

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

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

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Eighth Legislature**

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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 15, 2005

**The House met at 1:30 p.m.**

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PETITIONS

##### Crocus Investment Fund

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** I wish to present the following petition.

The background to this petition is as follows:

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

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

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

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

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

Signed by Della Cantin, Bev Smith and Ronald Knudsen.

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

#### Introduction of Guests

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us today a delegation from the Philippines on a study tour of Manitoba. These visitors are the guests of the honourable Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Trade (Mr. Smith) and the honourable Member for The Maples

(Mr. Aglugub). On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

**Tagalog spoken.**

*Translation*

*Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.*

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Devils Lake Diversion Water Testing

**Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the joint report on the quality of water in Devils Lake is now public. Finally, the evidence is in, evidence that should have been gathered years ago. For six years this Premier has made grand statements about the danger of the water in Devils Lake, yet the Premier took no action for six years to test the water in Devils Lake. Instead of aggressively pursuing scientific data, this Premier chose to grandstand.

My question to the Premier is why did he not pursue scientific evidence prior to the flowing of water. Why did this Premier wait for six years instead of gathering the evidence that could have been used to protect Manitoba water? Why did he wait?

**Hon. Gary Doer (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member opposite that, when we were elected in 1999, we were informed of two developments that were never made public to the people of Manitoba. One, that North Dakota had on the books plans to build an inlet from the Missouri River to Devils Lake and that, in fact, was in the platform and confirmed by former Governor Schafer in 1992 on.

\* (13:35)

Secondly, in June of 1999, North Dakota announced unilaterally, unilaterally June of '99, the members opposite can yell all they want that they were going to proceed with an outlet from Devils Lake. In fact, my first briefing from Mr. Chrétien, Raymond Chrétien, the former Ambassador from Canada to the United States, basically told me that the former government did not raise a finger when the North Dakota state water act was passed of

\$650 million, when an outlet was being proposed and when an inlet was also being proposed.

The recommendation from the national Canadian government to us was to immediately engage the State of Minnesota, which had not been engaged previously, and start to build the allies in United States in opposition to the unilateral decisions of the United States. In fact, we did meet with the former governor, Governor Ventura, and we—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I need to be able to hear the questions and the answers. I ask the co-operation of all honourable members. The honourable First Minister has the floor.

**Mr. Doer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We met with the former governor and received his support. We also received the support from the current governor, Governor Pawlenty, and we obviously wanted to have some of the tests or some of the results that we had in our hands for Devils Lake, which is an isolated lake.

We wanted to know what was in that lake, and we feel that the test results that were co-ordinated by the Canadian and U.S. governments, the Centre for Environmental Control, we feel that those are much more substantial tests than we ever had before. We had a lot of evidence but not a lot of clear tests, and I would point out to members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that the tests were conducted by Canada, United States. The departments of Conservation and Water Stewardship had two representatives in the lake and on the lake.

**Mr. Murray:** What we have heard from this Premier is absolutely unacceptable. What he talks about is how I go around and meet with all of these other governors to get them onside, Mr. Speaker. Six years and he never tested the water. Why did he not do that? That is the issue that Manitobans want from this Premier. It is not a matter of how many meetings can he have. It is an understanding of what is in the water.

Mr. Speaker, this Premier made comments such as, and I quote the Premier's own words, "The state of North Dakota is on the verge of pumping polluted water into Manitoba, an act that would have disastrous consequences." This Premier then went on to say and to tell Manitobans the outlet may deliver small relief locally, but there would be huge environmental and economic consequences in

Manitoba. This Premier chose to go to court without any scientific evidence.

I ask the Premier: Rather than travel around and have all these meetings, in six years, why did he not test the water?

**Mr. Doer:** I would point out that the member opposite was at the meeting in Washington when we jointly decided, based on the evidence, to go to court. He would remember that, Mr. Speaker, but if he does not remember that I will pull out the date where he concurred with that recommendation.

\* (13:40)

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the former government, former Premier Filmon, also said that any unilateral action of North Dakota to build an outlet from Devils Lake to Manitoba would be opposed in court. That was a consistent position of the previous government and our government.

We do have much more thorough test results than we had before. *[interjection]* Mr. Speaker, if they are just going to yell and scream, I am not going to be able to provide the answers.

**Mr. Murray:** Mr. Speaker, that limited answer goes along with the limited survey that we have just seen from this government.

On the eve of water flowing from Devils Lake into Manitoba, this Premier, in an act of desperation, agreed to a multijurisdictional testing of the water in Devils Lake. The Premier knew that the results from the test would not be available before the water flowed into Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this Premier has clearly fumbled the football on this issue. Untreated water from Devils Lake has now flowed into Manitoba, water that is potentially harmful to the fish stocks in Lake Winnipeg. Why did this Premier not pursue adequate testing of the water from Devils Lake prior to the water flowing? What was he thinking?

**Mr. Doer:** The member opposite knows that we did not have access to the lake on our own. We are not a country, and this lake does not reside in the province of Manitoba. It resides, let me point out, in the state of North Dakota. The member opposite—*[interjection]*—and his Benedict Arnold compatriots, Mr. Speaker—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Once again, I need to be able to hear the questions and the answers. I ask the co-operation again. The honourable First Minister has the floor.

**Mr. Doer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that the member opposite did agree to go to court, and then a few months later he and the member from Emerson hosted Mr. Belford from the Devils Lake area and supported the water coming into Manitoba, contrary to our position.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement reached between Canada and the United States does provide that Canada and the United States will co-operate in the design and the construction of a more advanced filtration and/or disinfection system for the Devils Lake outlet, taking into account the results of the ongoing monitoring and risk assessment. The participants will work with the IJC in terms of a comprehensive approach to address concerns raised by Canada, Manitoba and Minnesota with respect to an inlet being built from the Missouri River to Devils Lake to help stabilize lake levels. North Dakota informs it has no current intention, plan or perspective to proceed with an inlet, and the U.S. federal government affirms that it is prohibited by federal law from expending funds towards the construction of such an inlet.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the inlet was promised in 1992, and we did not have wording like that until just this summer.

#### **Devils Lake Diversion Advanced Filtration System**

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** Mr. Speaker, this government has spent a half a million dollars to fight Devils Lake outlet in court without any scientific evidence. After six years of all talk and no action this government finally conducted three days of testing of Devils Lake water, the results of which the government has admitted itself are inconclusive.

My question is for the Minister of Water Stewardship. Is he now saying that a test of 300 fish has provided sufficient evidence for the construction of a \$20-million permanent barrier at Devils Lake?

**Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister of Water Stewardship):** Mr. Speaker, let us put it on the record that the member opposite, in fact members opposite, have taken the following position: no legal action, not on Devils Lake, not on NAWS, not on anything that might impact in terms of Manitoba.

By the way, in terms of NAWS, we now have an injunction on the operation of that water treatment system that would transfer water from the Missouri into the Red River and into Lake Winnipeg. A legal success, Mr. Speaker.

\* (13:45)

Number two, the member opposite got up the other day and tabled a series of North Dakota studies, none of which dealt with foreign biota, and said, Mr. Speaker, "Basically there is no problem with the Devils Lake water." Now he is getting up and ranting and raving about the dangers of Devils Lake water. We are not going to rant and rave. We are going to do the work to protect Manitoba's interests. That is why we are part of the study with the White House CEQ, and that is why we will continue to fight for Manitoba's interests.

**Mr. Penner:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the record. I would like to correct the record. I have not tabled any North Dakota studies in this Legislature. The minister is wrong. This minister is obviously intent on spending millions of dollars to build a permanent barrier at the Devils Lake outlet.

Will the minister advise Manitobans today of who is going to be on the hook? Who is going to pay for the \$20-million permanent barrier that this minister is wanting to build?

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, you know, they start off in Question Period with a rhetorical rant, and now they say, well, who is going to build this and who is going to pay for it. Well, you know what? If it was not for the August 5 agreement, which this Premier (Mr. Doer) and this government were a key component of, we would not even be discussing that today. No help from the members opposite. If the member wishes, I can maybe give him a copy of that agreement. He will see very clearly the role of the White House, the Council on Environmental Quality and, indeed, the U.S. federal government in paying for whatever mitigation is necessary. He may want to start writing cheques here in Manitoba, but our position is if it needs to be built it should be built and paid for by the U.S. In fact, with the release of the information today, we said very clearly that they should have additional mitigation, again, because of the August 5 agreement.

**Mr. Penner:** Well, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba taxpayers are already on the hook and going to pay for a half-a-million-dollar fight to fight the Devils Lake outlet in the court, at which no scientific evidence was

presented. Manitoba taxpayers are also on the hook for testing of Devils Lake water that the government has admitted is inconclusive. Are Manitobans now going to be on the hook for another \$20 million to build a permanent filter on Devils Lake, or is this simply going to be another \$20-million political filter?

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, the only member of this House that needs a filter is the member opposite because he continuously speaks from both sides of his mouth on this. He spent the last several years consistently undercutting the position of Manitoba, so not just the provincial government is being vigilant in terms of protecting Manitoba's water, and the only reason we are at the point we are at right now is because of the August 5 agreement.

The same scientific study he just belittled earlier in Question Period is the basis of our call for that mitigation, and we expect our federal government and the U.S. federal government to take the results of that study and put in place the mitigation that is necessary. That is part of the agreement. That is what any responsible government would do. I would suggest the member opposite stop defending the interests of the state of North Dakota and start defending the interests of Manitoba in this House.

### **Gaming Social and Economic Impacts**

**Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield):** At a time when Manitoba has the highest addiction gambling rate in the country, this Doer government has driven the net income of VLTs up by 57 percent. Manitoba is now home to 60 348 problem gamblers, Mr. Speaker. To what level do these tragic numbers have to rise before the Doer government will call for an independent study?

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The question has been put.

**Hon. Scott Smith (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Trade):** Mr. Speaker, when we take into context the facts, when we go back in history a little bit for the member opposite, all gambling was introduced in the province of Manitoba starting in 1991 by the previous government. VLTs were expanded to a rate of over 4400 machines which we have not increased on the commercial side. The casinos were introduced by the members opposite into the city of Winnipeg under the previous government. The only increase that we have seen is following the Bostrom Report to give economic

benefit to our First Nations communities throughout the province of Manitoba.

\* (13:50)

Mr. Speaker, the member is wrong on the prevalence rate for the addicted gamblers in Manitoba. In fact, we are the lowest in the five western provinces right now. We intend to bring that down through a responsible gaming policy.

**Mr. Schuler:** Mr. Speaker, again, that answer is a disgrace. The history shows an independent study from Nova Scotia found that gambling is associated with 6 percent of all relationship problems, 5 percent of all financial problems, 5 percent to 10 percent of all personal bankruptcies and 6 percent of all suicides.

