



Second Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

38-39 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXVIII No. 142B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1990.



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIBERAL
ANGUS, John	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BURRELL, Parker	Swan River	PC
CARR, James	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CHARLES, Gwen	Selkirk	LIBERAL
CHEEMA, Gulzar	Kildonan	LIBERAL
CHORNOPYSKI, William	Burrows	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Emerson	PC
DRIEDGER, Herold L.	Niakwa	LIBERAL
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIBERAL
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Laurie E.	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Virden	PC
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Ellice	LIBERAL
HAMMOND, Gerrie, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HEMPHILL, Maureen	Logan	NDP
KOZAK, Richard J.	Transcona	LIBERAL
LAMOUREUX, Kevin M.	Inkster	LIBERAL
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANDRAKE, Ed	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MINENKO, Mark	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
OLESON, Charlotte, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PATTERSON, Allan	Radisson	LIBERAL
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Rhineland	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles	Springfield	LIBERAL
ROSE, Bob	St. Vital	LIBERAL
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
TAYLOR, Harold	Wolseley	LIBERAL
URUSKI, Bill	Interlake	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
YEO, J. Iva	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 12, 1990.

The House met at 8 p.m.

Mr. William Chornopyski (Deputy Speaker): On the proposed motion by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 99, The Appropriation Act—the Honourable Member for Gimli.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I have a change I would like to make, please. I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for the Monday evening, 8 p.m. session, be amended as follows: Penner for Findlay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

On the proposed motion by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 99, The Appropriation Act—the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Before the Honourable Member begins her remarks, could I make a committee change?

I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), that the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended: Storie for Plohman.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 99 THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 99, The Appropriation Act, 1989 (Loi de 1989 portant affectation de crédits). The Honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) has six minutes remaining.

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of the agreement with the Bill 104, I was discussing some of the matters, financial and otherwise, that are pertinent to my Department of Family Services, how they relate to the budget, and how they relate to the various groups in society that are funded by my department.

In the remaining very short time that is allocated to me for this speech, I would just like to touch on a couple of more items that pertain to my department, very vital parts of the department. One of those is the Child and Family Service Agencies that provide this service to children in the province, who are in the City of Winnipeg and some of the outlining areas, who are in need of protection from, in many cases, their own parents and others and the problems that are in connection with the financing of those agencies.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those agencies were set up, I believe in '85, the six in the City of Winnipeg, on a regional basis to better, it was felt at the time, address the needs of the communities and the needs of the families in those communities. It has evolved over time that they were set up, not with the realization of the increases in caseloads and in problems that they would encounter as the years went past.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

The funding has increased at a rapid rate to those agencies. The year '85-86 Budget, I believe, was \$21.2 million or \$21.3 million and today is over \$41 million allocated to the Child and Family Services area of the department. I do not mean just those six agencies, but the other agencies as well. That is almost a doubling in five years—well, four budgets, I guess—of funding to those particular organizations. Yet the constant problem seems to be that their caseloads exceed their funding. So as I had indicated last week, we have undertaken a program to get them better stabilized and better organized, shall we say, with the hope that we will not be in this deficit situation forever.

* (2005)

They have agreed to work with the Government and the department as partners in attempting to rationalize this system. Now, we know that the caseloads have increased rapidly. We know that the funds have not, over the years, kept up. If we had inherited the base that perhaps we should have, we would not be in the problem we are today with trying to keep those agencies afloat. We have indicated to them on many occasions that service to children is paramount. That is the purpose that they are there. That is the mandate they have to serve and that working together, we should be able to achieve that.

I know there has been some criticism of the way we have done this. Last year, we told them a very similar thing. We said, okay, we will fund your deficits, but only your actual deficits. Now, they projected deficits in excess of \$2 million. When we got to the final tally after actuals, we found with some measures taken by boards at the insistence of the department and at their own initiative the deficits were \$1.7 million. So it can be done, Mr. Speaker, it can be. By working closely with the department, we can achieve some sense out of this and we found—we did last year anyway—that their needs were not as great at the end of the year. This year we have set up a deficit relief fund that they can draw on with approved expenditures after the actuals have been tallied. So hopefully, working in this way, we will be able to better serve the children of Manitoba.

Also in the same directive that I gave them last week, we have set up a special needs fund, or a special circumstances fund, that will assist agencies that have cases of children who exceed the needs of that

established beyond Level 2, which is, I believe, \$81 a day. Now this will go to some measure to help those agencies because some of their cases that are really causing problems are the extremely high-need cases that go beyond that figure. We are telling them that anything above that figure the department will be asked to approve and then pay the bill. In that way we should be able to relieve them of some of those particular problems, but there is a lot of work to be done yet, Mr. Speaker, in that area. We know we do not have all the answers there. I do not think anybody has, but it is something we are working on with the agencies and hoping for their co-operation to resolve this.

