare, both of which are provincially funded under The Health Care Act and under the Family Services Department. The welfare is quite well known and it is public welfare, it is public health. Now we have to set up trust funds to put up separate funds to do what? To provide additional health care, private health care to these, as the minister indicated today in the House, the Minister of Health (Mr. Sale), that we should buy special insurance. I guess this is the start of buying special insurance and putting those monies into trust.

* (16:50)

What I find interesting, the carpentry trade pension trust fund, the employer will contribute \$2.50 an hour starting in 2006. That is probably about when the main construction will start, and the employee contributions will be \$1.16 an hour, bringing it to \$3.66 an hour. Then the welfare trust fund will contribute, by the employer 83 cents and 25 cents by the employee.

Then, if you move ahead to the, I believe it is the iron workers' trust fund, if you move ahead to the International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers, you find that the welfare trust fund, or the pension trust fund will be an employer being . . . by this agreement hereby covenants and agrees to be bound by all . . . trust. Effective May 1, 2004, employers shall contribute \$4.50 an hour, versus \$2.50 for the carpentry people, \$4.50 for the bridge workers, and there is I believe no provision that the employee actually contributes anything. Now is that equitable that the taxpayers of Manitoba will pay one sector into a pension fund?

The minister talked about equity in pension funding, and he pointed fingers saying we are against pensions. Well, we are against the inequities that are

prevalent here. So the taxpayers of Manitoba will have to add to the salaries \$4.60 for every hour that this section, that the International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers Local 728 will be receiving. Similarly, when you go then to the welfare trust fund, each employer shall contribute \$1.60 an hour instead of 80 cents an hour, double the amount for these employees than for the carpenters' trust fund. Can the minister explain this to us please?

Mr. Ashton: I think there is a fundamental differing view that the members opposite have, and certainly we do and, I think, most Manitobans do, when it comes to provisions of this agreement or any agreement that involves pensions and benefits for workers. In this particular case, the member mentioned various different subprovisions of the agreement. What he did not put on the record by the way is that these agreements essentially reflect what is happening out there in the market, reflect negotiations. You mentioned in one particular agreement involves the CLRAM, which is the Construction and Labour Relations Association of Manitoba, which represents employers. So I think he should be very clear when he puts that information on the record that that is the case.

The key element of this agreement, as is the case with the Hydro agreement, this is nothing new. This is essentially a reflection of what is happening out there. This is standard practice, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not sure what the member expects when it comes to pensions and benefits. He made reference to health benefits. When we talk about benefits, some employees in Manitoba, certainly my own constituency of Thompson, will have access to prescription drug benefits, eyeglasses, supplemental coverage that builds on our medicare system, not private health care but, for example, in hospitals, various situations where you have private rooms, various things.

Members of the Legislature also have the same sorts of provisions in this case that reflect the collective agreements signed by the Manitoba Government Employees Union and the Province of Manitoba. I say reflecting that because all of our employees and Manitoba MLAs also get those same kinds of benefits. Benefits are paid for either through an employer contribution or an employee contribution, or both.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, benefits will vary by contract. For example, workers in my community who work at Inco have different provisions in their collective agreement, in terms of pensions and benefits, than say those who are staff who are not covered by a collective agreement and have different provisions than we have with the Manitoba government. Inco, for example, has a 35 % prescription drug plan, which is quite unique. It certainly is a very positive benefit for employees at Inco.

So I think what the member is doing is again distorting what pensions and benefits are all about. He should recognize, I think, the fact that pretty well every employee in the areas that he has referenced would expect nothing less than salaries, pension benefits. It is fairly standard. Some employees will be unionized, some will not be unionized, but pensions and benefits are paid for either by the employers or by the employees.

I make no apologies. On the public record I have said before that we cannot build the floodway without having decent wages and decent working conditions. That includes pensions and benefits. Not a day goes by without the member opposite adding to some of the mythical numbers he has been bringing forward. He throws them around with abandon, and about the taxpayer is paying this. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about pensions and benefits. We are not talking about anything that is involving any Cadillac treatment for anyone. Pensions and benefits for Manitoba workers, you are not going to be able to build a major project like the floodway unless you have pensions and benefits for Manitoba workers.