Nova Scotia sought the truth. Why will this government not? Why are they scared of the truth? What do they fear that prohibits them from seeking the facts? Will this minister finally call for an independent study into the social and economic impacts of gambling in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Smith:** Mr. Speaker, as we introduced our responsible gaming policy in 2001, which members opposite should have done in 1991, it has had very large impact in the positives on people that develop gaming problems in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we have recognized and put a lot of resources through professionals in this province to address this problem. It is working with the advice of AFM which, in fact, was funded at a level of about \$1 million back in 1997-98. We have increased that funding to \$2.5 million to get the advice from professionals in that area. We have committed over the last three years 242 percent in a responsible gaming policy over and above what we started with. Our program is beginning to work.

**Mr. Schuler:** Mr. Speaker, the professionals are speaking. This government will not listen. The Nova Scotia study indicates that problem gamblers have a higher rate of job loss, divorce, suicide, bankruptcy, poor physical and mental health and higher arrests and incarceration rates. That is what the professionals are saying, and this all carries high costs to the victims, their families and society at large.

Nova Scotia had the courage to do the study. Why does this Doer government not? When will they call for an independent study with the highest gambling addiction rate in the country? Why will

they not do an independent study? Do the right thing. Stand up and stand up for Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Smith:** Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned, when we introduced one of the best responsible gaming strategies in Canada in 2001, we have continued to listen to the professionals in this area. I can inform the House that we committed another \$10 million this year to dealing with responsible gaming over the next five years for research and program development.

Mr. Speaker, that is over and above the 242 percent increase that we have had from 1999 to 2005. The only research we may be looking at and should be considering is when the members opposite built the casinos in Winnipeg and said it would be about \$50 million, it ended up being \$150 million. We will not apologize for a well-run corporation that serves Manitobans.

#### **Hog Processing Plant OlyWest Proposal**

**Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East):** A world-class, economic development initiative based on the principles of sustainable development is something we all strive for. In that context, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Conservation tell us when the Clean Environment Commission hearings will begin into the new hog processing plant that was announced yesterday and what the scope of those hearings will be?

**Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation):** Unlike the process that was there for previous projects that have been dealt with, such as Maple Leaf, I want to guarantee the member who just asked that question that a full process will be held. It will be transparent to the public. I will be asking the Clean Environment Commission to hold public hearings on this matter, Mr. Speaker. We have yet to receive a proposal from the proponent. Once that happens, we will ask the CEC to hold public hearings on this issue.

\* (13:55)

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** The minister has indicated that the application has not even gone to the Clean Environment Commission as yet. There needs to be a balance between the economic agenda and the environmental agenda of this government.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question for the Minister of Conservation is: Will the public have an opportunity to have their views and their concerns heard, and what will the scope of that public participation be?

**Mr. Struthers:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to help the member again. We will have a Clean Environment Commission public hearing. We will ask the CEC to conduct those hearings. They will be open. They will be transparent. They will provide Manitobans every opportunity to step forward and talk about all of the issues that they believe are important that need to be dealt with in this proposal. We have a process which we use which is thorough, which we will follow, which will be very open and very public for all.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** I would like to ask the minister what the source of the water supply will be for the new processing plant and will there be any special licences required for the water supply that will be used for the new facility.

**Mr. Struthers:** My advice to the Member for River East is to take a look at the proponent's proposal when it comes forward so that we know exactly what it is that we are dealing with, so that we know what all of the design components, what all of the components of the whole proposal are so that we can take a good hard look at it. So that we can do, Mr. Speaker, what Mayor Sam Katz said yesterday that he believes that there is a Clean Environment Commission which is an independent body, which is going to take a good hard look at this, and I am telling you we will be thorough, unlike our predecessors who were not.

#### **Hog Processing Plant OlyWest Proposal**

**Mr. Jack Reimer (Southdale):** Mr. Speaker, also with the announcement yesterday of the new hog processing plant in St. Boniface there remain a number of questions that should be answered. One of those is will there be a proper assessment as to the infrastructure requirements, the road traffic and the truck traffic that will be in that particular area. I wonder whether the Minister of Industry and Trade can give us an answer on that.

**Hon. Jim Rondeau (Minister of Industry, Economic Development and Mines):** Mr. Speaker, for those of us who went to the announcement yesterday, we were given a proposal. That proposal has not been entirely fleshed out. They said that they were going to undertake the Clean Environment

Commission. They are going to work with the City and the Province to develop a platform.

What we are doing is we are increasing the value-added in agriculture. We are increasing the economic base, and we are working with business, with the City and the Province to develop this important initiative. I think it is very important that we work with the industry piece by piece, moving it forward to have a good economic platform for our province and for this company.

**Mr. Reimer:** Mr. Speaker, I find that answer passing strange. The minister has indicated that they are going to do a study and due diligence, but at the same time in the announcement there is a \$20-million loan from MIOP. I mean, there has to be due diligence brought forth to the, I am sorry, there has to be due diligence—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I have to ask the honourable member to repeat it because I cannot hear a thing up here, and I need the co-operation of all honourable members. If there is a breach of a rule or procedure of the House, you would expect me to deal with it, but I need to be able to hear the person that has the floor. Once again, I ask for your co-operation.

**Mr. Reimer:** I appreciate that comment, Mr. Speaker, because it is a very, very important question and it should be put to the government. They announced at the same time a \$20-million MIOP loan. A MIOP loan is a lot of money, \$20 million.

\* (14:00)

There has to be a due diligence put in at that time, and I would think that, if the minister is standing here now and they are still going to do some more input and more research on this, possibly their loan is in jeopardy. I am not saying it is, but I am saying that if there is due diligence for \$20 million why can he not answer these questions, Mr. Minister.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, as I said, the proposal has to move forward. There has been no money flowed to the company because all the due diligence has not taken place.

I would like to remind the members opposite that under our MIOP program we made a profit of \$183,000. Under the members opposite's MIOP program, it cost the taxpayers almost \$40 million. We do not need lectures on accountability and how to manage this MIOP program. We have had good

due diligence. We have worked with companies to grow the economic bases and will continue to do that.

**Mr. Reimer:** I think you can get very sidetracked at the time of Question Period when ministers give us answers about all the due diligence they do on their program. When you look at the fact that they were offered a film and sound stage for \$1, they paid \$3 million for it. That is due diligence.

Mr. Speaker, in the release also there is stated that the Province will realize about \$10 million in additional taxes from the project once it has come to fruition. Will the minister ensure that a portion of that money or maybe even all of that money is allocated to Winnipeg's infrastructure roads in that particular area because of the increase in truck traffic in that area, a tremendous amount. You are talking about over 2.5 million hogs being processed. A lot of traffic. Will it be an addition to the roads?

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, all the process of all the economic decisions, all the program decisions are going to be worked out along with the environmental conditions over the next year. What this is is a large program, large projects that are being worked out through the City, through the Province and through the proponent, OlyWest. What we are doing is we are working through that process. It will take time. It has got to go in front of the Clean Environment Commission. It has to go through its normal due diligence process, through the department, through the MIOP program, and we are going to continue to do that.

What we are trying to do is we are trying to build Manitoba's economic potential. We are trying to grow the economy of Manitoba, increase the value-added and increase jobs. Members opposite said, "What are you doing?" We are creating jobs; we are growing the pie.

#### **Hog Processing Plant OlyWest Proposal**

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, draft regulations under The Water Protection Act have created a hostile environment for livestock producers. The newly announced hog process plant will require a constant and ample supply of hogs to successfully continue operating. What plan does the minister have to ensure adequate supply of locally produced hogs for OlyWest?

**Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives):** I am surprised the



member opposite, who is supposed to be my critic for Agriculture, would come across with such a negative attitude to an issue that the farming community has received so positively, Mr. Speaker. I want to give credit to the farming community and the hog producers who have been facing tariffs, who are concerned about border closures and who want to have their hogs slaughtered in this province rather than have them exported. All the member opposite can think about is how are we going to supply the plant. The member has to recognize that these hogs are already being raised in this province. They are being raised—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Eichler:** Mr. Speaker, for more than two and a half years, Manitobans have waited for a cattle processing facility in the province of Manitoba. Other provinces are moving ahead while Manitoba is failing desperately behind. What assurances can this minister give Manitobans she will not drop the ball on this project as she has done on the cattle processing facilities in Manitoba? Will she do the right thing?

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Well, Mr. Speaker, again the member is factually wrong. I would invite him to look at what has happened in other provinces when there have been producers attempting to build slaughter facilities for cattle. The Manitoba pork producers, the Hytek and Big Sky came together with a company from Québec to build a slaughter facility in this province for hog producers so that hog producers would not be caught in the kinds of tariffs that they were caught in last year or would not be caught in a border closure. I am very disappointed that the member opposite, instead of congratulating the pork producers in this province and Hytek and Big Sky, is finding ways to criticize them. Shame.

#### **Water Protection Act Proposed Regulations**

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** Just hollow promises, Mr. Speaker. The draft regulations and The Water Protection Act unfairly target livestock production without backing any scientific evidence. Can the minister commit to listening to producers who have expressed all their concerns but outrage in these regulations? Will she assure these regulations protect our water resources while impeding the ability of livestock producers to grow the industry?

**Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives):** Mr. Speaker, the

member said these are draft regulations and, in fact, it is draft regulations that are out for consultation with the industry.

I can tell the member that I met, as did the Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton), with the industry today, and we have met with them previously, and we are working through how we might have the environment protected but also have the livestock industry grow in a sustainable way. The member opposite should be supporting the industry rather than his doom and gloom. Doom and gloom. They were against increasing livestock capacity in this province. He said people were going to withdraw their money and then changed his mind. And now he cannot think of a positive way to send a message to the pork industry.

#### **Mental Illness Service Availability**

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, if a person waits for optimum mental health treatment, as appears happened with Anuj Sharma, the 20-year-old who stabbed a jogger in Assiniboine Park last Thursday, not only is the life of the person affected by the mental illness at risk but the safety of other citizens is also in jeopardy.

When will the Minister of Health (Mr. Sale) recognize that serious mental illness requires urgent attention and rigorous and optimum care or you put the safety of all at risk? Was Anuj Sharma unable to get optimum community care because there were no spots available in either the PACT program or the first episode psychosis program?

**Hon. Theresa Oswald (Minister of Healthy Living):** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and the answer to that question is now. In our Throne Speech given recently we certainly did make mention of the fact that we want to increase capacity for mental health and addiction services in Manitoba.

Certainly we express great concern to the victim of the recent incident and, indeed, express concern for the individual who was affected. That is why we have, since 1999, increased our mental health capacity somewhere in the neighbourhood of 38 percent, and we know that we need to do more. We announced recently in addition to the federal wait-list strategy and their attention to the big five as they called them, we announced Manitoba's priority in four areas and, indeed, preserving mental health and continuing with services for addictions was in that four. We know the time is now.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Mr. Speaker, where has the minister been? It is now apparent that Anuj Sharma, the 20-year-old who stabbed a jogger in Assiniboine Park last week, should have been receiving much better care for his mental illness, but because of the minister's abysmal management of mental health for the last year it has been almost impossible to get new patients into either the PACT program or the first episode psychosis program. Ontario has recognized the critical importance of quick access to PACT team care and has 60 PACT teams. We have only one in Manitoba.