We do not have endless sums of money to donate to any area of my department or any other, but we do want to work with people co-operatively because I think we all have the same goal in the long run. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, this matter will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson) and the Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray).

The Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey).

* (2010)

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise to put a few comments on the record.- (interjection)- The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) says to pass it. If it is the wish of the House to pass it, then I would be more than pleased to sit down and allow the House to pass this Bill. Is it the wish of the Opposition to have the Bill passed? I would be quite prepared to forgo my comments at this particular time.

The Opposition Members have elected to probably a worse treatment than passing the Bill by hearing me speak for some 40 minutes.

An Honourable Member: That is what I thought.

Mr. Downey: And, of course, immediately the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) concurs in that statement.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back to some two years ago, about two years and a few days ago, March 8 of two years ago. I know that that is not the happiest time for the Leader of the New Democratic Party because it was the beginning of the end for the Party provincially that has devastated the financial affairs of the Province of Manitoba. It would be unfair of me in my opening comments not to just recall, or not to recall that particular time some two years ago on March 8 when a man by the name of Jim Walding stood in his place at the right time and sat in his place at the right time, which, in fact, caused the defeat of the New Democratic Party Government and Howard Pawley.

Mr. Speaker, because it was truly an historic day for the Province of Manitoba and in no small measure because we had seen the Province of Manitoba devastated, devastated by mismanagement, devastated

by overexpenditures of the funds of the Province of Manitoba, whether it was within Crown corporations, Manitoba Telephone System, MTX, some \$27 million to Saudi Arabia, whether it was the mishandling of the automobile company, the Autopac and the Public Insurance Corporation which, in fact, was again another major nail in the coffin of the New Democratic Party when in the December, January period prior to the March of 1988, had in fact gone up by probably an average of some \$100 per vehicle.

When one looked into it further, not only did we see them experimenting and playing around in re-insurance of worldwide activities, but when one were to check closer to find out what happened through the Minister's office, we found that many of the records had been shredded by the Member for Gimli, who was the Minister responsible.

Mr. Speaker, so we have to think back to that particular period of time and really celebrate. We went from the position of Opposition, of which I think to a large degree we had put forward a reasonable alternative position and that we have made for the province some commitments that today have, to the majority, been lived up to.

The reason I raise that is because I believe the Liberal Party in the Manitoba Legislature as well have a responsibility to carry out their responsibilities just a little bit differently than they have. I say it with the greatest of kindness, because I am not here making a personal attack on any Member of the Liberal Party.- (interjection)- No, I would not do that, but I have to change my mind now I see the Member who just came in the Chamber. That may now force me to change the tempo of my speech to some degree.- (interjection)- I will tell you, he is not a rose, and it is for sure he is not a saint. I can tell you that. He is a flower of a different colour, I can tell you.

Mr. Speaker, let me use an example or two of what I am talking about, because in Opposition one has the opportunity to come forward and when things are good and right and should be supported, you support. When it is wrong, you put forward a legitimate opposition and case to that. If one were to do the research on the Leader of the Liberal Party and some of the speeches, although short as they were when in Opposition, one would see that particular individual speaking about how badly the New Democratic Party were misusing, spending and contributing to the massive deficits, the massive interest payments, just generally bad fiscal management on the part of the New Democratic Party.- (interjection)-

* (2015)

The Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) further supports my comments in saying that, yes, she was right. Mr. Speaker, then why is the Member for St. Vital not getting on the case of the Leader of his Party now, saying, carry on with what you were doing when you were in Opposition, but what has happened is now the Liberal Party are trying to replace or become the New Democratic Party of the Legislative Assembly when it comes to fiscal policy and fiscal management. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the policy of spend, spend, spend.

Monday, March 12, 1990

There has been, and again not too long ago the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), I guess several months ago now, listed the proposed expenditures of the Liberal Opposition, if they were to be in Government and/or carry on the fiscal responsibilities of the province. I believe at that time, Mr. Speaker, the number came to something like \$700 million in addition to what the current expenditure levels are of the province. That was last year.

Mr. Speaker, since that particular time, we now have to add an additional \$200-plus million to carry out what the Liberals say would be in the interest of the taxpayers of Manitoba. All the public would be doing would be replacing—if they were to vote for the Liberal Party, would be re-entering that era of socialist fiscal management which was no management at all. Every time there is an issue or a concern raised, they believe that you throw money at it. You do not assess it. You do not calculate the best way to proceed with the taxpayers' money, but you in fact solve the problem by again infusions of money, great gobs of money of which are taxpayers' dollars.

