



First Session - Thirty-Seventh Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report
(Hansard)**

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



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Seventh Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AGLUGUB, Cris	The Maples	N.D.P.
ALLAN, Nancy	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
ASPER, Linda	Riel	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky, Hon.	Inkster	N.D.P.
CALDWELL, Drew, Hon.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CIOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean, Hon.	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISSON, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
LOEWEN, John	Fort Whyte	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PENNER, Jim	Steinbach	P.C.
PITURA, Frank	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack	Southdale	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Carman	P.C.
RONDEAU, Jim	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
SALE, Tim, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Wellington	N.D.P.
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
SMITH, Joy	Fort Garry	P.C.
SMITH, Scott	Brandon West	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Eric	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
TWEED, Mervin	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, August 8, 2000

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS****PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES****Standing Committee on Privileges
and Elections First Report**

Mr. Conrad Santos (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Your Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections presents the following as its First Report.

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Your committee met on Thursday, August 3, 2000, at 3 p.m., in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

At that meeting, your committee elected Mr. Schellenberg as Vice-Chairperson.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 4—The Elections Finances Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le financement des campagnes électorales

*David Goldstein, Bryan Stone & Bill Hansen – Canadian Association of Broadcasters and Broadcasters Association of Manitoba
Clint Szakacs and Bob Mummery – Manitoba Community Newspapers Association
Paul Nielson – Private Citizen
John Doyle – Manitoba Federation of Labour*

Ken Mandziuk – Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Dan Overall – Manitoba Chamber of Commerce

Paul Moist – Canadian Union of Public Employees, Manitoba Division

Victor Vrsnik – Canadian Taxpayers Federation

Brian Hanslip – President, Manitoba Party

Written Submissions:

Bill 4—The Elections Finances Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le financement des campagnes électorales

Aaron Freeman – Democracy Watch

Bill 17—The Elections Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi électorale

Rob Hilliard, President – Manitoba Federation of Labour

Your committee has considered:

Bill 17—The Elections Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi électorale

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

MOTION:

THAT section 11 of the Bill be amended by adding "to their employer not less than five days before the requested leave is to take effect" at the end of the proposed subsection 24.2(2).

MOTION:

THAT section 11 of the Bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed subsection 24.2(2):

Notice of employer's right to request exemption 24.2(2.1) *A request for leave from an employee must contain a statement that the employer has*

the right to apply to the Manitoba Labour Board for an exemption to the requirement to grant leave within three days of receiving the request.

Timing of request for leave

24.2(2.2) *A request for leave may be made in advance of a writ of election being issued provided that an employee meets one of the criteria contained in subsection (1).*

MOTION:

THAT section 11 of the Bill be amended by adding "within three days after receiving a request for leave from an employee under subsection 24.2(2)" at the end of the proposed subsection 24.3(2).

MOTION:

THAT section 16 of the Bill be amended as follows:

(a) in subsection (1), by striking out "five days, from the Tuesday" in the proposed subsection 65(4) and substituting "six days, from the Monday";

(b) in subsection (2), by striking out "five" and substituting "six".

Mr. Santos: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), that the report of the Committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co.

Hon. Becky Barrett (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement for the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House of the explosion in the smelter that occurred at 1:32 this morning at the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operation at Flin Flon, Manitoba.

Twelve workers were on site and injured by the explosion. Six have been treated and released

from Flin Flon Hospital. Two remain in hospital in Flin Flon, and four have been medivacked to burn units in other hospitals: two in Winnipeg, one in Edmonton, and one in Regina. Of those transferred to other hospitals, two are considered to be in critical condition.

We are informed that the explosion took place as a reverb furnace, located above ground at the HBM&S smelter, was being shut down to prepare for rebuilding, a process that furnaces of this type undergo every three years. This is the first explosion that we know of that has taken place during this procedure.

Of course, we will be investigating the causes of the explosion. In addition to the Mines Inspection Branch, the Department of Labour has arranged to send a hygienist to the site and will be contracting with a metallurgical expert to assist in the investigation. We understand that the RCMP is also investigating and that foul play has been ruled out as a possible cause. The site will be held secure until all investigations are completed.

Our thoughts at this time are with the injured workers, their families and co-workers. I commend HBM&S for immediately flying the families of the injured workers to the hospitals where they are being treated. I have also been advised that post-trauma counselling has been made available for all employees and their families. Thank you.

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (Interim Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Labour (Ms. Barrett) for her statement this afternoon and want to indicate that members of the Official Opposition share with the Minister of Labour and her colleagues the horror that we feel when an accident like this happens in our province.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, none of us want to see anything like this happen to anyone who works within our jurisdiction. Our thoughts and prayers today are with the families and friends of those that were impacted, and also the co-workers, who may have escaped injury but certainly must feel a sense of sorrow and shock at what has occurred in the workplace and in their community.

I do want to indicate that we will be listening for updates on what is occurring, wanting to ensure that the Department of Labour and any other government department that might need to be involved in providing the counselling and support that families and co-workers and other members of the community might need, that all of those things are in place. We look forward to hearing of a speedy recovery for those who have been impacted. We know that those who are in serious condition may not see positive results, but want all Manitobans to know that we are thinking about those who have been involved. We want to try to ensure that we get to the bottom of the reason for this accident occurring and ensure that the checks and balances are in place so that it does not happen again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I ask for leave to speak to the Minister's statement.

* (13:35)

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have leave? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, I rise to express heartfelt sympathy for the workers who were injured, for their families, friends and relatives. We only hope that they are able to come through, including those who are in critical condition at the moment. So we hope and pray for the very best.

At the same time as an occasion like this is an opportunity to do all we can to care for those who are affected, it is a moment when we should rededicate ourselves collectively to improving and enhancing workplace safety throughout our province, clearly an important goal that I think we all share. Thank you.

Forest Fire Conditions

Hon. Oscar Lathlin (Minister of Conservation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement.

I wish to provide the Assembly with an update on the forest fire situation in Manitoba. As a result of above-normal temperatures and below-normal precipitation, accompanied by significant lightning, the province experienced

132 new fire starts from July 20 to August 7. While our department was successful in most of these fires, three fires did result in significant suppression difficulties, causing smoke concerns at St. Theresa Point, Gods River, and Wasagamack. This led to approximately 360 people being evacuated from those communities.

The fires at St. Theresa Point and Wasagamack are 2000 and 100 hectares in size respectively, and the communities are now secure. Conditions have improved now and residents are being returned to Gods River. Plans are underway as well to return residents to Wasagamack and St. Theresa Point this week.

The community of Berens River has not been in direct danger, but Manitoba Health continues to monitor smoke-related health concerns.

One fire in the Wee Lake area, east of Berens River, threatened an MTS tower which supports communications in eastern Manitoba and also threatened the wood supply of the Pine Falls Paper Company. This fire is currently 3200 hectares in size, but has not moved in the last few days due to a higher humidity and the successful efforts of approximately 300 fire-fighters supported by air tanker and personnel assistance from Saskatchewan, air tanker assistance from Québec and personnel support from Ontario.

In addition, there have been six single-engine, crop-sprayer-type aircraft dropping fire retardant, and there are ten helicopters working on this fire. Manitoba is very grateful for the assistance being provided by Ontario, Saskatchewan and Québec. The area burned in the province since July 20 increased from approximately 13 400 hectares to over 58 000 hectares.

* (13:40)

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank those leaders and residents of the affected communities for their patience and their co-operation. I would also like to thank all staff involved in both suppression and evacuation, including those from the Manitoba Association of Native Firefighters. In addition, I would again like to

express my appreciation for assistance provided by our neighbouring jurisdictions of Saskatchewan, Ontario and Québec.

Mr. Speaker, if the weather continues to cooperate, we do not anticipate further problems from the existing fires, although there is still much work remaining to be done, particularly on the Wee Lake fire east of Berens River. Thank you.

Mr. Harry Enns (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for the statement. Certainly it is important that those of us whose ridings are well outside the fire zone only are aware of it when the winds shift and make it somewhat uncomfortable for us here in the city of Winnipeg. I also want, particularly because of the coincidence of the statement that we just heard from the Minister of Labour, to remind all of us that fighting fires is a dangerous occupation. Planes are flying in very difficult circumstances, low altitude, poor visibility, smoke; the work on the ground has its dangers, so I certainly want to acknowledge those who are engaged in protecting our natural resources and our communities from the devastation of forest fires.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to throw a sour note into this, but I would assume, and I note that the province acted quickly, as it should, and it is only appropriate to ensure that those residences that were evacuated were done so with haste, that the province picked up the cost to be reimbursed at a later date by the federal government as bearing some responsibility with respect to First Nations communities.

That, of course, was the similar scenario back in 1989. Regrettably, this government could not, still not, find it in its political will to do the same for the very difficult losses that the farms of southwestern Manitoba received during their times of difficulty.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Canada Health and Social Transfer Premier's Position

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (Interim Leader of the Official Opposition): On the eve of our

Premier hosting other premiers from across the country in our province, I do know that health care will be a No. 1 priority and issue on the premiers' agenda.

It is interesting to note that there has been a significant conversion by this Premier because, when we were in government, certainly we had the issues around Ottawa decreasing the Canada Health and Social Transfer payments to Manitoba, I believe it was in the 1995 budget, and experienced significant reductions in transfers for both health and post-secondary education.

We had been calling and all provinces right across the country had been calling on the federal government to restore the transfer payments. It was interesting to note that the Opposition of the day, the now Premier and his party, certainly were not blaming Ottawa in those days; they were blaming the provincial government for all of the woes and the ills in health care, so much so, that, you know, the Premier ran in the election campaign with a promise of fixing health care immediately when he became the Premier in government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have seen wait lists for diagnostic tests increase. We have seen the number of people going out of province for treatment on the rise, not being reduced. We have seen the shortage of nurses go from 600 to 1100 under his stewardship. So my question for the Premier today would be, besides the call for restoration of the Canada Health and Social Transfer, which we certainly agree with, what will the Premier's position be on health care. What light will he be able to shed on the issue of health care and health care reform for all premiers to hear on what Manitoba is doing in order to get our health care costs under control?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I recall when the 1995 federal budget was introduced in Parliament, I think at that time we made the statement that the cutbacks to health care of \$240 million to Manitoba at that time represented the closure of every rural and northern hospital. I believe that was a message that was repeated by the then-Minister of Finance the next day and then the former Premier. I think in February of '95 there was a

very consistent message from us and certainly from the Government of the day that this cut of the federal government in '95 was absolutely un-Canadian in terms of its impact on health care, on post-secondary education, on social services. So we have been very consistent.

The only inconsistency that I think, and only because the Member opposite raises it, happened is the members opposite announced after that date, March 18, I believe, I am going by memory, a major capital program, and they said at that time publicly that this capital program would not be affected by the federal cuts. Then, in June of 1995, after the April 26, I believe, election, they said, oh, the federal cuts are making us do it. So that is the only inconsistency, and the Member opposite should be truthful when she is making these comments about the position that was maintained—

* (13:45)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Doer: I retract that statement. I will continue on in my answer. Apologies to the Member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the second point raised by the Member opposite in her rambling, scrambling question that she just posed to me was the whole issue of the situation in Manitoba on health care. I am pleased that Manitoba has had, in terms of improvement, the highest rating by an independent commission of any province in Canada in reducing the numbers of patients in the hallways. We are not perfect, but I would ask members opposite to join us in our nurses training strategy. We want all-party support on training more nurses for Manitobans. They fired nurses; we are going to retrain nurses. Join with us in a human resource strategy. Health care, I think we have to spend time with the premiers talking about innovation. We had an excellent debate at the western premiers' meeting. There was some discussion at that meeting on Bill 11 in Alberta and some interpretations given at that session, but every day we continue to innovate. Just a couple of weeks ago, we announced the dialysis pilot project in Garden Hill because we want to spend more money on providing direct services to people in Manitoba rather than

expensive medivac programs. That is where we want to head and talk about at the first ministers' meeting.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, but, with that rambling, scrambling answer, the Premier did not talk about that promise during the election campaign; they were just going to fix things in health care. Overnight, it was going to be sort of an immaculate conversion to this wonderful health care system. Well, the Premier talks about opening a dialysis unit in Garden Hill, but we found out that just last week dialysis patients had to be transferred to Kenora from Winnipeg for dialysis because we did not have the staffing resources here. So let him not fool Manitobans.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

An Honourable Member: Hallways to highways.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues rightly says they have moved from hallway medicine to highway medicine under this government and this leadership.

* (13:50)

National Infrastructure Program Premier's Position

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (Interim Leader of the Official Opposition): I want to move on from the health care issue and ask the Premier whether, in fact, the whole issue of an infrastructure program is going to be an issue that he is going to bring forward. What will his position be to share with other premiers across the country?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we believe that a national infrastructure program should be negotiated with the federal government. It has been re-announced by the federal government. Since the announcement by the federal government, there have been concerns that we have raised with Ottawa because they are treating Manitoba, in our view, in a very disproportionate way based on the fact that our unemployment rate is the lowest in

Canada. They want to adjust the infrastructure on the basis of the unemployment rate.

We think that the unemployment rate does not include some of our people in our aboriginal communities, in northern communities. We think some of the greatest needs for water, for transportation, for economic development are in those communities, and we would like to either see a change in the formula or a change in the aboriginal component of infrastructure. We have feedback from municipalities about some of the successes in prioritizing projects made by the former government. I think the model that was used generally was fairly positive.

I will give credit where credit is due. We think that the former Minister of Finance had a good system of prioritizing, but we do not think that the resources available based on the unemployment rate are high enough. I think other provinces will join with us on that message. I think there is renewed interest in changing some of the infrastructure programs' priorities from more of the edifice complex, if you will, the buildings that may be having a higher profile, to some of the basic programs, for example, the water projects that are so badly needed. We saw last week in Tyndall alone that the infrastructure renewal had been recommended in 1994, and I think all across Canada there is a lot of need for investment in our water, in our infrastructure, in our sewer programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on the road program, Manitoba basically delivers all of the gasoline tax, the user tax, back into highway infrastructure investment. The federal government takes about \$180 million out of the user fees in gas taxes per year. We would like to see those user fees go back to the users in a national highways program and road program.

National Agriculture Programs Premier's Position

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (Interim Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, of course another issue that is very important to Manitobans is our agriculture and the role that it plays in the economy of our province. We have seen over the last number of years our federal government not being as supportive as they

should be, particularly to Manitoba and western farmers.

I would like to ask the Premier what his position will be going into the premiers' conference and what points he will make with other premiers across the country to convince them that Manitoba should not be bullied into taking less than their fair share of federal dollars, but that he will stand up for Manitoba farmers and ensure that he can convince other premiers that Manitoba deserves their fair share of support dollars from Ottawa.

What will his position be as he moves into the rest of this week?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): There are four issues that we think are important in agriculture. First of all, we continue to believe that a national disaster assistance program should include all regions of Canada. We will continue to call on our colleague provinces for support for southwestern Manitoba and southeastern Saskatchewan.

Secondly, in the February meeting of premiers, we included in the communiqué the issue of income support to deal with the prices that were devastating our agricultural economy. Manitoba and Saskatchewan have since received and negotiated an enhanced \$400-million package in income support, a federal-provincial program, as an interim measure, in our view.

There is a third item, to call on the elimination of the subsidies and the WTO negotiations that have a strong consensus from the agricultural producing provinces.

The fourth issue is one that, as I can understand it, rather divides the provinces, the provinces of Ontario and Québec and Manitoba and Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Saskatchewan particularly with the Wheat Board support, the orderly marketing systems that are in place; the Province of Alberta does not. That is an area that I think we have gone from being on the fence on the Wheat Board to being pro-Wheat Board, and that is a position that changed with the change of government.

**Elections Finances Act
Amendments—Withdrawal**

Mr. John Loewen (Fort Whyte): Last Thursday at committee we heard a number of presentations opposed to Bill 4. The Manitoba Community Newspapers Association decried Bill 4, citing that it will severely hurt Manitobans' fundamental freedom of expression and freedom of association as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights.

* (13:55)

Will the First Minister withdraw this undemocratic legislation, as was requested, until there has been broader public participation in this political process?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): This issue of banning union and corporate donations and limiting third parties in a democracy was a promise made in the election. The last time that I looked, the most democratic process for consulting people was an election campaign. That consultation was made with the announcement that was made. There were some concerns raised. We certainly believe that the Libman case which talks about a balance between freedom of expression and the right of the public to have a level playing field, we certainly believe that we have that balance in this bill.

Some of the needs to discuss the guidelines in the Act with the Chief Electoral Officer, those are easily met, and we will be proposing amendments because after all there are no limits on third-party advertising outside of an election campaign. I want to be honest. We are not planning on calling an election over the next couple of months, so we can have the opportunity to consult with opposition parties, as we indicated in the Committee, and the broadcasters. But the balance, the principles of limiting third parties to make sure that third parties do not have partisan ads to get around union and corporate donation banning, those are promises we made in the election campaign.

We are not going to have a situation like they have in the United States where they have third parties basically campaigning with billions

of dollars to subvert the democratic process. We think we have that balance in this law, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loewen: The First Minister also promised in that election to work co-operatively. Will the Minister withdraw this legislation and set up an all-party committee to review this legislation in its entirety prior to rushing it through this House, as he promised during the election campaign, or has he forgotten his commitment that a promise made is a promise kept? Has he forgotten that?