PACT and first episode psychosis programs should be run with no wait list so that those with serious mental illness can get optimum treatment immediately. Why is the minister putting people's lives at stake because he has failed to ensure those with serious mental illness have immediate access to critical programs?

\*(14:10)

**Ms. Oswald:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I will say again that our government does put mental health and addiction services as a priority, as we stated in our Throne Speech and in our Manitoba wait-list strategy. It is very important to have early intervention, and that is why we have made those investments and have announced that we are going to continue to build capacity.

Curious, strange, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of reaction should come from someone who, while a member of the federal Cabinet, cut billions of dollars to health and social programs. It is really rather ironic that he cries now but cuts billions of dollars when he had the chance.

### **U-Haul Trucks Safety Concerns**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, the government—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The honourable Member for Inkster has the floor.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You identify a problem, they blame Ottawa. That is the story of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the show "W5" highlighted a very serious problem with the U-Haul trucking company, in fact, to the degree that the whole fleet has been called into question. In the province of Ontario, the

government is taking action to try to make their roads more worthy by addressing the issue of U-Haul trucks. There is now concern in terms of U-Haul trucks being dumped into the prairie provinces, including the province of Manitoba.

My question to the minister of highways is what has this government done to address the issue of the U-Haul trucks and their ability to be able to perform the way they should be performing on our highways and roads in the province of Manitoba.

**Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Transportation and Government Services):** Mr. Speaker, I know there are a lot of U-Haul trucks in Manitoba because a lot of people are moving to Manitoba.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lemieux:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have to tell you that through our 2020 vision report, and I have to tell you that through all the stakeholders and the different groups we have consulted with, one of the pillars of our transportation vision is dealing with safety. If the member would take a look at the document and read it, he would see where exactly we stand on transportation.

### **Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Customer Rebate**

**Mr. Drew Caldwell (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are truly fortunate to benefit from the services provided by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, which was a positive legacy of the Schreyer NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, a recent Public Utilities Board ruling will have profound impact on many Manitobans. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. Could he enlighten the House as to what these impacts may be?

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, while private auto insurance companies across Canada are struggling to keep the insurance rates down below 4 percent, Manitobans are enjoying their second rebate in five years.

Mr. Speaker, along with what I understand are average rebates of between \$70 and \$80 per motorist after March 1, I noted a couple of weeks ago the Consumer's Association of Canada said MPI had

among the lowest auto insurance rates in Canada, in fact, had the second-lowest rates. This PUB ruling means Manitoba has the lowest rates in the country.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time for Oral Question has expired.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### National Philanthropy Day

**Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa):** I rise today to recognize that November 15 has been recognized as National Philanthropy Day. National Philanthropy Day was created to recognize and celebrate the contribution of individuals and companies towards charitable causes. The theme of this year's Philanthropy Day is "Change the world with a giving heart."

The Association of Fundraising Professionals has held a National Philanthropy Day every year since 1986. This year's events include professional development sessions, a speech by guest speaker Gregg Hanson of Wawanesa Mutual Insurance and a National Philanthropy Day luncheon.

The Association of Fundraising Professionals is an international professional organization representing more than 27 000 fundraisers and over 170 chapters all across the world. This goal is to advance philanthropy through advocacy, research, education and certification programs. National Philanthropy Day is just one of the many initiatives that they have developed to help further their efforts in fundraising for charitable organizations and causes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is essential to recognize the efforts of those in our community that are working to make it a better place to live, and it is pleasing to see that these efforts are acknowledged and celebrated by the creation of the National Philanthropy Day. I would also like to thank the Association of Fundraising Professionals for their effort and tireless work to a truly worthy cause.

### Philippines Study Tour of Manitoba

**Mr. Cris Aglugub (The Maples):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize an important delegation from the Philippines in the House today. Made up of mayors and governors, regional directors and local government representatives, this delegation has travelled to Manitoba to participate in the Public Sector Capacity Building for Governance and Social Development Program project. They are here to study Manitoba's approaches and best practices related to local

government development, strategic planning for community economic development, environmental and sustainable development in a local government context.

Mr. Speaker, mayroong matibay na kaugnayan ang Pilipinas at ang Manitoba, lalo na sa Winnipeg. Sa halos apat na pung libong Pilipino-Canadian na naninirahang kasalukuyan sa Manitoba, at ang pagdating ng mga bagong "immigrant" ay lalong nagpapatibay ng bigkis na nag-uugnay ng Provinciayang ito Manitoba sa Pilipinas.

### Translation

*Mr. Speaker there is a long tradition of ties between the Philippines and Manitoba, and Winnipeg in particular. With a population of approximately 40 000 Filipino-Canadians in Manitoba and with the arrival of new immigrants each year, the common thread that binds this province to the Philippines continues to grow stronger.*

For this reason, I am pleased to welcome the delegation to the Manitoba Legislature and today we have the Philippines Department of the Interior and Local Government and Local Government Academy delegates. They are Ms. Everdina Doctor, regional director; Mr. William C. Paler, he is the regional director of DILG-Region 8; Ms. Maria Rosalinda Lacsamana, she is the AD-LGA.

From the Benguet province in the northern part of the Philippines, we have Governor Borromeo Melchor, province of Benguet; we have Mayor Jose Baluda, the mayor of Tuba; we have Mayor Concepcion Balao, the mayor of Atok, Benguet; Mayor Mario Godio, the mayor of Itogon, Benguet.

From the Samar province in the southern part of Manila, we have delegates Mayor Elvira Babalcon from Paranas, Samar; Mayor Vicente Labuac, Jr. from Basey; Mayor Abraham Ferreras, Jr. from Marabut, Samar, Mayor Reynato Latorre from Villareal; Mayor Mario Quijano from Pinabacdao; Vice Mayor Manuel Van Torrevillas from Catbalogan; Vice Mayor Ronald Aquino from Calbayog City and Ms. Sharee Ann Tan from the Samar Province, Governor's representative.

Welcome, ladies and gentlemen.

\* (14:20)

**Charlie Mayer**

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden):** Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 6, 2005, at the

National Trade Centre in Toronto, I had the pleasure of attending the Canadian Agriculture Hall of Fame induction dinner and ceremony honouring the career and achievements of the Honourable Charles James Mayer.

Charlie Mayer was born and raised in Saskatchewan. In 1965 he moved to Manitoba and bought a farm in Carberry. Mr. Mayer was a farmer with a vision and always saw a need to improve opportunities for all agricultural producers across western Canada. He provided leadership for the betterment of grain production and marketing on a fair basis. Mr. Mayer became active in the Manitoba Beef Growers Association, the Manitoba Farm Bureau, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and numerous other industry organizations.

In 1979 Charlie Mayer entered federal politics as the Progressive Conservative member for Portage-Marquette. He was a Cabinet minister from 1984 to 1993 and eventually held the portfolio of Agriculture Minister in this country of Canada. Mr. Mayer was responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and kept all Canadian grain and livestock farmers at the top of his agenda.

His decision to allow oats to be marketed directly to processors led to the development of a value-added oat processing plant in Portage la Prairie and the expansion of oat acreage in Manitoba. He also established the National Grains Bureau and headquartered it in Winnipeg. As a founding member of the Cairns Group of agricultural exporting countries, Mr. Mayer gained global recognition for his role in improving the GATT rules which resulted in better access to global markets for Canadian producers.

His constant agricultural support led to the development of the Gross Revenue Insurance Plan and the Net Income Stabilization Account. To this day he continues to be involved in many industry organizations. Mr. Mayer was nominated jointly by Mr. Art Enns, a past president of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers from Morris, Manitoba, and by Cargill.

On behalf of this Assembly, and in particular the Progressive Conservative caucus of Manitoba, I would like to extend my congratulations and best wishes to Charlie Mayer upon his official induction into the Canadian Agriculture Hall of Fame. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### **Cranberry Portage**

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, on October 5 of this year, over 40 American visitors, mainly retired couples, were formally welcomed to Cranberry Portage for an interesting day of hands-on cross-cultural activities. These people were part of the Polar Bear Safari Caravan which was on its way to Thompson and Churchill.

The day started at the renowned Northern Buffalo Sculptures Gallery with greetings, introductions and a sweet grass ceremony. A brief tour included a visit to the Tipi Flutes Craft Shop, the Rose Thompson Historic Site and the cairn in the park. Visitors learned that Cranberry Portage was first established in 1928 on Cranberry Carrying Place, a historic three-kilometre portage between First Cranberry Lake and Lake Athapapuskow. The portage has been used for thousands of years.

Activities for our American guests included soapstone carving, the crafting of souvenir tipis and the making of walking sticks. Some visitors were guided along bush trails to collect Labrador tea and to select just the right diamond willows to transform into walking sticks. Other activities included traditional drumming, singing and an explanation of the sweat lodge. Lunch at the campfire included traditional foods such as moose stew, campfire-roasted lake trout, bannock on a stick and Labrador tea.

The visitors spoke in glowing terms about having participated in a unique cross-cultural experience. They gained important glimpses into the Cree and Métis way of life in northern Manitoba and realized that this most beautiful part of Manitoba has a rich history, culture and tradition. No wonder the Snow Lake, Cranberry Portage, Flin Flon region is fast becoming a major tourist attraction.

Thank you to Irvin Head, Lisa Gamblin, Jeannie Dubray, Geordie Head, Lionel Mason and Lou Erickson. Your generous donation of time and talent created an unforgettable day for over 40 of our American neighbours. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### **Philippines Study Tour of Manitoba**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, just want to add a few words of comments in regard to the special guests that we had here today inside the Chamber in the gallery. The Filipino community has contributed so much to the economic and social fabric of our province, and I think that it is wonderful to see the type of partnership that

governments can enter into that really benefit the community as a whole both here in the province of Manitoba and abroad in the Philippines.

I just wanted to express that thought, but at the same time now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to comment very briefly in terms of the Crocus file. I believe the government once again ducked the issue of public debate on the Crocus file by not allowing for, and I would suggest to you it is the government that did not allow for, a debate of that issue. Yesterday, had the Government House Leader saw the merit of the 33 000-plus Manitoba citizens that would have benefited by that particular debate, we would have had that debate yesterday. It is only because this government goes out of its way to prevent any sort of discussion or debate on the Crocus file. That is to the detriment of the best interest of not only the Crocus shareholders but to all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, they are doing that only because they want to protect their own selfish political interests and the interests of a few union leaders that they are in fact too close within terms of a relationship. I find that it is most unfortunate that here we had an opportunity to have a discussion, to hear what the government had to say. If the government had an ounce of integrity whatsoever, it would acknowledge the importance and the need to have a full public inquiry into this whole Crocus fiasco.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

#### House Business

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, just as notice under the new rules with particular regard to Private Members' Business, next Tuesday we will be calling forth the resolution on war brides, and I understand that is being filed and will be distributed.