Let us put on the record here that the member is entitled to ask questions, but I think he should be careful not to distort what is in the Project Management Agreement. If he disagrees with the basic principle of either pensions or benefits, let him state so. I would invite the member, too, because I know he has raised a number of questions in the past about some of the details of the Project Management Agreement. There was a recent exchange of correspondence with the Manitoba Floodway Authority and Merit Contractors and the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association, which dealt with many of the questions that I know were raised by the contractors and subsequently raised by the Member for Emerson (Mr. Penner). Certainly, I would offer again, if the member wishes, a briefing with the

Floodway Authority. I think it would be important because some of the issues he has been raising have clearly been dealt with, both in the response to contractors I mentioned but also in terms of the public information.

I want to stress again that I appreciate the member opposite is opposed to a project management agreement for the Manitoba Floodway expansion. That is clear. That is the clear position of members opposite. We disagree. We believe what worked for Manitoba Hydro, what worked for the Mulroney government on the Confederation Bridge will work here for the Floodway Authority. I think it is the first time I have ever been compared with Brian Mulroney when the Premier (Mr. Doer) referenced the similarity the other day, and it is true. Project management agreements are nothing new, and the kinds of provisions the member is asking questions about are not new either. I would invite him, actually, if he has the time, to look at the Project Management Agreement for Manitoba Hydro, the Burntwood-Nelson agreements that have far more restrictive elements than this Project Management Agreement, in particular for the last 30-plus years, have required workers to become unionized when they enter the worksite. They are often what are called "closed shops."

* (17:00)

That is not the case with this agreement. This agreement builds in provisions for unionized and non-unionized employers, and builds in provisions for unionized and non-unionized employees. That, I think, is reflective of the Wally Fox-Decent report and reflective, I think, of our commitment right from day one, which is to have a project management agreement that reflects the reality of Manitoba in the year 2005. Part of that reality is pensions and benefits are a standard part of any contract of this type, and I would expect nothing less than Manitoba workers in the year 2005 to get decent benefits, decent pensions and decent wages. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will not be able to get people to work on the floodway unless we provide that and that is what this agreement does.

Mr. Penner: I am actually a bit surprised at the things the minister is putting on the record. I think he even surprised himself this time. What I find most astounding is that we have an agreement here which is supposedly a singular agreement, and then we

have 14 agreements attached to that which are substantially different. Yet, under the terms of this agreement, the taxpayers of Manitoba will have to top up. I do not disagree with what the minister says about employees and wages and negotiated agreements between unions on wages and salaries. No problem with that, the differentiation there, but, when the province of Manitoba, under an agreement signed and negotiated by their government, when the taxpayers of this province are going to have to pay differentiating amounts of money into pension funds for employees that are so vastly different as these are, that, to me, is simply unfair. That is an unfair process that has been established.

Secondly, then, to assume that there can even be an economic equilibrium created because the competitive bidding process on contracts on a project such as this which should be the, how do I say this, the equilibrium for creating comfort to the taxpaying public that there will be a fairness developed in the bidding process that will allow a competitive price to be established to make sure that when the construction is done, that it is done fairly and competitively. Yet, when I really look at this and read this agreement, I believe that the fair, normal, competitive bidding process has been badly skewed by this agreement.

How can the minister sit there and say one sector of society, the taxpayers of Manitoba, will contribute \$5.25 an hour to a pension trust fund, and it is not designated to a pension trust fund which will be managed by a union and then another \$1.50 an hour to a health and welfare trust fund and another 60 cents an hour for an operating engineer advancement fund? Then other parts of the agreement actually pay just over \$1 an hour into pension trust funds.

How fair is that when the actual money comes directly out of the taxpayers' pockets into those trust funds? They are all Manitobans working there, or we assume they might be. However, we are questioning that now. This might, in fact, be a whole international labour force or interprovincial labour force that comes in here and is able to underbid anything that we have in Manitoba. It could be huge international conglomerates that walk in here and tender the contracts except for one agreement, the agreement on the west dike.

