



Third Session - Thirty-Sixth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report
(Hansard)**

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Louise M. Dacquay
Speaker*



Vol. XLVII No. 69 - 10 a.m., Friday, June 27, 1997

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Sixth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise, Hon.	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	P.C.
DÉWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary	Concordia	N.D.P.
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Steinbach	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
ERNST, Jim	Charleswood	P.C.
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	N.D.P.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	P.C.
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Ind.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane	Osborne	N.D.P.
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn	St. James	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	P.C.
NEWMAN, David, Hon.	Riel	P.C.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PITURA, Frank, Hon.	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
RADCLIFFE, Mike, Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack, Hon.	Niakwa	P.C.
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Gladstone	P.C.
SALE, Tim	Crescentwood	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin	N.D.P.
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	P.C.
TOEWS, Vic, Hon.	Rossmere	P.C.
TWEED, Mervin	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	N.D.P.
Vacant	Portage la Prairie	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 27, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m.

CRTC Presentations

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

CRTC Presentations

Mr. Stan Struthers (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Donna Porter, Alex Holowachuk, Nick Manciniub and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the minister of telecommunications make presentations before the CRTC opposing such hikes in local rates.

Obstetrics Closure—Grace General Hospital

Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James): I beg to present the petition of Cecile Brown, James Hawkins, Melinda Anderson and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) consider stopping the closure of the obstetrics program at Winnipeg's Grace Hospital.

Mobile Screening Unit for Mammograms

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Clifford Stevenson, Lynn Bass, Ruby Clarkson and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba may be pleased to request the Minister of Health to consider immediately establishing a mobile screening unit for mammograms to help women across the province detect breast cancer at the earliest possible opportunity.

Obstetrics Closure—Grace General Hospital

Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Karen Duke, Audrey Duke, Susan Murray and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request the Minister of Health consider stopping the closure of the obstetrics program at Winnipeg's Grace Hospital.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Khalid Mahmoud, K.J. Traynor, Paul Kramer and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the minister of telecommunications make presentations before the CRTC opposing such hikes in local rates.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Gail Cork, Janet Smith, Mark Burch and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the Premier and the minister of telecommunications make presentations before the CRTC opposing such hikes in local rates.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

CRTC Presentations

Madam Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers). It complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

THAT the Manitoba Telephone System as a public asset served this province well for over 80 years providing province-wide service, some of the lowest local rates in North America, thousands of jobs and keeping profits in Manitoba; and

THAT contrary to promises made in 1996 by the provincial government, the majority of shares of the privatized MTS are controlled outside the province of Manitoba; and

THAT on June 16, 1997, MTS requested from the CRTC a \$5 increase per month for 1998, one of the highest increases in the country; and

THAT this follows previous increases ordered by the provincial government in 1995, 1996 and 1997; and

THAT these increases mean that for some communities in the Parklands will have almost doubled since 1995, with Dauphin alone having an increase of 87 percent when the rate for Yorkton, Saskatchewan, under the publicly owned Saskatchewan Telephone System is \$5 per month less; and

THAT MTS is requesting a rate of return of 13 percent per year from CRTC and to do this wants to raise local rates further above the rate cap in the 1998 going-in rates; and

THAT, contrary to promises made by the provincial government, MTS under private ownership is moving rapidly to raise local rates in rural and northern Manitoba.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the minister of telecommunications make presentations before the CRTC opposing such hikes in local rates.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Law Amendments Eighth Report

Mr. Jack Penner (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments): I beg to present the Eighth Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

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

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

Your committee met on Monday, June 23, 1997, at 7 p.m., Thursday, June 26, 1997, at 10 a.m. and 3:15 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 48—The Child and Family Services Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille et modifications corrélatives

Louise Malenfant - Parents Helping Parents

Wayne Helgason - Social Planning Council

Alice Wright - Private Citizen

Dave Waters - Winnipeg Child and Family Services

Mallory Newman - CUPE

Tamsin Collings - Private Citizen

Eileen Britton - The Grand Society

Donna Ekerholm - Private Citizen

Linda Dorge - Private Citizen

Colleen Suche - Law Society of Manitoba

Dr. Charles Ferguson - Winnipeg Child and Family Services—Abuse Committees

Helen Zuefle - Private Citizen

Linda Shapiro - Private Citizen

Garth Smorang - Manitoba Bar Association

Norma McCormick - Private Citizen

Your committee has considered:

Bill 48—The Child and Family Services Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille et modifications corrélatives

and has agreed to report the same, on division, with the following amendments:

MOTION:

That the proposed subsection 8(11), as set out in section 5 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "not less than \$200. and".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 15(3.3), as set out in subsection 6(2) of the Bill, be amended by adding "and any such order may be enforced as a judgment of the court." after "exceeding \$5000."

Your committee voted to defeat Clause 8(2) of the bill.

MOTION:

THAT the following be added after subsection 8(2) of the Bill:

8(2.1) The following is added after subsection 18.4(2):

Report of conclusion where child not in need of protection

18.4(2.1) Subject to subsection (3), where an agency concludes, after an investigation under subsection (1), that a child is not in need of protection, the agency shall report its conclusion

(a) to the parent or guardian of the child;

(b) where there is no parent or guardian of the child, a person having full-time custody or charge of the child;

(c) to the person, if any, who is identified by the investigation as the person who was alleged to have caused the child to be in need of protection;

(d) to the child where, in the opinion of the agency, the child is capable of understanding the information and disclosure to the child is in the best interests of the child; and

(e) to the person who reported the information that gave rise to the investigation, except where disclosure is not in the best interests of the child.

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 18.4(3), as set out in subsection 8(3) of the Bill, be amended by adding "or (2.1)" after "subsection (2)".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 19(3.6), as set out in subsection 10(2) of the Bill, be amended by striking out everything after "At a hearing," and substituting the following:

(a) the agency has the burden of proof on the balance of probabilities;

(b) all parties may be represented by counsel and shall, subject to clauses (c) and (d), be given full opportunity to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses;

(c) the court is not bound by the rules of evidence in relation to the evidence of a child who the agency alleges was abused by the applicant and may receive the child's evidence through hearsay, by way of a recording, a written statement, or in any other form or manner that it considers advisable; and

(d) a child who the agency alleges was abused by the applicant shall not be compelled to testify.

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 19(3.7), as set out in subsection 10(2) of the Bill, be amended by striking out "and provide all parties with written reasons" and substituting "and record the reasons".

MOTION:

THAT the section heading or proposed subsection 19(6) of the English version, as set out in subsection 10(4) of the Bill, be amended by striking out "re offence".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 30(1.3), as set out in section 17 of the Bill, be amended by adding "and any such order may be enforced as a judgment of the court." after "exceeding \$5000."

MOTION:

THAT the following be added after subsection 20(1) of the Bill:

20(1.1) Subsection 38(4) is amended by striking out "or master".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 78(5), as set out in section 28 of the Bill, be amended by striking out

(a) "or master"; and

(b) " , and person who was served but does not appear or with respect to whom an order was made dispensing with service is deemed to consent".

MOTION:

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

Mr. Penner: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger), that the report of the committee be now received.

Motion agreed to.

* (1005)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Disaster Assistance
Deductible**

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, last evening a number of people who were devastated by the flood this year from the Red River Valley spoke eloquently about the devastation, about the impact it had on their lives and their families and about the fact that they all believe we all live as one community on one flood plain and should be working together as one community, neighbour to neighbour, I think a sentiment that is shared by all of us.

One speaker, Rita Bartmanovich, wanted me to present a sign today to the Premier (Mr. Filmon)—and I told her it was out of order—that I am still homeless. She spoke eloquently about the devastation to her family and her property where she had lived for 42 years. She has been quite confused by messages of this government. One day the door is open to change this; the next day it is closed by the Premier. One day the minister is going to open the door again on the 20 percent deductible; the next day the Premier says, you live on a flood plain, tough luck, and on and on and on.

So I would like to ask the Acting Premier today—and certainly people wanted the Premier there—in light of

the fact of the replacement cost to many families, as we have been outlining throughout this session—the depreciation plus the deductible is a double deductible for families—will this government now agree to drop the 20 percent and state that clearly in this Chamber today, the 20 percent deductible, so people will have a chance of rebuilding their lives?