I want the warning to go out to the public, Mr. Speaker, that today's Liberals in the Manitoba Legislature, as it relates to fiscal policy and management, would be no different than the New Democratic philosophy, fiscal management and spending that we had for six and a half years that devastated the provincial revenues, which in fact put us into the depths of debt which probably will take many, many more years to recover.

Mr. Speaker, let me further enforce what I am saying as it relates to fiscal policy. We believe it is Government's responsibility to provide essential services to the people of Manitoba. Health, education and those items that we have come to expect Government to provide in the field of services, whether it is the social services budget in the foster children, the foster parents, whether it is the issue of day care, whether it is the issues that people feel that are on the social-side needs, we have responded and responded very responsibly and respectfully for those needs.

Mr. Speaker, even more important is the fact that we have been able to reduce the personal income tax for the taxpayers of Manitoba. We have been able to reduce the budgetary deficit for the people of Manitoba, which in turn reduces the interest charges which in fact we have to pay to the banks of Japan, to outside of this country. Probably as important as anything, which I want to take a minute or two to talk about, is the fact that we have been able to put in place a fiscal stabilization fund.— (interjection)— Well, here is the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) making the comment, a slush fund.

We have put aside, Mr. Speaker, when we had an abnormal year of funds come to the province. We have put in place a fund that can help bounce off a time in which we in fact see revenues drop and/or undue expenses that may incur but basically to cover off. It is obvious that a shortfall of revenues from the federal Government, a shortfall of revenues from other sources, are in fact very real. If we had taken the path, if we had had two years ago an election of a Liberal Government, we would have been nosediving again

into the depths of debt that no one would have been able to recover us from. We would have had an additional \$700 million, of which the Liberal Party said they had to spend in this province, added onto another \$200 million.

* (2020)

To further prove that is what they were going to do—and did not like our policies—they voted against — (interjection)— No, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) says a slush fund. We lower taxes for him and his family and his family's family and his constituents, even his father-in-law received a tax break, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember that the Liberal Party voted against tax cuts.

An Honourable Member: We voted against a reduced deficit.

Mr. Downey: It is on the record books, Mr. Speaker. It is in the Journals, Votes and Proceedings record what happens in this Legislature. I think we would be doing all the taxpayers a service by mailing each one of the taxpayers a copy of Votes and Proceedings, showing what the Liberal Party did when it came to voting for them.

Let us talk about the Stabilization Fund, because I heard from the Liberal Convention a few days ago that the big attack on our Government and our fiscal policy was we underspent some departments. I am sure there must be enough former Conservatives that went to the Liberal Caucus Benches to tell them, when you underspend a particular project and you have some money left over, you do not run out and try and spend it to get rid of it. You maybe put it away some place or use it for something else and reprioritize it, you just do not spend for the sake of spending.

Are there not enough former Conservatives over there that still have a little inkling about that, or did they throw all that away when they went into the Liberal bastion of—well, the Liberal bastion—

An Honourable Member: Is there a Liberal bastion?

Mr. Downey: So the point is, Mr. Speaker, why would the Members persist and continue to harp on the fact that we have underspent? If I remember correctly our health care spending was some eight percent above previous years; our education was not too far from that; our general administrative expenses were not anywhere near that, we kept them to something like a four percent increase to the lowest in all of Canada.

Well, you know —(interjection)— oh, I am pleased to hear that the Liberal Party is supporting Bill 105. I will leave that to the latter part of my speech. I will not be detracted from my comments as it relates to how I believe the taxpayers of Manitoba want to see, how the taxpayers of the province—

An Honourable Member: We will see how smart you are. You have not proven to be too smart in the past my friend.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, again, they seem to for some reason have something against a savings account, or they seem to have something against—if you do not have all your money spent—just not spending it and having it lapse at the end of the year and improve your position for the next year.

Mr. Speaker, who is the man that was so strongly opposed to the FOS or so strongly supportive of the FOS Bill and then all at once—I think it was the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). It was the Member for St. James who was going to repeal FOS. He was all for it. All at once, he started looking around in his caucus room and he stood alone. Everybody had peeled.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that that is what the public of Manitoba would like to see running the province, is somebody that on one day it is this way and the next day it is that way and the next day it is this way.

The bottom line is to have voted for a Liberal Party in the last election and to have put them in as Government would have been as disastrous, if not worse, than the previous New Democratic Party that some two years ago were turfed out by Jim Walding's knowing when to stand up and when to sit down. That, Mr. Speaker, I think has to be said and said over again.

* (2025)

The Liberal Party would have been no better fiscally than the previous New Democratic Party. We would have been still in a nose-dive because of the projected expenditures that they were telling the people of Manitoba that they would spend on behalf of them. So let them not escape the fact that—well, I guess one could take a look at some of the New Democratic membership that now make up the Liberal Party. That may well explain why.