What I find interesting is that one union member, one of the group of union members, will be

paid \$7.36 an hour through the trust fund contribution by the taxpayers. That is clear. That is documented right here. The least one, I believe, is almost \$4 an hour. So there is a spread there of better than \$3 an hour which the taxpayers will pay to employees of a project. Now, maybe that is fair. In the minister's view, maybe that is fair. I find that absolutely unfair. I just want to indicate to the minister that we have done a substantial amount of background work in looking at all these contracts.

What I want to ask the minister is how come there is only one of the contracts which has a clear indication. I will read it to him that none of the monies put in trust will be used for political campaigns. There is only one of these agreements that had that provision in it. Why is that? Can the minister answer that?

Mr. Ashton: I want to deal with the member's comments to begin with. You know, I am not quite sure now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether the member has recanted on his opposition to the Project Management Agreement and is now getting to the specifics, or whether he wants to have it both ways.

Members in opposition, and it has been said in this House in the past, Abe Kovnats said, "You are in opposition; you can have it both ways." But now, Mr. Speaker, the member from Emerson has gone from opposing the project management agreement, and also going through it page by page and taking out certain elements of the contract, and saying, "Well, this is better than that, or different than that." I am not quite sure where the member is coming from.

One thing I would suggest is that the member understand one thing. If he checks the Hydro agreements, he will find the same thing. The project management agreements are no different from any of the other provisions of any agreements that you will see across the province. Mr. Speaker, nurses have different agreements than doctors, than nurse's aides, than physiotherapists. You have different wage rates; you have different pensions, different benefits. You know, MLAs have different benefits than other employees.

So the member is going through it and saying, "Aha, there are differences." Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason there are specific provisions for each trade is because there are different market conditions and

different prevailing pensions and benefits out in the marketplace. If we try to have a one-size-fits-all approach for Manitoba, we would find out there are different market rates in the economy.

This agreement is very much based on the existing experience, both in terms of collective agreements, but also in terms of the prevailing rates throughout the economy. There is not some over-the-top contribution here. This is really reflecting what the agreement is all about which is recognizing the going salaries, pensions, benefits and other provisions.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that even when the member now tries to get off the untenable position of opposing the Project Management Agreement, certainly in my view, it is untenable, and certainly the key provisions of the Project Management Agreement, he will now have you believe that he is not really opposed to the contributions. It is just a differing amount. Well, that is not what he said when the Project Management Agreement came out initially.

As for political contributions, Mr. Speaker, you know, the bottom line here is it is illegal in this province to give contributions for provincial elections from either a union or a corporation. Thanks to the Manitoba NDP government, that is the law. Whether it is in a collective agreement or not, that is unnecessary. Now there may be provisions of collective agreements that predate that. There may be certain agreements that did have such provisions, but what matters is that the NDP took out union and corporate donations. Maybe the Tories want to go back to that, maybe they want those big cheques back in their bank accounts, but we took that out.

The real answer to the member's question is, the reality is, that there is not any ability, Mr. Speaker. Even the federal government, I believe, has restricted corporate and union contributions, if I can go by memory, to a maximum of \$1,000 a year, far less than the \$5,000 that is put forward by individuals.

* (17:10)

So the bottom line here is—I am not quite sure why the member is getting his magnifying glass out and going looking through the agreement for provisions regarding political contributions. You cannot make a union or a corporate political donation

to a political party in Manitoba under Manitoba law. That supersedes anything that is in any agreement. It is the law. You cannot make the provincial contribution to a party. It is the law.

An agreement, Mr. Speaker, has to follow the law. So, in this particular case, the member can—I know I have accused the member of being part of the Flat Earth Society at times. I know that on the member's flat earth, there is also a grassy knoll, because he is always looking for some conspiracy here, but how would it be relevant, whether there is a provision in a contract preventing contributions in this case, when the law says you cannot contribute to a political party in Manitoba?

We solved that, we did that. Members may disagree, but, right now, it is not legal to make a contribution to the NDP, the Conservatives, the Liberals, any party in Manitoba, because we fixed that. We made sure that individuals make those contributions. So, again, I think the member's question is redundant.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I find the minister's comments interesting. Every time he gets stuck or he feels threatened, he accuses people and starts name-calling, and all that sort of stuff. The term Flat Earth Society has been his favourite one. I have always said to the minister, "Yes, I am a member of the Flat Earth Society. I live in the Red River Valley. It is flat as can be."