Mr. Doer: I said in committee, and I will say it in the House, that there is no limitation on third-party advertising outside of the writ period. So, for a period of time, maybe a thousand days, maybe less, maybe more, till the next election, there is no limitation on third-party advertising and freedom of expression. There are limitations on political parties inside an election campaign. The theory is that if political parties that are combatants in an election campaign have to have restrictions, so do third parties. You cannot have one rule for election of political parties and another, no rules, for third parties.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we are more than willing to have an advisory committee consisting of members of the media, members of the opposition parties to discuss the guidelines with the person who will interpret them, and that is the Chief Electoral Officer, not this member, not that member, but the Chief Electoral Officer. You should know, if you have read the law, which you probably have not, it is the Chief Electoral Officer who interprets this law.

Mr. Loewen: Mr. Speaker, the Minister should explain the law to his own members, and then they would not issue misleading precedents. My question to the Minister: Will he follow the recommendations of the Chief Electoral Officer, show some respect for the people of Manitoba and withdraw this undemocratic bill until the specific press case has reached a final determination before the courts?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, this bill, we believe, provides the balance between union and corporate donations. I mean, an interesting individual has just been nominated today by one political party in the United States, Mr.

Lieberman, who has been opposed to the abuse of campaign finances in the United States. John McCain has been campaigning for the Republican Party to deal with the abuses of campaign finances in the United States, and we are proud of the fact that we have taken leadership. Members opposite have become the withdrawal party. They cannot decide whether they are going to vote for or against union and corporate donations, so they sit on the fence and say withdraw the Bill, withdraw the Bill. Vote one way or the other. We believe in these limits, and we believe in banning union and corporate donations with the banning or limitations of third party. Get up and speak on it.

Elections Finances Act Amendments—Withdrawal

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the National Citizens Coalition has stated that the Premier's bill will confer an enormous advantage on incumbent governments silencing opposition voices but do nothing to limit how much money governments can spend for their own political benefit. I ask the Premier, since the Bill is seen as dictatorship behaviour, will he now withdraw this legislation?

* (14:00)

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, it may surprise members opposite to know this, but we actually have laws and rules that limit our ability to speak in a campaign and the amount of money we can spend on advertising in a campaign. Is that a dictatorship or just reasonable rules to have a level playing field in an election campaign? It may surprise members opposite to understand that there are numbers of people who believe in democracy, are calling for some restraint on the ability of money to control democracy, some reasonable limits, and we are taking a leadership position by banning union and corporate donations. We are still allowing freedom of expression for third parties, but they are not going to be able to do as they do in the United States, come through the back door and subvert the election process. We are proud of the leadership we are taking, and let us vote to get rid of special-interest financing in election campaigns. Vote with us.

Mr. Tweed: Mr. Speaker, since the National Citizens Coalition has already successfully challenged similar gag laws to this Premier's, will he now withdraw it as unconstitutional?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has stated that there must be a reasonable balance between freedom of expression and rules to ensure that big money does not control democracy. Just last week there was a report produced by a research institute chaired by Mr. Hugh Segal that talked about the increased cynicism based on the influence of big money on election campaigns. I am not even sure who funds the citizens coalition. I am sure it is the "corporate coalition" in terms of who funds them.

Having said that, the Calgary-based institution does not determine the rules for Manitoba. We are perfectly able to make promises in election campaigns, to consult with people during a democratic process. The kind of leadership that is being opposed by similar groups in the United States, you know, that want unfettered amounts of big money to control election campaigns, the people in the United States, the people in Canada, do not want big money to control elections. They want the people to control elections. Get outside.

National Citizens Coalition

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): If the Premier is supportive of citizens' rights to express their ideas, then why is the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) trying to gag the National Citizens Coalition and referring to them as liars?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): I think that the Member for Transcona and the Calgary-based chair of the National Citizens Coalition are perfectly able to engage in that debate without the help of the Member for Turtle Mountain.

First of all, let us deal with the facts. There is no restriction on any third-party advertising on any issue outside of the election campaign. There is no restriction on issue-based advertising and advocacy advertising within an election campaign. There is a prohibition—and we are perfectly prepared to ensure that that happens—for political parties advertising in a partisan way,

and there is a restriction for third parties from advertising against political candidates and political parties. So there is unbelievable freedom of expression, but there is balance, the reasonable limits that are on political parties are also on third parties for purposes of advertising.

The real issue here is: Are you going to vote to allow big money to continue to control elections? Are you going to vote with big money, or are you going to vote with the people to eliminate the influence of big money in the election campaign?

J. M. Schneider
Plant Expansion

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): On January 31, 2000, the announcement was made on the expansion of the Schneider Warman Road plant, and I quote: set the project in motion today by announcing the company's investment of \$125 million to transform the St. Boniface plant into a 436 000 square foot state-of-the-art facility.

Having driven past the proposed site and seeing no construction activity, could the Premier update this House as to the status of the Schneider's project?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): The status is as announced in January. The plant is in negotiations with their employees, as I understand it. They are also in negotiations dealing with the price of hogs in Manitoba to ensure a hog supply; and thirdly, they are subject to an environmental assessment.

Mr. Schuler: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier: When will the, and I quote, "hundreds more good-paying jobs for Manitobans" be reflected in the Manitoba labour force statistics, which seem to have stalled at this point?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, if the Member opposite would refer to pages 2, 3 and 4 of the press release, he will note the employment obligations for the company, subject to the conditions that would be met by the provincial and civic governments and subject to an environmental assessment. He will probably note that there was no commitment for increased employment in the year 2000 because the year 2000 was the

beginning of the environmental process for both the water supply from the aquifer and the disposal of water because we are concerned that the whole issue of the sewage going directly into the Seine River and the Red River had to be fixed, and that is part of our proposal with the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Schuler: Mr. Speaker, will the Premier confirm that Schneider's remains committed to expanding its operations here in Manitoba?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, Schneider's, and I do not want to speak to their specific corporate strategy, but they are in the process of negotiating a labour-management agreement dealing with the expansion. As I also understand it, the Maple Leaf plant in Brandon has a reduction in the number of employees because of the cost now of hogs. I think hog incomes are up about 16 percent for producers, but that is presenting a real challenge for Maple Leaf, I know, and obviously everyone works in the same market.

Labour Relations Act
Amendments—Picket Line Violence

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, in 1994 there was a strike at Trailmobile Canada. There was picket line violence for which employees were prosecuted and convicted. The Labour Board forced the employer to rehire these workers. The Minister of Labour (Ms. Barrett) dismisses the seriousness of this matter, saying it was the only time. Apparently strikers are now allowed to commit one criminal act without consequences.

* (14:10)

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Labour advise if she has even viewed the videotapes showing the strikers illegally entering, occupying and damaging the plant, and does she support this behaviour?

Hon. Becky Barrett (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, at no point have I ever dismissed picket line violence or violence in any shape or form. I merely stated the reality which was since 1973 at least there has only been one incident, one instance, where this situation occurred. I am not

trivializing that incident, that situation at all. I was merely putting on the record the facts. No, as I have stated before in this House, we do not condone violence in any form.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, why would the Minister change this legislation to allow that behaviour to happen again?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Barrett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a serious issue, and I would like to suggest to the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) that he has been in this House long enough to know when he should be treating issues with respect and not with disdain and throwaway lines.

Mr. Speaker, we are not condoning violence in any shape or form, and we have been listening to Manitobans. We are prepared to take this piece of legislation to committee and hear more suggestions from Manitobans. Bill 44, when it is finally passed in this House—and make no bones about it, it will be passed in this Legislature—will be a fair and balanced piece of labour legislation, unlike Bill 26.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Why would the Government be contemplating reverting to the 1994 scenario and allowing picket line violence again to be acceptable in Manitoba? Pull this bill. Remove this piece of legislation from the Order Paper.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of condoning violence anywhere. If the members opposite would let the piece of legislation go to committee, hear from Manitobans. There are over 60 Manitobans now, I understand, who want to make presentations to the public hearings. We are prepared to listen to them.

We have been talking with labour groups. We have been talking with individual workers. We have been talking with management organizations, with individual employers. We want a good piece of labour legislation, and we will have a good piece of labour legislation that will restore balance to the labour community and

good labour relations to the province of Manitoba.

Evidence-Based Medicine Premier's Position

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, health care appears to be high on the agenda for the premiers' conference coming up this week. Clearly, the Premier should be asking advice from the other premiers, as he is running the most expensive health care system of any province in Canada.

An approach being used elsewhere is evidence-based medicine in which the health care practices for which there is evidence that they improve health care are provided support by the Province. I ask the Premier whether at the premiers' conference he will be supporting the use of evidence-based medicine approaches to improve the quality and reduce the costs of our health care system.

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): As I said last week to the Member opposite, the situation when we came into government, the per capita spending was the highest in Canada. The evidence that we had from the citizens of Manitoba is the results and effectiveness of health care spending had to be improved.

Every time we try to improve the effective use of our resources, there has been resistance made by the Member opposite. I recall when the initiative was made to expand from a BN program and an LPN program to an RN program, the Member opposite, when going to that kind of cost-effective multidisciplinary team of nurses, opposed it. So this is a member opposite that was involved at the cabinet table to cut \$240 million out of the health care system in Manitoba. He had his chance to stand up for Canada's health care system, and he failed.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has demonstrated once again that he needs that advice from the other premiers badly.

I ask the Premier whether he will also provide details of his efforts to use evidence-based medicine to reduce costs by withdrawing health care services where there is no evidence

of health benefit and to return such areas of uncertainty to the realm of research until they are fully tested.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite is able to ask a general question. But when it comes to specific issues dealing with nurses, when it is dealing with other diagnostic equipment, when it is dealing with almost anything we are dealing with, I recall every question the Member opposite has asked is to ask for more resources and not less.

Mr. Gerrard: Well, I just asked whether you were going to spend more wisely.

Early Childhood Development Initiatives Premier's Position

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Well, I ask the Premier, in my second supplementary, if he will today provide details of his support for early childhood development initiatives at the premiers' conference, since there is substantive evidence that wise investments in this area can improve health quality and as an example save up to \$7 for every \$1 invested.

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we met with a number of people on the front lines of early childhood programs in Manitoba. We had a very good meeting. They certainly appreciated the efforts we have begun to make. We have reduced some of the pressures on families and children. They like the announcements we have made on the Healthy Child program. They like some of the initiatives we are attempting to lead on fetal alcohol syndrome programs. They certainly support our announcements for an 18% increase in the day-care budget in Manitoba. I would note that the federal government announced in '93 to have a national child care and day care program.

They like the fact that we are balancing off the July 1 so-called clawbacks for children in poverty and starting to reverse that trend. They like the fact that in our budget we not only attempt to provide more resources to families on social assistance, particularly children, but working families that are paying taxes. The largest deduction for any child in any provincial budget in Canada for children is a tax reduction

through the increased credits in this budget starting January 1, 2001.

* (14:20)

So we have a lot of work ahead of us, but early childhood programs, we agree with the Member opposite, have long-term benefits not only to the family, to the child, but to our total community and our country. We are committed to national priorities for children, national strategies for prenatal and postnatal programs, and we are committed to working with our federal partners to have those programs implemented in our communities where they belong. That is our commitment to the premiers at this meeting here this week.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry, with a very short question.

Public Schools Act Amendments—Minister's Comments

Mrs. Joy Smith (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, on August 3, last Thursday, Minister Caldwell was quoted as saying he inherited the home-schoolers' bill, Bill 12, from the former government.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I just want to remind all honourable members to address members by their constituencies or ministers by their titles.

Mrs. Smith: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Minister of Education was quoted as saying that he inherited Bill 12 from the former government. This erroneous information is something that is very troublesome to this side of the House and to Manitobans.

My question to the Minister of Education: How can the Minister of Education put such erroneous information on the record in the *Free Press* when indeed this side of the House does not have anything to do, never did have anything to do with Bill 12?

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member opposite for her comment. She raises a point raised in the *Free Press*. I noticed this past weekend in fact the Member talking in the *Free*

Press, expressing her confusion as to what agenda we on this side of the House were pursuing in regard to education.

Of course, we on this side of the House are investing in education in historic levels to restore educational excellence in this province after a decade of abuse by the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue on this side of the House as the Government of Manitoba to put the interest of children first in our public school system, to invest in our public school system and continue to seek excellence in our public school system.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Speaker's Rulings

Mr. Speaker: I have a ruling for the House.

During Oral Questions on July 26, 2000, I took under advisement an alleged matter of privilege raised by the Honourable Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) concerning comments spoken by the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Doer) while responding to a question addressed by the Honourable Member for Russell. The Honourable Member for Russell contended that the Honourable First Minister had breached the Member's privileges by suggesting that the Honourable Member for Russell as Minister of Rural Development had received a report in August 1999 and had kept the report from the people of southwestern Manitoba. The Honourable Member for Russell concluded his remarks by moving "That the Premier of this province did break the privileges of this Member of the House by accusing me as a member for the constituency of Russell for covering up a particular report when such a report was delivered during the election period and that this matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections for the Committee's consideration."

Contributions on the alleged matter of privilege were made by the Honourable First Minister, the Honourable Official Opposition House Leader (Mr. Laurendeau), the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Mackintosh), the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr.

Praznik), the Honourable Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), the Honourable Member for Emerson (Mr. Jack Penner), the Honourable Member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), the Honourable Minister of Highways and Government Services (Mr. Ashton), the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings), the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) and the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed). I took the matter under advisement in order to peruse the procedural authorities and report back to the House.

There are two conditions that must be satisfied in order for the matter raised to be considered a *prima facie* case of privilege: First, was the matter raised at the earliest opportunity; and second, is there sufficient evidence that the privileges of the House have been breached to warrant putting the matter to the House.

The Honourable Member for Russell has satisfied the first condition, in that the matter was raised at the earliest opportunity.

Regarding the second issue, of whether or not a *prima facie* case of privilege has been demonstrated, there are a number of factors that need to be taken into consideration.

Beauchesne's Citation 24 defines parliamentary privilege as "the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions. . . . the privileges of Parliament are rights which are absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers. They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the service of its Members, and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity."

Marleau and Montpetit, in *House of Commons Practice and Procedure*, Chapter 3, list the individual parliamentary privileges of members as: freedom of speech; freedom from arrest in civil action; exemption from jury duty;

exemption from appearing as a witness; and freedom from obstruction, interference, intimidation and molestation. The collective privileges of the House are defined as: the power to discipline; the regulation of the House's internal affairs; the authority to maintain the attendance and service of members; the right to institute inquiries and to call witnesses and demand papers; the right to administer oaths to witnesses; and the right to publish papers containing defamatory material. The complaint of the Honourable Member for Russell does not appear to fall into any of the enumerated categories.

Joseph Maingot, in *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, second edition, states on page 222 that alleged acts complained of must relate to a member's parliamentary work, which means that there must be some act that improperly interferes with the rights of members, such as freedom of speech. The alleged interference must obstruct the Member in his or her parliamentary work. The parliamentary work must relate to a proceeding in Parliament before the Speaker may find a prima facie case of privilege.

Maingot also states on page 224 that "privilege is concerned with the special rights of Members, not in their capacity as ministers or as party leaders, whips or parliamentary secretaries, but strictly in their capacity as Members in their parliamentary work. Therefore, allegations of misjudgment, or mismanagement, or maladministration on the part of a minister in the performance of his ministerial duties do not come within the purview of parliamentary privilege." Although the remarks complained of were raised in the House after the Member for Russell was no longer a member of the Executive Council, the alleged actions were reported to have taken place while the Member was a minister. Also, on page 250, Maingot opines that reflections on members must relate to the Member's parliamentary work.

Beauchesne's Citation 31(1) indicates that a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of facts does not fulfill conditions of parliamentary privilege. Citation 69 states that "something can be inflammatory, can be disagreeable, can even be offensive, but it may not be a question of privilege unless the

comments actually impinges upon the ability of Members . . . to do their jobs properly."

Turning to rulings given by Manitoba Speakers, Madam Speaker Dacquay in a ruling given on June 7, 1995, noted that Maingot states "improper reflections by one Honourable Member upon another is a matter of unparliamentary language – that is, it is a matter of order, not a matter of privilege." On June 15, 1994, Mr. Speaker Rocan ruled that privilege is concerned with the special rights of members in their capacity as members in their parliamentary work, not in their capacity as ministers or party leaders or whips. On December 10, 1992, Mr. Speaker Rocan cited from *Beauchesne's* Citation 69 that "it is very important . . . to indicate that something can be inflammatory, can be disagreeable, can even be offensive, but it may not be a question of privilege unless the comment actually impinges upon the ability of Members . . . to do their job properly."

Although the comments of the First Minister may be discourteous, and may arguably contain an imputation of unworthy motives or a personal charge against a member, it has not been demonstrated that a prima facie case of privilege exists according to the procedural authorities cited and according to previous rulings of Manitoba Speakers. I would therefore respectfully rule the Honourable Member for Russell's motion out of order as a prima facie case of privilege.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Mr. Speaker, with the highest of respect for your office and for you—

An Honourable Member: Doer wanted the floor.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have already recognized the Honourable Member for Russell. If he chooses to give the floor to the Honourable First Minister, it is entirely up to the Member for Russell. I have already recognized the Honourable Member for Russell.