An Honourable Member: We have Tories too.

Mr. Downey: Well, but some of your Tories came from some NDP roots too. I mean background. So it is just a current stopping point for some of them before the Reform looks like an opportune Party to go to, I am sure. Anyway, I just want to make the point again and make it again, that the Liberal Party's fiscal policies would be absolutely no different than the previous NDP spendthrifts that people of Manitoba said, no more, because of the way they handled the Crown corporations of Autopac, MTS, and all the other Crowns, whether it was the development of ManOil, and that—

The development of ManOil, remember what Howard Pawley said was going to do. It was going to build us hospital beds. It was going to give us the Medicare. It was going to do all those things that the society needed. Well, when we took office some two years ago, ManOil had already expended some \$12.5 million in capital expenditures and shares by the province and on top of that had lost some \$4 million in operating costs. So the province had contributed to ManOil some \$16

million, of which not one Manitoban asked for to be bought, established. So the first mandate of this province was to move responsibly and divest of it.

An Honourable Member: Howard wanted a hard-hat. That is why he started ManOil.

Mr. Downey: With the greatest of respect, I do not think he needed one.

An Honourable Member: Well, he is not here to defend himself.

Mr. Downey: That is right. Thank God, he is not. Mr. Speaker, let us look at a few other initiatives and there have been many. There have been many initiatives that the Government of this province has taken upon itself. Rather than to say that it is the total responsibility of the taxpayers of this province to create employment, to invest and do all of those things, we believe in a mixed, in a combination of activities to help generate the economic activities of the province. Let us be straightforward, after some six and a half years of the Pawley administration goodness knows we needed to give back to the private sector and the public the confidence to go ahead and invest. We needed to re-instill in the people's minds of this country that Manitoba is a good place to invest. Manitoba is a good place to do business and there is room for entrepreneurs in this province.

I am extremely proud and I stand here tonight and say it, and I will say again, of the activities of our Government, of our Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), in the divestiture of Manfor. Goodness sakes, Mr. Speaker, it has been a problem for the taxpayers for many years, ever since the NDP flowed the cash to turn it into a Crown corporation under Ed Schreyer. That had to be a problem that had to be dealt with. It has been a problem financially. It has been a problem environmentally.

* (2030)

We have proceeded to move responsibly to sell it based on sound environmental studies and impact work and opportunity for increasing the job opportunities of a tremendous magnitude, of cleaning up the current environmental problems that were there because it was not cleaned up under the previous administration and the Crown operating corporation. Probably more importantly of all and that is the fact of the employment creation commitment in the Swan River area, The Pas area, and all the related activities that will support surrounding communities, support our Native economic development activities that everyone is so anxious to see take place and as well improve the reforestation of that whole northern area of the province.

There have been some sound basic principles that have been established by our province and by our Government in the divestiture. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the records of the history books will clearly spell out that probably it was one of the single most positive things that we have done in our term of office as it relates to the taxpayers of this country.

Let me proceed again to another initiative which we have not heard near as much as we should have and that is the whole development, and I would say, the whole responsible development of the Manitoba Hydro activity dealing with the building of Conawapa and the sale of some 1,000 megawatts of power to Ontario. The famous or the infamous bridge builder from Dauphin who could not spend any money in the Dauphin constituency to help the medical or the health care needs of the people of Dauphin spent his priority and the taxpayers' money to build a bridge to nowhere north of Selkirk that did not have a road to it, did not have a plan to it, all it had was an expensive top and an expensive—well, I guess they referred to it as a tourist site for people to go to see. In fact, people used to sit on the bridge and watch the ice break up.—(interjection)—

The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) jokingly says, I am hoping jokingly, that I am against tourism. No, I am very much for tourism but I am not for spending \$30 million for the tourists to come and sit on in their lawn chairs to watch the ice go out of the Red River in the spring of the year. That is a little bit extraordinary.

Let us just deal for a few minutes with the Manitoba Hydro activities and the proposed Conawapa sale because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is far underrated what the impact of Conawapa and the Bipole III will have down the east side of Lake Winnipeg. I believe that the injection of \$5.5 billion over the next probably 10 years, the development of the Conawapa project and the Bipole line is the biggest investment probably that will take place in this decade within the province.