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): I am wondering if we can call committee rise?

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if there is leave not to see the clock so that we can deal with a sessional order regarding the ordering of business.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement to not see the clock so we can deal with a sessional order? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, would you canvass the House to see if there is leave to introduce a sessional order regarding the ordering of House business?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to introduce the sessional order dealing with House business? Is there leave? Is there agreement? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach)

THAT the following Sessional Orders apply to this and the next session despite any other rules, Sessional Order or practice of this House.

1. The House is to sit on Monday, June 13, 2005, to Thursday, June 16, 2005.

Monday, June 13, 2005

2. At 5:00 p.m. on Monday, June 13, 2005, the Speaker must interrupt the proceedings and, without seeing the clock, put all questions required to conclude Report Stage on all bills then at that stage, without further debate or amendment.

Tuesday, June 14, 2005

3. Any bills considered by a Standing Committee on Monday, June 13, 2005, must be reported to the House on Tuesday, June 14, 2005, and any Report Stage amendments on those bills must be disposed of on that day before debate is called for the Opposition Day Motion.

Tuesday, June 14, 2005, is designated as a day for debate of the Opposition Day Motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Russell set out in the Order Paper of Thursday, June 9, 2005.

Wednesday, June 15, 2005

4. The House must, if necessary, sit beyond the usual adjournment hour on Wednesday, June 15, 2005, to conclude the business of supply for the 2005-06 fiscal year as follows by 8:00 p.m. on that day:

(a) by 4:00 p.m. on that day both the concurrence motion in the Committee of Supply and the concurrence motion in the House must be put; and

(b) by 8:00 p.m. on that day, all stages for the passage (including all related motions and all three readings, but not including royal assent) of the following bills must be completed:

The Appropriation Act, 2005
The Loan Act, 2005
The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2005

If the Committee of Supply, the Committee of the Whole, or the House has not concluded any item or stage described above by the required hour, the Committee Chairperson or the Speaker, as the case may be, must interrupt proceedings at that time and, without seeing the clock, put all questions necessary to dispose of the required items without further debate or recorded vote.

Thursday, June 16, 2005

5. At 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 16, 2005, the Speaker must interrupt the proceedings and, without seeing the clock, put all questions required to conclude Concurrence and Third Reading on all bills then at that stage, without further debate or amendment.

Royal assent on all bills that have had Third Reading disposed of must take place before the House adjourns on that day.

Subsequent Sitings 2005-2006

The following are to apply for the next Legislative Session.

1. Subject to rule 2(2), the 4th Session of the 38th Legislature must begin on October 27, 2005, and must rise on December 8, 2005.

2. Subject to rule 2(2), the House is to return on March 6, 2006, and is to adjourn on March 23, 2006. The House is then to resume sitting on April 10, 2006, and must adjourn no later than June 13, 2006.

3. A Friday on which the Committee of Supply meets counts as a separate sitting day of the House, for which there is to be an Order Paper setting out only the Orders of the Day, but Routine Proceedings are not to be held.

Two Fridays are to be designated, at the call of the Government House Leader after consulting with the independent members, as days for consideration by the independent members of the concurrence motion by the Committee of Supply from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. On those

Fridays, a quorum is not required and no question may be put to a vote.

4. All government bills introduced by April 13, 2006, must have the Second Reading Stage completed by May 18, 2006. However, the Opposition House Leader may designate up to five of those bills as bills for which the Second Reading Stage must be completed by May 31, 2006. At 4:30 p.m. on the applicable day, the Speaker must interrupt all proceedings and, without seeing the clock and without further debate or amendment, must put all questions necessary to complete the Second Reading Stage on every bill that the Speaker has called for debate at least three times.

This order does not apply to a bill unless, on or before April 13, 2005, the government has provided a written explanation of the bill to the Opposition House Leader and the independent members, with a copy to the Speaker.

This order also does not apply to The Loan Act, 2006, The Appropriation Act, 2006, or The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2006.

5. All government bills introduced after April 13, 2006, and not given royal assent before the end of the 4th Session of the 38th Legislature are to be reinstated during the 5th Session of the 38th Legislature at the stage they are at when the 4th Session is prorogued.