Mr. Derkach: With the greatest of respect for the rules of this House, I know that the Premier was—I did not know. I know now that he was on his feet, and indeed I think it is only respectable

that the Premier should have the first word in this instance.

* (14:30)

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Notwithstanding the ruling, Mr. Speaker, I do want to apologize to the Honourable Member for Russell. I think the word "cover-up" has been used against me a couple of times in the last session but there is no excuse in this session for me using it. I do apologize to him.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the First Minister for his apology.

Mr. Derkach: I certainly would thank the First Minister for his ruling. However, Mr. Speaker, I still have a problem with your ruling. With the highest of respect for you and your office, your words, "may arguably contain an imputation of unworthy motives or a personal charge against a member," trouble me. I think that is as far as I want to take this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Honourable Member for his comment.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: I have one more ruling.

Following the presentation of a Speaker's ruling on July 31, 2000, the Honourable Interim Leader of the Official Opposition (Mrs. Mitchelson) rose on a point of order respecting the words "it is still a stupid question" that the Honourable Interim Leader of the Official Opposition attributed to the Honourable Minister of Family Services and Housing (Mr. Sale). The Honourable Minister of Family Services and Housing also spoke to the same point of order. I took the matter under advisement in order to peruse Hansard.

The words complained of do not appear in Hansard. I therefore rule that there is no point of order.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Marringhurst Heritage House

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the privilege and pleasure to attend the opening of the Marringhurst Heritage House in rural Manitoba. The ceremony marked nearly seven years of effort and thousands of dollars of fundraising to restore this magnificent house.

The house was originally built in 1909 by resident farmer Richard "Dick" Milner on an area of gently rolling farmland just off of PR 253. Mr. Wilson earned a reputation for his dedication to his community, his role as a leader in the formation of the Grain Growers Association, and for being a generous host in this lavish home. The dances, parties and dinners he hosted tied the community together for nearly half a century.

Recently, the home fell into a state of disrepair, and in the '70s the people who took over ownership of the farm, Bill and Marie Baron, donated the house in its current form to the Marringhurst Historical Society. The organization, chaired by Vic Nelson, raised several thousands of dollars, received a municipal heritage designation, and the Historical Society set about restoring this landmark.

The grand opening will now allow the house again to become a focal point for community activities, including weddings, anniversaries and several tourist attractions. By the large turnout, it is evident that the house will be well received by people travelling through Manitoba.

Reeve Jack Bolack, the Reeve of Argyle, was there to cut the ribbon. It was noted that when Argyle first became a municipality, Marringhurst was designated a school district, and for that the Marringhurst community thanked him.

I would like to congratulate the society and all of those who have played a role in restoring the Wilson house. By doing so, they have not only preserved an important landmark, but they

have preserved their community's identity for now and into the future.

Tibetan Sacred Arts in The Ruins

Ms. Linda Asper (Riel): Representing the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism (Ms. McGifford) on July 16, 2000, I participated in the opening ceremony of the Tibetan Sacred Arts in The Ruins. Thirty Tibetan artists were at the St. Norbert Arts Centre for the last two weeks in July. This residency was an international coup for the centre with artists in exile from Europe, India and North America. A reunion of this magnitude has been a rare occurrence since the invasion of Tibet in the late 1950s.

St. Norbert Arts Centre was transformed into a Tibetan Buddhist Temple for the Tibetan Institute of Performing Arts, Chaksampa Dance and Opera Company, together with spiritual leader The Venerable Lobsang Samten, Jamyang Norbu, a senior scholar and writer, and Thanka artist Kalsang Dawa.

Workshops and lectures for the general public were held daily in The Ruins. Topics included dance, chanting, story telling, mask making, meditation and cooking. Master classes for local artists were held every morning. The residency culminated in a traditional eight-hour opera entitled Sukyi Nyima on July 29, a mythical tale of passion and renewal.

It seemed altogether appropriate that a monastery once destroyed by fire became a temporary home to artists in exile. The St. Norbert Arts Centre, under the artistic direction of Louise May, is congratulated for arranging this residency and offering Manitobans a wonderful opportunity to experience the sacred arts of another culture.

* (14:40)

Custom Software Solutions

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): It gives me pleasure to rise today to inform this House of a tremendously successful company which is operating in the Arthur-Virden constituency.

Mr. Speaker, Custom Software Solutions, located in Virden, has developed a unique set of office management applications for the insurance industry. Mr. Scott Andrew, president of Custom Software Solutions, is quoted as saying: "A year ago we had five employees; today we have twenty-one." This comment shows the commitment of entrepreneurs like Mr. Andrew. Mr. Andrew has also set up a technical support centre to help the 130 insurance brokers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan who have already bought the management software suite.

Custom Software Solutions is just another example of the entrepreneurs who have made the commitment to invest in Manitoba, but I would caution this government that by the introduction of Bill 44, the investment and job-killing bill, these kinds of success stories could not be told.

Again I congratulate Mr. Scott Andrew of Custom Software Solutions on the great opportunity he has created for many Manitobans.

Elwick Village Centre Project

Mr. Cris Aglugub (The Maples): I would like to express a few words of commendation to the staff, volunteers and parents participating in the Elwick Village Centre Project in my constituency. The project works with parents who want to help their pre-schoolers develop the social, physical and learning skills they need for success in schools and later life. Parents participate with their children in a different learning activity each day, such as recognizing the letters of the alphabet, learning how to count or listening to stories and rhymes.

But the project goes much further than the scholastic abilities. It recognizes that other skills and resources contribute to a nurturing environment for children. To this end it runs a very popular discipline program called 1-2-3 Magic. It helps parents locate the medical and social resources available to them. It provides parents with pre-employment training, basic computer classes and workshops on budgeting.

Now in its fourth year, the Elwick Village Centre Project can already take satisfaction in seeing its alumni happily progressing through the first three years of school. Their parents, the

project staff and the community volunteers must take the credit.

I would particularly like to commend the good work of the program co-ordinator, Tammie Smith, the other staff members, Ravinder Gill, Rose Mederos, Lona LeClair and Susan Robinson and volunteers like Rose Smith, who help the centre thrive.

St. Pierre-Jolys Frog Follies

Mr. Frank Pitura (Morris): Mr. Speaker, Evelyn and I had the pleasure of attending the 31st annual Frog Follies held in St. Pierre-Jolys. This is an opportunity for people throughout the province to come and visit St. Pierre-Jolys and get a taste of Francophone customs and culture and their hospitality.

They had a very successful Frog Follies this year. Their children's frog jumping competition attracted over 200 children. It was just a great time had by all. They also had a very successful ball tournament. Their social evenings had the best attendance ever for the time that they have been on—a bit of rain, but it certainly did not dampen their spirit. I had the pleasure of participating in the VIP frog jumping. I had won the national title three years ago but was unable to regain it.

I would just like to congratulate all of the volunteers and the organizers for all the great work that they did in putting on this event. It is the 31st one. It looks like it is going to have many more years to come. I would encourage all members if they have a chance to get out to St. Pierre-Jolys and enjoy some good, down-home Francophone hospitality. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections will meet this afternoon at 4 p.m., by leave, to sit concurrently with the House, with the Committee to rise at its own discretion to consider Bill 4.

Mr. Speaker: It has been announced by the Honourable Government House Leader that the

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections will meet this afternoon at 4 p.m., by leave, to sit concurrently with the House, with the Committee to rise at its own discretion. The Committee will consider Bill 4. Is there leave? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, just to clarify that there be no quorum counts during those committee times.

Mr. Speaker: For clarification, is the House agreed there will be no quorum counts? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the following business for this afternoon. First of all, under report stage, Bill 42, and then under debate on second readings, Bill 44, and then, if there is leave of the House to interrupt proceedings at 5 p.m., to consider, first of all, Bill 201, private member's bill for second reading, to be followed by Resolution 83.

Mr. Speaker: Business for the afternoon will be report stage on Bill 42 and second reading of Bill 44. Is there agreement, at 5 p.m., to move to Private Members' Business to consider Bill 201 and Resolution 83? *[Agreed]*

Prior to calling report stage on Bill 42, I would just like to recognize the Honourable Member for Pembina with committee changes.

Committee Change

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended as follows: Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings).

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 42—The Public Schools Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: Bill 42, The Public Schools Amendment and Consequential Amendments

Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques et modifications corrélatives), amendment 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson (Mr. Jack Penner).

Is there a will of the House for the Bill to remain standing?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: It has been denied.

Is the House ready for the question?

* (14:50)

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, we were having a bit of a conference over here.

I am pleased to hear the comments on the amendments made by members opposite. Certainly, we had a vigorous discussion, both within committee and within caucus, about Bill 42. There were some thoughtful amendments, I believe, put forth that required some deliberation, and we did have an opportunity last week to hear members opposite speak to the amendments that they were placing forth. We are not in government accepting amendments that were put forth by members opposite, and I would move that the debate on this matter adjourn, that we have a vote on this, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed amendment to Bill 42, The Public Schools Amendment and Consequential Amendment Act, moved by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith),

THAT Bill 42 be amended in the proposed preamble, as set out in section 2 of the Bill:

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

(a) in the ninth clause, by striking out everything after "interest" and substituting "that educational resources be managed efficiently

and effectively for the good of students and communities"; and

(b) in the tenth clause, by adding "and accountability" after "responsibility".

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is amendment 1 to Bill 42, The Public Schools Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of adopting the amendment, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it. On division?

Some Honourable Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mrs. Joy Smith (Fort Garry): I move, seconded by the Member from Russell (Mr. Derkach),

THAT Bill 42 be amended in section 4 by adding the following after the proposed subsection 105(2):

Factors

105(2.1). If a matter under arbitration may reasonably be expected to have a financial effect on the school division or school district, the arbitrator or arbitration board shall, in addition

to any other relevant factors, consider the following:

(a) the school division's or school district's ability to pay as determined by its current revenues, including the funding received from the Government and the Government of Canada and its taxation revenue.

(b) the nature and type of services that the school division or school district may have to reduce in light of the decision or award if the current revenues of the school division or school district are not increased.

(c) the current economic situation in Manitoba and in the school division or school district.

(d) a comparison between the terms and conditions of employment of the teachers in the school division or school district and those of comparable employees in the public and private sectors, with primary consideration given to comparable employees in the school division or school district or in the region of the province in which the school division or school district is located.

(e) the need of the school division or school district to recruit and retain qualified teachers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion presented.

Mrs. Smith: Mr. Speaker, today I would like to put a few comments on record about this particular amendment because it is one of the most important amendments, one of the most important factors that is going to impact on school divisions and taxpayers and on teachers across Manitoba.

It is very important that we take a very close look at Bill 42 because, as we know, in Bill 42, 105(2) says: "An arbitration board shall make an award within 60 days after concluding the proceedings, or within any longer period that the parties agree to." It stops there. In The Public Schools Act, 50 pages have been withdrawn. A very important part of The Public Schools Act

and the former Bill 72 is the ability of schools to pay.

This side of the House has taken this part, this amendment into very careful consideration. The most important part of this consideration is to ensure that school divisions do have the ability to pay and that arbitration awards are in alignment with the kinds of taxation that the public taxpayers can bear.

In this year 2000, we are on the brink of an educational system that needs to meet the needs of students all across Manitoba and all across Canada, that will create jobs that members of this House and Manitobans cannot even understand in terms of the new job market. There are going to be jobs created that members of this House and Manitobans have not even heard of. These jobs have to prepare students to be ready for the future.

Having said this, the ability of the school divisions to pay is a common-sense amendment. This side of the House cannot camouflage the fact that when the ability to pay is taken away, it hurts students, it hurts parents, it hurts teachers, it hurts programming and it hurts the public school system.

Mr. Speaker, to be an effective Minister of Education, to be an effective government, the Government has to look into the long-term possibilities. They have to look at the problems that might occur. They have to look at ways of solving those problems. It is widely understood that members opposite are promoting a tax-spend agenda. The lack of vision, the lack of accountability in all areas of the bills that are before us, the lack of public consultation, is of paramount importance.

I would like to put it on the record that I have pleaded with this Minister of Education and the members opposite to stop this Bill 42 until they have gone out to all parts of the province of Manitoba, until they have consulted with trustees in a meaningful manner, until they have consulted with principals, with parents of the children in the public schools, with the general public, with the advisory councils for school leadership and other parent councils.

This request has fallen on deaf ears. This very important clause is of paramount importance to the well-being of the students and of the public school system. We heard earlier in this House that this minister, even though the Minister of Education did not answer the question concerning the August 3 quote in the paper concerning the fact that he said he inherited Bill 12 from the former government, in no way, as we all know, did that even occur or come close. This erroneous information is worrisome.

* (15:00)

Mr. Speaker, having heard from members opposite that they have an open-door policy, having heard from members opposite that they want to "listen" to the public, at committee, I was witness to the fact that the Manitoba Association of School Trustees was literally shut down. Why were they shut down? They were shut down because they were talking about the pitfalls, the red flags, the problems that would occur if Bill 42 went through. The pleas from members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and the pleas of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the principals, the pleas from the committees saying, please, Minister, would you please hold the Bill until you find out information, has fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the members opposite, for this one last time, would reconsider for their sakes. A lot of the decisions that were made by members opposite are political decisions. Having said this, members opposite keep reminding us that this was a political promise to repeal 72, but they did not promise to bring in a disastrous Bill 42. They did repeal 72. Then they brought in a bill. Members opposite brought in a bill that is going to be the downfall of the public school system and the taxpaying people across Manitoba.

There are issues that had to be dealt with. Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House support teachers, support teachers getting a raise in pay. We support putting resources into classrooms. We support the 50-50 partnership between the parents and the teachers. We support students. I need to remind members opposite that schools were built for students, and

anything that should be done, should be done for the well-being and good of the students.

Having talked about working conditions and having talked about the need to improve teachers' working conditions, I agree with that. Members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, agree with the fact that teachers need to be supported. However, we have before this House a bill that is going to cause dreadful harm to teachers across Manitoba. It is a very short-vised, Band-Aid, quick-fix approach to the problems that are presented to teachers.

Mr. Speaker, when we see Bill 42 and we see the lack of ability of school divisions to pay, we have a lot to be concerned about. I would like to draw attention to this House, in one section of Bill 42 that is very, very worrisome in terms of what it is going to do to impact on the ability to pay. Members opposite should listen carefully to this. In the camouflaged umbrella of the definitions in the subsection, there have been introductory provisions that have gigantic impact on the ability to pay. Under the definition "unit," it says: "'unit' has the same meaning as in *The Labour Relations Act*, and includes a group of teachers. When the expression 'appropriate for collective bargaining' is used with reference to a unit, it means a unit that is appropriate for collective bargaining, whether it is a group of teachers employed by a single school board or by two or more school boards."

In this definition two teachers' associations could apply to the collective bargaining unit, even though, for example, we have Fort Garry and Seine River. On paper, they are separate school divisions. The employers, the trustees bargain in good faith with this example, with these two school divisions. I will just use these two school divisions as examples. Mr. Speaker, the two associations from Seine River and Fort Garry, according to this definition of "unit," could now get together and collectively bargain together, even though the employees cannot do that. This is very, very worrisome. This applies very directly to the ability of school divisions to pay. It is very worrisome that, even though amalgamation is something that this side of the House does endorse to a degree, especially in terms of voluntary amalgamation—I underline "voluntary"—dependent on how the school

divisions collaborate with one another, discuss with one another, agree with one another.

Having said this, the former government set out a fair playing field for both teachers and school boards. When we use this definition "unit" and we apply it to the ability of school divisions to pay, this very important amendment impacts in a very meaningful way. This definition of "unit" has employers bargaining with units or teachers' associations that can get together. More than one association can get together to bargain with one direct school division. This definition of "unit" has not been interpreted well enough by members opposite to be able to define a fair playing field.

In looking at the ability of school divisions to pay, the amendment 105(2.1) says: "If a matter under arbitration may reasonably be expected to have a financial effect on the school division or school district, the arbitrator or arbitration board shall, in addition to any relevant factors, consider . . . the school division's or school district's ability to pay as determined by its current revenues."

Under this definition of "unit," as outlined in Bill 42 at the present time, which has been passed by committee, the combination of the definitions and the lack of this very critical amendment in Bill 42 makes for disaster in the educational system.

The present Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell), has said that he wants to make the liaison between parents and teachers and trustees to be very fluid and go very well.

This ill-fated Bill 42 will have impact all across this province to such a degree that the liaison will be non-existent. The frustration that was felt by the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the frustration that is felt by every school division in this province right now because of the lack of collaboration on all those important issues, is mind-boggling.

After we speak to this amendment, I would plead with the Minister of Education once again to put this bill on hold until he goes out across this province and does some proper collaboration.

* (15:10)

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have lived up to their election promise. I want to make the point: They repealed Bill 72.

My question to members opposite is: Why do you slam-dunk and rush a bill in that is so disastrous to the public school system, the students in this province, the taxpayers and the teachers? Why do that? This ill-fated bill is doomed for disaster.

In the nature and type of services that in the amendment we have asked that the matter under arbitration, when it has a financial effect on the school division, one of the things in the ability to pay is to pay very close attention to the nature and the type of services that the school division or school district may have to reduce in light of the decision or award.