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that this Premier and this government and my colleagues are extremely concerned and have taken some very important actions as they relate to those individuals who have suffered the hardship of the floods. Not only was the government working with the city and other municipal governments very aggressively and actively in the prevention and the protection of those individuals throughout the province where at all possible, there were some unfortunate situations which are being dealt with.

I can assure the member that this government is far more compassionate than the government which he was involved in when Mr. Harry Harapiak on April 3—press release—1987, increased the deductible to 25 percent. We have lowered that to 20 percent, not 25 percent—it is 20 percent—and have raised the maximum coverage from \$30,000 to \$100,000, which is taking place across the province.

We want to make sure those individual cases—I am sure the minister can speak to it more appropriately than I—hardship cases, that we can move as aggressively as possible to make sure they receive some of the funds necessary in addition to what they have already received.

Mr. Doer: The minister will know that they had printed the pamphlets and the bulletins at \$30,000 until this opposition had done the homework across Canada to show what had happened and, Madam Speaker, the Harapiak policy improved on the former policy, and the policy that the government was pushed into improves upon that policy. There is no question about that.

All of us should be building upon the experience of the tornado in Alberta and the Saguenay region to improve again on the federal-provincial flood relief. All we are talking about is fairness for people in the

Red River Valley. That is what we are talking about in this Chamber.

**Flood Victims' Rally
Premier's Absence**

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, in light of all the confusion between the minister and government members that have been attending meetings, why, with all this confusion, did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) not have the intestinal fortitude to show up at that public meeting last night to hear the people? Why did he slink off to the golf course, come through the back door and hide in this Chamber instead of meeting the victims of the Red River flood?

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Madam Speaker, I take strong exception to the comments that he made about the Premier and the way in which he has dealt with these people of Manitoba and the flood conditions. The Premier was out doing what he had to do to promote this province as part of the Pan American Games promotions.

I want to also state that that meeting last night was—we had a very capable representative at the meeting who is directly affected as the MLA and the minister, who has worked very hard and aggressively along with the Premier, my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings), for months to make sure the people of the Red River Valley were well protected, building a Z-dike in a week's time to make sure the water did not back in on the city of Winnipeg.

I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that he has been defeated three times at the polls, and he will be beat again. The people of Manitoba have shown who they support to look after them, and it is not him, Madam Speaker.

* (1010)

**Flood Victims' Rally
Premier's Absence**

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Speaker, during the flood we cared about our family, our friends, our neighbours. We worked together in this province. I remember the Premier (Mr. Filmon) was pretty visible

at the time, particularly when it came to taking helicopter rides. Whenever there was a camera, the Premier was in front of it, but yesterday when there were 400 Manitobans, flood victims, who were pleading for the Premier to speak to them, he sat in this air-conditioned Chamber throughout the entire time.

I want to ask the Deputy Premier—

An Honourable Member: You were not around.

Mr. Ashton: Well, I know he was here because I came upstairs. While the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) was speaking to the flood victims, the Premier was sitting here in the air-conditioned Chamber.

I would like to ask a very simple question and that is: Why is it that this government will not meet, have the Premier meet with the flood victims? Why will they not deal with the human concerns of people who are still victims of the flood? Why did they have their Premier, Premier Filmon, sitting in this air-conditioned Chamber ignoring those real people who want to hear from the Premier?

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Madam Speaker, I want to, first of all, deal with the compassion of this government as it relates to the changes that were made to former NDP policies. It was directed by the Premier of this province not by pressure from the opposition but the real need to increase the coverage from \$30,000 to \$100,000 for those people who were, unfortunately, so severely affected by this flood.

They can talk about printing of bulletins. We are not directed by bulletins. We are directed by compassion, of which this Premier led the way. We also had a 20 percent deductible, when the opposition party were in government had a 25 percent deductible. We have also said that if people want to put their sweat equity in contribution towards that deductible, they can do so, that it does not take hard cash to do that—again, a compassionate move by this Premier and by this government.

Madam Speaker, I would hope that the members would pay attention to the time and the effort, day and night, that the Premier spent all through the flood to make sure the direction of the safety of the people of

Manitoba was well in hand, and it was. So we are not going to stand here or sit here and take any lessons from them on compassion, because I am extremely proud of our Premier and my colleagues in the handling of the biggest disaster this province has ever seen.

Mr. Ashton: Indeed, so compassionate he would not meet with flood victims yesterday, and on a daily basis he is undercutting his Minister of Government Services (Mr. Pitura) any time the minister even suggests that he would listen to the flood victims. That is how compassionate the Premier is.

I want to ask the Deputy Premier—and I want to plead on behalf of the people I went outside to listen to—will he commit to have the Premier sit down with the many Manitobans who are still being devastated because of the flood. If he would not come out yesterday from the Chamber, will he meet with the flood victims as soon as possible and deal in a real, compassionate way with the needs of those flood victims?

* (1015)

Mr. Downey: Our Premier—unlike the members opposite when they raised Autopac rates 20 percent and they had thousands of people out here, when not one member of the NDP caucus would face that group of people in 1987, not one of them would appear before those people, we had a minister of the Crown who represents that community. It is my understanding that the Premier was not through the event that he was involved in to be back. I also want to understand that there were, Madam Speaker, more like 200 people, and it is unfortunate there were any devastated. More importantly—

Point of Order

Mr. Ashton: Madam Speaker, it is not in order to make reference to the absence of a member, but I could confirm that the Premier was sitting here while the rally was still going on. While the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) was actually speaking at the request of the people, the Premier was sitting here in this air-conditioned Chamber.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Thompson did not have a point of order.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The honourable Deputy Premier, to complete his response.

Mr. Downey: I will just conclude my comments. It is my understanding that the Premier will be visiting some of the communities tomorrow in the Red River Valley. He will be visiting those people. I know the Premier very well. He is quite prepared to meet individuals who have difficulties with their lives, with their hardships. I can assure you, if the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Pitura), responsible for emergency services, needs or wants the Premier to be involved, I am sure that can be accommodated.

Disaster Assistance Deductible

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Madam Speaker, this government is sending out mixed messages. Yesterday the Minister of Government Services actually broke the rules of the House by saying one thing in the House, saying there was no change in policy, and then going out in the hallway and saying, well, maybe there is a change in policy.

What this government is doing is breaking the spirit of the people who have suffered from the effects of the flooding in the Red River Valley. When is this government going to listen to people and waive the deductible, as has been asked, and help these people through the hardships that they are facing and help them get on with their lives? When are they going to get a straight message from this government?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I wonder if, through a point of order, I might appeal, through you, to members of the House on all sides of the House who from their seats seem to be having more to say than those who stand to their feet. I suggest that if we all who do not have the floor did a little more

listening and a little less talking, we might all learn something.

Madam Speaker: I thank the honourable government House leader for that observation. It is very difficult to recognize an individual so that he or she may be heard until such time as there is more calm and quiet in the Chamber.

* * *

* (1020)

Madam Speaker: The honourable Government Services minister, to respond to the question asked.

Hon. Frank Pitura (Minister of Government Services): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have met with groups in Rosenort, St. Adolphe, Ste. Agathe, Red River Drive. At no time did any of those groups ever get the impression from me that there was a movement on the part of government with regard to the cap or the deductible, and that can be accounted for in the fact that the representative of the Red River Drive group walked out of our meeting last Thursday and reported to the press that the government was not giving any more money, and I stick by that.

I would like to just recap for members opposite some of the things that happen in disasters. Time is everything in the situation. If you recall the rains of 1993 that devastated the same area that I represent today, many of the producers right immediately following the rains and the occurrence of tombstone in their crops said: Our crops are worthless; we should write them off; you should allow us to burn them. They pleaded with government, crop insurance, to allow them to write these crops off immediately because they were devastated. They needed money because they were going to be bankrupt. As time went on, harvest came, the crop came off, sales were made. The event turned out to be much more positive than they anticipated.