Thursday, June 8, 2006

6. At 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 8, 2006, the Speaker must interrupt proceedings and, without seeing the clock, put all questions required to conclude Report Stage on all bills (other than the bills referred to in Item 7(b) below) then at that stage, without further debate or amendment.

Monday, June 12, 2006

7. By the usual adjournment hour on Monday, June 12, 2006, the business of supply for the 2006-07 fiscal year must be concluded as follows:

(a) by 4:00 p.m. on that day

(i) the consideration of departmental estimates in the Committee of Supply must be concluded, and

(ii) both the concurrence motion in the Committee of Supply and the concurrence motion in the House must be put; and

(b) by the usual adjournment hour on that day, all stages for the passage (including all related motions and all three readings) of the following bills must be completed:

The Appropriation Act, 2006

The Loan Act, 2006

The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2006

If the Committee of Supply, the Committee of the Whole, or the House has not concluded any item or stage described above by the required hour, the Committee Chairperson or the Speaker, as the case may be, must interrupt the proceedings at the usual adjournment hour on that day and, without seeing the clock, put all questions necessary to dispose of the required items without further debate or recorded vote.

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

8. At 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 13, 2006, the Speaker must interrupt proceedings and, without seeing the clock, put all questions required to conclude Concurrence and Third Reading on all bills then at that stage, without further debate or amendment.

* (17:20)

Royal Assent on all bills that have had Third Reading disposed of must take place before the House adjourns on that day.

At the conclusion of business on that day, the Speaker must adjourn the House without a motion for adjournment. The House then stands adjourned to the call of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Government House Speaker, seconded by—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Moved by the honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader (Mr. Derkach),

THAT the following Sessional Orders—dispense?

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, this is, I think, an important day in the House for a number of reasons. Most importantly, though, I think this represents some improvement and, indeed, some parliamentary reform in the province of Manitoba. For the last number of years, we have increasingly been directing our efforts to put together a sessional calendar so that the work of the Legislative Assembly is more respectful, particularly of the public, but also of members in this Chamber and the ability of the respective parties to order their business to make their efforts more planned.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have to begin by saying hats off to the members of this House for accommodating this motion, in particular the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach), the Opposition House Leader, and the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), who have been working on this. I want to, as well, go back, of course, to Marcel Laurendeau, those early discussions in terms of the rules that now set out when the House does sit, in broad terms. But now we are, I think, moving along so that for more than a year from now, we can predict the sessional calendar. As well, there is, I think, some good guidance in terms of how the mechanics will work in this House so that there is an orderly disposition, or at least putting of questions in the House. I think this is a great step forward.

In terms of the current session of the House, I am, as well, I think, quite pleased, quite frankly, that we have an orderly wind-down. I know that if this motion had not been put, we would be asking, Mr. Speaker, for you not to see the clock this evening, and I expect that we would have been going very late because there was a lot of House business yet to do.

We recognize that a significant part of that House business is some bills that came in, by necessity, after April 28. Of course, that was the date after which bills had to be put for questions. We recognize that the issue of teachers' pensions is an important one to many people. I know that there would be some financial difficulties for retired teachers, in a matter of weeks, I understand, if the bill was not proceeded with. I understand, as well, of

course, that the public does expect the Auditor General's report to have action taken in terms of legislative change, and so that legislation, by necessity, does come later than the April 28 cutoff.

So I think, for those reasons, the current session, as well, is going to a more orderly wind-down, and I think the mechanics that we have agreed to in here allow for that. There is a lot of work, obviously, to do next week. I think the number of hours that we have recognized are needed attest to the amount of work that is still on our agenda. So I think that we have accommodated that well.

I notice that when it comes to the amount of time that we spend asking questions and doing answers in Question Period, Mr. Speaker, there was a recent tally. It showed that from 2000 to 2004 the average number of sessional calendar days, and I suspect that might be Question Period days, in Alberta is 48; in B.C., 58; in Saskatchewan, 71. The order here increases that time in the House, but, Mr. Speaker, we remain steadfast in the assertion that the measure of legislators' time is a very difficult measure indeed.