Going back to the definition of "unit," members opposite and this Minister of Education have not clearly defined what "unit" means. It seems that in collaboration with different parties we have found out that it means a unit that is appropriate for collective bargaining, whether it is a group of teachers employed by a single school board or by two or more school boards.

In a given school division—I will map this out, put down little red feet, as it were—if a school division has a certain type of service that is very beneficial to the students and if two teacher associations get together and bargain against a single school division, what happens to these very important student services?

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

When we look at this, I dare say that the well-being of the students is not of paramount importance to members opposite. Earlier today this Minister of Education said that he was going to have excellence for students in the province of Manitoba, in the schools of Manitoba. If indeed that is the case, I would implore the Minister of Education to put back in this very important clause, ability to pay, so the students and the student services would be available. This

Minister of Education will have to guarantee that the funding is so huge toward the public school system that everything is left out to meet the needs and the services of these students.

The members on this side of the House have heard little about the good of the students. This minister opposite is filled with hyperbole and pat phrases about the good of the education of the children of Manitoba. The Minister of Education has waxed eloquently about how important it is for liaison and communication.

I dare say that teachers across this province are not informed about this bill, the grassroots teachers. The members opposite have been dealing with the executive of the teachers' union, and the teachers' union is working in good faith. I know the teachers' union does have the well-being of the working conditions of the teachers at hand.

What I am saying in this message today is that the ability to pay, the Minister of Education has to take a leadership role here and realize that the ability of school divisions to pay will help teachers, because in school divisions that refuse to give teachers the kind of wages that they deserve and need, when they have the ability to pay, the bargaining unit can say to them: We know that you have the ability to pay.

With the ability to pay they can demand that these wages be received. Eliminating the ability-to-pay clause puts a disastrous future for the teaching profession.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the taxes get too high, when the services are cut, who is going to pay? Who is going to really pay? The students are going to pay and also the teachers, because we have many teachers. We need more teachers. There is now a shortage of teachers in math and science. We need to have more teachers. Without the ability to pay, the school divisions cannot find the money to subsidize, to pay these teachers' salaries. We need more teachers in classrooms.

Withdrawing the ability to pay clause is an ill-fated and a very ill-thought-out way of doing things. There has been no thought beyond this year.

From an election point of view, to repeal 72, that is already done. That is done. There are some things that, as governments across Canada and here in Manitoba, we have to look at working conditions of teachers, we have to support teachers, we have to increase wages of teachers. But there are so many types of school divisions across Manitoba, school divisions across Manitoba will be forced to amalgamate to survive.

Members on this side of the House, even though it is thought that amalgamation would be very beneficial for a lot of school divisions, we believe in the democratic approach. Members on this side of the House have said that school divisions can speak to each other, look at their financial books and make the decision if they will go in partnership.

When we talk about amalgamation, we have to talk about building communities, and we have to look at the flavour of the communities. Communities differ across Manitoba. That is what makes Manitoba so special. We have different parts of Manitoba where school districts and communities have developed in different ways. The principles that they have brought forward have been near and dear to the community involved. This is the very core of the democratic process here in Manitoba. It is freedom of choice. That is why when members of this side of the House went through the Norrie report, we did not sneak amalgamation in through the backdoor by putting forth legislation that compared to Bill 42. That is unacceptable. That is sneaking amalgamation into the backdoor. That really is forced amalgamation.

When you take the ability-to-pay clause out, it has far-reaching effects, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I ask you: How can school divisions afford to hire the fine teachers that they need when the school divisions cannot afford to pay them? I ask: Is this Minister going to supply those financial needs? I think not.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) keeps talking about more money into the system and the bogus funding announcement that really embellished the funding formula, the promise that no school divisions would have any tax increases. These falsehoods are something that is

very hurtful to the school divisions across Manitoba. Then to introduce a bill that takes away the ability to pay is a lack of knowledge, a lack of foresight and a lack of understanding about how school divisions depend on the economic situation in Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, members on this side of the House have put forward—one of the factors that we are imploring this minister to look at is the current economic situation in Manitoba and in the school divisions or school districts. When I look at what is happening to Manitoba, when I look at Bill 44 and I look at the lack of vision and insight that this bill has given to the workers of Manitoba and to the management of Manitoba, when I look at the way of doing business—this top-down directive way of doing business—that members opposite are imposing on the citizens of Manitoba, the current economic situation in Manitoba has to be considered.

* (15:20)

We have companies that are currently pulling out of Manitoba because of Bill 44. We look at Bill 4; we look at the lack of democratic voice in Bill 4. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is an umbrella of the certain kind of agendas here that are impeding democracy in Manitoba. It is the basic democratic right, and governments in any part of the world, governments who govern for the people, by the people and have democratic votes—this kind of thing is what Manitobans have held close to their hearts for years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you are talking about a public school system, I do understand that the members opposite are newly in government. I do understand that the members opposite, I am sure, are concerned about the education system. But the lack of knowledge and understanding about how the school system works and what impacts on student services and impacts on teachers is alarming. I daresay that the decision makers for Bill 42 have not spent time in a classroom of any degree. It is unfortunate that the members opposite—and I understand the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) has had some experience; he has been a substitute teacher in the school system. I am sure he has good intentions; however, it is not a

matter of partisan tug-of-war. What this is a matter of is good common sense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, sometimes leaders, if you are going to be an effective leader, have to make some hard decisions, and, for the first time, the federal government has given phenomenal transfer payments this year. Members opposite know that these transfer payments impact in a meaningful way on health care and education. It is time to support teachers. It is time to put resources into the classroom. But, looking at this very ill-fated, short-sighted bill, members opposite need to understand that this is going to impact on students and teachers and parents in a very negative way, when teachers, three years down the road, are looking at losing their jobs, and when they are looking at the fact that they cannot have the supports and resources that they need in their classrooms to teach the students.

Bill 42 even has a commission out about class size. I ask members opposite: How are members opposite going to produce small class sizes when the school divisions and the taxpayers do not have the ability to pay to support the school system?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these bills have been put forward like a patchwork quilt. This very tedious way of producing government laws, government legislation, is an abomination to the democratic process here in Manitoba.

The repeal of Bill 72 is done. It is gone. The members opposite have lived up to their election promise, but to bring forth a bill like Bill 42 that has little knowledge about how a school system works or a bill will be so damaging to the students in this province of Manitoba.

No one is interested in listening to the hyperbole about how concerned members opposite and the Minister of Education is about the well-being of the students in this province, because the education system is in dire jeopardy in this province. I am imploring the Minister of Education to take another look.

I taught in a real classroom full time for 22 years. My colleagues, the teachers, my teacher friends that have supported the position that I

personally have taken as education critic in terms of the ability-to-pay clause have also told me about the problems they have had with some of their employers. That is a problem-solving issue. Members opposite need to get their best minds, they need to get their problem solvers, and they need to address the issue of better working conditions for teachers.

This Bill 42, in withdrawing the ability of the school division to pay, clearly does not give better working conditions for teachers. When you cannot build up the liaison and the good understanding between trustees and parents and teachers, there are problems. This ability to pay is crucial to the well-being of the students and of the taxpayers, as I said, across Manitoba.

Another part of the amendment is the need of the school division or school district to recruit and retain qualified teachers. In this ability-to-pay amendment, this side of the House has set forth amendments that address the needs of the students, the needs of the teachers, and the needs of the taxpayers. It is a common-sense amendment.

Members opposite during committee have voted down this common-sense amendment. In two or three years this will do more harm to members opposite than it will do to anybody else, because when they talk about we have lived up to election promise and members opposite repealed Bill 72, there, said and done, they have lived up to their election promise, but there is no excuse for a government body to bring forth a destructive bill with no collaboration, with no mind to the taxpayers, with no care to the students of Manitoba. There is no excuse.

It is an irresponsible move by members opposite to put this province and these students in that kind of jeopardy and to put the teachers in jeopardy. Members opposite should be working on things like producing math and science teachers, improving the post-secondary education. If they are talking about better working conditions for teachers, the ill-fated Bill 42 is not the answer. There is a point in time when the spring will be drawn so tightly that it springs back. I have heard from members opposite ad nauseam about keeping up to election promises.

I can say to members opposite you have repealed Bill 72, you have kept your promise. Now do not destroy the province, do not destroy the teaching profession, and do not destroy the educational practices and the potential for an excellent education throughout this province.

It is very worrisome and baffling to see this type of legislation go through. Members on this side of the House have tried to work in collaboration, have tried to implore the Minister of Education, have tried to say please put the bill on the shelf for a while. Do not ram it through. What are your reasons for ramming it through? What are your reasons? That is a good question. Manitobans will be asking it very shortly.

What members opposite need to know is that this bill will come back to haunt them. They have lived up to their election promise, Bill 72. But they need to get their best minds together to solve the problems that our education system faces.

This year was a dream year for government, with the balanced budgets and with the transfer payments. With the hyperbole we heard all through the election about excellent education and repealing 72, this government should have had the ability to build the best possible education system in Canada. The groundwork was laid. Members opposite know that members on this side of the House put forth new curriculums, put forth testing procedures, all these things. The accountability factor was in.

Members on this side of the House admit that education is a challenge. Education is something that we have to deal with on a daily basis. But to put a destructive bill in place that is going to break the backs of taxpayers and cause teachers to lose jobs and cut services for students is an ill-fated bill.

Members on this side of the House are imploring members on the opposite side and the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) to put forth this ability-to-pay clause and put it right in Bill 42. It would put a bandage on some of the damage. Members on this side of the House would be very pleased to support the ability-to-pay part of this bill. I would applaud members

opposite for doing it, because this is not a partisan decision.

* (15:30)

The students of Manitoba are not held up for ransom. The students of Manitoba cannot be used as political pawns for the well-being of any political party. Sometimes leaders have to take the hard road and they have to make decisions that maybe everybody might not like, but members on this side of the House know that you do not listen to just one group of people.

When the election comes around again after the damage has been done from Bill 42, members opposite and this Minister of Education will have some tall explaining to do to people that are having school closures, to teachers that are being laid off, and to services to the students that are being eliminated.

Unless this Minister can put unheard of funding into the education system, there is no other way of making this possible. When you look at the economy of the province, when you look at the school system, it is a symbiotic relationship. The good of the schools depends on the economic quality here in Manitoba.

Members opposite have put forth Bill 42 along with other bills, I dare say. When you put the combination of Bill 44 and Bill 42 together, it is a very alarming thing that has happened here in Manitoba. We will quickly become a have-not province. As we speak, businesses are relocating in other provinces. They will be leaving in droves after two or three years if this continues.

It has been a hard-fought battle. We are here now in August. We will continue to hold members' opposite feet to the fire to try to show some reason.

We are standing up for the students, the teachers, and the parents of Manitoba. We want them to be successful. We want for the students of Manitoba to receive an excellent education.

We want the teachers to have secure jobs and be well respected. There are ways of putting legislation in. It is time now to do that, but not like this, not through a bill, the ill-fated Bill 42.

I would implore the Minister of Education to collaborate with knowledgeable people to repeal this bill. Thank you.

Committee Change

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended as follows: Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) for Minto (Ms. Mihychuk).

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Once again I rise to put some comments on with regard to the amendment that was brought forward by my colleague the MLA for Fort Garry. Indeed, it is an amendment that I wholeheartedly endorse. I guess I can speak for many of the people in my constituency who would also see this as an important amendment in an attempt to make a piece of legislation as good as it can be, a piece of legislation that is going to set school divisions back considerably when it comes to negotiations and bargaining.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill 72 was a promise made during the election, a promise that is being upheld by the Minister of Education and Training. It is a promise, I think, that was short-sighted, a promise that only looked at one side of the equation and indeed a promise that is going to interfere, in my view, with the ability of school divisions to manage their affairs as custodians of the education process in our province. It is going to impede, I think, the ability of students in many of our school divisions to seize the best and the most diversified opportunities that they can in terms of their educational years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I spoke to the first amendment that was proposed by the Member for Fort Garry. Although this amendment was lost, I feel that the Minister and the Government did not take full account of what this amendment really would do with regard to this bill. If it had, they would probably have searched very hard in

their hearts and should have probably accepted it in the end.

This next amendment talks about the ability of school divisions, the ability of the taxpayer to afford a particular bargaining position or an agreement between the school division and the teachers. Now, I do not think there is a soul in Manitoba who would disagree that teachers should be paid fairly, they should be paid equitably, and indeed they should not be treated as second-class citizens. On the other hand, I think everybody would also agree that we should not simply put all our eggs in one basket and give teachers everything they want in terms of the bargaining process and leave the students sort of at ransom for the costs that are being paid to the teachers for the educational programming.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the fundamental issues that is always at stake is whether or not he who pays the bill can afford to pay that bill. We live that in our everyday lives. Every one of us here lives by that rule. We have to live within our means. I think that Bill 72 was simply stating that very publicly, that school divisions had to live, the taxpayer expected that the school divisions had to live within their means.

Now, Bill 42 ignores that. It lifts that section of Bill 72 out completely, repeals it, and now leaves open to the arbitrator to decide unilaterally what the bargaining process should end up as and what the final award should be. It does not say that the award has to consider whether or not the school division has the ability to meet those demands. I recall one arbitrator—he used to sit in this House here, Mr. Deputy Speaker—who put out an award, and in his statement after the award was put out, he indicated quite directly that indeed all the school division had to do was raise taxes. So the ability of a school division to pay was not an issue.

Well, if we take that attitude, where are we going to end up? I would say that we are going to have a tax revolt with regard to the education taxes that taxpayers have to pay. They are simply going to say at some point in time that enough is enough. The Minister will argue that, indeed, the arbitrator can consider and should consider the ability to pay. He says that in his bill it does not say anything that the arbitrator

should not consider that, but neither does it say that the arbitrator should consider it. So simply by avoiding to implement that in the Bill, the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) is saying it is really up to the arbitrator to do as he or she chooses.

* (15:40)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that is wrong. I think that is wrong fundamentally. I think that is wrong, and it does a disservice to the children of our province. Now why the children? Because they are the ones who are going to suffer the consequences as a result. Whether it is increased class sizes, whether it is reduced programming, whether it is reduced resources, all of those things are going to be affected by the fact that the arbitrator does not have to consider a school division's ability to pay.

I can see other changes that should be made, other than what the Minister is proposing in this legislation, because indeed if he had left Bill 72 alone, and sure, if he wants to use the arbitration process, I have no difficulty with that. He made a commitment to change some things. That is fine. But in terms of the ability to pay, if the Minister had left this intact and in place, he could have then used another means to ensure that those school divisions who have a lesser ability to meet their challenges, could meet those challenges by increasing the grant payments to those school divisions and by amending the education funding formula so that indeed it does reflect better those schools that have dropping enrolments and those schools that do not have the ability to raise the tax revenues that other school divisions do, thereby making a more level playing field in the education system than we have even today.

Now I can see where the Minister could have done that. I can see where the Minister could have hired some experts to take a look at the funding formula. That funding formula, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was put in place while I was Minister of Education and Training back in 1989, I believe. So that is an 11-year-old formula that should indeed be looked at. Now there has been some tinkering going on with regard to some of the elements of the formula, but basically the formula is still intact. The other

thing that I think should be looked at, and it is certainly past due, is that FRAME accounting process that is used by all school divisions. I think it is out of touch with some of the accounting principles that we have in today's society and in today's world, and that should be looked at, instead of taking a narrow view of one element and that is the element of bargaining and how do we better appease the teachers who work in the system.

I have nothing against teachers, and I have said this time and time again. But this is a bill that does not even speak to the regular classroom teacher. It is a bill that speaks to the Teachers' Society, and we should not confuse teachers with the Teachers' Society because they are two different things. The Teachers' Society has one thing, and that is to enrich the welfare of its membership as much as it can, and it hires the best people that it can to make sure that that happens.

Whereas, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe the teacher out there is a member of our society, is a member of a community, he has some responsibility and accountability to the people with whom he lives in that community. Many times that teacher is very sensitive to the kind of bargaining process that takes place in that school division, because it does impact on him in terms of his relationship with other people in that community. I have talked to dozens and dozens of teachers who see it that way. Yes, they expect to be paid a fair salary. We all do. But they certainly do not want to upset the balance scale so that it is all tilted to the benefit of the Teachers' Society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, some members have even expressed to us privately that if they had their druthers they would like to probably use their funds that they send to the Teachers' Society in other ways. But that is just not possible at this time. Indeed, with this government, that will be an impossibility forever and a day, if they have their way because, with Bill 44, it now ensures that a lot of people do not have a democratic say as to whether or not they should or should not belong to a particular union or a body or an association. So this government has taken a big step towards limiting democracy and limiting the freedom that people have to

choose where they want to belong and where they want to put their money.

This bill falls very much in line with Bill 44 because it tilts the scale to the teachers completely. Yes, this government may buy the vote of the teachers or the Teachers' Society and its membership to a certain extent, but let me assure you that down the road there are going to be people who are going to be wiser than this government in terms of how this is impacting on the school, because this bill will have a direct impact on the classroom. It will have a direct impact on the classroom; it will have a direct impact on the student.

I can see the day when school divisions, school trustees are going to be cutting classrooms. They are going to be cutting resources. They are going to be cutting teachers and support personnel to try and save dollars so that they can pay those salaries that have been bargained through an arbitration process where ability to pay has not been taken into consideration and was not a factor.

The Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith) places four specific points as an amendment to this legislation with regard to bargaining and with regard to the arbitrator having to take into consideration the finances of the school division.