Ms. Wowchuk: Madam Speaker, is the Minister of Government Services saying that what he said yesterday on tape to the media is not true, and in fact they are not looking at reviewing waiving the cap, or is what he is saying here in the House true? Give the

people a clear answer. What is the message? Are you waiving the cap, or are you not waiving the cap?

Mr. Pitura: Madam Speaker, as I indicated to the group last night, our government is attempting to address the situation of devastation, of frustration, of the stress of everybody in the Red River Valley that has been affected by the disaster as quickly as possible. We have put extra inspectors out to make sure that all properties are inspected by the end of June. We are bringing in 160 assessors to put the evaluations together so that people will have their award letters before the middle of July so they can start to reconstruct their homes, their businesses and be able to put their lives back together.

We must remember, Madam Speaker, that this flood is of such magnitude that we can never, ever, I think, expect a return to what it was exactly before. We will always have that impact of that flood in our lives, but we hope to be able to address these situations, and we are trying to help these people get back on their feet as quickly as possible.

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Chairman's Salary

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, people in Manitoba know that the real proposed increase for rates is about five times that of inflation for MPI this year, when you consider all the changes both directly and indirectly to the costs of auto insurance in the province of Manitoba. That has been well documented by CAA.

We find it scandalous that a Tory fundraiser that was appointed to the board of directors is making, on top of the \$35,000 annual salary for the part-time work on the board—has got up to close to \$29,000 reported in per diems from this government. How can the government justify eliminating the deductible for people who have their cars stolen at the same time they can find tens of thousands of dollars for Tory friends? Where is the priority for people in this province?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister charged with The administration of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): After the profligacy of the Pawley-Doer government, Madam Speaker, we are not likely to

take too many lessons from the honourable Leader of the Opposition on this point. However, when I was appointed Minister responsible for MPIC, I quickly learned that some of the goals that I wanted to see achieved were to have the highest level of service to the public that we could attain. There were issues related to strategic planning for the corporation, its governance, the new system of no-fault and phasing out the old system of no-fault, the retirement of that particular way of doing business. Employee-employer relations were an important—these were all important matters. In addition, the corporation was in the throes of preparing their application for the Public Utilities Board.

Mr. Thiessen has a background that particularly well fits him for the chairmanship of the board. It is my expectation that, as Mr. Thiessen gets a good handle on some of the issues that I have referred to, the amount of time that he would have to spend as chairman would be reduced, but by no means do we want to have a chairman of the board who does not take any role whatsoever.

* (1025)

Mr. Doer: It sounds like the only handle Mr. Thiessen has is a good handle on car theft victims' wallets in terms of the changes being made in the Public Insurance Corporation.

Auto Theft Deductible

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): The minister never answered the question. Why do you not cancel the tens of thousands of dollars that are going out in per diems to Mr. Thiessen and cancel the deductible that this government, this Premier (Mr. Filmon), this minister instituted for victims of car thieves? Why do we not go after the thieves, rather than the victims? That should be the policy of this Legislature, and this minister should start taking a leadership role, take on the perks for his buddies and start protecting the victims and cancel that deductible for victims of car thieves.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): I am glad the honourable member

raised the issue about car thefts, because indeed the corporation is taking leadership in this area. It was the corporation and the government of Manitoba that approached the City of Winnipeg Police to see in what way we could assist in attacking this very, very serious problem relating to car theft.

It is not a one-pronged approach, Madam Speaker, to dealing with this problem. We think that, if the City of Winnipeg Police appropriately use dollars that we are contemplating making available to them to assist us with reduction in car thefts, we can save Manitobans throughout Manitoba dollars with respect to premiums to pay for the problem related to car thefts.

This is another area that I have asked Mr. Thiessen, the board and the executive of the corporation to turn its attention to—a serious problem that requires serious responses.

Personal Income Decline

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry (Mr. Downey) continually boast about the economic progress made by Manitoba in the past year. Yet, when we look at the average weekly wage increases in this province, we find that they continue to lag behind the nation as a whole and also that those increases are less than the rate of inflation so that the purchasing power of Manitoba workers has declined in this past year alone. In reality, average weekly wages have dropped by \$10.70 between March of 1996 and March of 1997. In fact, in a month, that is \$40 of purchasing power that the workers—\$40 a month in one year, \$40 in one year. My question—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I am certain the honourable member for Brandon East has a question.

Mr. Leonard Evans: My question very simply and directly to the Minister of Finance: Is this loss of \$40 a month, over \$40 a month, supposed to be economic progress in this province?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): Well, Madam Speaker, I am glad the member for Brandon East in his preamble acknowledged that we are proud of how Manitoba's economy is performing. I am sure he need look no further than many of the articles in the local media, whether it is: Manitoba economy to sizzle by the Royal Bank; Manitoba leads in job creation.

So, certainly, in terms of job growth, Manitoba is leading the nation, and that is something we should all be proud of. When you look at real disposable income for the last three years from 1993-96, Manitoba's after-tax disposable income has grown by 2.1 percent compared to Canada's growing by 1.1 percent, almost double the Canadian rate and the third-best performance in all of Manitoba.

An Honourable Member: Canada, all of Canada.

* (1030)

Mr. Stefanson: So, again—in Canada. So, whether you look at that economic indicator, whether you look at jobs, whether you look at exports, retail sales, whatever indicator you want to look at, Manitoba's economy today is performing amongst the best in all of Canada, and that is something all members, including the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), should be proud of.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Madam Speaker, can the minister explain very carefully why, in Canada as a whole during the same period of time, March to March, '96 to '97, the real weekly wages have increased by \$2.68 per week or nearly \$11 a month since March '96, while Manitoba's workers, the average wage in Manitoba has dropped by \$10.70 a week or over \$40 a month? In other words, why are Manitoba workers losing \$40 a month purchasing power while the nation as a whole, the workers of the nation as a whole are increasing their real purchasing power?

Mr. Stefanson: Madam Speaker, most of the economic organizations have come out with statistics in the last few weeks. Stats Canada came out with information on disposable income; the Conference Board has come out with their forecast for the economy. If you look at the most recent information from Stats Canada, again you will see that our growth

in real disposable income continues to be amongst the best in all of Canada. Today we in Manitoba have the fourth-highest family incomes in all of Canada, a good performance for the province of Manitoba.

So, again, if you look at all of the economic indicators and certainly all of the coverage through all of the local media over the course of the last several months, Manitoba's economy in all of these areas continues to perform amongst the best in all of Canada.

Disaster Assistance Government Flexibility

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Government Services. A fair comparison to the problems for the Red River flood victims is the problems the flood victims in the Saguenay region in Quebec had. According to officials in Quebec, it took 49 different Orders-in-Council to reach what they considered fair levels of compensation.

My question for the minister is: Given the obvious distress of some flood victims in Manitoba, will the government show as much flexibility as the government of Quebec in dealing with these issues?

Hon. Frank Pitura (Minister of Government Services): Madam Speaker, with respect to the member's question in terms of the flexibility, we have shown, I think, a great deal of flexibility in being able to address the magnitude of the disaster that has hit southern Manitoba. A number of things have occurred with respect to that. The first was, of course, increasing the amount per claim up to \$100,000. Another area was with the farmhouse, farm business, getting the claims up to a hundred thousand dollars on each particular claim. We are at the present time into negotiations with the federal government in terms of being able to fulfill all the requirements of the MOU, which are what the member references as separate Orders-in-Council—could be likened to the same thing in that many recommendations, or at least many agreements have to be put into order, are being put into place as a result of this disaster that we had this year.

Mr. Kowalski: Is the minister aware that in Quebec, where it was not possible to rebuild the original

structure, according to an Order-in-Council by the government of Quebec dated October 9, 1996, which I will table, where there was a cap of a hundred thousand dollars, residents were compensated for 75 percent of the damage exceeding a hundred thousand dollars? Will the minister commit to following Quebec's lead in offering such a benefit to Manitobans as Quebecers had the benefit of?

Mr. Pitura: With respect to the question put by the member, the present policy is that those people who have homes that are unsalvageable will be compensated to the maximum level based on either the appraised value or the market value of the residence that they cannot return to.

Flood-Fighting Honorees Winnipeg Police Service

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): Will a member of the government tell me why, in the press release dated June 20 that honoured the Canadian Forces, RCMP and coast guard for their flood-fighting efforts, the Winnipeg Police Service was ignored? Does not the government care about the Winnipeg Police Service and respect the work that they did?