I do not think that we have historically adequately recognized the work that we do in committees. We do not recognize the work that we do in concurrent sittings of Supply, often in three sittings of Supply. But, having said that, there are more Question Periods now that are accommodated under the sessional order.

So, with that, I conclude by simply reiterating my thank you for the rolling up of sleeves of the Opposition House Leader and the Member for Inkster in coming to an all-party agreement this year on how we are proceeding until at least June 13 of 2006.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Official Opposition House Leader): Well, Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of this motion, I want to begin by, first of all, thanking the Government House Leader for the effort that he put in to ensure that we were able to work co-operatively toward an agreement that, quite frankly, is overdue. I know that this effort was started a number of years ago by Mr. Laurendeau in conjunction with the House leader here to try to arrive at a sessional calendar that would put some, I guess, order to when this House sits and when it recesses.

One of the things that I want to note about the agreement, Mr. Speaker, is that what is provided here

is not only a sessional calendar for when the House sits, but, more importantly, if you go back to the agreements that were struck and the rules that have been established since 2002, you will see that we have moved many of the activities that take place during a sessional sitting into intersessional sittings. The agreements have provided for us to hold intersessional committee hearings on bills. We have provided in our changes to the agreement and the rules, the provision for standing committees to sit when the House is not sitting. This is a time when members do have to come into the House and to plan for that. Certainly, there is a lot of work that goes on in that regard as well.

One of the other important elements is that, although we have shrunk the number of Estimate hours, because, quite frankly, we thought we could use our time much more effectively than the 240 hours that we had at one time for Estimates—we now have 100 hours of Estimates, but, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, we do not sit in just one section or two sections of Estimates any more. We sit in three sections of Estimates, which also means that the clock runs, but it does not recognize the fact that the session could be prolonged inordinately if you did not have three sessions running concurrently.

So there is a lot of work that has been done to try to be more effective and more efficient in the way that we do our business in the House and outside of the House, Mr. Speaker. To that extent, I have to take my hat off to all of those who have been involved in ensuring that this kind of an agreement is arrived at.

Now I know that there is one negative about this and that is sometimes when the parties sit down and talk about agreements like this, someone gets a little anxious, wants to take all the credit for it and runs out to the media even before the agreement is done. I regret that on CJOB just a little while ago, the independent member from Inkster was out there talking about an agreement and that he was going to be holding up this agreement if he did not get what he wanted out of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nobody does negotiations this way. I regret that he stooped to that kind of level when, in fact, we have to ensure that when we are negotiating among ourselves, that there is a lot of fluidity, if you like, in what happens. We have to ensure that we are true to our word when we do these

things. There has to be co-operation and to that extent, I do have to take my hat off also, not only to the Government House Leader, but to the member from Inkster who is a party to this on behalf of his member. There has to be total co-operation, and, to that extent, we have worked and we have worked very hard to ensure that there is something in this for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the extension of the session, there is a need to extend this session because there is a lot of unfinished business on the books that has to be concluded. I think that the extra four days that we have had, we are limited by the Manitoba rules in terms of when the House has to rise. If you go according to the Manitoba rules, the House does have to rise on the 16th of June or thereabouts. I think it is the second full week in June, but we have been able to accommodate an extension to this session to accommodate some of the issues that we have outstanding, but, more importantly, for us to continue to explore what really went on in the issue of the Crocus Fund that many Manitobans are turning their attention to at this time.

*(17:30)

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we are trying to accommodate the work that Manitobans want us to do in this Legislature. I conclude by simply saying that this is an example of how government and opposition can come together from time to time to achieve something that I think is for the good, not only of this Chamber and this House, but for all Manitobans.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I, too, would like to put a few words on the record in regard to this particular motion. I recognize right up front that negotiations are a very delicate thing, at times, and I think that when you sit down, there has to be a sense of good faith, and, generally speaking, I believe that that is, in fact, what has happened.