The first one, of course, was the amendment (a), which said: "the school division's or school district's ability to pay, as determined by its current revenues, including the funding received from the government and the Government of Canada, and its taxation revenue."

This is a pretty practical amendment. It simply says that when you are making an award with regard to salaries take into account what that school division is receiving. Take into account how much money is coming from government. Take into account what special revenues might be coming to that school division from the Government of Canada. Take those into account. It does not say that your decision has to be based solely on that issue, but it simply says take account of what those issues are and know that you are dealing with people who have to depend on those taxpayers for their revenues.

The second amendment, which again is a very practical, reasonable amendment says: "the nature and type of services that the school division or school district may have to reduce in light of the decision or award, if the current revenues of the school division or school district are not increased."

That is a very, very important issue to consider, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You have to consider the impact that this decision is going to have on the children who receive the programs and the services. Now if those little children are going to have to receive less services because I want more money in my pocket then there is something wrong with that concept. There is something wrong with that approach. I am sure the Minister should understand that.

All this amendment is saying is, when you are an arbitrator and you are making that decision, what we want you to do is take account of the impact this is going to have on that child. It does not say that is the only issue you have to consider but you have to consider that as one of the issues in making the award. Maybe then common sense will prevail and you may temper your award as a result of the impact this is going to have on the small children and the students of our divisions.

The Member's amendment says: "(c) the current economic situation in Manitoba and in the school division or school district."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have lived through some pretty difficult times in our province, especially when we consider the rural part of our province. But it also affects the urban, because we are an agricultural province. What affects the rural part will affect the urban part as well. There are times when the economy of a province is such that we cannot move ahead as quickly as we would like to. We have to, you know, pull in our horns a little bit or, if you like, have to tighten up the purse strings a little bit. So, therefore, we are asking in this amendment that the arbitrator who may be making the decision on the award take into consideration the economic times that we are living in.

Now that is a pretty practical approach, I would think. That is not outstanding. That is not

saying that the arbitrator should consider that as the sole thing, so, once again, a very practical amendment that has been proposed by the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith).

Now the last one, I think, needs to be read as well because, in her amendment, she says: "a comparison between the terms and conditions of the employment of the teachers in the school division or school district and those of comparable employees in the public and private sectors, with primary consideration given to comparable employees in the school division or school district or in the region of the province in which the school division or school district is located;" well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why should the arbitrator not consider what is being paid to other employees within that region or other employees who are employed in government or in the private sector who could be compared?

* (15:50)

We have all kinds of measuring sticks where we can compare teachers to other employees in the private sector or other employees of government. That is not an insurmountable issue. All we are saying, that once again this is another element that the arbitrator should consider. Now, if you are a common-sense arbitrator, you would consider those things anyway. However, we have seen awards in the past where those things have not been considered. We see examples of that. We saw examples of that right here in this province by an arbitrator who was a member of this Assembly, who stated very clearly in his award that you did not have to consider the economics of the school division because all the school division has to do is jack up the taxes anyway.

An Honourable Member: Who said that?

Mr. Derkach: Well, it was an arbitrator who sat in this House. As a matter of fact, he was Minister of Education at one time.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say to you that, when you have arbitrators of that kind, you have to have clauses of this nature to protect the school division, to protect the students within our province, because the teachers and the school division should be able to look after

themselves at the table. They both can hire negotiators who can look after their needs, but when it is taken out of their hands and put in the hands of an arbitrator, then they have no say. They have no way of trying to redress what that arbitrator is going to award in the final award.

In the arbitration process that used to take place, where you had three people, one was chosen by the Teachers' Society, one by the trustees and a third party was chosen by a process that was very well described, there could be a minority award, which means that the arbitrator and, say, the teachers' representative could agree on an award and award it. Once again, that award would not necessarily have to consider the factors that my colleague is proposing in her amendment.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I think the Minister should take an account of what the impact of removing those issues from his bill will have on the school divisions and on the children of our province. Indeed I ask him to take a very good look at the amendments that have been proposed by the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith) and to consider them in adopting them as part of this bill to strengthen that bill so that indeed the playing field becomes a little more level than it is in its current format.

So, in closing, I want to congratulate the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith) for her wisdom, for looking at this bill very carefully and for proposing some very practical amendments that would strengthen this bad legislation as it is and make it stronger for the benefit of the children of our province.

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pleasure to once again speak to an amendment that has taken much time, probably more time than the Bill itself, to come up with and the use of much wisdom. I think it adds a lot to this particular bill. This and the other amendments that have and will be proposed certainly do add a lot to the Bill, and strengthen it to the point where one could almost support the Bill. But, of course, it would take all of the amendments to do that.

I am sure we have heard the amendments read into the record. I think it is a good thing to focus in exactly what it is that we are debating on, and that is:

"THAT Bill 42 be amended in section 4 by adding the following after the proposed subsection 105(2):

"If a matter under arbitration may reasonably be expected to have a financial effect on the school division or school district, the arbitrator or arbitration board shall, in addition to any other relevant factors, consider the following:

(a) the school division's or school district's ability to pay, as determined by its current revenues, including the funding received from the Government and the Government of Canada and its taxation revenue."

It just reminds me of this lovely weekend past that we had. I certainly have children who have an awful lot of wants and desires. I do not know if I would call them necessarily "needs," but maybe "needs." They look into the catalogue and they see a swimming pool.

"Dad, can we not have a swimming pool?"
What is the answer back?

"Well, kids, it all comes down to ability to pay." That is de facto, one of the things that regulates life in our modern, democratic society as we see it today.

Then they say: "But, Dad, where are we going to swim if we do not have the swimming pool?"

I know the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell), perhaps does not have the same connection to the swimming pool as I do, but this swimming pool seems to be becoming a thorn in my family's side. You just write a cheque. Put it on that gold card or the grey card, whether it is called VISA or MasterCard. You just go in. You hand over that little card, and we have ourselves a swimming pool. I always point out to my children: "But, guys, it comes down to ability to pay."

I think, when we look at it in these kinds of terms, does the amendment not make sense? Can you not just see the wisdom in this amendment? Because, really, decisions, whether they are based in our personal life in our home, whether they are based in our churches, in our community clubs, whether it is in our business—I would go so far as to say: I bet that ability-to-pay clause is even something that unions look at.

I can imagine there will be somebody in an office saying: I would like to have a new computer with "750 GIGY JAM" and "Gohigymajigy" and whatever else. They go to Bernie Christophe and they say: "Mr. Christophe, I need this new computer."

I can see Bernie Christophe looking at the bill, and he would say: "I would love to give you that new computer. Right now, the thing that I want to do is give you that computer. But there is one problem. The ability to pay for it. It is just not in the budget."

So why would something as fundamental, as easy, as simplistic as ability to pay be a problem, dare I say, for our Minister of Education? I am sure our Minister of Education goes shopping maybe with that one special person in his life. They go into that evil place called "the jewellery store." They go into that jewellery store and I am sure that one special person in his life looks at all kinds of stuff. I am sure it has happened to a few other people in this Chamber. You know what? We just cannot go and buy the whole store. There are limits because I am sure, even for the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell), it comes down to the ability to pay. Sweetheart, I agree with you. You are worth a two-and-a-half carat diamond ring. Absolutely. That is not the debate, is it? No. Or that watch worth \$12,000 or \$13,000, are you worth it? Absolutely. That is not what the debate is about. Earrings, \$700 for a set of earrings. Yes, honey, you are worth it. Absolutely, every penny. But that is not the point.

What it all comes down to, I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, through you, probably even to the Minister of Education, I have a feeling that when they walk through that jewellery store, hand in hand, gazing in each other's eyes with true love, crossing the Minister's lips will be that

one little sentence: But, sweetheart, it all comes down to the ability to pay.

An Honourable Member: Or you can have it for a couple of days.

Mr. Schuler: No, there is not a rent for a week program in these jewellery stores. I do not mean to burst anybody's bubble but you just cannot rent this stuff. You either buy it or you ain't got it. That is just the way it goes. So it is a very fundamental part of our life, alas, even for ministers of the Crown and for members of the Opposition and for moms and dads in the home, for business people, for Bernie Christophe in the union, for the churches, for the community organizations.

You know what? That is why this is so fitting as an amendment, because, and I will read (a) again: "the school division's or school district's"—now are you all listening quietly? I appreciate that—"ability to pay, as determined by its current revenues."

*(16:00)

You see, we even go a step further. I have got to start quoting this to my children. Maybe I will even quote this to the Minister of Education's one special person in his life. You see, not just is it the ability to pay, but it is the ability to pay—here is the kicker actually—as determined by its current revenues.

You see, that is actually a sentence one should give to one's family. You know, kids, it is not just the ability to pay, but it is also defined by what dad earns. It is also defined, by any organization, what kind of money comes in, and so, too, should it be determined when a school board, which represents the taxpayers, basically when the taxpayers and their employees sit down and we all want to have what is in the best interests of our taxpayers. Taking the analogy back in our families, we do want what is best for our families.

I am sure the Minister of Education wants what is best for his sweetie, his significant other, but it still comes down to the reality that you have to have a guiding principle, not just of ability to pay but it has to be judged on the size

of the paycheque. When the school board, de facto the taxpayer, sits down with its employees, and we want what is best for our employees. I know they want what is best for their employees, and everybody deserves a pay raise.

Everybody deserves to have their concerns recognized. Everybody deserves to have their concerns acknowledged. It is basically the taxpayers sitting down with their employees and they want to make sure that they have—what is that slogan—a happy teacher is a happy student, I mean, however you want to word that particular slogan. I think that is very important. We used to hear that when we were on the school board of River East School Division, because clearly a high morale with your staff translates into a better education for your students, and that is without a doubt. Yet when you sit down and you have these negotiations you clearly have to look at the kind of money that the taxpayers can put forth, the kind of money you can raise from the taxpayers. The ability to pay is defined clearly, determined by its current revenues, including the funding, and then it goes on and on.

Item (b), "the nature and type of services that the school division or school district may have to reduce in light of the decision or award"—another complete area to look at, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very telling again. I will read it for the record. I do not know if everybody heard it the first time: "The nature and type of services that the school division or school district may have to reduce in light of the decision or award." What is very important about that is, for instance, River East School Division—I believe wages are now at about 80, maybe 83 percent of the total budget. So, if you see a sizeable increase in the pay, and the taxpayer is saying: Whoa, uncle; we cannot pay anymore—where do you get the money from? It actually has to then come from programs. That is where this (b) is very important, because there is a necessity to have a certain amount of programming. If you do not have this particular item in there, basically what you will have school boards doing is being squeezed between the taxpayer, squeezed between the arbitrator.

Where will the hardest hit be? The hardest hit area will be in programming, and that affects the students, and that affects the staff. If you

have a high morale and you have a happy staff which translates into high morale and a happy student population, so, too, a high morale and a happy student population translate into a high morale and a happy workforce, the teachers and the like. It goes both ways. To cut all the programming out, certainly, is not something that will help with the morale of the students. I think this particular item follows in. It is really like a glove in the hand, (a) and (b) together. Mr. Speaker, "if the current revenues of the school division or school district are not increased," that finishes off article (b)

Article (d), "a comparison between the terms and conditions of employment by the teachers in the school division or school district and those of comparable employees in the public and private sectors, with primary consideration given to comparable employees in the school division or school district or in the region of the province in which the school division or school district is located." Mr. Speaker, this again takes a different approach, and really deals with a comparison. It deals with individuals doing like kind of work in other areas. Again, it is very important to this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker, (e), "the need of the school division or school district to recruit and retain qualified teachers." I would suggest to all members present that, rather than spending time on Bill 42, which, I daresay, is probably not the best use of this House's time, I think what we should be spending a lot more time with as governance in Manitoba is the need of school divisions or school districts to recruit and retain qualified teachers.

During the process where we heard presenters to Bill 42, one of the presenters was discussing that Winnipeg No. 1 might see 300 to 500 teachers retiring. That is a serious hit to any school division, especially when—we certainly asked the individual—you get into the Senior 4 level. In Senior 4 math, which is preparing you for university, getting you ready to move on to post-secondary education, it is very important that you have a qualified, trained, slightly seasoned teacher in those particular subjects, the problem being that high schools, and I know of several of them, went into the universities, recruited graduates from the Faculty of

Education, put them into a Senior 4 program, and they had great, great difficulty with the program. I think it is only fair that a student that just comes out of university will not have the same kind of teaching skills, will not have the kind of rapport. Those things take a while to build up with a class of Senior 4 students.

I think we are going to be facing a difficulty here. Instead of the kinds of things we have seen in Bill 42, I again would have to say are probably not the best investment of time of this House, we should be talking about our teachers. We should be talking about the workforce. We should be talking about what is the product that we are coming out with in Senior 4. Are we going to have enough Senior 4 math teachers? Are there going to be enough qualified staff there that can take on the Senior 4 subjects? Frankly, if you talk to any of the front line, whether it is trustees or principals and vice-principals or recruiters or teacher organizations themselves, this is clearly a concern that they have. Where are we going to get the qualified staff to go into the high schools and prepare our students for post-secondary education?

Another area that has been brought to my attention, certainly if you are very strong in mathematics, if you are very strong in English, if you are very strong in languages, you tend not to vie for education. Especially if you are in mathematics, they tend to go into IT, they tend to go into engineering, which does pay a substantial amount of money on the open market. So we are not getting the same number of strong candidates going to education with mathematics, because they tend to find a different faculty and pursue a different line of work. That has been an area that has been pointed out to me on numerous occasions, that people do have a concern on the front lines with that particular issue. I think (e) is terribly important to be part of this. I am glad to see that it was included.

* (16:10)

I have spoken to this House before, and I think I have unanimous agreement that when you listen to all the presentations, you found that there was a common theme. Again, there were people who varied a little bit more on one side, a

little bit more on the other side, but the concern for the students, the concern for the education of our children, those kinds of things certainly came out each and every time.

The last time I got to speak on the last amendment I did not have quite the opportunity to finish the brief by MAST. I got as far as page 5. I would just like to conclude, because it certainly draws a lot of what we are debating here out of it.

I quote: "The legislative amendments introduced in 1996's Bill 72 sought to rectify the deterioration that had become increasingly evident in the collective bargaining process, and the concurrent shift in the balance of power in favour of the teachers' union. One of the major components of Bill 72 was contained in section 126(2). That section listed items that were not referable to arbitration"

Here this is what we are dealing with. I will just conclude the paragraph: "the selection, appointment, assignment, and transfer of teachers and principals; the method for evaluating the performance of teachers and principals; the size of classes in schools; and the scheduling of recesses and the mid-day break. These items are often referred to collectively as 'management rights.'"

I certainly hope at a later date I will have the opportunity to finish this particular presentation. I thank you very much for the time to get up and speak to this very important legislation and this most worthy and recommendable amendment that is being proposed. I am pleased to stand here in favour of that particular amendment. Thank you.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to address this particular amendment in this very controversial bill that has been brought forward by the Minister of Education to deal with the success and future success of the students that we are raising in Manitoba today.

As I said at the last opportunity to debate this bill when we were dealing with the previous amendment, I had indicated that the future of this province depends on the success of our

children today. I believe the future of any region of our country, anywhere in the world, for that matter, depends on the ability to provide a sound education to the students of any particular region in Canada and in the world, but particularly this bill has been put forward here in the province of Manitoba and the central part of Canada to deal with the future successes of the children that we have in this province.

Before I get to the amendment that our member today has brought forward on the ability of taxpayers and the ability of regions to pay for the kind of education that we want our students to have, I just want to refer to the previous amendment and say how unjust and how hurt many of us feel by the fact that an amendment, and I quote, which says "that educational resources be managed efficiently and effectively for the good of students and communities."

The Government defeated this amendment. The Government defeated an amendment to a bill that calls for managing efficiently and making effective and efficient use of the goods that we have as educational resources for the good of our students and our communities in this province. I cannot imagine why you would vote against that amendment. But it also goes on to speak about how they also were against the word "accountability" being added to the clause after "responsibility." Now, if there is anything we need in this province, it is a responsible, accountable education system, and this government defeated both of those amendments. So I just wanted to put that on the record because I think it is very pertinent to the kinds of listening that this government claims that it is doing to the people of Manitoba for the benefit of the future of the students of this province.

In speaking to Bill 42, the amendment that has been put forward today by my fellow Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith) is better known as an ability-to-pay clause, to be able to have some accountability in a watchdog approach, if you will, in the ability of a region to pay for the kinds of educational opportunities that are there. As my colleague from Russell said, there is no doubt that schoolteachers have to be paid at a very acceptable level in the province of Manitoba. They have to continue to be seen in negotiations with the expansion and

the workload that teachers carry in the province of Manitoba. They have to be kept up to pay scales in those areas. But, when we bring forward amendments that deal with these, as the Government in its wisdom sought not to seek these in its own bill, we are finding that they are not listening to them, and, in fact, defeating—as I have just talked to the previous amendment—very sound amendments that would deal with the future opportunities in education for our students in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it is not always easy to make the hard decisions that have to be made in our lives. The Member for Springfield (Mr. Schuler), I think, was referring to some of that. He did it so eloquently that I am certainly not going to try and top his examples how accountability plays such a role in our lives. There I go back to the word that the Government just defeated, "accountability," in the previous amendment. But he was referring to ability to pay. The Government does not seem to get it that, when it comes to the fact that taxpayers as well as our students and teachers today, because our teachers are certainly taxpayers in the province of Manitoba as well, it is the ability to pay and the impact that that can have on various regions.