There is a basic difference between the development of the Conawapa project and Limestone. The Conawapa project was built on a sound business plan to sell the product to Ontario Hydro. We knew the price. We know that at the end of the period of the sale, Manitobans' hydro bills —(interjection)— The Member who stood up and pounded his chest about having the Frontier School Division a week ago, and now is telling us about getting something else, did not know very much about what was going on in his riding, did he? —(interjection)—

Well, that could be true. I think the Liberals can take the responsibility of killing the whole decentralization initiative which will help the whole process of redistribution of Government services closer to the people.— (interjection)—

I want to make it very clear to the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) that the Conawapa sale project was developed on a sound business principle of having a market for the hydro that was going to be produced, rather than producing the hydro and then running and looking for a market, and then having to sell it for less than what it cost to produce, and again the taxpayers of Manitoba having to carry the brunt of that mismanaged decision which was made by the Member for Dauphin and his collection of incompetents that were called the Government, Mr. Speaker. That is a better terminology than referring to the NDP as a Government. It was a collection of incompetents, who were misusing and abusing the taxpayers' funds of this province.

The sound principle of selling the hydro based on a profit and a return to Hydro, so the taxpayers and the

hydro users do not have to carry it, is the right one. As I understand it, by the year 2020, with Conawapa, the hydro bills of people of Manitoba will be 25 percent less than they would have been without Conawapa. It is very important for the people of Manitoba to clearly understand that.

An Honourable Member: Twenty-five per cent less, eh?

Mr. Downey: That is what I said, that by the year 2020—I am sure I am correct on that year—the hydro bills of the users of hydro will be 25 percent less than they would have been without the investment and the building of Conawapa and the sale to Ontario Hydro.

An Honourable Member: That is 30 years from now.

Mr. Downey: That is 30 years from now. Let us look at the record of the Howard Pawley, Ed Schreyer, what they did with our Hydro.— (interjection)— I plan to be standing right here in this particular place occupying this chair, the good Lord permitting, and the voters of Arthur still supporting me. That is my long-term plan, Mr. Speaker.— (interjection)—

Well, if I have to adjust to the right here, then I am quite prepared to, or miss a chair, and move somewhat to the left, but I do not plan to go to the other side. I think that is for the Liberal New Democratic philosophy to stay there for a long, long time. That is what should rename the two Opposition Parties, the Liberal New Democrats. Really, that is what it has turned out to be. Fiscally, on labour legislation, every time you turn around there is a —(interjection)— and now I must touch briefly on Bill 105, because it is only important that I do—

An Honourable Member: If you make him Leader, he would switch.

Mr. Downey: If I made who Leader, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman)?

An Honourable Member: You bet, NDPC Party.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Downey: I could make a comment, but I will not, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I respect individuals. I do not respect their politics, but I do respect individuals.—(interjection)—

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I am being threatened. I am sure we can work things out in that particular area, if the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) wants to sit down and deal with it rationally.

Let us just deal briefly with 105, because it seems for some reason that the Opposition Members are threatening, or promising, to do something greater than this. Why are they so upset? I think that this is a fair approach dealing with all MLAs—

An Honourable Member: Especially in an election year, right?

Mr. Downey: Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Dauphin says, especially in an election year. I believe

that the tradition of this province is a four-year mandate for the Party that is elected and governing. I work on the principle of four-year mandates. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Member for Dauphin knows something about an election that I do not—mind you, he will have the opportunity on this Bill or other money Bills, I guess, to vote against us with the Liberal New Democrats to in fact defeat us.— (interjection)—

Well, the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) laughs about the word “Liberal New Democrat”. I think for a lot of the—we could almost say Liberal New Democrat former Conservatives who have gone astray—we could make it a longer title, Liberal New Democrat former Conservatives who have gone astray, that is not a bad way of putting it.— (interjection)— No, we will call them Liberal New Democrats. I think Liberal New Democrat is a better terminology which currently fits the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), who is trying to finesse himself through the FOS mess he has created for his Party.

An Honourable Member: He has done very well.

Mr. Downey: The Member for Kildonan says he has done very well. Well, I think he is on his own for the last week or so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill 105, let us just deal with Bill 105 for a minute. I know it is not really the order of the speech that I am supposed to be giving, but I think it is a responsible way for all Members to deal with an area of cutting an expenditure that treats everyone in the Legislature equally. I think it is a clear indication of our commitment, as individuals, commitments—all of us—to deal with an expenditure that in fact can be dealt with.

* (2040)

I would hope the Liberal Party, the Liberal New Democratic Party and the old collection of incompetence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was the former Government of the province could in fact see their way fit to support this and show the taxpayers of Manitoba we are serious about, in a fair way, dealing with the expenditures of provincial taxpayers' money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will conclude my remarks if you give me an idea of just how much time there is left.— (interjection)— We have gone to the world of computers, it takes a long time now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. Downey: I thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker for that—

An Honourable Member: Must have been a couple of points of order.

Mr. Downey: I think I am being treated generously by the Deputy Speaker of the House. I started 32 minutes ago to be exact, and I did not need a calculator to figure that out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will conclude my remarks tonight by just further elaborating on how I think the

Province of Manitoba will proceed under sound business and sound financial planning, such as we have seen in the past two years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a commitment of ours, it is a commitment of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and our Government, to not increase personal income tax. I think that is a basic principle

An Honourable Member: Cut services.