Hon. Frank Pitura (Minister of Government Services): Madam Speaker, I know that there were many, many groups representing many jurisdictions that helped with the flood-fighting efforts. With acknowledging all the groups that had participated in the flood directly related to the province, with regard to the Winnipeg Police Service, I was not aware personally, myself, that they were directly helping the provincial organization in flood-fighting efforts. They may well have indeed been very active within the city, and I think that on that basis the province has extended a very warm thank you to all those participants in the city: Winnipeg police, firefighters and the like that participated in the flood-fighting efforts. I think that that is under that purview where they have been recognized.

Political Contributions Public Funds

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): Madam Speaker, last year this government had the publicly owned Manitoba Telephone System sponsoring a hole in its golf tournament to raise money for the PC Party fund. Now

we see them soliciting more money from public bodies such as the Winnipeg Convention Centre and the Manitoba Capital Fund. How can the Acting Premier defend his government's sense of morality when he leads a party that solicits public bodies like the Winnipeg Convention Centre to give money to his political party?

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): The society in which we live provides the opportunity for individuals to support political parties, to be involved—not under pressure like the NDP would have when it comes to having the employees contribute to political parties. Not only do they contribute to political parties, but they are controlled by the American union bosses making decisions out of the United States. This is a recent addition—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Downey: So, Madam Speaker, there has been nothing wrong. People are free to provide resources, to sponsor if they like. There is no pressure to do it. It can absolutely be done of their own volition.

Mr. Sale: Madam Speaker, can this Acting Premier explain to Manitobans why public funds from the government itself—the Workers Compensation Board, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, the Superannuation Fund—should be used to buy tickets to raise money for the PC Party of Manitoba? How can he defend that?

Mr. Downey: Madam Speaker, I do not accept for one minute the premise or the preamble which the member brings to this House. There is no one forced to participate in any way, shape or form by this government in any fundraising unless they, by their own governing system, decide to do so, unlike the NDP who used legislation to force working people, hard-working men and women to participate in political parties through checkoffs.

* (1040)

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): A point of order, Madam Speaker. Beachesne Citation

417 is very clear that "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate." The member for Crescentwood asked why this government was getting political contributions from public funds, from Workers Compensation and MPIC through MCF capital holdings. He is not even close to answering the question. Perhaps he did not hear it, but I would appreciate it if you would ask him to for once answer a serious question about why public money is going to the PC Party.

Madam Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Thompson, I would remind the honourable Deputy Premier that, indeed, Beauchesne 417 is very clear—should respond to the question asked and not provoke debate.

* * *

Mr. Sale: Madam Speaker, will the Acting Premier finally admit that the reason he will not tell anybody where Manitobans' money is invested through the Manitoba capital corporation is because he wants to allow that corporation to use public money to do what his government wants. Essentially, he manipulates public funds for their benefit. Is that why he will not tell us where they even invest their money? You will not tell us where they are putting their money, Mr. Deputy Premier. You will not even tell us where we are investing our money. That is because you want to keep it hidden.

Mr. Downey: Madam Speaker, this government has put in place several instruments which will help the province's economy grow, employ people—investment in projects and confidence in the people of Manitoba. That is the instrument that has been developed. We have seen them enter into projects that are with private sector companies that we cannot disclose because it may, in fact, cause them some major difficulties in the marketplace which will erode those job opportunities. We do not direct how they spend their money. We do not direct how the Crocus Fund direct their money—again, a labour-sponsored program established by this government.

I have answered that in Estimates, I have answered it in the House and I can assure the public there is absolutely nothing inappropriate as to the way in which these funds are carried out, Madam Speaker. They are

subject to the audits of the Province of Manitoba. Information is available, and as much as possible, when it does not put in danger the company which is involved, we are prepared to provide that information.

Desktop Management Services SHL Systemhouse Contract

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): My question is to the Minister of Government Services. Did this minister sign the computer contract before or after SHL Systemhouse agreed to be the major corporate sponsor for the recent PC Manitoba fundraising dinner?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): As usual, I find myself correcting the member for Elmwood. There is no contract signed with Systemhouse. We entered a letter of intent, and we are in negotiations with Systemhouse which might well lead to a contract, but again he was wrong with his preamble and his information.

Mr. Maloway: My supplementary to the Minister of Government Services is this: Given the cosy relationship between SHL and this government and the sponsorship of the PC Manitoba fundraising dinner by SHL, can the minister inform this House as to what the current state of negotiations is, what the terms of the contract will be, the position of the staff and would he release a copy of the contract and would he also explain why it is that SHL, given that he said they do not have a contract, are out negotiating subagreements right now?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Point of Order

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I believe, Madam Speaker, if I could get the attention of all colleagues in the House, we may get some business done today. If honourable members on all sides of the House were to sit quietly in their seats when they do not have the floor, I think we could probably get a lot of work done today.

Madam Speaker: Once again, I thank the honourable government House leader for his advice, but he does not have a point of order.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The honourable Minister of Finance, to respond to the question.

Mr. Stefanson: As the member for Elmwood knows, there was a solicitation of proposals from this entire industry, from the information technology sector. Systemhouse was chosen from those that submitted submissions, and we are in negotiations with them which might well lead to a contract, but this does provide me an opportunity—he asked about the staffing issue, and as we have indicated consistently on this issue, some employees might well shift to Systemhouse, but at the end of the day, it is our intention that all of those employees will have jobs, either with Systemhouse or within government. In fact, a letter was sent from the Civil Service Commission to the Manitoba Government Employees' Union outlining that, that it is anticipated that job opportunities will be available within Systemhouse for civil service staff, and further, it is also anticipated that there will be no layoffs. I repeat it is anticipated there will be no layoffs of employees as a result of this initiative, so that is one issue. Obviously, at the end of the day, we will end up with a better system, providing better service to all Manitobans on a cost-effective basis. That should be the objective of any government.

Health Care System Hip Replacement Waiting List

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Madam Speaker, a month ago I asked the Minister of Health about the government's underfunding of health care in this province, creating extensive waiting lists of over a year for persons awaiting hip and knee replacement surgery.

Madam Speaker, we were happy to see that the government put in, I believe it is some \$300,000 into the Manitoba cancer treatment to reduce the waiting list in that regard. We know the government put a half a million dollars in to reduce the waiting list prior to the 1995 election, but the government has put no money in to reduce the waiting list for hip and knee surgeries. The minister indicated he would go back to Treasury Board to seek additional funding.

I want to ask the Minister of Health here today what success, if any, he has had in gaining additional funding to reduce the waiting list for those persons waiting for hip and knee replacement surgery.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health): As I outlined to the member in my answer to him previously, in most areas, many of those areas that he has mentioned, we have increased, as a government, funding and increased the numbers of procedures done, in some cases very dramatically.

The need, because of an aging population, continues to grow. We are always trying to address that and keep up with it. This year in our budget Treasury Board provided some additional dollars to deal with waiting lists specifically, and we are dealing with each one of those lists one by one. He has referred to a couple of areas where we have already reached agreement to put in additional dollars. I can tell him that he should be expecting some additional announcements in the very near future.

Madam Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

NONPOLITICAL STATEMENT

90th Anniversary—Knowles Centre

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): I would like to make a nonpolitical statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable member for Radisson have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Ms. Cerilli: Madam Speaker, Knowles Centre celebrated its 90th anniversary last night with a dinner at the Manitoba Masonic centre. There was a slide show highlighting the history of Knowles Centre from 1907 in a house on Broadway Avenue where Wilfred Knowles, a CPR clerk, took in a homeless Polish immigrant boy of nine years old, all the way to the current treatment centre with a school for troubled boys and girls, which has day programs as well as a residential care facility.

* (1050)

Then Stephen Lewis, of UNICEF, gave an inspiring address on the advances in children's rights internationally. Mr. Lewis entertained and informed the audience of more than 200 with advocacy on the importance of the convention on the rights of the child. He emphasized how important the work of Knowles

has been over the 90 year to now, complying with, particularly, Article 30 of the convention of the rights of the child on minority and aboriginal children or indigenous children and their rights to their culture and traditions since aboriginal youth now make up the majority of clients served at Knowles Centre.