I am only going to refer today for a few moments to the region that I come from, that of Arthur-Virden; but, before I do that, I want to go back to the fact that I just stated, that it is not always easy to make the hard decisions in dealing with decisions that have to be made in our daily lives as individuals. Certainly, it is not easy as politicians here in this House to make the hard decisions sometimes because you are much more public about the decisions that are being made, and there will always be someone, perhaps, that does not see clearly the decision that you have made as being a sound one for the future of either themselves or the province of Manitoba.

An Honourable Member: The story of my life here, Larry.

Mr. Maguire: The Minister says that may be the story of his life. Well, we have all had to make very hard decisions, and I hope he is listening because I just want to point out that it is not only his government that has had to make those in the

past, but my predecessors, before I was elected, certainly had to make some of those, and the federal government has had to make some of those as well.

Now I would say that one of the things that this government and this minister have done here is make a parallel to what has already been done by the federal government, when the federal government reduced its deficit in Canada. Everybody applauds them for doing so, just as the Filmon government did in Manitoba in reducing its deficit. They were to be applauded for that. But, unlike the Filmon government that did it because we had to make some tough decisions, or that government had to make some tough decisions, in regard to how finances were going to be managed because there was an extremely limited resource of them. In fact, the Premier (Mr. Doer) of this province today and others have referred to in the past the \$240 million of transfer payments that were taken away on an annual basis from the Province of Manitoba, and when that was done, in times when all governments had to get their deficits under control so that we would have a sound future in this province, decisions were very hard to make.

* (16:20)

Now throughout that whole period of time, I just want to say that while the Filmon government made cuts and remanaged the financial affairs of this province so that we could have a sound future, which was an unlike process to the federal government. The federal government came into a situation where there was a deficit but there had been processes put in place that allowed them to come out of deficit because of increased trade opportunities in the rest of the world, because of the positions that Canada had been put in, and they did it without making major spending cuts from the federal level of government. But, of course, the one area that was extremely cut was two areas, Health and Education spending, and transfer payments from federal governments were one of those major areas.

Now this government is parallel today. The government of the day here in Manitoba has also decided that it now has the opportunity to go

ahead and expand some of these programs and it is doing it based on a budget that includes very enhanced trade opportunities in the province of Manitoba which have brought in, as we have seen in their own budget, many hundreds of millions of new dollars in economic activity here in this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, are we back to the situation where we are in a tax-and-spend situation in the province of Manitoba?

We have now become the highest taxed province in all of Canada. In spite of the fact, having the highest taxed province in Canada certainly was not an election promise that this government brought forward, but it is one that they have ended up giving the taxpayers of this province.

My point is: Does this provide them with an opportunity to then take those dollars and spend them helter skelter however they wish, without the same kind of responsible management that has been there over the last decade and a half in the province of Manitoba? That has a lot to do, and certainly the public sees it, in dealing with Bill 42.

Now I indicated earlier that I was going to refer to the constituency from which I come, that of Arthur-Virden. I am going to refer to it on the basis of our ability to pay in that corner of Manitoba. The Minister knows full well, because he represents part of the city of Brandon that has had some economic down turn. I mean, in spite of the growth of the City, there could have been greater, if it had not been for the fact that 1.1 million acres in western Manitoba was not seeded in 1999. It would have been even worse if the previous government had not made available funds to support that particular region, unlike what the Minister has been able to attract from his counterparts in government today here in the province of Manitoba.

They are willy-nilly blaming the federal government for not coming up with some support to match dollars that they think are already out there on the table that were not matched.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the provincial Conservatives were in power, they put forth

those dollars last summer to the province of Manitoba for the farmers in that particular region of the world. They had no guarantee that any of those dollars would be matched by the federal government, and it amounted to some \$71 million. So we must make sure that, when we are dealing with these kinds of issues, we do it in a responsible manner. That is why my colleague from Fort Garry has brought forward this kind of an amendment, so that the ability to pay in a region is brought to the forefront in dealing with arbitration matters that need to be dealt with by school divisions throughout the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say that because of some changes in federal legislation we are seeing an influx of new inland elevator terminals throughout the province of Manitoba, across the Prairies, and certainly that is nowhere less evident than it is in my constituency in Arthur-Virden. I have, in private member's statements last week, acknowledge two of those, one in Elva, southwest of Melita, and one at Boissevain by Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which are large facilities being built. There has been a large expansion in Louis Dreyfuss at Hargrave, as well, west of Virden, and other companies are looking at the kinds of facilities that they will use for the future.

These are rather large, 15 000- to 42 000-tonne terminals, 400 000 bushels to a million and a half bushels for those who have not converted to metric perhaps yet. They are popping up on the landscape of that rural area to handle what we hope will be an extremely good crop out there this year. It looks like some volume, but the grade may not be determined yet. But when those pop up—and do not get me wrong. There is a tax base that will go to the municipalities now because none of these companies will build these kinds of facilities in the town where the school is built and the education of our children takes place.

When these happen, virtually every wooden elevator in the province of Manitoba may be closed within the next 10 years—that is certainly the indication from the companies themselves—and they are the facilities that, in many cases, are the largest tax-paying base in that particular local community today. When those wooden

elevators close and move out of town, the communities have not been, to my knowledge at least, compensated for that kind of tax loss by the government of the day. That may be something that needs to be looked at in the future, but I think that we need to take into consideration the impacts that some of these other factors have on an area.

Now what has this government done is a question that keeps coming to mind. What does this NDP Government do to help in those particular areas? Well, Mr. Speaker, when you have fewer inland terminals and you close down the number of wooden facilities in the country, then farmers of today have to haul the grain further. If they are going to haul the grain further, they are going to do it over roads that have not traditionally been the ones that have perhaps been hauled on in the past, or they are going to use the highway facilities that are already there.

But what has this government done? Cut the highways budget. They have cut off the ability of people to make a living in those particular regions. It is going to take a lot more local dollars to provide an opportunity to keep that infrastructure in place—some of the honourable members opposite have never got outside the Perimeter Highway, or they would know what I am talking about, and when you have to rebuild some of those roads—we are just sailing along here, Mr. Speaker, but not to mention anything, but now we are on highways, and we are not on water rights. *[interjection]* I have got members opposite rather incensed, Mr. Speaker, and I am enjoying the contribution that they are making to this discussion. I am sure the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) is listening very intently to them.

I referred earlier to the fact that there was 1.1 million acres that did not get seeded in southwest Manitoba last year. Most of those acres were in the 11 municipalities that make up the constituency of Arthur-Virden. When you look at the kinds of dollars that are available in an area to do any kind of arbitration, then I am absolutely incensed that there is no sensitivity to a region's ability to pay in Bill 42.

You know, it is certainly my belief that this kind of legislation weakens the ability of a

school board to manage its affairs within its boundaries. I would say, as in everything, there is progressiveness, things need to progress. There may need to be some changes and harmonization, as was talked about earlier, in a voluntary manner in some of the school boards working more closely together in issues in their areas. That will come about as we provide more distance educational opportunities, which is what many of our rural schools are looking at as a means of being able to actually get the course outlines that they need to have that sound education in the future.

It is perhaps not surprising that we have seen this whole move towards centralization in the school system today because, of course, that is the New Democratic philosophy in regard to how to handle things: centralize it all and run it from one central area; and monopolies are always good; and close some more schools, which if we are going to close schools, are likely going to happen in rural Manitoba. That also does not provide any better education in some cases because, of course, it has not been actually proved yet that there have been large savings from closing some of the small schools that are there today.

* (16:30)

Mr. Speaker, whether it is clergy or clerks, whether it is equipment operators or business owners, they are all living according to being dependent on ability to pay. So, having said that, teachers are no different. They are like any of the other people in those communities, but what this government is trying to do is make them different, and I do not think most teachers in those areas want to be different. They recognize the impact of the economy and how it enhances and impacts on a whole rural area. They are quite willing because they know that perhaps, if things are bad like they were last year, maybe the plumber does not have as much opportunity to make a living. The clergy do not have as much opportunity to be any higher paid because the local citizens are watching the dollars that they are spending. Equipment operators, it does not matter what business they are in, they are all dependent on the ability of that region to make a living.

So I present to you, Mr. Minister, that these comparisons I have made and that have been made by my colleagues are very pertinent towards the kind of legislation we should be bringing forth in all of the bills the Government is dealing with today and not just Bill 42. This amendment that has been brought forward is a very sound amendment that would give us an opportunity to have a greater say by those local school boards. Therefore, the province could gain a lot in information that is available to them for what is happening in local regions.

Certainly, we have curriculums that are planned throughout the province. We want to make sure that we are able to provide as much opportunity to those students as we can to have that education that will bring them to university so that they are on a par from all parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on the amendment brought forward by the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith). I think that, looking back to the legislation when it was first drafted by us as a government years ago, the argument of ability to pay was there then, and it was something that people on the Government side today argued that should not be in there. Certain groups and organizations in the province suggested that it should not be in there, and we as a government took the responsibility of suggesting that it should be in there, and it should be adhered to in certain instances where the case could be presented to the decision makers as to how much they could pay.

It has been said time and time again in here, and I know members opposite experience it: there are times when we as individuals, as families, as friends, there are certain limitations put on us economically at times, and we have to live by those decisions. I think everybody here could think of an example of where they had to say no to something, pure and simple, because they could not afford it or did not have the ability to pay for it. We make some jest about that back and forth, and yet I think probably the truest part of the whole statement is the ability to

pay. If we do not have the ability to pay, we do not have the ability.

So how can you impose on someone something that can no longer be afforded? I know during that argument back in 1996, I think the argument on the other side was, well they can simply raise taxes; that creates the ability to pay. If we applied that to everything that we do, listening to some of the members' comments, the Member for Springfield (Mr. Schuler), we would have to say, his son should just tell his dad to get a raise or write a cheque, use credit, borrow the money. At some point, these young children have to understand and have to learn that a fundamental part of how we live today is the fact that our ability to pay for things is restricted by what we earn, and if it is not considered, then we start down the path to destruction, and then we have to rebuild the families and rebuild the system again to make it more worthwhile.

Mr. Cris Aglugub, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

But rather than just talk about my comments, I do want to just take a couple of quotes from some of the local papers, and just to show that the Government has to start listening a little bit more and perhaps consider some of these amendments so that we can make a better bill. And again, I said earlier in the week, or last week when we were talking on one of the other amendments, it somewhat mystifies me, it bothers me that we are talking about an education bill that does not mention education or children or anything else in the Bill except how to settle labour negotiations. It is beyond me when I listen to members opposite continually stand up and talk about the children and the families and education and what is best for them, and yet this bill, brought forward by the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell), does not even touch that.

I do want to just read a couple of comments. These are people that are involved with the Bill and have taken the time to understand it and taken the time to comprehend what the Government is suggesting in the Bill that is put forward, and these are some of their comments. This was made by Mrs. Jean Oliver from the Lord Selkirk School Division. She says, "It is almost like he is ignoring the school's trustees

and the rights of citizens to be able to pay," referring to the Minister. She goes on to state, "I am concerned, not only as a school trustee, but as a taxpayer. I think all taxpayers should be worried." This is coming from Selkirk. This is coming from a community that is supposedly on side with the direction that the Government is taking, but it is quite unfortunate that they do not understand, I guess, the true intent, or perhaps they do understand the true intent of this bill and are very concerned about it. I am sure that they have had conversations with their MLA and will be taking those issues forward.

The other comment that she has is the fact that because of the timing of the Bill and when it may or may not be proclaimed, she says: My fear is that it is going to go through early in September. At that point any hearings we want to add would be too late. I think that is another statement of a lot of the things that this government is doing. They are bringing it in through the back door, late in the session when, hopefully, not too many Manitobans are paying attention. We can slide it through.

We all know the score in the House. No matter what the debate is, if the Government chooses to do it, they can and will do that. But to ignore the numbers, the masses of people that are objecting to the legislation of this session in the heat of summer when most people's interests are focussed on their families and on a bit of a summer vacation, I think it is something that these people should take strong notice of. I suggest to them if they want to continue down that path, it is certainly going to be an interesting period in Manitoba's time as far as the people's concerns and the issues and how they are being dealt with, and not only how the issues are being dealt with, but how the people and the organizations themselves are being dealt with by this government.

* (16:40)

I know the Member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire) spoke on it a little bit. I do want to elaborate too. I think the real test of this legislation, if this amendment is not brought in and accepted by this House, is going to happen very quickly, because the southwest corner of

Manitoba has suffered. They are struggling out there. Their ability to pay has been diminished.

When you talk about ability to pay, you can have certain parts of your economy that perhaps are not functioning as well as the other parts. Fortunately, in Manitoba, we have been able to diversify to a point where, although agriculture has struggled the last several years, the Manitoba economy has actually moved forward and progressed quite well. That is all good if that is what you are basing this ability to pay on. But you are not. You are looking at an area of the province where the entire economy, not just the agricultural economy, but all the economies within the communities are suffering and struggling.

They are having to make tough decisions right now. I would suggest to you that owners of businesses right now in rural southern Manitoba are working longer hours than they ever had. People that were close to retirement are now coming back and working 12 and 14 hours a day, and displacing a person from work. But they are doing it because they have no other ability. They do not have the funds to pay another employee to come in and carry that extra load. This is where this bill is going to be magnified to the public, because the negotiations are underway in the school divisions in that area. If you bring an outsider in and tell him to go in and adjudicate a settlement, and not consider the ability to pay of that particular region at this particular time, then I think we have made a grave mistake. I think we are sending the wrong message.

As the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) mentioned, people in rural Manitoba—I would invite all members across the way to go out and meet and visit some of the people in those communities. You will find out that they are very generous, very kind, very polite people, but they are tiring. They are tiring of a lot of the things that have happened to them, not necessarily the fault of any government, but compounded by government actions. We all know their disdain for the federal Liberals in that part of the province. Obviously, we all know why. They have been totally neglected by the politicians in Ottawa. I daresay you would be pressed hard to find a Liberal who would stand

up and admit it. We all know who they are. They are not talking very loud right now in that part of the province because of the way that the party they belong to has ignored their issues and ignored their concerns for far too long.

I would say to members opposite: It is a caution, but I say to you that they are not that pleased right now with this government. Their concerns are being raised in regard to the flood support. Did the government of the day do enough? Did they not only just pound Ottawa for their neglect, but come up with some alternatives that could be managed from the provincial side alone to help this? We do it in other jurisdictions. We have done it in firefighters. We are doing it right now up north. We are providing the resources and the necessities to fight the fires, and everybody on this side would agree to that. There would be no argument, but when you are looking at a condensed area that has suffered such tragic economic disaster and then put them into a position of where some guy is going to come in and make a decision for them and not consider what has happened to them in the last two years, I think it is very unfortunate and very unfair. I think it will reflect very brightly back onto the government of the day in a way that they will not be happy with. Mr. Acting Speaker, I do know that there are other members, my colleagues who would like to speak on this, but I would like to encourage all members across to stand and be counted and support this bill amendment.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): I, too, would like to just put a few comments on record specific to Bill 42 and, of course, today's amendment as we see it. I know that you are very much aware that I do not support Bill 42. I do support this amendment. However, I believe in total, the Bill should be withdrawn. I want to give you a few reasons for saying that. This is, again, the complete contrast between what has happened between Bill 72 and Bill 42. In '95, we went across the province, and we talked to teachers, we talked to trustees, we talked to anyone who wanted to give a presentation. We, in fact, did not limit time. We gave everyone an opportunity to say the things that they felt were important regarding the whole area of compensation, the whole area of responsibility of school boards and responsibilities of teachers as well. What I found

interesting, actually I spent a little bit of time this afternoon and reviewed some of the responses that we received specific to Bill 72, and we had many, many submissions handed out, but we had submissions from teachers who indicated very clearly that they supported and would be in support of ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Now, what I find ironic in this situation is that there has been no public consultation. I realize that this is an election promise, but an election promise or not, is it not important that you go back to the general public, back to the electorate, those who are affected by it? I dare say everyone is affected by it: parents, grandparents, children, teachers, trustees, the taxpayer. Everyone is affected by the information that is given out here and by this bill. So why not go out and find out? If they feel so strongly that Bill 72 is wrong, that it is not meeting the needs and that it was, in fact, not designed to meet the needs of Manitobans, then I would say go out there and find out exactly what the general public is feeling. You did not do that, the Member from Brandon is quipping from his chair. I would suggest that that has not taken place. Yes, this is a promise that was made to the Manitoba Teachers' Society. I understand that, but are these the only people that they cater to? It appears that they are, and so that is where I have the real problem with Bill 42. It has not gone to public consultation. It has not gone out to the general public to ask them for the opinions that they have. In fact, I have teachers in my area that would oppose this. They believe very strongly that ability to pay needs to be taken into consideration, and so my colleagues here have indicated, given and cited examples of areas that did not have a crop.