Mr. Downey: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) says cut services. He is not correct. We have guaranteed services, we have increased health by 8 percent, we have increased the education by a generous amount, and we have kept our administrative expenditures averaging something like 4 percent. Those are the kinds of things that the Member for Kildonan votes against. I cannot believe it, being a responsible man who the people of the province put their lives in his hands as a doctor, and yet he turns around and votes against such responsible Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to again reiterate that I think the people of Manitoba want more of the same. They want more responsible Government, they want more cutting of taxes, they want more personal income tax reductions. They believe as we believe that the best place, the people who know best how to spend their money are the people who earn it themselves.

The Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureaux) says “hear, hear!” and acknowledges that, yet he and his Liberal-New Democratic Party vote against it. How can he honestly sit there and hold his face to the public when he says “hear, hear!” to the cutting of taxes and the putting away of a stabilization fund and the maintenance of essential services? He says “hear, hear!” and yet stands up and votes against it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, well, I know I have to help the Member, because he had a difficult time some two weeks ago on a Monday night and a very frustrating moment. He was not quite sure, but the biggest problem was he took the advice from the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) instead of the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema). The Member for Kildonan did have a little bit of an inkling that something was happening in here, but he was not quite sure what it was all about, and then when he realized it, he took the advice from the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) who is so mixed up he walked across the floor from Government to Opposition. My God, the objective is to go the other way, to get from Opposition to Government.

I cannot believe it yet. I mean, if the Member had only taken a minute, he would have had some valuable stock if he had at least stopped halfway and said, I will become an independent. Then he would have had some value to his constituency. Then he would have some value to either Party in the House, but he walked straight from Government to Opposition. That is a clear indication of how mixed up the Member for Springfield was. Why would he have walked from Government straight to the Opposition Party? Why did he not sit as an independent and make his stock worth something

Monday, March 12, 1990

to his constituency and to either Party, or the three Parties in the House—

An Honourable Member: And they are rewarding him by running somebody against him.

Mr. Downey: And they are rewarding him. Yes, they are rewarding him. He is being challenged in his nomination, so I cannot believe that he is the kind of outspoken person he is, yet he is so subdued to the fact that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) and the New Democrats are now challenging him in the riding in which he wants to run.

So his loyalties he did not find when he got there. The loyalties were very thin. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just would hope that the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer), I would hope that the Liberal New Democrats in the House would see fit to fairly and honestly, in a fair-handed manner, support Bill 105 to clearly indicate to the people of Manitoba that there is a responsibility and it cuts right across—(interjection)—The Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) says that he will make it better. I cannot believe that you could make a Bill better of that nature.—(interjection)—Well, there you go. That goes to show the political belief and the agenda of the NDP.

I would have hoped to have taken a few minutes on decentralization. I would like to have talked for a few minutes on decentralization, because I think that it is extremely important. It is an initiative that has been supported by all Parties in the Legislature. I understand that decentralization is a supportable action of Government.—(interjection)—The Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) says, it is how we do it.

Let me say it is not our intention to deal in any way, shape, or form that is not fair to the people who work for the province. We will go out of our way to treat individuals fairly, and if there are specific situations, where individuals come forward and clearly indicate a difficulty they have, their case will not be dragged through the newspaper and through the public. It will be dealt with in a confidential, fair manner, so that there is no personal difficulty that has to be shown through a newspaper story.

We hope to deal fairly, and will deal fairly, with any individual who demonstrates a hardship because of the decentralization action. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is an action which I would hope the positive comments would come from the Liberal-New Democratic Party, the Liberal-Democrats. The Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) kind of likes that. He feels back at home again when I use that Liberal-Democratic—the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) would say the same—

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we committed to give the people of Manitoba good Government. We have given them good Government, and we continue and plan to continue to give them responsible Government, something that I have not heard come from either the Liberal-New Democrats or the New Democrats or the former collection of incompetents that called themselves the Government as the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to have been able to speak to this important Bill. I

would hope that Members will now pass the Bill so that we can get on with the affairs of the province.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have some changes to make to the committees tomorrow.

I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations for the Tuesday, 10 a.m. Session, be amended as follows: Helwer for Oleson, and Downey for Praznik.

I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Private Bills for the Tuesday, 3 p.m. session, be amended as follows: Gilleshammer for Connery, and McCrae for Burrell.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As previously agreed, the debate on Bill No. 99 will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson) and the Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray).

* (2050)

BILL NO. 100—THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Act (Loi de 1989 portant affectation supplémentaire de crédits, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa, who has 10 minutes remaining. Stand?