He described how the youth issues addressed at Knowles are some of the many being put on the policy agenda in countries all over the world with the help of the rights of the child declaration which has been ratified by 191 countries. He passionately described conferences and meetings all over the world where children themselves are sitting at the table face to face with politicians influencing government policy on many areas such as child labour, child prostitution and the rights of girl children to an equal education.

He emphasized that these are no longer needs, but rights. I would like to congratulate the 90th anniversary committee of Knowles Centre: David Davis, Rudy Ambtman, Eleanor Cameron, Marshall Gardner, Mark Minenko, Gerry Nytepchuk, Dianne Olivier and Debbie Smith, as well as all the staff, the volunteers and supporters of Knowles Centre in their role in advocating for children's rights as part of the 90-year legacy of Knowles Centre.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider and report of matters referred.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill 49—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1997

Mr. Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau): The Committee of the Whole will come to order, please.

The committee has before it for consideration Bill 49, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1997.

Does the honourable minister responsible have an opening statement?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): Thank you very much, no, Mr. Chairman. I made my comments at second reading, and I have provided the critic from the official opposition with some committee reading notes, so I am certainly prepared to move on to questions.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Does the critic for the official opposition have an opening statement?

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): No, but we have some few specific questions to ask as we proceed through the bill.

Mr. Chairperson: I thank the critic for that. If the minister's staff would enter the Chamber at this time.

The bill will be considered clause by clause. During the consideration of a bill, the title and the preamble are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order by the committee. We will also put aside the table of contents.

Is it the wish of the committee to do it in groups of clauses? [agreed]

Shall Clause 1 pass?

Mr. Leonard Evans: I hope I have the right area here, but we are talking about corporation capital tax? I guess we do not oppose what the minister is proposing, but my question is why increase it, say, from \$2 million to \$3 million for this particular period? I note you say it will increase the exemption for about 700 small corporations, but why not \$4 million? Why not \$5 million? I am just wondering why this particular decision, why this particular cutoff.

Also, could you tell us how many in total will now be taken off the capital tax rolls?

* (1100)

Mr. Stefanson: First, I would like to introduce the two staff who have joined me. On my right is Mr. Barry

Draward. He is the Acting Assistant Deputy Minister of Taxation, and on my left is Mr. René Perreault who is the director of Taxation and Federal/Provincial Relations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to very briefly take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Brandon East and his wife Alice on 44 years of marriage. I am sure I speak on behalf of all members of this Chamber in wishing them all the best on this special occasion and many more happy returns and great days in the years ahead.

In terms of his specific question, when we look at the amount, we do look at it in every budget, and we have moved the exemption once before. As the member knows, it was originally a million dollars. We moved it to \$2 million a couple of budgets ago. We have now moved it to \$3 million. So our decision is based on the financial impact and obviously the numbers of companies that are affected by making the adjustment. So it is an issue that we will look at again in our 1998 budget as to whether or not there is capacity to move again, what that impact would be on companies and so on.

After having said all of that, Mr. Chairman, as the member mentioned, about 700 corporations were removed from the tax roll as a result of this. That leaves about 3,800 corporations still affected by the capital tax.

Mr. Leonard Evans: First, I want to thank the honourable minister for his kind words, and I will certainly pass on his congratulations to my wife who will be glad to hear of them. Thank you very much.

I was not sure whether I heard the minister correctly, but I gather 3,800 are now exempt by virtue of this latest change. I do not know whether I heard him correctly. Is it 3,800 that are exempt, or how many are left who are not exempt? Maybe I could put it that way. [interjection]

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. Could I ask honourable members who want to carry on a conversation to do so in the loge. We are having great difficulty—[interjection] Order, please. Could I ask the

honourable members who want to carry on their conversation to do so in the halls or in the loge. The honourable minister and the critic are having great difficulty hearing each other. We will continue once the conversations stop. Thank you.

Mr. Stefanson: The answer to that last question, that is the 3,800. There are 3,800 corporations that still are on the corporation capital tax roll, approximately.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Chairman, then, if there are 3,800 on the tax rolls, do we know how many are not on or is that impossible to know? I guess you would have to guess as to the total number of corporations in the province.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, a very difficult question to answer. I am told there are in excess of 40,000 corporations in Manitoba, but beyond that I do not have the specific number for the member.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I can appreciate the difficulty, Mr. Chairman, of the department and the minister getting that information. I guess it would be based on estimates made by Statistics Canada of the corporations that exist out there. Either that or registrations, I suppose.

At any rate, I wondered if the minister could comment on how effective he thinks that this corporation capital tax exemption is. Certainly it will be welcomed by those businesses, obviously. Is there any sort of impact assessment of these exemptions in terms of the success of the corporation or the growth of these businesses?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, there is no specific study that shows the direct cause and effect of this particular tax adjustment. As the member for Brandon East knows, this capital tax is applied against debt and equity in corporations. So when we meet with many of the business organizations, like the Chambers of Commerce, like the Federation of Independent Business, they point to the fact that this tax can be a deterrent in terms of businesses that want to borrow some money to then invest because it might push them over the threshold, or, of course, it might also increase their tax.

So whenever I met with those kinds of organizations, the taxes that they most often point to as being, from their perspective and their membership's perspective, the most negative in terms of the economy and the growth in those businesses are usually the payroll tax and the capital tax.

So that is the anecdotal information. We certainly track growth in private sector investment in Manitoba. The member knows that our growth in private sector investment in Manitoba has been relatively strong in the last few years, relatively within Canada. I guess one could make the point that this is one contributing factor, but there is no specific study that says this removal of \$1 million has exactly this impact on our economy.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Chairman, I understand you would permit discussions and questions on all the items in the bill and then we would pass the whole bill at that time, rather than calling them section by section. So I would just highlight some of our concerns.

The other major change here is the payroll tax exemption; again, increasing it, I know to set a cost of about \$3.8 million. I know the criticism about a payroll tax is that it has a dampening effect on job creation. I know a lot of economists make that argument. Nevertheless, I appreciate and I think the minister appreciates the fact that it is a very significant source of revenue for the Treasury of Manitoba. It is not one that is as easy to give up as one would like. No one likes taxes. No one wants to increase taxes; no party does. I am sure no Minister of Finance does, but nevertheless the tax still remains.

So I just make that observation. As a matter of fact, the tax not only remains in place in spite of previous commitments made by the former Leader of the Opposition, the now Premier (Mr. Filmon), that the health and education levy would be totally eliminated. It still remains. I note that in the Estimates, in the budget, that the amount of revenue from this source is actually going to increase this year, in spite of the increase of the exemption.

Just passing on to the Manufacturing Investment Tax Credit, again, could the minister—this has been extended for another three years—give us any assessment of the impact of this tax credit? Is there anything he can point

to, to show—again, it may be very difficult, but is there any analysis he has or any conclusions he has about the tax credit on manufacturing investment being of some benefit to the province?

* (1110)

Mr. Stefanson: In terms of the payroll tax, as the member for Brandon East and I discussed the other day, these changes now reduce the number down to, I believe, about 1,600 firms that will be paying the payroll tax, so, again, a significant reduction in numbers paying, but the gross dollars are similar because approximately half of the revenue that comes in comes in from either the federal government or other organizations, other public organizations here in Manitoba.

On the expenditure side, we actually refund some of the payroll tax that we collect, as the member knows. We refund it to education, to public schools. We refund it to municipalities and so on. So on the one hand we have a gross revenue figure, but some of it is offset through some expenditures, and about half of it does come from government or government related kinds of organizations.

In terms of his very specific question on the Manufacturing Investment Tax Credit, again, when I meet various business organizations, the ones I referred to, the Chamber, the Federation of Independent Business, accounting organizations like CAs and CGAs, they all point very directly to this as being a very positive aspect of the growth in our economy. In fact, particularly people in the accounting professions who would see it first-hand on tax returns and the impact on businesses say that this definitely is having a significant impact in terms of economic activity in Manitoba.