Second of all, in terms of Government Business on today's agenda, would you please call the business as it appears on the Order Paper?

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill 9—The Farm Practices Protection Amendment Act

**Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Advanced Education

(Ms. McGifford), that Bill 9, The Farm Practices Protection Amendment Act, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

#### *Motion presented.*

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Mr. Speaker, the proposal that I have brought forward is to amend the existing Farm Practices Protection Act by incorporating a provision in the act that will afford its members, its acting members and any other persons acting under the authority of the act protection from personal liability for anything done in good faith in the performance or intended performances of their duties or for neglect or default in the performance exercised in good faith.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, liability protection is offered through the use of an indemnification agreement as there is no such provision in the act. Each time a member is appointed, the indemnification agreement has to be completed.

The indemnification agreement that they have to complete provides, in short, that the Government of Manitoba agrees to pay any damages or costs awarded against the member in any action or proceedings as well as legal fees, provided that the member's conduct which gave rise to the action did not constitute gross negligence of duties or malicious acts or omissions.

However, Mr. Speaker, in numerous other provincial statutes which provide for an appointed body there is a provision in the statute affording that the members have liability protection. This amendment will eliminate the necessity of a separate indemnification agreement, be consistent with other statutes and represent standard wording being employed in Manitoba legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a straightforward amendment that will offer protection to people who agree to serve on boards, and I would hope that there is support from other members of the House for this legislation. Thank you.

\* (14:30)

**Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake):** It is an honour to rise today to speak to this amendment. It is just another example of this government's commitment to the farming industry in our province, and I welcome the opportunity to speak on this matter. I especially thank members opposite for giving us on this side of the House the unusual opportunity to speak because, as a rule, they leap up in arms whenever any of our members on this side of the House attempt to speak.

It is an old practice of muzzling government members, and I guess things are unravelling over on that side of the House. They are simply not prepared to speak on the bills that we have put forward, so we are more than willing to rise to the occasion. Certainly, on the farmer front, it is an honour to me to do so.

We have taken a number of initiatives over the last six years, and this initiative to further enhance the protection of members on the Farm Practices Protection Board will just make it all that much easier and more secure for our producers in rural Manitoba to carry on their business.

Our government is committed to the principle of the right to farm and there are often challenges in rural Manitoba from a variety of different groups. I am pleased as a rural member myself to see that this government has stood firm with our producers from the moment we came into office to this very day, to this point where we are introducing this legislation which will further enhance, as I said, the powers of this board to protect the rights of farmers to carry on their business.

It is also predicated to some degree on one of the founding principles of sustainability that this government put forward from the very beginning. We, unlike members opposite, recognized that we had to expand our industry but we also had to do so in a sustainable manner. So sustainability has always been our primary objective, and I can think back right to the year 2000 when we constituted the Livestock Stewardship Initiative.

We put together a panel of three very renowned men led by Mr. Ed Tyrchniewicz, who did quite a commendable job. I recall the report finding common ground which made a number of recommendations as to how agriculture could be proceeded with in our province in a manner sustainable, not only from an economic perspective but also from a social and an environmental perspective as well, because you have to look at the big picture, Mr. Speaker.

You cannot just proceed willy-nilly, as members opposite did, with no recognition whatsoever that environmental issues were something that was important to the people of Manitoba, so this is something that we have certainly recognized. We followed up on a number of the recommendations of the Tyrchniewicz report to see that expansion did take place in a sustainable manner.

We are all very familiar with the situation which occurred when the Crow rate was done away with, with the approval of members opposite, I might add. I seem to recall the former Member for Lakeside was a strong proponent of doing away with the Crow rate which put our grain producers in this province in a very, very difficult situation, Mr. Speaker, because being in the centre of the province we are so, so far away from the export ports that transportation costs put quite a burden on our grain growers.

So Manitoba farmers are very innovative. They are used to diversification, and the movement toward the expansion of the livestock sector was the natural result of that. This government has acted in a manner to sustain that movement. We have approached the expansion of livestock in a very positive way, and we have tried to encourage the development of the processing side of things. I think the announcement yesterday, with a second hog processor coming into this province, is a sign of that. Members opposite are no doubt feeling a little jealous, at this point in time, that we were able to achieve this, but that is a credit to our minister and a credit to this government.

We will do this in a sustainable manner as well, though. The Member for Dauphin-Roblin, the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers), stood in this House today and assured us that we would be going through the full Clean Environment Commission process on this, so that, as I said, it will be sustainable from a social and environmental perspective, not just from an economic perspective. I think back to, again I think it was the year 2000 or '01, when another processor was looking at coming into the province here. I believe it was Schneider's. Similar objective, but at the end of the day their proposal did not quite pass muster and did not get clearance from the Clean Environment Commission and was subsequently refused. So I think that is of great assurance to people in Manitoba who are concerned about the environmental and social impacts. In that sense, definitely we have stepped up to the plate.

We have had a lot of criticism from members opposite about the Rancher's Choice proposal as well, which never ceases to amaze me. I was, in fact, quite shocked when members opposite actually came out in opposition to this. Well, the Member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) first and foremost, who is quoted in the *Farmers' Independent Weekly* and probably a few other agricultural journals out there, said that we did not need this expansion, but subsequently flip-flopped, flap-jacked on his position

and now they are in favour of it. I remember we went through a little glitch with the proposal with the Corporations Branch, and he was not at all pleased when the Agriculture critic on that side of the House leapt into this issue and started to spread fear amongst our producers, which in essence had the potential to scuttle this whole project.

We on this side of the House, from the very beginning, said that this was a critical situation, that this was a crisis that our producers were facing, and our position from the very beginning was to try and deal with this in a non-partisan manner. We called upon members opposite to co-operate on this front. I think it lasted for about 15 minutes in the House here. It was not very long before the Leader of the Opposition, the Ag critic and many of them, in fact, on that side of the House began to politicize this issue, began to try and capitalize on minor details like a glitch in the Corporations Branch, the end result being that it has not been of any great assistance at all to the entrepreneurs that are pushing this facility. I know members opposite do not want to hear this because, as they say, the truth hurts, but if they are going to give us the opportunity to speak in the House, then that is what we are going to do. We will explore some of these issues in depth if that is what they want. It might be painful to them, but so be it, Mr. Speaker.

\* (14:40)

You know, they continue to say that the expansion of processing lags in this province. Well, even in my little hometown community of Poplarfield, Manitoba, population 150 people, there is now a beef processing plant, just to give you an idea that across this province, these things are occurring in a town the size of Poplarfield with a population of a hundred and some people. We have the Pattysons, recent immigrants from British Columbia, as a matter of fact, must have been some of the U-haul people that the Minister of Transportation was referring to during Question Period here, the massive influx of immigrants into our province. Here were a couple of families from British Columbia, true entrepreneurs who came here, bought some property, and it was not long after that they expanded their operation to include processing, and it is functioning very successfully, I might add, Mr. Speaker.

I got involved in this project quite early on. They called me in. They were having some difficulties with the bureaucracy. You know, they were new to

the province. They were not familiar with this system. I got involved, and we mobilized some of our senior staff very quickly. It was within a matter of days, possibly weeks, that this operation was up and running.

So we are expanding processing. I think the announcement yesterday with the OlyWest proposal is a prime example of the big picture happening in our province under the leadership of this government.

One thing that is near and dear to my heart is the movement toward biofuels in this province. Very early on, I saw the potential of biodiesel. We were briefed on this. I know the initial emphasis was on ethanol, but I thought that biodiesel had significant, if not even more, potential than the ethanol side of things. Given that, you know, we encountered this BSE crisis, and suddenly the renderer in our province was no longer taking bovine product, this was a real impetus to this industry. Again, they say, "Well, where is it? Nothing is happening."

But, once again, in the Interlake, that region of entrepreneurial spirit and farm leadership, once again, one of my constituents, Mr. Paul Bobbee, stepped up to the plate. The two of us were appointed to the Biodiesel Advisory Council. We held meetings for a number of months. We travelled into the U.S. to view facilities down there. Would you not know it, when Paul came back to Manitoba, entrepreneur that he was, he put in place an experimental system which very successfully produced biodiesel. It will be very soon now that we will be breaking ground on a production facility in the community of Arborg. So, once again, accomplishments on this side of the House, politicians, people in government, working in conjunction with producers in our province, here.

Getting back to the concept of sustainability: two things that this government has done have been to amend The Planning Act and also to put in place The Water Protection Act. Part of the problem with the expansion of livestock that we inherited from members opposite was that there really was no planning process. As I said earlier, they were just willy-nilly, let us go, wherever you want to slap a barn up, feel free to do it. I can think, there are a few in my constituency built in swamps next to water courses. You really have to wonder who was thinking, if anybody, when this occurred. But there was really no guidance from the previous administration to municipal councils how they wanted people to operate. Every time a proposal

came forward it was anarchy and chaos, in essence, with no guidance whatsoever from the Filmon administration. The locals would rise up in arms, and you would get a big fight and all kinds of bad feelings created amongst members of the communities.

So we recognized that this was not the way to do business. It was not sustainable from a social sense, creating all kinds of strife at the local level. So we endeavoured to rectify that. We introduced an amendment to The Planning Act the previous year, and there was a lot of opposition to it. We sat in standing committee and realized that there were a few problems with it, so we pulled it. We came back again this year with a revised version of the act, and that is now law. I might add that I think probably 95, if not more, percent of the municipalities in this province are now in planning districts and are working on their planning proposals and so forth. So definitely a giant leap forward compared to the way things were done in the past.

The Water Protection Act, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely critical. If we are going to expand livestock to the point where we are raising 7, 8, 10 million hogs in this province, then we have to do it carefully. I know the Interlake is seeing an influx of these operations, which is good in the sense that it creates employment and gives our grain producers options, but the Interlake is also susceptible to pollution if things are done carelessly.

There are a lot of limestone dolomite ridges exposed to the surface throughout the region. There are a lot of swamps and then, of course, extensive drainage network that drains a lot of our agricultural land into the two bodies that border on the Interlake, Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba, so we cannot just go in there with our eyes shut. We have to plan in a sustainable manner. The move toward water quality management zones is going to be a godsend to these people. We will be able to know that as this industry expands, it is going into areas that are properly suited for it, not into swamps and built on ridges and so forth the way things were done when the former Member for Lakeside, Harry Enns, was the Minister of Agriculture. We are going to go forward on this, but at the end of the day, things are going to be done in a sustainable manner.