Is there leave to have this Bill remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger)? Is there leave?

I would ask for a clear indication whether there is leave to have this Bill remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa. Is there leave? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe the Conservatives and the NDP have denied leave.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Leave. I mean I do not have any problem. I think we should pass it. I do not like wasting my time.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): I believe it is the desire of the House to pass Bill 100.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House—

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a pleasure that I rise and speak on Bill No. 100, The

Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1989. It is interesting to rise after the Member for Arthur-Virden, or Arthur, it is still called, it has not got a second name yet, it will soon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is strange indeed that this Government tries to make itself appear as a good manager, and yet we have the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), who introduces a Bill on day number 142, he introduces Bill No. 105. Then they have the gall to accuse the Opposition of being obstructionist.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Government and their House Leader had their act together, a lot of these Bills would have been introduced far earlier in the Session than they are now. There certainly has been a great amount of -(interjection)- What is that? The Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) said if we had ended the Session in November, we would not be introducing these Bills.

So is she saying they are introducing Bills just for the sake of keeping the session going? That is what she said. She just finished saying that if the Session had ended in November, we would not be introducing any more Bills. Therefore one can only assume that they have no real desire to end this Session and we know why. We know why, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are very, very concerned that once people have time to sit back, assess and digest what this Government has acted upon or rather not acted upon, or better yet as we saw the letter sent out to their membership and potential contributors recently what they would like to act upon, the so-called the famous phase 2 of this Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, well it got the attention of a lot of people. It points out that if you want to implement a phase 2 it is kind of like saying this is a two-phase Government and that is what the impression is out there. The fact remains and if this Government had a majority it might make Mr. Mulroney, Mr. Wilson look like pikers compared to them, that is the concern out there.

As I go out into my constituency there is a definite feeling of mistrust. People who voted for me the last two times despite my Leader, despite my Party at the time, have told me over and over again that they will find it far easier to support me this time than they have in the past. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the previous speaker, the Member for Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) alluded to Members of this caucus coming from various political backgrounds. He should have been at our convention and seen how many people formerly from the other two Parties were there.

The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) laughs, chuckles. It is a nervous chuckle I should add because, yes, he is going to get a kick all right. As soon as he has the courage to—well, I guess he will not have the courage to bring down this Government. He is going to keep on propping them up as long as he can because he is consistently at 20 percent in the polls. He will have the distinct honour of having brought the NDP from Government to oblivion in Manitoba. He has already brought them into third place and now he is going to reduce them further. At least he does not have

to worry about the effect to his leadership; that is for sure.- (interjection)-

When you are on a roll everybody wants to challenge your position. When a ship is sinking nobody is going to apply for the job of captain and I am afraid that the Member for Concordia is the captain of the Titanic right now.- (interjection)- That is right. No deals were made. At least, from time to time, he does make one honest comment. He has truthfully pointed out that there were no deals made. Now, what about the former Member for St. Vital, Mr. Jim Walding? Was there, or was there not a deal made there between him and the Conservatives? -(interjection)- The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) I am sure will want to get up after I am finished speaking and tell us about the deal that was made between his former colleague from St. Vital, former colleague, not the existing one, and his current colleagues from the Government Caucus, the NDPC Government or PCCF, whichever way you want to call it.

This Bill 100 provides supplementary funding to various departments. Included in one of them is an Environmental Innovations Fund. It is strange that, all of a sudden, because the environment has become fashionable, this Government which I am not exactly sure is that sincere in its concern about the environment, nevertheless are bringing forth various kinds of environmental legislation. Yet there is one Private Member's Bill on the Order Paper, Bill No. 10, which I introduced back last year, I believe it was May 29 or thereabouts. It is currently standing in the name of the Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mrs. Mitchelson) and has been standing in her name for quite some time.

They accuse the Opposition of obstructing this Government, of standing their legislation, yet when it came time and the Estimates process is over and it came time to deal with Bills, prior to that famous evening when they had their joint caucus, there was not one solitary Government Bill standing in a Liberal Members' name. Yet if one looks at the Order Paper, the Private Members' Bills, with possibly the exception of two or thereabouts, are all standing in the names of Government Members. They seem to be taking the attitude that if a Bill is introduced by a Private Member, it is of little or no significance. I mean, they have this arrogant attitude, but only 24 seats. Can you imagine what the attitude would be like with a majority? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest to you and to Members in this House that they would be impossible.

* (2100)

Bill 10, I would have been pleased if they had taken it, which is entitled The Beverage Container Act, and then according to their Environmental Innovations Fund or one of their other various environmental Bills that have come forth because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not a philosophical partisan Bill. It is a Bill which actually comes quite close to the legislation which was passed in Alberta several years ago by the then Government of one Peter Loughheed. It is an environmental initiative which was taken, apart from Alberta, in British Columbia by the Social Credit Government, not exactly a left wing Government, and by various American states.