We do not have a specific, again, study related to it, but if we look at since the introduction of the Manufacturing Investment Tax Credit, the growth in manufacturing shipments have increased every year. In fact, in 1996 the growth was 8 percent, the third best in Canada and far in excess of the increase of 2.9 percent. So, again, if you look at much of our performance in manufacturing, I would suggest that a lot of it is, in fact, related to the investment tax credit, and, interestingly,

now some other jurisdictions have introduced similar programs, I believe.

Just to conclude, I mean provinces like Saskatchewan, but when we have been in discussions with companies that are expanding through I, T and T or relocating, this topic does come up on a fairly regular basis as being something that companies do look at in terms of their expansion. We felt it was then the responsible thing to do, to put it in place for a slightly longer period of time. To give three years, it creates more stability, more predictability and hopefully will encourage even more businesses to expand here in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, to encourage manufacturing in this province and to promote manufacturing is a very great challenge. It is probably the most difficult job I think any minister has, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Industry. It is very, very difficult for all kinds of basic structural reasons, it seems to me.

While we have some advantages for economic location, we also have some disadvantages, unfortunately. Of course, probably the weather is one of them, in January, February sort of thing, but apart from that, there are other disadvantages. That is why it is always a struggle, and even though I appreciate the manufacturing shipment value of manufacturing shipments have gone up, some of that, of course, is inflation, but I am not suggesting the total physical output has not gone up. I am just saying that the value in current dollars tends to exaggerate the increased output of manufacturing.

It is a little disturbing when you look at the employment in manufacturing this year. The first five months that we have of this year, which is the latest information we have from the labour force survey, shows a decline in the employment of persons in manufacturing. I do not know how the minister can explain that, but there is a 1 percent decline in the first five months of this year. That is nearly half a year where we see the level of employment declining. Of course, if we look back, while there has been some increases in the last few years, if we look back to 1988, I believe the level of employment actually was higher at that time.

So I am just saying that we have these incentives, such as the investment tax credit for manufacturers. I think they may be of some benefit, but I think they are limited. Obviously, they are not permitting a massive expansion of manufacturing jobs in this province. As I say, in the first five months of this year, we had fewer people working in manufacturing than we had in the first five months of last year.

That is a comment. I am just passing on—unless the minister wants to respond, I pass on to the next item, which is the Manitoba Film and Video Production Tax Credit, which I want to congratulate the minister on introducing. I think this is a very good move, and it will, hopefully, enhance our film and video industries.

I think cultural industries, when we are talking about jobs, are not as appreciated as they should be for job creation potential, apart from all the other value, of course, of providing tax credits for this industry, such as the enhancement of Manitoba culture, the enhancement of culture generally, providing of opportunities for a lot of other firms that relate to this industry, so we have no trouble whatsoever.

I stand to be corrected, and I could ask the minister this question. Is it approximately \$16 million to \$17 million of tax revenue that will be involved in credits for this particular industry? In other words, this formula, when it is worked out for this industry, is it correct that it will be \$15 million, \$16 million, \$17 million worth of tax revenue that is being given up?

Mr. Stefanson: I did not bring with me all of my statistics on jobs and so on, so we can certainly leave that discussion for another day. I know over the last several years our performance on an overall basis in manufacturing jobs has been quite strong in a relative sense within Canada, but just to conclude on the Manufacturing Investment Tax Credit because it really has a cause and effect in terms of investment, from 1992 to 1997, the average annual change in capital investment in Canada was 2.2 percent. The average change in Manitoba was 18.6 percent, so I think the investment tax credit is obviously having an impact in terms of the capital investment because if you look at Saskatchewan over the same period, they actually had a reduction of 13.8 percent, and even Alberta only grew

by 7.3 percent, so I think that credit does have a significant impact.

* (1120)

In terms of the next issue, the film and video production tax credit, I thank the member for Brandon East for his compliments relative to the introduction of this tax credit. I agree. I think it is very timely. It is going to have a positive impact on this sector of our economy. It is a sector that has been growing significantly over the last few years with tremendous opportunities in Manitoba from cost competitiveness, the quality of our employees in this area and so on.

In terms of his very specific question on cost, in 1997-98, we are estimating the cost to be about \$1.5 million, and over the three-year lifetime of this credit, at this stage we are estimating the cost to be between \$5 million and \$10 million. Obviously, we will have a much better indication after the first year, but the total cost over the three years, we are expecting it to cost between \$5 million and \$10 million, but, obviously, we also expect a significant degree of activity in this sector of our economy.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I just have one or two other areas to cover and we can pass the bill.

I just want to comment on the first-time-buyer retail sales tax rebate which is being extended. We have been critical of the rebate, not that we are critical of rebates or not that we are critical of enhancing housing construction. Our criticism is not of taking initiative to enhance housing construction, but our criticism is that it is not as effective as it should be. The actual rebate is \$2,500, I understand, and it has not really translated into much improvement in the level of housing starts.

The minister need only look at the housing starts over the years to see how pathetic the level of housing starts in Manitoba is in the last several years. It was not uncommon for us to have 5,000, 6,000 housing starts per annum in Manitoba, and now we are down. The last few years, we have been just barely over a thousand. In fact, the urban—at least I have some urban housing statistics here. The total is a bit higher, but, nevertheless, it gives you the same pattern.

The urban housing starts are only 1,243 in 1996; the year before, 1995, were 1,215; 1994, there were 1,664; in 1993, 1,702; 1992, 1,821. So we seem to be coming down rather than going up in terms of the level of housing starts. For the life of me, I do not understand why there is so little activity in the residential construction industry in this province, given all the other good news statistics the minister keeps talking about. It is certainly not being translated in terms of new housing construction.

So I do not see how this tax rebate has been of any particular significance in enhancing this industry.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, well, first of all, since its inception in 1994, the program has rebated about \$1.9 million to 889 qualified applicants, and with the extension we expect it to create and maintain up to about 150 jobs in the construction industry, and we actually are estimating about 400 first-time home buyers to take advantage of the program in the upcoming year.

I meet with many groups when I prepare Manitoba's budget. One of the groups I meet with is the Manitoba Home Builders Association, and they certainly, as an industry, speak very positively about this program. They requested its extension. I know that it has received some media coverage where they speak very positively about the impact of this program. I see the City of Winnipeg, here in Winnipeg, just introduced an initiative relative to new home construction. The good news in this sector is that in 1997 our growth right now is amongst the best in Canada.

So it is an area that has struggled over the last few years. That is not unique to Manitoba. Housing in various parts of Canada has struggled over the last few years, Mr. Chairman, but I think a combination of several factors today, the lower interest rates, the solid economic growth, more jobs, strong retail sales, all of these things are adding to what we see as being significant growth in 1997 in the house-building industry. I know I had the opportunity just the other day to speak to one of the main firms in this area, and to date in 1997 they are very pleased, and they also are very complimentary of this program.

So I appreciate the concerns that the member expresses, but within the industry this program is acknowledged as being one element of helping to maintain and sustain growth in new homes.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I am sure the industry is happy to have this kind of sales tax rebate in effect and, of course, the particular buyers themselves who benefit from it. Our criticism is that it is not enough, that maybe the government should bring in a bit more because of the very sluggish nature of the residential housing industry in this province.

I appreciate that there has been some increase in '97 over '96. Percentage-wise, it looks good, but when it comes down to the level of housing starts, it is still far, far below where it was about a decade ago, and there are some reasons for it. Fortunately, mortgage rates are coming down, so that will be of assistance. I believe, however, another constraining factor is the ability of Manitobans to actually undertake a mortgage. In other words, it is an income problem.

As I was pointing out in Question Period today, there has been a serious drop in real wages in the past year alone, and the average industrial wage in real dollars has gone down by over \$10 a week, over \$40 a month, so that sort of phenomenon does have a dampening impact on the demand for new housing.

At any rate, just passing on, Mr. Chairman, because I know we are limited for time, just the last point we will touch on is the aircraft gasoline tax rate that is being reduced by one cent per litre. How do we compare now with other jurisdictions? I imagine the minister has some information on that. Is this one-cent reduction considered to be sufficient to perhaps enhance air transport in Manitoba, or especially the Winnipeg Airport?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, the short answer to the question is, yes, we do think it will be enough. We did a detailed analysis of this issue of the gasoline tax for aircraft, and we did it based on an industry model that we utilized. Today, when we look at what our rates are, to give the member a comparison, at gasoline tax rates in our neighbouring provinces, B.C. is at 5 cents, Alberta is at 1.5 cents, Saskatchewan is at 3.5 cents. We are now at 3.2 cents.