We have also expanded in terms of research and development. Just last week, as a matter of fact, the minister, myself and a number of my MLAs, friends on our side of the House, toured the Functional

Foods and Nutraceuticals Centre at the University of Manitoba, a building under construction. *[interjection]* The Member for Fort Garry (Ms. Irvin-Ross) there was with us as well, one of our southern belles, and I was glad to see that. I was glad to see that members within the city of Winnipeg also have an interest in the way things are done in rural Manitoba. All members of our caucus are concerned about the environment, about the way things are done in rural Manitoba. I know the Member for The Maples (Mr. Aglugub) was also there.

**An Honourable Member:** Where was this?

**Mr. Nevakshonoff:** This was at the Functional Foods and Nutraceuticals Centre, the Richardson Centre at the U of M in Smartpark, so that is going to be a great boon to our province. We have always led the world in terms of diversification, in crop development, and this government's commitment to that centre is going to make a considerable difference, as is our commitment to the Food Development Centre in Portage la Prairie, something that we worked on in the previous year. These are the initiatives that are necessary from a government. A government has to show leadership and assist our producers, especially when times are tough.

\* (14:50)

The weather has not been very co-operative, Mr. Speaker. The last three years have been quite chaotic and very difficult for our producers, going back to the election campaign in 2003. In the midst of one of the worst droughts that this province has seen in recent history, they were hit again with the BSE crisis. I recall those months very clearly because it was very painful for the people that I represent. There is a lot of ranching in the Interlake and, if you get up into the northwest of the Interlake, there is not very much grain production whatsoever. So these people were stuck between a rock and a hard place. They had no pastures. Their pastures were finished by the end of June. Their winter hay supplies which were maybe 20 percent of what they normally cut, they were feeding to their cattle already. They were left with nothing.

Normally they would have sold cattle, but that was not an option with the border closed, so this government stepped up to the plate. I recall very clearly when we put over \$100 million, Mr. Speaker, \$100 million on the table in low-interest loans for the producers, something that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Murray) was calling for. I remember he actually sent a letter out to my constituents



suggesting that low-interest loans were something that the government should consider doing.

So we did it, and what did members opposite do? They rose up in arms and criticized us, saying what a horrible thing it was that we were flowing these low-interest loans, just a prime example of what I was saying earlier, how they attempted to politicize this crisis when our ranchers were in the worst spot that they have been in, in decades. Rather than pulling together, members opposite tried to divide them, spread false information out there, recommend at one point that we give them a low-interest loan and when we did, criticize us for doing it. It boggles the mind, Mr. Speaker. I have been a member for six years, but nothing ceases to amaze me, and that was a prime example of blatant politicization of an issue.

We took it a step further, Mr. Speaker. When they were faced with that crisis, we realized that loans were not the be-all and end-all. There was not much money available. People were financially strapped, but what were they going to do for feed? So we realized that in the absence of local supplies in the immediate area, something had to be done. Hay was selling at a premium. There was no hay available really. It was to the point where our producers were feeding straw to their animals with food supplements. That is how desperate the situation became. As I mentioned earlier, there was no straw available in that area. They were looking at freighting straw in excess of a hundred miles into that area. Some of the larger producers were facing transportation bills in the \$40,000 to \$50,000 range, which was the end of their operation, quite frankly. If they did not see something in a hurry, a lot of those producers would have gone out of business.

*Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

The Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), our Minister of Agriculture, came out to Ashern on a number of occasions, and, again, I recall we had a rally there, and a number of my urban compatriots made the trip out to Ashern, as well, to attend a farm rally that we were having.

**An Honourable Member:** I was there.

**Mr. Nevakshonoff:** That is right. The Member for Fort Garry (Ms. Irvin-Ross) was there. The Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) was there, among others. Once again, we have all of us on this side of the House committed to this.

So very shortly after that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, this government stepped up to the plate and we flowed the freight assistance program, which facilitated the movement of what hay was available. Some of them said straw from as far away as 150 miles, they were hauling loads in. This is 20, 30 semi loads, not a cheap undertaking, I assure you. As I said, sometimes \$40,000, \$50,000 to facilitate that.

So, between those two programs, between the freight assistance program and the low-interest loan program, a good number of our producers, in fact practically all of them, I would say, are still in business in the Interlake, thanks to those two programs alone, among seven or eight other different programs that we structured at a provincial level and lobbied very hard at the national level to see that programs delivered from Ottawa were equitable and fair. That was not always the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I remember the BSE Recovery Program that Ottawa rolled out was not fair to us at all, quite frankly. We were supposed to have guaranteed access to slaughter facilities in western Canada. They were promised to us. On that basis we agreed to that program, and in short order we realized that it was not coming to pass. We had already committed quite a bit of our capital toward that program. It was not flowing because the federal money which would trigger it was not flowing, so what did we do? We did not put it back into the piggy bank. We did not put it back into the general revenues. We were innovative. We structured a number of other programs so that, at the end of the day, our producers benefited from it.

I talked to a number of ranchers over the last three years and not all of them are sworn New Democrats, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to say that. There are a few ranchers that support the party for members opposite, and even those individuals would stop me on the street and say: You know what? We do not necessarily vote for you or we did not the last time, but you guys sure pulled our fat from the fire and we thank you for those programs that you thought of.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the very beginning this government has shown its commitment to our producers, not only in terms of sustainability but in terms of diversification, expansion of livestock in a manner that is sustainable from an environmental, a social and an economic perspective. I am proud to be a member of this party and this government and I thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill 9 is an interesting bill. It is actually fairly straightforward. You know it is a bill, in essence, to protect the financial interests, if I could put it that way, of board members of the Farm Practices Protection, which is something that is positive. I guess in general we do not have a problem of the bill going into committee and see if there is any feedback and what type of feedback there might be on it.

I was kind of listening to the member talk about Bill 9, and he spent a great deal of time talking about the hog industry. I sat back and I am trying to figure out in terms of what it is that this minister, the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), the Deputy Premier, has actually been doing over the last couple of years. It is a significant investment that is being made and no doubt, the hog industry as a whole stands to make tremendous gains. All in all, as long as you go through due process in terms of the environmental checks and so forth, this could be of real benefit for Manitoba as a whole.

\* (15:00)

Having said that, if I were a cattle farmer, I am not too sure in terms of how it is that I would be interpreting what I have seen over the last 24 hours, because if I were a cattle producer I would be reflecting on the last couple of years and how the government treated me as a producer. I do not understand why it is that here you have a government that ponies up a considerable amount of tax dollars. You are talking about millions of infrastructure, millions in terms of direct grants, millions and millions in terms of loan guarantees that are being provided in order to ensure that we get this hog-producing plant.

I, for one, believe at times that it is necessary for government to be involved, to support our industries, Mr. Speaker, but where was the government in regard to the cattle farmer? The member from Interlake, I suspect, probably has more cattle farmers than he has hog producers. I am not too sure, but I suspect that that could be the case. I would be thinking, if I were that member, you know, what have you done in a real sense for production of beef in the province of Manitoba. That has kind of whittled away. They say, "Well, we provided, we made available \$100 billion for the cattle industry that was affected by BSE." Well, they throw some money in an area, and no doubt it was of great help and assistance for a lot of producers, but what the

producers want to see is long-term investment in the industry. One of the ways in which you demonstrate that investment is you come to the table in a very real, tangible way so that the future of the cattle industry would in fact be protected, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I do not understand why it is that this government has failed and failed miserably, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the cattle issue in the province of Manitoba. They have squandered away opportunity after opportunity to ensure that Manitoba would have had some sort of a beef-producing industry, viable industry in the province of Manitoba. I have not heard this Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) or this Premier (Mr. Doer) stand up and talk about the importance of having a cattle-producing province in terms of the meats. I am disappointed with that. They might at times stand in certain places and say, "Yes, we are defending the cattle industry in Manitoba; we are providing this kind of money; we are kind of like putting a patch on a vessel that is sinking." If it was not for the cattle producer, we would not have an industry. If it was not for the sacrifices that the cattle producers are making and the huge losses that they are incurring because of the BSE crisis, if it was not for their sacrifice, Manitoba would not have a cattle industry. It is no thanks to this government. They have been dragged, kicking and screaming, to give any sort of real, tangible support to the cattle producer. That is the reality of it.

If they were genuine and they were sincere and they wanted to help the industry, Mr. Speaker, Rancher's Choice would be real today, not, from what I understand, capital that is out rusting in rural Manitoba because of the government's inability to take action in a meaningful way in order to ensure that we had a processing industry here dealing with cattle. So I find it interesting. Now remember, they have had a five-and-a-half-month break from this Legislature and the first bill that the Minister of Agriculture has introduced, and in fact a member of their own caucus has commented on, is Bill 9. Yes, sure, does the bill hurt? Well, now it is just, no, the bill does not hurt, and we will let it go to committee.

But, Mr. Speaker, is this the best that they can do in terms of providing a better sense of security for our cattle industry? I am sure, like many Manitobans, that I wish the very best to the hog industry. I am sure that we all wish the very best. We all want to see that industry grow and prosper, but I think that the government needs to take responsibility for its

inaction and its absolute failure in addressing the needs of the cattle industry in our province.

I do not have the educational background of many others inside this Chamber from an agricultural point of view, Mr. Speaker, but I have met with many cattle producers, and I have seen the tears. I have seen the sacrifices that they have made. Sadly, I have seen the government's response to that industry, and I am very disappointed in the government's response.

We believe that the government could have and should have done more, and as a result of not doing more, it is going to be that much more difficult because other provinces have decided to do more than what this government has done which is going to make it possibly a little bit more difficult for us. But it is almost as if this particular administration has conceded defeat on the issue of the cattle producer. What they are prepared to do is to provide some financial assistance, some loan guarantees and low-interest loans, possibly, but I will tell you, in the long term it is not going to have the same sort of positive impact it could have had if, in fact, the government would have been more proactive at recognizing the value of processing our cattle and to facilitate—  
[interjection]

Well, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Nevakshonoff) said, "What do you want us to build, plants?" What are you doing for the hog industry? You are building. You are building a plant.

**An Honourable Member:** We are working with the industry.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Well, you are working with the industry. Well, excuse me, but I believe there are individual Manitobans who are trying to work with the government to give the same sort of treatment to the cattle industry, but you have chosen to ignore the cattle producers. That is what is obvious. Rancher's Choice has been on the table for how long, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They have been there for two years and you have not done anything on it.

So, anyway, I had indicated that it was not my intention to speak long on this particular bill, but I do think it was an important point to emphasize, that we need to be more proactive not only in the hog industry, but we have got to show that we care and be more proactive in other industries, in particular our cattle industry, and recognize the value of farm diversification. I am sure that is the type of attitude the Member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire) shares

with me, that we have got to protect our rural communities as best we can, and I say shame on the government for not doing what it could have done for the cattle industry.