I would like to assure the member from Russell, in particular, and members of this Chamber that, in fact, it was a CJOB report, I believe it was twelve o'clock, and which I understand we can get a transcript of it, where it indicated that the PCs and the New Democrats have reached an agreement. I had clearly indicated after getting a printout of that particular report that there is no agreement and there cannot be an agreement unless we also are a part of

that agreement because, after all, leave would, in fact, be required. As members will recognize, there was a need for leave. It was not to try to take credit. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Having said that, I would like, and I would encourage members—they can get a copy of the transcript, as I say, from CJOB, and they will see exactly what it is that took place on the twelve o'clock news. I think it was twelve o'clock. It might have been the one o'clock. It was a last minute thing that was handed over to me from staff in our office.

Mr. Speaker, the rules are critically important. We all operate under rules. Back in 1988, when I was first elected, one of the things that I took as an interest was how the Chamber actually operates. The rules have changed a lot over the years. The Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) talks about the Estimates. I remember the 240 hours, two committees, private members' hour at five o'clock, the rotation on how private members' bills, all bills, were addressed. There were far more resolutions being debated. There were different ways in which members could actually get and communicate messages through the Legislature.

Over the time, we have seen a lot of rules change. Some of those rules have been to the better. Some of those rules have not been to the better. The Government House Leader (Mr. Mackintosh), as an example, makes reference to Alberta and B.C. and the number of sitting days. The tradition in the province of Manitoba, prior to this government being the government, has been 80 days, in terms of as a normal sitting day. That was an average for a good number of years. In fact, while in opposition, it was the government that believed that it still was not enough days in terms of the actual number of sitting days.

I think that we have to reflect on the tradition of the Chamber, and, having said that, Mr. Speaker, speaking strictly about the resolution itself, I do believe it is a step forward. Are there things that I would have liked to have seen? Yes, but I recognize that there has got to be compromise from all sides. I especially appreciate the efforts of the member from Russell and the Government House Leader, and also Rory. Rory also did a considerable amount of work. There might have even been other people involved.

I am encouraged, in the sense that we talked about the former member from St. Norbert, this is

something that he has talked about as other members have talked about. I know the member from Portage la Prairie showed me a sessional calendar that he would like to see. I think there is a genuine need for us to look at the rules and see what we can do to make democracy, or this Chamber, work better for the public.

I believe that this agreement, the real winner on this agreement is, in fact, the public of Manitoba. I think that, at the end of the day, did we get our 80 days? Not quite. If we get the Fridays, it will be 80, 81, and I compliment—as I say, sometimes you have to compromise. At the end of the day, I do believe that this document that the minister has moved and the member from Russell has seconded will ensure that there is more accountability for the Province, and I think that is important.

That is why, in principle, myself and my leader have no problem in terms of supporting the rules that we are changing. We wait. We do want to see the process continue to the extent in which, as opposed to having motions of this nature, we make some permanent rule changes. I know that there are other members in the Chamber that do have an interest in the rules, and I have always welcomed sitting side by side, whether it is in the Chamber or outside the Chamber, and having that dialogue.

Mr. Speaker, I would also acknowledge your efforts in terms of hosting meetings where we have talked about other issues, whether it is the Question Periods, organizing questions, members' statements, petitions. There is a lot more that we can do, but for now I think this is a good agreement which we can all of us share some credit for. If I did, in fact, do something that was not appropriate, I would apologize to all members. That would not have been my intent. Without further ado, it is with pleasure that I speak to the motion in anticipation that it will be passed. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Before recognizing the honourable Government House Leader, he has already spoken, but I just wanted to, for clarification of the House, our *Manitoba Rules and Proceedings*, 59.1, "A member who has moved a substantive motion may reply." So that is why I will be recognizing the honourable Government House Leader. Just for clarification of the House.

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think it is very important that we put on the record of this

House those who work hard behind the scenes and might not be seen in here in terms of being the movers and shakers on work like this, but I think it is important first of all to recognize the work of Rory Henry. Rory has been working with the government for five and a half years now. He is moving on into the policy area more, but he has provided tireless, steadfast and steady devotion to House business, and I think members in this House know how important his work has been. I mean that.