So within western Canada we are certainly competitive, and, as I say, the short answer is, yes, we think this step maintains that competitive aspect and will ensure that we get our share of activity taking place in Manitoba. That was the whole objective, to be sure that the activity continues to take place here in Manitoba.

Mr. Leonard Evans: While there are other questions, many other questions we could ask of the minister in this bill, because of time constraints, I think we will conclude at this point and just say that while we do not agree with every item in the bill, by and large we support the initiatives taken by the minister and, again, I repeat, particularly the film and video production tax credit, which is new. I think it is very positive, and we look forward to some positive results.

* (1130)

Mr. Chairperson: As previously agreed, we shall do groups of clauses.

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; subclauses 3(1) to 4(2)—pass; 5(1) and 5(2)—pass; 5(3) to 6(2)—pass; 6(3) through 9—pass; 10 through 11(4)—pass; 12(1) through 14—pass; 15(1) through 16(2)—pass; 17 to 19—pass; 20(1)—pass; 20(2) to 20(4)—pass; 20(5)—pass; 20(6) through 21—pass; 22 and 23—pass; 24(1) to 28—pass; 29(1) to 30—pass; 31 through 32(6)—pass; 32(7) to 32(10)—pass; 32(11) through 34—pass; 35 and 36(1)—pass; 36(2) through 37—pass; 38(1) through 38(7)—pass; 38(8) through 38(12)—pass; preamble—pass; table of contents—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Chairperson of Committees): Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 49, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1997, and reports the same without amendment.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 41—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Bill 41.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): I adjourned the report stage debate yesterday in order to ensure that the Health minister responds to the concerns raised by the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Sale) on the report stage amendment that is currently before the House.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health): Madam Speaker, the amendment, this particular amendment, arises out of a representation from the interfaith association.

Under Bill 49 passed last year by this Assembly which created regional health authorities, the plan as envisioned at that time was that in rural and northern Manitoba, facilities would be evolving into the regional health authorities.

Under Revenue Canada's ruling, it is our understanding that they were to be treated as mergers for tax purposes resulting in no tax consequence, so in order to accommodate that tax requirement, the act required them to dissolve. What the Interfaith Association has requested—and this is why this amendment is, in fact, out of scope in this bill and requires approval to be considered because we are dealing with an item from last year—was that there may be the rare circumstance where a corporation that holds a facility that is evolving does not wish to dissolve. It has another purpose with which to continue. I would point out, for example, the Grey Nuns is not probably a good one because most of the holdings of religious orders are, in fact, held as corporate bodies in which the religious order is the shareholder. So you could still have the dissolution of that particular corporation without affecting the function of that order.

However, if we were to have a circumstance arise where a corporation owning a building was going to

turn that building over to the RHA but for some reason had an asset or some portion that they wish to continue, this provision would allow, with the approval of the minister, for that to happen. Why the approval is required is that particular action may result in tax consequences to the province or to the regional health authority or to that religious order that would have to be negotiated as part of that agreement. So having the approval required for the minister ensures that the public interest and those tax consequences will, in fact, be dealt with.

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): I thank the minister for that explanation. I did call legal counsel for the faith groups last night, and they agreed that this amendment would do the job from their perspective. Although they were not sure that the approval issue was required, they did not think it would do any harm. So we are prepared to support it, and I appreciate the minister's explanation.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the amendment on Bill 41, moved by the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik), seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach)—dispense.

THAT the following be added after Section 9 of the bill:

9.1 Section 49 is renumbered as subsection 49(1), and the following is added as subsection 49(2):

Exception

49(2) Subject to the approval of the minister, a health corporation is not required to dissolve or disestablish under clause (1)(b) or (c) if it does not transfer all of its operations and property to the regional health authority.

[French version]

Il est proposé d'ajouter, après l'article 9 du projet de loi, ce qui suit:

9.1 L'article 49 devient le paragraphe 49(1) et il est ajouté, après ce paragraphe, ce qui suit:

Exception

49(2) *Sous réserve de l'approbation du ministre, la personne morale dispensant des services de santé n'est pas tenue de procéder à sa dissolution en application de l'alinéa (1)b) ou c) si elle ne transfère pas l'ensemble de ses activités et de son actif à l'office régional de la santé.*

Is it the will of the House to adopt the amendment?
Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. McCrae: By leave, Madam Speaker, and on behalf of the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik), I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 41, The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi concernant les offices régionaux de la santé et modifications corrélatives), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development and subsequently amended, be concurred in.

Madam Speaker: First of all, does the honourable government House leader have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

* (1140)

THIRD READINGS

Bill 41—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): With the leave of the House, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 41, The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi concernant les offices régionaux de la santé et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Madam Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion presented.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, my comments will be brief, because we have commented at previous readings of this bill with respect to our difficulties, but I do want to put a few short comments on the record.

Firstly, this government does not listen. When presentations were made with respect to the predecessor bill, Bill 49, the changes that were recommended by all of those presenters were simply not heard by the government in this amendment with respect to Bill 41 and the structure of the regional health authorities in Winnipeg. They simply do not listen, which is one of the reasons why we cannot support this bill.

Secondly, we were concerned about the fact that this was an omnibus bill. In fact, this bill does not only deal with regional authorities, but it deals with giving the minister power to take over operations of institutions, and, thirdly, it gives the minister power to take over the operation of public health in the city of Winnipeg. We object to the omnibus nature of the bill. However, having said that, we do support the provisions in the bill that deal with the ability of the minister to take over operations, even though we felt the minister had the power anyway.

We call this amendment the Holiday Haven amendment. It has, obviously, been brought in to try to deal with the extraordinarily bad situation that resulted from Holiday Haven Nursing Home and lack of government action, and this amendment that has been brought in will allow the minister to step in. I only hope that if the minister should have to ever utilize this section again, it will be utilized at the urging of citizens and individuals who raise it, rather than waiting seven months in order to invoke some changes at an institution that was as badly managed as Holiday Haven was.

The third part of the bill we cannot support, and not necessarily on principle are we against, for example, improving public health in the city of Winnipeg, but we are very concerned, because by virtue of the third part of this bill the government wants to take over the operation of public health in the core area of Winnipeg.

We have found from unfortunate experience in this province that, whenever this provincial government steps in to manage some form of health care, it usually results in diminished health care. It usually results in cutbacks, and it usually results in the government offloading the services somewhere else. We will not allow them to take over the public health operations in the city of Winnipeg until we are guaranteed that the services that are going to be put in place are at least equal to or better than the services that are presently very well operated by the City of Winnipeg.

So we have a grave difficulty with supporting this, as well as the principle that, in fact, the civic government should be totally excluded from the provision of public health care. Madam Speaker, the province could learn from the city with respect to the provision of public health, rather than take over and say we are going to do it in many areas. In fact, there are many ways that public health in Winnipeg could teach the province a lesson. I am afraid the experience we have had in the province is that, when the province has taken over, it has been a decreasing service that they offer; it has been a worse service that they offer. That is why we cannot support that third aspect of the bill.

You know, I just did an interview with a reporter with respect to this bill who indicated to me for the first time the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) is saying, well, we might look at elections regarding regional boards. I wonder, Madam Speaker, because every presenter said we should have elections, and the minister completely quashed any suggestion. In fact, at no time did he even open slightly the crack or the door in terms of elections. But, of course, now that the bill is going through he said, well, at some point we might look at that, which is totally contrary to the recommendations of their own committee that set up these regional boards.

So, Madam Speaker, regrettably, we cannot support this bill. There are some provisions in it that we are supportive of, but, overall, the scheme and the way this government is using health authorities, it is something like we had predicted in the past that they are using them as political footballs to try to undertake the cuts. It is very clear from the way there has been severe budgetary cutbacks already. We are very concerned

about the patronage appointments to those boards and, accordingly, we cannot support this bill.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 41, The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

An Honourable Member: Nay.