Maybe it is time that they pull up their pants and do a better job in ensuring that there is going to be a better future for all of our agricultural industries. Hopefully, we will see a deputy premier or a minister of agriculture who will come to the Chamber with more legislation that has more of a positive impact, or budget, I should say, incorporate other ideas in the budgets that would, in fact, benefit rural Manitoba. Do not sell them short. Do not just leave it up to rural Manitobans to ensure that the province succeeds, that there is a role in other areas of agriculture that the government could be more proactive in.

With those few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I indicated, the principle of the bill, we do not have a problem in terms of it going to committee. Thank you.

**Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler), that we adjourn debate on Bill 9.

*Motion agreed to.*

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### Bill 2—The Private Investigators and Security Guards Amendment Act

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Resume debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh), Bill 2, The Private Investigators and Security Guards Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les détectives privés et les gardiens de sécurité, standing in the name of the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach). Stand?

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It will continue to stand in the name of the Member for Russell.

\* (15:10)

### Bill 3—The Enforcement of Canadian Judgments Act

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Resume debate on second reading of Bill 3, the proposed motion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh), The Enforcement of Canadian Judgments Act; Loi sur l'exécution des jugements canadiens, standing in the name of the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach).

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** I am pleased to stand today and speak in favour of a bill which I believe serves several good purposes. Now, this bill will do two things. It will recognize civil protection orders coming in from other provinces and it will also make it much easier to register judgments which have been pronounced by courts in other provinces. As I say, it is a good bill on a number of fronts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the first thing it will do, which, I think, is most important, is it will recognize civil protection orders, obtained by the victims of violence, of threats and stalking in other Canadian provinces. Through this bill, we would see that such orders could be enforced as if it is an order of the Manitoba court without any need, as is currently the case, to bring a separate proceeding in the Manitoba court, which means that a woman, or man for that matter, moving to Manitoba, often to escape an abusive partner, can walk into a police station or RCMP detachment, provide his or her order from another jurisdiction and have it recognized and acted upon by law enforcement in Manitoba.

The positives for that, Mr. Deputy Speaker: it is quick; there is no need to retain a lawyer, there is no need to commence an independent proceeding here in Manitoba; and it makes sense because that person has already proven their case to the satisfaction of a court in another Canadian province. It only makes sense that this be done quickly and easily in the province of Manitoba for the protection of those people.

I am very proud, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is just one of a number of other initiatives which our government is undertaking to reduce the incidence of domestic violence and to protect victims of domestic violence. We have proposed amendments to The Domestic Violence and Stalking Act, of course, to make legislation that will make more victims of domestic violence eligible to access protection orders. This now includes, for the first time in Canada I believe, protection for people who have dated but are not living together and for cases of abuse in families where relatives have not lived together.

We saw in the news just in the last couple of days, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a horrible situation out of Windsor where a nurse was killed in a hospital by someone with whom she had not lived, but had dated. It is this exact type of situation that this other movement by our government will hope to prevent.

We have also been a participant in the Silent Witness Project. If we look in the lobby of this building, we can see a display of life-sized silhouettes representing women who had been murdered by their partners. I attended a very moving service a couple of weeks ago in which those 10 silhouettes, each representing a murdered woman, were moved within the Legislature.

The Province has provided funding for a month-long public awareness campaign which is running, not only in the city of Winnipeg, but also in rural and northern communities to make more people aware of the problem of domestic violence.

As well, in the 2004 Throne Speech, we indicated we would be moving ahead to have an expanded domestic violence program. Indeed, within the next few weeks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will be announcing the details of that program. It will begin in Winnipeg and as well the City of Brandon, and will also be expanded to other communities in the province of Manitoba.

I am very proud, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that since 1999, funding for a comprehensive range of services to assist victims of domestic violence has doubled and now totals over \$10.4 million per year. Just this year, our province has provided an additional \$315,000 for 34 community-based agencies which deal with domestic violence.

Now, in November 2004, our government announced a comprehensive strategy to prevent domestic violence which includes some of the matters I have already spoken about, but also expanding specialized domestic violence victim services from five to 28 communities for better access for those victims of violence who do not live in the city of Winnipeg.

We have expanded the mandate of victim support workers to help victims obtain civil protection orders either before or after charges are laid. As I have indicated, we are working on our public awareness campaign with the motto, "Promises aren't the only things that get broken," to reinforce the very important message that people can take steps to help end domestic violence in their communities.

I am also very proud that our government supports A Woman's Place and has provided \$40,000 in funding as well as the services of Crown attorneys and victim support worker staff.

Finally, on that front, I am very proud of Manitoba's domestic violence Front End Project, which was recently recognized as an award-winning court project to reduce the time that domestic violence cases will take to go from their first court appearance to a trial or a final disposition. In fact, that effort has reduced the time that that happens in Manitoba from more than seven months to as little as two months. The Chief Judge of the Provincial Court, Raymond Wyant, certainly was pleased and noted that we were able to cut the total backlog of those cases within the province of Manitoba. So, certainly, I am very pleased Manitoba is leading the way in terms of protecting the victims of domestic violence, reducing domestic violence, and this bill takes us further down the other way.

The second thing this bill does, of course, is it makes it much easier to recognize judgments which are issued by other Canadian courts. It is always a surprise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to learn that despite the fact we all live in the same country, each province has—in some ways it is like a silo where it is very difficult to recognize things which happen in different provinces. Certainly, it was a surprise as a lawyer to find out the difficulty in terms of taking an Ontario judgment or a Saskatchewan judgment or a B.C. judgment and having it have effect in Manitoba. What is very good about this bill is that we will now be able to have a much simpler process to register those judgments in Manitoba so that individuals, corporations can actually pursue people who owe money. The net impact of that is it will be tougher for people to evade their legitimate obligations in other provinces.

This entire bill came out of the unified law conference which is an effort being made by all Canadian provinces to harmonize laws, to make laws which are going to make it easier for trade to occur between our provinces. Now, this conference suggested an easier registration system for judgments, and I think we should all be proud of the fact that Manitoba is the first legislature in the country to introduce legislation of this type. I expect that Manitoba will be followed by other Canadian provinces, but we are certainly carrying the lead on this one. I think it speaks volumes for our wish to make sure that we are truly working not only within our boundaries but as a leader in the country of Canada to provide good initiatives.

So, for both those reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the protection of victims of domestic violence and also a very common sense initiative to ease trade and

ease the recognition of judgments between Canadian provinces, this is a good bill, and I would certainly urge it to move on to committee as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Are there any other speakers?

Is there unanimous consent that the bill continues standing in the name of the honourable Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach)? Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Now we shall proceed to Bill 5.

#### **Bill 5—The Dental Hygienists Act**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Sale), Bill 5, The Dental Hygienists Act; Loi sur les hygiénistes dentaires, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

**Some Honourable Members:** Stand.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Stand? Is there leave that this bill remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina? *[Agreed]*

We will proceed on the next one.

\* (15:20)

#### **Bill 6—The Dental Association Amendment Act**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Second reading on the proposed motion of the Minister of Health (Mr. Sale), Bill 6, The Dental Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association dentaire, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Stand?

**An Honourable Member:** Right.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave that this bill remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina? *[Agreed]*

#### **Bill 7—The Architects and Engineers Scope of Practice Dispute Settlement Act (Various Acts Amended)**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour and Immigration (Ms. Allan), standing in the name of the honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Schuler).

Shall it continue to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Springfield?  
*[Agreed]*

**Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain):** It is nice to put a few words on the record in regard to Bill 7. It is certainly a very important bill coming forward here. As we know, there have been quite a few issues raised throughout Manitoba in regard to the discussions between the engineers and the architects.

I think what the amendment to this bill will actually do is it will amend The Architects Act to clarify the circumstances in which a professional engineer can do engineering work, and it would also be considered architectural work. It will facilitate the joint practice of architecture and professional engineering. Quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is where we have to be as a result of the court ruling that came out earlier.

There were certainly some significant changes as a result of that court ruling. Really what it has done is it has really halted and ground to a halt the development in Manitoba. I know in my particular constituency, I had a number of issues that came forward. I want to read, in particular, the changes to that arena were put on hold. We know going forward that it may cause extra expenses going forward as well. Certainly, I think when we look in Manitoba, and we look at the construction period in Manitoba, it is a relatively brief window of opportunity there.

So we are now to the point, as a result of today's storm, where a lot of those types of construction activities probably will not be carried forward. So in my particular case, and in this group of individuals that have gotten together to work on a community project, their project has been delayed and, in essence, we will probably be delayed for another year because of the dispute coming forward. It is something that we hope the government would have addressed prior to this so it would not have come to the situation we are in now. We are certainly holding up production across Manitoba.

We recognize that both the engineers and architects are a very professional group. Both organizations and both groups do valid work throughout the province of Manitoba. I reflect back on my university days where I met quite a few engineers and some architects at that time. Of course, being in agriculture at the university at that time, the aggies and the engineers did not always get along. There were always several pranks involved

throughout the year. But, certainly, I have a number of good friends in the engineering faculty as well.

The engineers are quite involved in a lot of different activities, too. You know, we talk just about the structural engineer, but there are also the electrical engineers, mechanical engineers. Of course, the ones that I was more familiar with were the agricultural engineers, on that side of things.

*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*

So we are hoping, Mr. Speaker, that this particular act will resolve some of those discrepancies that are now in place, that we can hopefully move things forward here in Manitoba. Again, because of this court ruling, things have been held up, so we are certainly hoping that this government will work towards having the issue resolved.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are, I think, over 100 presenters signed up to speak to this particular bill in committee. So I think we have to get this bill moved on to committee because with 100 presenters it is going to take some time to hear what they have to say. Of course, when we hear the people of Manitoba, there may be some changes to this particular piece of legislation as well.

So I think it is important when we are moving forward that we do get this particular piece of legislation right so that we do not have to keep facing these particular discrepancies and these issues over time. So, certainly, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to getting this bill over to committee and having Manitobans voice their opinion on it.

So, with that, I thank you very much for the opportunity to say a few words on this important piece of legislation.

**Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to put a few comments on the record regarding Bill 7, The Architects and Engineers Scope of Practice Dispute Settlement Act. Obviously that encompasses the intent of this, it is to try and correct a dispute that is out there. But I want to take a moment just to thank the Member for Springfield (Mr. Schuler) for the work that he has done in his consultation with the architects and the engineers in trying to bring a very troubling circumstance to some sort of a resolution.

It is unfortunate that we have gotten to this point where it has created animosity between two groups, two professional bodies. I must indicate,

Mr. Speaker, that within my area it has created some real problems in that I understand, and engineers, architects understand, that there are certain elements that need to take place as projects are built and as they are prepared for construction. That is a known fact and no one is disputing it.

On the other hand, though, I did have an engineer, in fact, several, who approached me and indicated very clearly that they have projects ongoing. In fact, what had happened was that these were projects where it was not new construction. There were changes being made to the existing structures, but they exceeded the allowable square footage that is built into the legislation.