Now, again, the members opposite sort of make light of this fact that, well, you know, ability to pay is not there, and Brandon West is doing exactly the same thing. I image he has no problem being without a salary and still saying my taxes can go up. That is identical to what is taking place with people who do not have a crop or, with that, you have the ripple effect of industry not being able to function, and they close shop, grocery stores. So the one follows the other, but again there in no apparent

recognition of this, that in fact this does hamper people's ability to pay. Again, I fail to see the rationale that is being used because the contrary could happen as well. You could have a greater increase given than was generally given.

Now, let us refer back to the 1990s. I happened to be on the school board and in negotiations during those years, and what happened year after year, we were in a recession in this province. The civil service had to take a decrease in pay because there were not the dollars available to do it. Locally, due to depressed prices, due to crop failures, due to industry not being able to keep going, these are the ones who pay the taxes who, and maybe this is something new to members opposite, in fact do pay the salaries of the people who are out there, they did not have the ability to pay. Yet though, when you look at the contracts that came out, there were always increases. Now again, I indicated last week when I stood and rose and spoke to the first amendment that I do not begrudge teachers a good salary. In fact, if there were the ability to pay, if we could do it I would say we could increase our salary. I believe they are doing a good job and money is not always going to correlate to a job well done or not, but the money has to be there in order to be able to pay these salaries. This is our issue. This is why the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith) has put in the second amendment and said it is of vital importance that ability to pay be taken into consideration.

* (16:50)

I would urge members opposite to look at this and to look at this seriously. I made the comment that I went back to the submissions that we had in 1995 and the hundreds of submissions that we got, from teachers, from all areas of life, and some were opposed, many were in favour. They said they thought this was a realistic approach, but I just want to make a few comments.

Here at the hearings that we had, MAST came out and you know, I will just read a few lines here: This bill deals with collective bargaining and puts the interests of our children first, they say, or rather they say that you have indicated this is what would happen. But, they

say: This bill deliberately and significantly increases the power of the teachers' union within our school system, to the extent that this bill shifts the decision-making powers to teachers' union and arbitrators and away from the elected community representatives. This bill compromises the interests of Manitoba children.

Now I would urge members opposite to listen to that. Carolyn Duhamel makes another comment and, of course, we will not go into that one because that may be a little sensitive, but certainly I believe that the diatribe the Minister of Education gave her, he may bear the consequences and the scars of that at some later date, but certainly they were not impressed.

We had AMM coming out, another submission that they gave. Did you listen to that? No. I mean, they have opposed this. *[interjection]* It was a nice letter. Here: AMM cannot support this fundamental shift away from local, elected community officials. They are opposing what you are doing here. Now you say that—you know, a nice letter. Well, whatever, take it whichever way you want.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying here today is that you need to listen to the people of Manitoba, and that has not taken place. You put your legislation out there; you took it to committee hearings and basically you bombarded it through the second reading. Have you listened? No, you have not listened. And what we are saying is why not listen to the people of Manitoba? If you have something that you want to do, which is pay-off to the unions, I guess, so be it. That is what I take this to be, and from the information and from what I have seen and heard in the House here so far, there is absolutely no recognition of what the people of Manitoba are saying. You are bent on just passing this bill, and yes, you will please a few of the people out there, but again I maintain and I submit to you that this is going to severely impact on the people, not only in rural Manitoba, also in the urban areas when they do not have the money to pay the taxes and when this, in fact, is going to go beyond the ability that they have to pay.

So again, I want to thank the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith) for putting out this amendment, and I do support the

amendment. On the other hand, though, I do wish that this government, that the Minister of Education (Mr. Caldwell) would withdraw Bill 42. Thank you very much.

Mr. Glen Cummings (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of the amendment, as proposed by the Member for Fort Garry, on the ability to pay. I think it bears remembering why this clause was discussed or why the ability to pay was originally put into legislation. What we forget too often is that there can too easily become a separation between the reality of society, reality of the economy, and the decision taken by arbitration boards. Eventually, that corrects itself as they roll through the systems. But far too often there seems to be little resemblance between reality, as the members of government are fond of saying these days, and the balance that needs to be kept in society.

The members for Brandon East (Mr. Caldwell) and Brandon West (Mr. Smith) should both be cognizant of the fact that I think, if the numbers were checked, Brandon School Division is a perfect example of where the ability to pay did not restrict the teachers' ability to get a better arbitration award. In fact, it assisted them, in one of their more recent arbitration awards, to get a better award, because Brandon has been a very efficient, and teachers, in many cases, some of whom I know personally, argued that it was somewhat tight-fisted. Their last arbitration award, I believe, if we checked the numbers, was slightly higher than the provincial average, because the arbitrator took into consideration the ability to pay.

When we look at the ability to pay, I have heard it argued by those who believe that it should be ignored, I have heard it argued by senior personnel involved in arbitration that there is, in fact, no such thing as ability to pay when you are talking about a public institution. All they have to do is raise taxes, Mr. Speaker. Well, I would suggest that that is a very unsettling comment for those in the taxpaying public to hear, and it does very little to address the fear of those of us on this side and many people across this province who are going to start wrestling with their tax bills this fall: How does this government anticipate dealing with the

balance between provincial support and local taxpayer-based funding?

While the Minister responsible for Education (Mr. Caldwell) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) were able to, for a short period of time, perpetrate on the public the concept that they had changed and increased the share of provincial funding, when reality came home to roost, then it became clear that this government, so far at least, has not demonstrated its willingness and ability to put a lot more provincial dollars into the funding side of education.

I look at the way that Bill 42 is structured, and I read some of the WHEREASes in the preamble to the bill. They are all motherhood and apple pie. No one can criticize the preamble, but when we look at the one WHEREAS that says the democratic local school divisions and districts play an important role in providing public education that is responsive to local needs and conditions, they also provide a good share of the funding. If we are in fact going to be funding awards under arbitration made that are relative to the real situation in the local economy or in the provincial economy, then what we are doing by not passing this amendment or by allowing the Government to pass Bill 42 as they have proposed it is that we have gone back, to some extent, to the bad old days.

Now, in the short term, this will not be evident. Teachers do deserve growing recognition in their arbitration awards or negotiated awards. The fact that we now have a growing and more buoyant economy, but, in fact, if that economy slows down, if there is a change or if they are relative to other jurisdictions, a displacement of the normal relationship between the public sector employees and the economy of the province, the rate of growth, the competitiveness with other jurisdictions, Manitoba, in terms of hiring educators, was at the high end of salary ranges for teachers across this country.

I would like to bring to the members' attention that, if you look at the relationship between raising local taxes to deal with this issue and what the responsibility of the provincial government is, and look at the

argument of those who say: raise the taxes; that is how you will have to deal with this. At the same time I think the members opposite may be overlooking or may have forgotten or choose to ignore that this is very much the same as a company coming into town and saying: Well, if you forgive my taxes, I will provide X number of jobs in this town. So the benefit to the town will be greater because they will have the jobs, but just forgive my taxes.

In a short-term solution that may have some appeal, but in fact that is the same thing that this bill is going to have. It is going to have short-term appeal. It is going to address an issue that would have been addressed anyway, if that clause had been left in place. What we have, in fact, is a bill that returns us to a situation where it is taken out of the hands of the local people to have an influence on the arbitrator as far as what the ability to pay is, some of the local circumstances that occur. In fact, what we have is a version of representative democracy, something that I picked up over the weekend. It says, an example of representative democracy is you have two cows—

* (17:00)

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hour being 5 p.m. I am interrupting proceedings by previous agreement of the House.

When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings) will have 13 minutes remaining.

As previously agreed, I will be calling second reading on Bill 201 to be followed by Resolution 83.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 201—The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire), that Bill 201, The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act (Loi

modifiant la Loi sur les circonscriptions électorales), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Helwer: I just would like to say a few words in support of this bill. First of all, let me explain the reasoning behind this. During the last election almost a year ago, 11 months ago or so, last September, while visiting a number of constituents in the Gimli and St. Andrews, West St. Paul area, it came to the attention of many people that the name Gimli alone did not necessarily give a proper description of the whole constituency. I want to say there, we certainly do not want to drop the Gimli name because the Gimli name has been synonymous for many years with the Gimli constituency and the Gimli area.

But, having said that, during the campaign last year and since then, there has been a lot of discussion about—especially the people in St. Andrews and West St. Paul when you try to explain to them that they are in the Gimli constituency. There is nothing wrong with that, but if we change the name to Gimli-St. Andrews, as I have proposed in the Bill, it better explains the make-up of the whole constituency.

When you look at the population of the constituency, Mr. Speaker, the Municipality of St. Andrews, which has over 10 000 people, makes up over 50 percent of the population of this constituency. Therefore, with Gimli making up only—the two Gimlis, the town of Gimli and the R.M., which are a very important part of the constituency also, do not get me wrong—probably about less than 5000 people in the two Gimlis, or over twice as many in population in the R.M. of St. Andrews. Also involved in the constituency, the next largest town or rural municipality in my constituency is West St. Paul, which is just outside the City of Winnipeg boundaries.

After hearing from a number of constituents and receiving a petition from some constituents in St. Andrews, I did go to speak to all of the councillors and the mayors and the Reeves at the various council meetings. After explaining to them what the population of the constituency is

and how it is made up, they all agreed that it was time for a change and that the name of the new constituency should be Gimli-St. Andrews.

I have letters of support from the Town of Gimli, the Town of Winnipeg Beach, the Village of Dunnottar, and also I have one here somewhere from the R.M. of West St. Paul. So I have explained this fairly well, I think, Mr. Speaker, to the municipalities involved, both the councillors, plus I have a petition from the residents of St. Andrews. So I have gone through the process and come to the point now where I have the Bill 201 to change the name from Gimli to Gimli-St. Andrews.

When I first got involved in this name change, I looked as to what I would have to do in order to go through this process. There is a process for the passage of a private member's bill. I have gone through the process that says you must have a petition, first of all, from residents saying they would like to do this, and then of course get support locally, and then carry on with getting the bill drafted and passed.

One of the things most of the councils, including the R.M. of St. Andrews, which is the largest municipality in the constituency, felt that it better describes the makeup. That is what I have been trying to explain. That is, according to the Chief Electoral Officer, what has to be done. So I have gone about the process properly. I think I have done exactly as is outlined in the process for passage of a private member's bill and/or the passage of the bill to make the changes necessary.

I just want to explain a little about the constituency as to how the make-up is. If we look at, starting from south to north, looking at the community of West St. Paul, which is basically an agricultural area, and a rural residential area, whereby the majority of the people who live in West St. Paul either work in Winnipeg or have businesses along Highway 9 which is Main Street leading to Selkirk. That area is very built up and developed. There are a lot of businesses and residences along Highway 9. That seems to be the main thoroughfare between Winnipeg and Selkirk and also for West St. Paul and St. Andrews that is kind of the main thoroughfare, of course.

With the development over time of subdivisions and residential areas in both St. Andrews and West St. Paul, there are some excellent lots come available and has expanded the area. The growth of the area has certainly been phenomenal, this past number of years. Even this year alone in the make-up of the Selkirk-St. Andrews-St. Clements-West St. Paul planning district, St. Andrews by far has the largest number of building permits. The number of homes and the quality of the homes that are going up there is just phenomenal.

When you look at the developments along River Road, it is just an excellent area to subdivide and make excellent lots for people to live. It gives people a little sense of pride to have a large lot whereby their children have room to play and they have room to expand and to enjoy the summer, especially in West St. Paul and St. Andrews.

* (17:10)

Mainly, **again**, in St. Andrews, the area goes **right around the town** of Selkirk actually and **north right up to** Winnipeg Beach. The northern part of St. Andrews is probably agriculture, while the southern part is mainly rural residential. That is where it seems they would like to be recognized, because there is the St. Andrews community; there is a St. Andrews community hall; there are the schools. So it is basically also a community of as such there in the area of St. Andrews, which is just south of Lockport. An excellent setting, excellent area to live, and it certainly has grown a lot in the last number of years.

As a matter of fact, because of the increase in the population there and because of the increase in the number of families, there has been an addition to the school there. I am glad to see that there will be an increase in students there. Not very many schools can boast about an increase in students, but some of the schools in St. Andrews, even in Gimli, too, actually, there is an increase in the number of students, and in Winnipeg Beach, also, where we built a new addition to the school. It is still not complete there yet.

All these areas along the Red River and along Lake Winnipeg, right from the edge of Winnipeg here to the north end of the Rural Municipality of Gimli, the growth has been phenomenal over the last number of years. When you look at the number of cottages being built, they are not really cottages in R.M. of Gimli anymore; they are full homes, full year-round homes, and people commute to work in Winnipeg, or Selkirk, or some of the larger centres, wherever they can find employment, of course. A lot of people who own businesses, as a matter of fact, even in Selkirk and Winnipeg, live in St. Andrews or in the vicinity and commute.

There is also a new area of development there, especially along Netley Creek and along some of the other creeks there, just in the Clandeboye area. Excellent cottage lots and excellent areas for homes. There are a number of new subdivisions there. *[interjection]* Yes, as a matter of fact, I am glad you brought that up, because there is already a golf course at Petersfield, and it is expanding from 9 to 18 holes.

But the real jewel of golf courses is at Larters in St. Andrews, which is an excellent course. Larters has always excelled in a number of tournaments that they have. Actually, the number of golf courses, I have more golf courses in my constituency probably than any other constituency in Manitoba, when you look at Larters, at Petersfield, at Winnipeg Beach, about three at Gimli, and another one, at Arnes there is a new one. So I have a number of golf courses, and of course you have probably heard the advertising on CJOB where Pelican Beach Golf Course there at Gimli is called the Pebble Beach of Manitoba because it is a lovely—it is right on the shores of Lake Winnipeg. It is a very nice setting. They have improved the golf course to such an extent, and new management has taken over there. They have just done a great job doing that. It is a good place.

Getting back to the reasons for Bill 201. It is basically because of the fact that I think the name Gimli-St. Andrews would depict the make-up of the whole constituency better. It has been a pleasure speaking on this, and I certainly hope to see this bill pass second reading and on to

committee and become law before this session rises for the summer or whenever.

Mr. Speaker, I think that pretty well explains the Bill from my perspective. Thank you.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West (Mr. Smith), that debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Transcona, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that debate be adjourned. Agreed?

An Honourable Member: No.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: No?

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of adjourning debate?

Point of Order

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Is there a collected vote on an issue to stand? If it is denied, is there not the will or the ability of the members to speak on it?

Mr. Speaker: Order. On the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Transcona, if the Honourable Member wishes to ask for leave to continue debate, we can do it that way or we can deal with the motion. Once the motion has been dealt with, if it is supported that debate be adjourned, then the Member can ask for leave to continue debate on the motion. The choice is yours.

* * *

Mr. Tweed: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to continue debate.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for debate to continue on Bill 201, The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act? Is there leave?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been denied.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is: All in favour of adjourning debate, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it. The motion has been carried.

On the proposed resolution—order. The Honourable Member for Arthur Virden, on a point of order?

Point of Order

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Mr. Speaker, I just wondered if I could ask for leave to add some comments to this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Bill 201?

Mr. Maguire: Bill 201.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for the Honourable Member for Arthur-Virden to continue debate on Bill 201? Leave has been denied.

* (17:20)

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 83—Peacekeeping Day

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for St. James, Peacekeeping Day.

Ms. Bonnie Korzeniowski (St. James): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Rondeau), that

WHEREAS Canada has been a supporter of the United Nations since its founding in 1945; and

WHEREAS Canada was instrumental in the establishment of the United Nations' Peacekeeping force; and

WHEREAS many Canadians have participated in peacekeeping operations for more than 50 years; and

WHEREAS many Manitobans have served or are serving in peacekeeping operations; and

WHEREAS the element of danger is inherent in peacekeeping missions; and

WHEREAS the largest number of Canadians paid the supreme sacrifice while participating in a peacekeeping operation while flying over Syria on August 9, 1974; and

WHEREAS the August 9, 1945, destruction of Nagasaki also marked one of the all too many days in human history that have demonstrated the consequences of a breakdown in peaceful relations; and

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I have deviated from the original form in the Order Paper. Do I have leave to make that correction?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Ms. Korzeniowski: WHEREAS many Manitobans who have served in a peacekeeping operation wish to have a dedicated day once each year in which they may promote the good work of peacekeepers within their community and remember their comrades who have served both Canada and Manitoba through their work to help maintain peace in the world.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the provincial government to consider recognizing August 9 as Peacekeeping Day.

Motion presented.

Ms. Korzeniowski: As a granddaughter and daughter of veterans, I take great pleasure and tremendous pride in speaking to this motion today. For Canada, peacekeeping is an important aspect of our national heritage and a reflection of our fundamental beliefs. It is also a dynamic concept that must respond to the changing international environment.

Canada has been building on that established foreign policy tradition to continue making solid and imaginative contributions to international peace and security. Fifty years of experience in peacekeeping has established an international reputation for Canada.

Peacekeeping is an important component of Canada's foreign policy and its contribution to the multilateral security system. Canada has participated in an overwhelming majority of peacekeeping missions mandated by the United Nations Security Council. UN peacekeeping personnel were first used in 1948 to help establish and maintain peace in areas of armed conflict. Since that time, UN forces have been involved with peacekeeping operations in locations such as India, Pakistan, El Salvador, Cambodia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Namibia, Afghanistan, the Middle East, and, recently, Sierra Leone, and Manitobans have been doing a part of this all along.