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

* (1150)

Formal Vote

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

Order, please. The question before the House is third reading, Bill 41.

Division

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

Yeas

Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Dyck, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Gillehammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Newman,

Penner, Pitura, Praznik, Radcliffe, Reimer, Rocan, Stefanson, Sveinson, Toews, Tweed.

Nays

Ashton, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Hickes, Jennissen, Kowalski, Lamoureux, Mackintosh, Maloway, Martindale, McGifford, Mihychuk, Reid, Robinson, Sale, Santos, Struthers, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 26, Nays 22.

Madam Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

House Business

Mr. McCrae: Madam Speaker, the agreement that we discussed yesterday had the House sitting until twelve o'clock. I do not know that the record of that is particularly clear, so we would now require agreement to sit a little past 12 to deal with the next couple of bills.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave for the Speaker not to see the clock? [agreed]

Bill 46—The Criminal Injuries Compensation Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 46, The Criminal Injuries Compensation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'indemnisation des victimes d'actes criminels), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I would just like to take a few minutes to put a few comments on the record with regard to this bill and say how harsh it is, in particular to several people who live in my constituency who have been victims of crime and have had their income reduced, their only income; they are unable to make a living. This government has absolutely no heart when they are dealing with these people. It just shows a true

indication of what this government has been doing, not only to victims of crime but many people who live in this province. It shows the true heartlessness of this government.

It reflects very much in the community when the people have no other source of income. They are faced with increased costs of living but have nowhere to turn to have their expenses—or no ability to make a living, so I want to say on behalf of my constituents that this is very heartless legislation and one that we cannot support.

* (1200)

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): Madam Speaker, this government has come by with this face about being so concerned about victims and victims' rights. They talk about how victims have to come first. I have heard it in the election, I have heard it in this House day after day, but what is the heart and soul and hands of this government? It is to denigrate victims; it is to turn their backs on victims, and this speaks more loudly than anything of how this government views the role of victims in the justice system.

We see how they treat the victims of car theft, Madam Speaker, by ensuring that there are deductibles increased and applied to those victims. We have seen how this government and the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) have broken an election promise to increase funding by a quarter million dollars last year to Victims Assistance. That money was frozen when they came into office.

We see how they leave the victims out of the justice system. We see how the minister so cruelly, when faced with the problems that Lisa Drover had to deal with when her case went to trial when no victims were subpoenaed, he would not even apologize to that victim. We saw how he dealt so heartlessly with the child who suffered sex assault just a couple of weeks ago.

Now with the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, which really can form the heart of a governmental response to victims' concerns, we see a capping of counselling sessions for victims. We see a de-indexing

of benefits, and that is what the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) spoke about. We have seen how they have moved to a system of lump-sum payments to reduce the periodic payments that they were paying out before, and now this, Madam Speaker.

What does this bill do? It says if you are entering the workforce tomorrow and your job starts tomorrow, but you are a crime victim today and are unable to show up at the office tomorrow, you do not get a nickel for criminal injuries comp, not a nickel. If you are a seasonal worker and you are returning to work, but just before you return to work, you are a crime victim, you do not get anything. You actually have to be working on the day of the crime, Madam Speaker.

This is an immoral bill. It is heartless and it belies, it puts a lie to the promises and the rhetoric of this government. We do not support it, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 46. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Formal Vote

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

Order, please. The question before the House is third reading of Bill 46.

Division

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

Yeas

Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Dyck, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Newman, Penner, Pitura, Praznik, Radcliffe, Reimer, Rocan, Stefanson, Sveinson, Toews, Tweed.

Nays

Ashton, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Hickes, Jennissen, Kowalski, Lamoureux, Mackintosh, Maloway, Martindale, McGifford, Mihychuk, Reid, Robinson, Sale, Santos, Struthers, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 26, Nays 22.

Madam Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

Bill 58—The Law Reform Commission Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 58, The Law Reform Commission Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): Madam Speaker, this bill represents one more in the long list of broken promises by the government.

When the former government made changes affecting the independence of the commission, this government screamed bloody murder, and they went into the election campaign in 1988 saying that they were going

to restore the Law Reform Commission with full independence, public funding. When they came into office, they went ahead and they fulfilled that, and they introduced legislation into this House, legislation they said would ensure that the independence of the commission would never again be affected, that never again could a government go and destroy or affect the operations of the Law Reform Commission. Never again, they said.

Well, what we are looking at today, Madam Speaker, is just another sign of a pathetic administration that is just breaking more promises day after day. What now is the reason that the government gives to do away with the Law Reform Commission as we know it? Well, we need the money for public safety. Is that not interesting that just two weeks ago this same Law Reform Commission brought forward some of the most progressive ideas to deal with safety for women? It proposed a series of recommendations to help prevent and deal with stalking. Is the government saying by this legislation that women are not part of the public?

At the same time, by destroying this commission, the government has destroyed a paper that will lead to significant changes in how we deal with elder abuse. It has destroyed a paper that has been years in the making respecting the competency, dealing with issues that are so important to Manitoba seniors.

There are two bills on the Order Paper. That is because this government has completely bungled this initiative. They did not consult with anyone. They just went ahead and hacked, but it is our view that there is virtually no difference in outcome between Bill 22, The Law Reform Commission Repeal Act and this one, the Law Reform Commission Amendment Act. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 58. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

* (1210)

Formal Vote

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

The question before the House is third reading, Bill 58, The Law Reform Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit.

Division

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

Yeas

Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Dyck, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Gilleshammer, Helwer, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Newman, Penner, Pitura, Praznik, Radcliffe, Reimer, Render, Rocan, Stefanson, Sveinson, Toews, Tweed.

Nays

Ashton, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Hickes, Jennissen, Kowalski, Lamoureux, Mackintosh, Maloway, Martindale,

McGifford, Mihychuk, Reid, Robinson, Sale, Santos, Struthers, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 26, Nays 22.

Madam Speaker: The motion is accordingly carried.

House Business

Mr. McCrae: Madam Speaker, according to the discussions and agreement, this sitting of the House will adjourn in a moment or two, and a new sitting will begin at 1:30 this afternoon. I believe that is the agreement of the House.

Madam Speaker: This House is accordingly adjourned until 1:30 p.m. this afternoon.

Mr. McCrae: Point of order, Madam Speaker, I think in this situation we need to ask for the agreement of the House for that.

Madam Speaker: Is there agreement? [agreed]

This House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. this afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 27, 1997

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		L. Evans; Stefanson	5424
Presenting Petitions		Flood-Fighting Honorees Kowalski; Pitura	5426
CRTC Presentations		Political Contributions Sale; Downey	5426
Struthers	5417		
Cerilli	5417		
L. Evans	5417		
Obstetrics Closure—Grace General Hospital		Desktop Management Services Maloway; Stefanson	5427
Mihychuk	5417		
McGifford	5417	Health Care System Reid; Praznik	5428
Mobile Screening Unit for Mammograms		Nonpolitical Statement	
Chomiak	5417		
Reading and Receiving Petitions		90th Anniversary—Knowles Centre Cerilli	5428
CRTC Presentations			
Struthers	5417		
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Standing Committee on Law Amendments Eighth Report		Committee of the Whole	
Penner	5418	Bill 49, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1997 Stefanson	5429
		L. Evans	5429
Oral Questions		Committee Report	
Disaster Assistance		Bill 49, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1997 Laurendeau	5434
Doer; Downey	5420		
Wowchuk; Pitura	5422		
Kowalski; Pitura	5425		
Flood Victims' Rally		Report Stage	
Doer; Downey	5421	Bill 41, Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act Mackintosh	5435
Ashton; Downey	5421	Praznik	5435
Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation		Sale	5435
Doer; McCrae	5423		
Auto Theft		Third Readings	
L. Evans; McCrae	5424	Bill 41, Regional Health Authorities	
Personal Income			

Amendment and Consequential
Amendments Act
Chomiak 5436

Bill 46, Criminal Injuries
Compensation Amendment Act

Wowchuk 5438
Mackintosh 5438

Bill 58, Law Reform Commission
Amendment Act
Mackintosh 5439