So, consequently, this project, or these projects, in fact, a lot of the engineers from my area indicated very clearly that he was presently dealing with three projects. I believe two were churches where they were doing renovations, there was another fairly large project, but they were at a standstill because of the continuing dispute that was taking place.

In our consultation with the engineers and the architects, it became evident that there needed to be a resolution and a very quick resolution put in place in order to resolve those issues that are out there. Now, I think the other thing that has taken place and that, of course, we have become aware of, as time has gone on, that there are approximately 150 architects within the province and there are approximately 4000 engineers within the province.

So now, if you have to have that stamp of approval on each one of the projects now, I do not think on the one hand that some of the professional bodies knew and were aware of the impact it would have, and consequently the workload that would be put upon them when this, in fact, did take place. So now we are at an impasse. We are at an impasse of trying to resolve the situation. Now, the minister, the government, has been aware of this for quite some time. As we wait, as we stall, these projects cannot proceed. So we are looking for some way of being able to move this thing through, move it through quickly.

The interesting part as we proceed on this is that we are finding out that there are, I believe, 90 presenters at this point who are coming and wanting to make presentations as we are going to be moving it to committee. Now, again, it is interesting to find out as well that when there are issues on the table, when there are disputes that need to be resolved, that

is when people become quite involved and become involved quite intensely.

\* (15:30)

So this is what we are hearing and so, again, I would just encourage us that they proceed to a point where, in fact, they do resolve the issues so that the building within this province that is taking place can continue. Again, I want to speak very clearly on behalf of my constituents and the projects that are taking place there that we need to do this and we need to do this as expeditiously as possible.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any other speakers?

When this matter is again before the House, it will remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Schuler).

#### **Bill 8—The Official Time Amendment Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** Bill 8, The Official Time Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire).

What is the will of the House?

The honourable Member for Arthur-Virden.

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to put on the record a few words in regard to Bill 8, The Official Time Amendment Act.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Smith) brought this bill forward to try to harmonize our time zones here in Manitoba with that of our American counterparts for the issue of trade. Of course, we ran into a bit of an unusual circumstance when this bill was brought forward, that this government has gone against what was considered normal procedure in this House as far as dealing with it. Our side decided we would move this bill to second reading back on the day that it was introduced, but the government has insisted that it continue to speak to this bill. I think that their members could have at least spoken to each other before this bill was brought forward from Cabinet and caucus meetings. However, Mr. Speaker, if they wish to have the Minister of Trade filibuster his own counterpart's bill, that is up to them in regard to how they handle the procedures in the House.

There is no doubt we need to co-ordinate issues across the border. I would just want to point out that,

as the Minister of Trade has indicated, between Canada and Mexico and the U.S., there is about \$190-billion worth of trade every year, much more than that, in fact. But, you know, they think that they are going to co-ordinate the movement of product between our countries by harmonizing the time zones, giving three more weeks of daylight-saving time in the spring and another week in the fall. Well, Mr. Speaker, they do not even have co-ordinated times on the border crossings that we presently have. So maybe they can go back to the table, to square one, on that issue and negotiate further with trying to make sure that we have harmonized the times of the border crossings so that product can actually move across the border in a co-ordinated manner.

I do not have a lot more to say on this bill, Mr. Speaker. I think it is fairly straightforward. Our side of the House agrees that the timing of these times has to be co-ordinated, and so with those few comments I would recommend that we move this bill along to second reading and committee.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be speaking today to Bill 8, The Official Time Amendment Act, and I—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

#### Point of Order

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

**Mr. Leonard Derkach (Official Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I am so confused, because for the second time now members on the opposition have indicated and moved that this bill go to committee so that Manitobans can be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the House Leader wanted expeditious dealing with bills, and the government wants to ensure that bills move through the process in a timely fashion. Now, here is a bill that deals with time that we are prepared to move to committee, and as I have been cautioned many times, it is very unusual for a government to speak to its own bills once it has moved in action.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am confused about why the government is procrastinating and why is it filibustering its own bill. If they should reconsider, we are prepared to move this bill to a committee of the House so that Manitobans can be heard. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Government House Leader, on the same point of order.

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader):** Well, just in terms of this silly inside baseball stuff, I will just say two points: No. 1, the "filibuster" word, that has a certain definition and this is no filibuster; No. 2, I know that if the member had not stood up, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Derkach) was prepared to get up and complain that our members were not speaking to the bill.

So I know the kind of point of order that is being raised here, but members have an opportunity, I think, in light of the importance of the bill, to put their views on the record, and I know that the bill will be passed to committee.

I am very pleased that there is a recognition that this is a good piece of legislation, and I look forward to seeing it in committee as well, Mr. Speaker. But I think the members should have an opportunity to put remarks on the record that they have laboriously prepared, I am sure, before they came into this Chamber.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader, he does not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Maloway:** Once again, I am very pleased to rise to speak to Bill 8, The Official Time Amendment Act. I do note at the beginning that the Member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire) and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Derkach) certainly have their shorts in a knot this afternoon. You know, we have a snowstorm outside. You would think they would be happy to stay in the Legislature until five o'clock and listen to speeches and make some of their own. We have been waiting to hear from them on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill is an important bill, and I did want to point out in the beginning that the daylight-saving time is not something that just happened in the last few years. It has been around for a number of years. It has been around since the 1916, 1918 period in the United States, in fact in Germany in 1916.

In fact, the American president, when he signed the Energy Policy Act of 2005, did so for a reason. You know, some people, and I have had one call so far on this issue, no more than that, but there is the odd person out there who thinks that somehow we should not co-ordinate because it is the United States. The fact of the matter is there is a good reason why they are doing so.



So I look back to the arguments that were made in the Congress on this issue when they passed the bill, and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, there were some very good reasons why they passed this legislation. They did not do it just to cheese us off and cause trouble for their northern neighbours. They did it because there were some good reasons in their own economy why they should do it.

Now, in 1973 during the Arab oil embargo of the United States and the world, the United States introduced legislation to increase daylight-saving time. In that period, the United States saved the equivalent of 100 000 barrels of oil each day or 1 percent of the nation's energy consumption. So, for those of us who are environmentalists, we should applaud this initiative on their part and now on our part, as environmentalists, to reduce the consumption of oil in the country.

In fact, if you consider that Canada is one tenth the size of the American economy, then we should be saving roughly 10 percent. So rather than 100 000 barrels of oil a day, Canada should be saving 10 000 barrels of oil per day. I guess if you live in Alberta you might not be happy about that, but in Manitoba where we do not have a lot of oil, I think we should be very pleased that we are taking this initiative.

I want to point out, too, that in the United States, in the beginning they had a national program. We in Canada leave it up to the provinces to make a decision, so we have a patchwork quilt. The Member for Minto (Mr. Swan), the other day when he made his speech on this very bill, referenced Saskatchewan that is a province that does not participate. The United States had a national program at one point, and they took it away after the first World War, and they allowed each state to make its own rules. I have some information about how that has caused a lot of problems in some of the United States where, in fact, people have gotten on a train or driven a car for I believe it was 20-some miles and they went through six or seven different changes.

\* (15:40)

That, Mr. Speaker, is the problem that you get, a patchwork quilt, when you do not have a national mandate. Now, the United States has a national mandate. In fact, they can now go to the court, if one of the states does not go along, and force the state to comply. We do not do that in Canada. We have individual provinces making decisions, and so, in this particular case, we have Ontario has agreed.

Manitoba has now agreed to go along. Where is Saskatchewan? They still have not done it.

So we will have to see what happens with this measure looking forward. We do not know whether we will have a consistent national approach. We do know the Americans have a consistent national approach at this point.

Now, there are other benefits, Mr. Speaker, to this legislation. One is, as I indicated, the energy savings. Number two, less crime. That has been studied, and there is less crime as a result of daylight-saving time. There are fewer traffic fatalities because, once again, more traffic accidents occur when it is dark. There is more recreation time and more economic activity. So these are all good reasons why we have the daylight-saving time.

I did want to point out, in addition to some of the arguments that we have had in favour of the measure, some of the other incidents and anecdotes, it is called, according to my notes here, that people have observed over the years. For example, I mentioned the widespread confusion that can occur if you do not have a consistent approach. In the 1950s and the 1960s when each U.S. locality could start and end daylight-saving time, in one year 23 different pairs of daylight-saving time start and end dates were used in Iowa alone. That is what happens when you do not have a centralized approach and you allow the local autonomy. In one Ohio to West Virginia bus route, passengers had to change their watches seven times in 35 miles.

Well, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Derkach) questions this information as being important. I want to tell him I have more. If he is not happy with the information I have given him so far, I am going to have to compete and give him some more information. For example, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Murray), I am going a little far here at this point, but the Opposition House Leader, well, one move at a time, I want to let him know that Amtrak, the American railway network, to keep their published timetables, trains cannot leave a station before the scheduled time. So, when the clocks fall back one hour in October, all the Amtrak trains in the U.S. that are running on time stop at 2 a.m., and they wait an hour before resuming. Overnight passengers are often surprised to find their train at a dead stop and their travel time an hour longer than expected. In the spring daylight-saving time, the trains instantaneously become an hour behind schedule at

2 a.m., and they just keep doing their best to make up the time.

Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting anecdote. In September, and this is to the Opposition House Leader, I want him to consider this, that in September of 1999, the Palestinian West Bank was on daylight-saving time, and Israel had just switched back to the standard time. Now, some West Bank Palestinians had prepared some time bombs, and they smuggled them to the Arab Israelis. They misunderstood the time on the bombs. As the bombs were being planted, they exploded one hour too early, killed all three terrorists instead of the intended victims. So that is just an example.

In the case of Halloween, the Premier (Mr. Doer) pointed out that, when we introduced the legislation, it was an important factor for children who are out trick and treating at Halloween to be able to have that extra hour to go out and collect candy.

The Minnesota cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul once did not have the same times. These two, you know where they are, are just south of us. In 1965, St. Paul decided to begin daylight-saving time early to conform to most of the nation while Minneapolis wanted to follow the state law, which stipulated a later start date. After negotiations and quarrelling, the cities could not agree, and so the one-hour time difference went into effect bringing into a period of turmoil between the two cities. Once again, an example of where you have one time in one city, a city side by side, and a different time in another.

So, when we get to where this is headed at the end of the day, there are going to be some interruptions. There are going to be problems to the detriment of some people in the industry in some airline schedules, we recognize that, but there are other people who highly support this measure in Manitoba. We have the trucking industry, and let us look at the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce president Dave Angus. Here is what he said. You know, the members opposite are quick to quote the member of the Chamber of Commerce. He said we have such an integrated economy in North America, it is tough enough to do business across multiple time zones, and he called the Province's decision to extend daylight-saving time fantastic. He was also glad Manitoba was one of the provinces leading the way on the issue and he would like the rest of the provinces to do so as well. *[interjection]*

The Member for Southdale (Mr. Reimer) says that we are in favour of it. Where have we heard that before? We have heard the opposition consistently and constantly over the years. One day, they are in favour of a measure. The next day they are against it. In fact, it is even sometimes the same member. They do not even caucus this and decide that, you know, one day—well, of course, the Liberals even have more of a problem because they cannot really delegate to anybody else because there are only two of them. But, I mean, trying to be on both sides of the same issue on the same day is awfully difficult.