Just as recently as last May 29, military personnel from 17 Wing Winnipeg left for Sierra Leone to help enforce the peace accord there. Soldiers from Winnipeg's Second Battalion Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry are currently collecting donations of household goods, medicines, clothing, tools and school supplies for Manitobans to bring with them on their next deployment in the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The donations will be used to help families who were victims of ethnic cleansing and are now trying to rebuild their homes and lives.

Over 100 000 Canadians have served in more than 40 separate missions since 1949. UN peace and security operations form the majority of Canada's international military commitments. While peacekeepers come from all branches of the Canadian Forces—army, navy, and airforce—the army has provided the vast majority because of the nature of the tasks involved. More recently, thousands of men and women from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Elections Canada, the Canadian Red Cross, and other governmental and non-governmental agencies based in Canada have served in peacekeeping missions.

Unfortunately, peacekeeping missions are not without risks. Over the years 107 Canadian military personnel have lost their lives while performing peacekeeping duties. Canada is one of a select group of countries to which the UN regularly turns when it requires valued peacekeeping advice and when it wants expert military contributions. The Canadian Forces have the well-earned reputation of being professional, well-trained and highly motivated with a vast reservoir of knowledge and experience upon which to draw when faced with critical situations. Canada makes an effort to contribute not only to peacekeeping but also to peace building, the broader re-establishment of normal life that has been torn apart by conflict. In Rwanda, Canadian troops opened airports and helped restore vital communications. In Haiti the RCMP provided training to help transform the local police force into a professional unit appropriate to a democratic society.

I would like to read from a piece prepared by a prominent Manitoba peacekeeper, Lieutenant General Ray Crabbe. Lieutenant General Crabbe commanded the Canadian contingent in the former Yugoslavia and was awarded the Meritorious Service Cross for his leadership in that mission. The piece is entitled "What Is a Peacekeeper?"

Since 1947, Canadians have participated in virtually every UN peacekeeping operation in every corner of the globe in the service of peace and have done so with little recognition, in most cases. Over 100 Canadians have died as peacekeepers and many more have been wounded or maimed for life. Over the past decade, we have experienced a very significant change in so-called peacekeeping activities. The days of simply imposing troops between two factions and reporting on cease-fire violations have disappeared. Canada's peacekeepers today face a much more complex, multidimensional, multitasked environment in which cease-fires and co-operation with the UN force are very fragile, indeed.

The former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Kosovo are but a few examples of peacekeepers involved in wars and being subjected to death, destruction, and the vagaries that accompany war. Peacekeepers or peace makers are

individual members of the Canadian Forces, police forces, and civilian organizations who take up the cause of peace on behalf of Canada.

As someone who has had the privilege of commanding Canadian and other troops in the former Yugoslavia, I know that Canadians need not take a back seat to anyone when it comes to the gritty, tough, dangerous and difficult job of keeping the peace.

The Canadian peacekeeper is a young man or woman who leaves his wife or her husband and family and loved ones behind for six to twelve months, works in relative anonymity, who puts himself or herself in harm's way to keep an often fragile peace, who dodges bullets, tiptoes through minefields, avoids artillery fire, puts up with hostility from those he or she was sent to help. Today's peacekeeper is a humanitarian, feeding hungry children, building schools and shelters, providing clothing to children caught up in the throes of war.

Peacekeeping is nation building, and on many occasions Canadians have led the way in rebuilding the infrastructure of a nation devastated by war. Today's peacekeepers must understand and attempt to instil in others the fundamentals of human and civil rights. It is in these ways that Canadians rise to the occasion so very well in applying those traits that are so successful in peace operations: impartiality, fairness and objectivity, virtues that have become internationally recognized as uniquely Canadian.

* (17:30)

Many, many peacekeepers that I have talked to on return from operations have developed a much greater appreciation for Canada and for being a Canadian. Despite our regional disparities, cultural make-up and language differences, we are still privileged to live in the best country in the world. Peacekeepers today contribute in so many ways, in so many countries, to assist them in enjoying what we take for granted in Canada.

Peacekeepers are young Canadian men and women who deserve our respect, admiration, and support for the wonderful and often thankless

jobs that they do, far away from families, friends and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I was approached early in the year by Ivan Poitrous. He is the provincial director of the Canadian Association of Veterans in United Nations Peacekeeping and is a past president of the Royal Military Institute of Manitoba. He served as a peacekeeper in the Gaza Strip and in Ismailia. Last year, this association had a small ceremony at the cenotaph, wanting to pay tribute to peacekeepers who do go so unacknowledged so often. This year, they are hoping to expand it to include a memorial service and a march past tomorrow, August 9. They have been working very hard at this and were hoping to have the legislation passed in time for their ceremony tomorrow.

I would just like to acknowledge some of the people who are involved here just in case some of our fellow members know these people and can appreciate the level of skill and interest.

Ben Van Ruiten is the reviewing officer for the first annual Peacekeeping Day in Manitoba. He is the honorary colonel of 17 Wing Winnipeg. The Honourable Colonel Van Ruiten is also the president of the Royal Military Institute of Manitoba and is a founding member of the Manitoba International Tattoo, where he has consistently promoted the good work of peacekeepers to the public.

Max Katz, is the post commander of the Jewish War Veterans in Manitoba. He has promoted the role Jews have had in Canadian military history to both Jews and Gentiles.

Gordon Shields is the Rector of St. Philip's Anglican Church in Winnipeg. He is a retired military padre who served in Cyprus.

Bill Neal is the president of Joint War Veterans in Manitoba. He served in World War II and is well known for his advocacy of enhanced housing and other benefits for veterans.

Norm Van Tassel is a past president of the Korea Veterans Association in Manitoba. He served as a peacekeeper in Korea.

John Catellier is the assistant director of the Canadian Association of Veterans in United Nations Peacekeeping for Manitoba. He is a past president of the Morris Branch of the Royal Canadian Legion. He completed two peace-keeping tours in Cyprus.

Dusty Miller is a platoon commander and employed with CN Rail. He served in Cyprus and the Golan Heights. Armand Lavallee, platoon commander, retired from the RCAF, served in Alert. Rick Jones, chairman of the Winnipeg Metropolitan Committee of the Royal Canadian Legion. Dennis Hendrickson, serving member of the Canadian Forces. Bill Neal, Master of Ceremonies. He is President of the War Amputees of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, these men have worked tirelessly for the last few months hoping to see their dream met of having this Peacekeeping Day legislated in time for their parade tomorrow. I would urge all members of this Legislative Assembly, I daresay there is one in this Chamber who does not have a legion who will be waiting and appreciative of their passing of this bill in time for this most important event. I would urge all of the members on the opposite side to please consider passing this bill so that tomorrow at the parade they will know that they have the full Legislative Assembly behind them in this endeavour. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): I am very pleased to stand today to speak to this particular resolution. As a daughter of an air force veteran, issues such as this are very important to me and very special to me. In fact, I am currently in the process of joining my local legion who have been wanting children of veterans to get more involved in what they are trying to do and in trying to keep the public more aware of the efforts that peacekeepers have made, and always to put forward a reminder to all of us what the wars have done to this world.

As a little girl, November 11 always was very special. I can remember going with my family and standing beside my dad at all of these services and remembering the poppy and listening to "In Flanders Fields," and November 11 always had an incredibly special meaning. Even to this day, Mr. Speaker, I find that

November 11 does not seem quite right unless time is spent either at a Legion hall or at least in some way paying some tribute to those people who have given so much so that the freedoms of those of us that are here will always, always be something special.

I think it is important that when we look at special days like November 11 to look at August 9 as Peacekeeping Day could grow to have the same kind of significance and importance. Days like this should be set aside, and having a day to honour peacekeepers is certainly something that we can support. Canada has been a very strong supporter of the United Nations since its founding in 1945, and Canada has been instrumental in the establishment of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force.

Canadians are very well recognized, honoured and respected as peacekeepers throughout the world. I think that is something that we can all be proud of. The peacekeepers that we have in Canada who make the commitment to leave their families, to leave their homes, to go to other countries like Sierra Leone, Bosnia, many of the other countries where they encounter a different culture, a different climate, different food, perhaps not seeing their families, their children for up to a year. I recently had an opportunity to speak with an RCMP officer who had just come back from Bosnia. He had been there for a year, and he had indicated that he has never seen anything like that in his life. He has indicated to me that he would like to sit down with me and share with me what those experiences were like for him. He said it was quite an absolute, unique experience.

I imagine that, when one leaves home and spends upwards of a year in a different country like Bosnia or Sierra Leone, you come back with probably very different perspectives on what is important, what is significant. The images imprinted into one's mind certainly must have an incredible effect on one's person and how one chooses to live one's life in the future.

I think the dangers that peacekeepers face perhaps are not as well known to all of us as they should be. I think the dangers that they face are never to be underestimated. We think often, I think, that because this is not an actual big war

that people are involved in, perhaps the dangers are not there, but perhaps it is those more hidden dangers that create a situation where caution must never be forgotten in situations like this.

* (17:40)

Having spent, as Canadians, more than 50 years involved in peacekeeping, it is certainly an honour and something that we should all be recognizing. Many Manitobans have served as peacekeepers, and I think all of us are incredibly proud of the work that the peacekeepers from Manitoba have contributed to maintaining peace not just for those of us in Manitoba but really for those of us in the world in the efforts that they have put forward.

I drive every day past Kapyong Barracks, Mr. Speaker, and I see the young men and women in training. I see the incredible work that they put into preparing for the future that they may be uncertain what it will hold. When we see peacekeeping troops on television, on the news, leaving Winnipeg, leaving the airport, when we see them holding their spouse, hugging their children, we must be grateful for the contribution that they are willing to make for all of us on peacekeeping missions where when they go they really are not sure of the kind of danger that they will be facing, the sacrifices that they will have to make, the different way of living they will have to learn for a period of time.

I notice that in yesterday's paper we have again seen some of the good work that the military are currently doing in gathering relief for Bosnians. I think that their goal is certainly one that we should all be pleased to see and be supportive of what they are trying to do. They are looking to gather enough tools, books, clothing, radios and sporting goods to fill two semi-trailers and help homeless Bosnians rebuild their lives. I think for those of us here that are in the comfort of our own homes, in the comfort of our own country, it is probably very difficult for us to even imagine what Bosnians are going through as they do try to rebuild their lives.

The article in the newspaper also indicates that by the time the 700 members of Winnipeg's Second Battalion Princess Patricia's Canadian

Light Infantry head to the former Yugoslavia in a month, they hope to have enough humanitarian relief to make any soldier proud. That is, Mr. Speaker, 700 young men and women who will be leaving Winnipeg to do something that really is quite remarkable that most of us probably do not really have an idea of what it might be like.

They are hoping that generous Manitobans will donate anything, from a box of nails, to a hammer, to a wheelchair and crutches, to burned-out and desperate victims of the Bosnian war, where these people are coming back into an area where their houses are now rubble. They would like to collect enough material to pack two sea containers for distribution to the homeless in Bosnia. The military people are going to hand it out and help those people in Bosnia re-establish themselves. The soldiers are heading overseas for a six-month deployment. So, again, Mr. Speaker, we see a great effort being put forward by our military as they head to some place far away to really a very, very different world, where they are truly going to make a huge difference in helping people rebuild their lives.

In fact, they themselves feel that they are benefiting from it because just getting involved in this effort has boosted their morale. I am sure the feelings they are going to get as they can help people in this country rebuild their lives will give them satisfaction beyond anything we can probably imagine.

So, Mr. Speaker, when all of us were asked to gather soil from our constituencies to send to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, I found that to be a very humbling experience to know that we could contribute in some small way by sending a little bit of dirt from our constituencies to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

With the peacekeepers wanting to have a special day, with the work that they have put forward to prepare for this special day, August 9, to be recognized as Peacekeeping Day, I think it would be an honour for all of us to stand and recognize the work of peacekeepers and to support their efforts over the past many, many years. All of us salute the efforts that they have made, and we would be pleased and honoured to support August 9 as Peacekeeping Day.

Mr. Jim Rondeau (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased to rise in support of this resolution. I think the proclamation is very important because what it does is it recognizes what Canada has done as a nation. I think we, as Canadians, should be very, very proud of what we have done. I look at the list and what it says. In the last 50 years, Canada has been a leader in all the world in peacekeeping. If you look at it, we started in 1948 in order to maintain peace and to help countries set up so that there is less death, less destruction.

I think we can be proud of what our armed forces have done. Especially considering the fact that we have a very small armed forces, we have done work in the world very disproportionately to our size. We have done an excellent job. I look at it. We started off with Pakistan, Cyprus. We have done a lot of work with the United Nations. Our service has been in Lebanon, Kuwait and Iraq, Bosnia. We have done work in Kosovo, East Timor, Gaza Strip, Afghanistan and Pakistan, the Congo, Yemen, again through the Middle East, Iran, Namibia, Angola, El Salvador, Cambodia, Mozambique, Somalia, Uganda, Rwanda and Haiti.

I think this is wonderful because what we have is we have a history of working very strongly to preserve peace, to restore order and to help nations rebuild. I think, when you look at what we have done, we have a reputation around the world for doing excellent work, for being true peacemakers. It is nice to see that we have used our armed forces, not to wage war in the last long time, but what we have done is we have worked to wage peace, and what we have done is we spent a lot of time rebuilding countries as far as building schools, water, restoring order, training people how to keep peace, and that was very important.

The other thing, I think, we should take note of is when we have an armed forces of around 80 000 people, we should take note that the Reserves and the armed forces have spent lots of hours and many months trying to restore the peace and when they have done a very good job. I think about when my dad was in the forces and I think about what they were doing as far as exercises, overseas, all over the world, and for our group we should be thanking the men and

the women who devote many hours in training and many hours in very hazardous conditions. To date, a hundred and seven people died trying to maintain the peace, and we should be very respectful and very appreciative of their efforts. We have an excellent reputation in very tough environments, and as Canadians we should be proud of our accomplishments and our armed forces' accomplishments in their peacekeeping role around the world.

Therefore, I stand very strongly and very happily in support of the proclamation for peacekeeping that is being proposed. Thank you very much.

* (17:50)

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): I just wanted to put a couple of words on the record. It is very well known how our peacekeeping troops have worked throughout the world in bringing peace and rebuilding different societies throughout the world, but there is one area that we all tend to miss out on once in a while and that is when they fight and they work here in our home country.

I would like to thank the peacekeepers for the work that was done during the 1997 flood right here in Manitoba. We had one armed forces gentleman who actually lost his hand because of the work he was doing near Emerson. There were many, many armed forces' workers that were out in my constituency helping us when we thought we had lost some homes where they were still putting the sandbags on to the dikes while they were leaking. There was one morning at 6:30, I still remember it was the first house we lost on Ave Lord. The two armed forces, the two engineers were out standing on the dike with 16 feet of water on one side of it when that dike collapsed, and all they had time was to run off and leave their bags on that dike because it collapsed from underneath them, but it did not stop them from going out and working on further dikes and trying to save the properties of the people within the area, even though they did not know them.

We had the soldiers from Québec, we had the soldiers from Alberta, and from across Canada. It was interesting to watch them. Even though some of the group from Québec did not speak a word of English, they still got along really good in the community and they worked as one. When the ice storms were in Québec, they were there, and they were there to see that the people had the help. So let us not forget our peacekeepers who not only go out in service throughout the world to bring peace but here at home to help us rebuild when we have natural resources.

So I am very happy to see this resolution go forward and see August 9, as proclaimed in the Member's resolution, as Peacekeepers' Day.

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

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

An Honourable Member: Mr. Speaker, you can make that unanimous.

Mr. Speaker: Unanimous.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered. Ordered unanimously.

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Family Services and Housing): I would like to call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement to call it six o'clock?

The hour being 6 p.m., the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, August 8, 2000

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Speaker's Rulings	
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees		Hickes	4854
		Doer	4856
		Derkach	4856
Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections First Report		Members' Statements	
Santos	4843	Marringhurst Heritage House Tweed	4856
Ministerial Statements		Tibetan Sacred Arts in The Ruins Asper	4857
Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co.		Custom Software Solutions Maguire	4857
Barrett	4844		
Mitchelson	4844	Elwick Village Centre Project Aglugub	4857
Gerrard	4845	St. Pierre-Jolys Frog Follies Pitura	4858
Forest Fire Conditions		Orders of the Day	
Lathlin	4845	Report Stage	
Enns	4846	Bill 42—The Public Schools Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
Oral Question Period		Caldwell	4859
Canada Health and Social Transfer		J. Smith	4859
Mitchelson; Doer	4846	Derkach	4866
National Infrastructure Program		Schuler	4870
Mitchelson; Doer	4847	Maguire	4873
National Agriculture Programs		Tweed	4877
Mitchelson; Doer	4848	Dyck	4879
Elections Finances Act		Cummings	4881
Loewen; Doer	4849	Private Members' Business	
Tweed; Doer	4850	Second Readings—Public Bills	
J. M. Schneider		Bill 201—The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act	
Schuler; Doer	4851	Helwer	4882
Labour Relations Act		Proposed Resolutions	
Gilleshammer; Barrett	4851	Res. 83—Peacekeeping Day	
Evidence-Based Medicine		Korzeniowski	4885
Gerrard; Doer	4852	Driedger	4888
Early Childhood Development Initiatives		Rondeau	4890
Gerrard; Doer	4853	Laurendeau	4891
Public Schools Act			
Smith; Caldwell	4853		