I also want to recognize the work of Linda Marek, who has come on recently to the opposition caucus and, I think, has done some great work and has really done some good partnering with Rory for the common good. I also want to recognize the Clerks at the table, of course. I want to recognize Legislative Counsel, Val Perry, Jake Harms, and the translators that pulled this together.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, may I have leave for a moment to address this issue because I was remiss in not doing it in my remarks?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been granted.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to echo the words of the Government House Leader because you know, without the staff who really put their shoulder to the wheel on these kinds of issues, we would never be able to accomplish what we do from time to time. I really want to commend Rory Henry

for the work that he has done. It has been a pleasure working with him on all House issues. As a matter of fact, he has a very appropriate demeanour for the kind of work that he has to do in terms of negotiating a lot of things between House leaders.

To that extent I also want to thank my own staffperson, Linda Marek, for the tremendous work that she has done on this effort and also on House business, and to the table officers and to the Clerk's office, Mr. Speaker. I certainly commend them for the work that they have done on such short notice. So I just wanted to make sure that those remarks were echoed and extended to those members of the Chamber and outside the Chamber.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is a sessional order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, would it be appropriate for me to ask that this motion be recorded as unanimously endorsed and moved?

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

Okay, it will be recorded as unanimously passed.

The hour being past 5:30 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Monday.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 9, 2005

CONTENTS

Matter of Privilege		Maples Surgical Centre Murray; Doer	3473
Lamoureux	3467		
Rocan	3468	Crocus Investment Fund	
Mackintosh	3468	Murray; Doer	3475
		Loewen; Selinger	3477

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Petitions		Flood Damage Rowat; Smith	3480
------------------	--	------------------------------	------

Ambulance Service Schuler	3468	Members' Statements	
Fort Garry Hotel Rocan	3469	Geri Weir Brick	3481
Wuskwatim Project Development Agreement Driedger	3469	Golden West Broadcasting Penner	3482
Teachers' Pension Plan Pension Adjustment Account Eichler	3470	Kendall Kostur Struthers	3482
Maguire	3471	Phoenix Flames and Science Fair Participants Taillieu	3483
Crocus Investment Fund Lamoureux	3470	Seniors of Radisson Constituency Jha	3483
Education Support Levy and Special Levy Stefanson	3470		

ORDERS OF THE DAY (Continued)

Tabling of Reports

Annual Report of the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund for the year ending December 31, 2004 Bjornson	3471
---	------

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Oral Questions

Health Care Services Murray; Doer	3473	Concurrence and Third Readings	
Goertzen; Sale	3474	Bill 25—The Workers Compensation Amendment Act	
Stefanson; Sale	3478	Lamoureux	3484
Gerrard; Sale	3480	Murray	3485
		Schuler	3486
		Gerrard	3488
		Cullen	3488
		Allan	3489

Royal Assent

Bill 2—The Child and Family Services
Amendment Act (Child Protection
Penalties) 3490

Bill 3—The Recreational Trail Property Owners
Protection Act (Occupiers' Liability Act
Amended) 3490

Bill 6—The Real Property Amendment Act 3490

Bill 7—The Personal Investigations
Amendment Act 3490

Bill 9—The Manitoba Centennial Centre
Corporation Act 3491

Bill 11—The Provincial Court Amendment
Act (Justices of the Peace) 3491

Bill 12—The Liquor Control Amendment
Act 3491

Bill 13—The Milk Prices Review
Amendment Act 3491

Bill 14—The Electricians' Licence
Amendment Act 3491

Bill 15—The Emergency Measures
Amendment Act 3491

Bill 18—Le Collège de Saint-Boniface
Incorporation Amendment Act 3491

Bill 20—The Life Leases Amendment Act 3491

Bill 23—The Workplace Safety and Health
Amendment Act (Needles in Medical
Workplaces) 3491

Bill 24—The Consumer Protection Amendment
Act (Cost of Credit Disclosure and
Miscellaneous Amendments) 3491

Bill 25—The Workers Compensation
Amendment Act 3491

Bill 26—The Margarine Repeal Act 3491

Bill 27—The Horse Racing Commission
Amendment and Horse Racing Regulation
Repeal Act 3491

Bill 32—The Rural Municipality of Kelsey
By-law No. 5/02 Validation Act 3491

Debate on Report Stage Amendments

Bill 22—The Water Protection Act
Penner 3491
Fauschou 3494

Committee of Supply

Concurrence Motion 3495

Sessional Orders

Mackintosh 3505
Derkach 3508
Lamoureux 3509