When the member from Southdale says he is in favour of it, I just have been around here long enough to know that I really cannot take that to the bank because tomorrow he is—today he is questioning the new hog plant, right, he is against it, and tomorrow he will be out there in his constituency telling the residents how he is so in favour of bringing jobs into his constituency, right? That is the advantage, the big advantage, of being in opposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much more time I have got here but—

**An Honourable Member:** Lots more.

**Mr. Maloway:** Lots more time, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) tells me.

So my points were that this is nothing new, that the time issue has been around since World War I and obviously there are—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Member for Southdale, on a point of order?

**Mr. Jack Reimer (Southdale):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I truly enjoy listening to the Member for Elmwood and his pontifications about the glories of free enterprise and quoting the Chamber of Commerce and jobs and everything, but I have got to bring him to task. He mentioned that the Member for Southdale was against jobs for the hog plant. I never said that.

Never have I said that, so I think, Mr. Speaker, as a sense of honour for this member here, I will allow him to stand in his place and withdraw that.

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Member for Elmwood, on the same point of order?

**Mr. Maloway:** Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the member has a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Southdale, he does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Maloway:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I really want to thank the Member for Southdale for giving me the time to find some notes that I have been missing here.

I want to point out to that member that in the area of crime, a study by the U.S. Law Enforcement assistance administration found that crime was consistently less during periods of daylight-saving time than comparable standard time periods, which is a very interesting statistic. Data showed violent crime down 10 to 13 percent and it is clear that for most crimes where darkness is a factor such as muggings, there are many more incidents after dusk than before dawn, so light in the evening is most welcome. That was the information that I wanted to provide the House with respect to the issue of crime.

\*(15:50)

Now, Mr. Speaker, we in Manitoba here are a hub, a location for trade. Historically, we have been known as "Chicago of the North." We rely on trade; we are a trading nation, we are a trading province, we are a trading city. It is to our long-term benefit to be able to have a very brisk trade with the United States and with Mexico. We have been promoting a mid-continent corridor, which runs from the Port of Churchill through to Texas and on to Mexico. We would not want to see any of that trade impeded by differences in times.

The United States currently accounts for 80 percent of our trade and nearly half of our trade is with corridor states. The trade between Manitoba and Mexico has grown by 47 percent in the past years. You know, it is interesting that the members want to talk about roads and so on, and the fact is that if this corridor is to develop over the next century and operate efficiently, it really is important for us to have a good road system, both not only in the States, but in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, we have, in the last year, 9500 private-sector jobs have been created in this province. Do you know that our gross domestic product in Manitoba, since we became the government, has gone up over 40 percent? This is a phenomenal point to remember here, that under this government, this economy has been literally booming. There have been no recessions at all. We

had, in 1992, the biggest deficit in the history of the province, when Clayton Manness was the Finance Minister, and the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) knows the figures very well, and I believe it was \$892 million, I think he was saying. It was an awful lot of money, and the opposition failed to remember that. When they want to talk about deficits and debt, they do not remember that, in fact, an equivalent six-year period that they were in government, just following the Howard Pawley government, that they added to the debt an almost equivalent amount that they were criticizing the Howard Pawley government for, including the biggest deficit in the history of the province in 1992.

Mr. Speaker, since taking office in 1999, nearly four of every five jobs created in Manitoba have been full-time jobs, not part-time jobs. The members opposite would like to make hay of the fact that these are part-time jobs and not serious jobs. We are talking about full-time jobs. *[interjection]* I know, you can pretty well tell what the next line is going to be. "Well, you know, they are not private-sector jobs, they are government jobs."

Well, to answer the member's question, 55 percent of the jobs were in the private sector. There, you have your answer. I wish I had mentioned it in the beginning. They could have pre-empted your question.

October's 4.4 percent unemployment rate is the second lowest in the country after Alberta's. In October, 2005, youth unemployment was 7.7 percent, a significant decrease from 9.9 percent last month, and the second lowest after Alberta's 7.2. In 2004, private capital investment increased by 8.1 percent in Manitoba, close to the Canadian rate of 8.4 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can get results like that, what are we going to do when we pass this bill? So I am not sure just how much more time I have, but I have a number more quotations here I am willing to give the House.

**An Honourable Member:** Turn the clock back an hour.

**Mr. Maloway:** Turn the clock back.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Dolyniuk, the general manager of the Manitoba Trucking Association, said it is critical for his industry. There are many as 450 for-hire trucking companies based in Manitoba, directly and indirectly employing more than 33 000 people, and contributing \$1.2 billion to the provincial

gross domestic product. The trucking companies run on such tight schedules now that any breakdown in time zones would cripple the industry because delivery schedules are sometimes timed down to the last minute. It would be a horrendous problem, Dolyniuk said. The Canadian Bankers Association and the Canadian Capital Markets both expressed support for harmonizing the DST to mitigate potential impact related to time-sensitive transactions in the financial services sector.

So there is no doubt that there are a lot of different combinations and permutations to this argument. I am not really sure what is going to happen to your VCR and your computer and other issues, but I do not think we will go there at this point. I am just happy the opposition have not noticed that.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I did want to point out that adding daylight to the evening can also improve road safety, more people going home from work in daylight, and it would give kids a chance to do some—well, I mentioned that before, about the Halloween trick and treating.

So, Mr. Speaker, unless there is any overwhelming requirement that I continue here, I think I would like to express my total support for this bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? *[interjection]* Oh, the honourable Member for Carman.

**Mr. Denis Rocan (Carman):** Mr. Speaker, the only reason I want to rise this afternoon to speak on this particular bill is to probably—I am not going to say correct the record—but the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), in his grandiose style, stands here before us and makes all sorts of quotes and comments about why this particular piece of legislation should be good to the average person.

Unfortunately, what he does not tell us, in the same document that he was quoting particular sections of, he does not make reference to the section where it hinders and hampers the farmers. *[interjection]* Oh, you were getting to that. The member says he was getting to that, but he does not realize, Mr. Speaker, that certain individuals who get up in the morning, and who get up before 7 a.m., find this bill not to their liking. But the member would not comment on that, no.

Only those individuals who work at a particular job from 8 till 5, or whatever, these are the

individuals that he was supporting. He did not tell us that. He does not tell us that chickens do not just change their clock internally, just for the fun of it, no. But it is in that same document, is it not? *[interjection]* I am not reading your notes, but I know how you think. These are the arguments.

We have certain individuals in the supply management industry, whether it is hogs, dairy, chickens, right—*[interjection]* I know I am right. These are the people that are affected by this particular piece of legislation, who take a dislike to it. Not all of us have the opportunity to go golfing whenever we feel like it and are looking for that extra time, no. That also was in that same document that he forgot to make reference to. So the only reason I am standing here now, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that, if you are going to comment on a particular piece of history that you think that you have that is beneficial to this discussion, all I say is that if you want to share it with us share it all. There are always two sides to an argument, sir. Not that we are against this, but all I am saying is there are certain individuals in the supply management industry that have a problem with this. They should have their voices heard.

I just want the record to show that there are certain people in the industry, whether it is the chicken or the dairy, they have a problem with this, because they just cannot turn the animals around for an hour. They still have to get up that much earlier. Sunrise is sunrise when it comes to a cow or it comes to a chicken. They really do not care. I mean, these are the individuals who live outside the Perimeter and who are having a lot of discussion about this particular piece of legislation, that this government has brought forward once again, in order to hamper rural Manitoba. I would not have said a word if the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) would have kept his remarks accurate to the piece of information that he was able to find.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I just close by saying, you know, we got to be open and honest with the people that we are here to represent. So, following that, thank you very much.

**Mr. Drew Caldwell (Brandon East):** As one of the members like the Member for Carman (Mr. Rocan) who lives outside the Perimeter, and those of this on this side of this House, there ain't nobody here but us chickens, I guess, after that one.

\* (16:00)

You know, this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is important to Manitobans; it is important to business in Manitoba. It is important to co-ordinate our time with the rest of this continent in terms of our friends and cousins south of us in the United States. I do not know of any cow or chicken that wears a wristwatch or pays attention to clocks and time, as devised by human beings, usually. Those of our fellow spirits in the animal kingdom that guide their lives by the rise and the fall of the sun, and guide their lives by the seasons—

**An Honourable Member:** They will adjust.

**Mr. Caldwell:** They will adjust, as my colleague from St. Vital suggests, who, incidentally, owns an animal who rises with the sun and goes asleep with the setting of the sun.

You know, this has been an interesting debate. It has been very entertaining to listen to in my office on the internal system, Mr. Speaker, but I just could not help rushing myself down to the Chamber, when I heard the Member for Carman get up to speak to this. To add a few words to the record, in support of having more daylight in Manitoba, which is

something that needs to be—some light needs to be shed on this subject. You know, a couple of years ago, I was very proud to be part of the Doer government when we extended summer. Today I am very proud to be part of the Doer government when we give more sunlight to Manitobans. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The question before the House is Bill 8, The Official Time Amendment Act.

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

\* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the will of the House to call it five o'clock?

**An Honourable Member:** Five o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 15, 2005

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<b>Petitions</b>		Charlie Mayer Maguire	378
Crocus Investment Fund Lamoureux	369	Cranberry Portage Jennissen	378
<b>Oral Questions</b>			
Devils Lake Diversion Murray; Doer Penner; Ashton	369 371		
Gaming Schuler; Smith	372		
Hog Processing Plant Mitchelson; Struthers Reimer; Rondeau Eichler; Wowchuk	373 373 374		
Water Protection Act Eichler; Wowchuk	375		
Mental Illness Gerrard; Oswald	375		
U-Haul Trucks Lamoureux; Lemieux	376		
Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Caldwell; Mackintosh	376		
<b>Members' Statements</b>			
National Philanthropy Day Rowat	377		
Philippines Study Tour of Manitoba Aglugub Lamoureux	377 378		
		<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY (Continued)</b>	
		<b>GOVERNMENT BUSINESS</b>	
		<b>Second Readings</b>	
		Bill 9—The Farm Practices Protection Amendment Act Wowchuk	379
		Nevakshonoff	379
		Lamoureux	384
		<b>Debate on Second Readings</b>	
		Bill 3—The Enforcement of Canadian Judgments Act Swan	386
		Bill 7—The Architects and Engineers Scope of Practice Dispute Settlement Act (Various Acts Amended) Cullen	388
		Dyck	388
		Bill 8—The Official Time Amendment Act Maguire	389
		Maloway	390
		Rocan	394
		Caldwell	394