In my opinion, I think it could have been easily done by (a) passing it as presented, or if they felt it needed some amendments, they could have amended or else incorporated it along with their own environmental Bills. I would have been pleased. They did that with one of my other Bills. They did that with one of the Bills from the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo). They have done that with others, and we do not mind. We do not mind at all because the purpose of introducing legislation, Bills, amendments, is to hopefully—I believe that is a feeling on all sides of the House—improve the lot of Manitobans.

What we see in this current Bill, Bill 100, is \$500,000 as Environmental Innovations Fund. When it comes to giving an incentive to people to recycle, there is little done in any of their other Bills. Yet it has been proven in other jurisdictions, for example, you take the Government's own Liquor Control Commission, they put in an environmental tax. Well, all that does to the consumer, it becomes part of the overall price. For the Government, for accounting purposes, yes, it goes in a segregated fund to be used for certain environmental initiatives. But you put something in that price, a refundable deposit which is currently in place for other types of containers, it provides an incentive for people to return, to recycle.

Now, some people have said, those solid substances, such as beverage containers, are only one portion of the overall problem of litter of the environment. One of the greatest offenders, I suppose, is newspapers, magazines, which I think steps are being taken right now to recycle. It is voluntary, and I think with everyone becoming more conscious of the environment, it is happening. Therefore, I cannot understand why this particular Bill, Bill No. 10, has not become part of this environmental innovations fund, and maybe it will be, hopefully it will be, or part of other legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, everyone knows there needs to be rules and regulations for society to operate properly, but wherever possible, it is far, far better, and I say it again, to use the carrot rather than the stick approach. The stick should only be used as a last resort. In this case, I believe a refundable deposit is far better than an additional tax on the people.

I was going to tell the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) if he had further comments he could say them later, but he has spoken already, although, with leave, anything is possible in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member has approximately 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is kind of strange at this late date we are here debating the Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1989. With proper management on the Government side, we would not be in Session yet. With proper negotiation, with proper consultation, there would not even be a need to have passed two interim Appropriation Acts and now this one, all the money spent already, or virtually all of it, for all practical purposes.

It is kind of strange that we have to be in Session this long. Despite accusations of obstructionism, the fact is that a lot of major pieces of legislation introduced by this Government were introduced in the very latter part of what they thought would be the end of the Session. They introduced Bill 79, The Municipal Consequential Amendments Act, for example, in late November, and they wanted it passed before Christmas. It could not be done. One of the most important pieces of legislation to have been introduced in the last several years, and they want it passed at the last minute. I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but even in a majority situation that should not happen, much less a minority situation. There have been various items introduced at the last minute, and then Members of Government come crying, come on, let us pass this through committee, let us get on with the business of Government. No, no. We say, wait a minute here. We want to study this Bill.

It is kind of strange, today, to introduce a Bill to reduce the resources of Opposition Members - (interjection)- No, no, not Government Members. We will look after that if you have seen the resources of Government Members. We have to be consistent in this House. We will be consistent and that is fine.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government, if it continues to be introducing Bills the last minute and decides we have even less resources in which to do our research and study, that will take that much longer for individual and Private Members to study these Bills, do the proper research, while trying to maintain and provide proper constituency services especially for rural Members. It becomes kind of strange too that a Government dominated by rural Members would think of cutting back services to their constituents. It is very strange, very strange.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, had this Government introduced a law that made this legislation back in May and June, we would have had a chance over the summer, especially in the case of Bill 79, to have committees gone throughout the province rather than just in this building here in Winnipeg. They certainly are not decentralizing the committee meetings here, that is for sure. But, no, they forced the Opposition to debate these various Bills of which 95 percent, possibly more, the funds have been spent now, late into the year. As a matter of fact, we are virtually at the end of fiscal year. With proper management on the Government side, we could have had—I am sorry, I was being waved at by Government Members and I have lost my train of thought here.

* (2110)

The fact is the Government could have at least attempted to get us back on a normal cycle. I mean, last year, the previous Session finish in December of '88, it would have been ample time with co-operation, which was offered by the Liberal Opposition and I believe the New Democratic Opposition too, for the Government that came back into this House with a Speech from the Throne and a budget in early 1989; it could have been done probably late March, early April.

They chose, not us, they chose a late May date so that by the time we got through the debate and the

Monday, March 12, 1990

Speech from the Throne and the debate on the budget itself, we went to our summer recess, which had been previously agreed to. Then they started introducing all their major Bills in the fall. Then we had to go through the Estimates process at the same time. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is the height of arrogance, especially in a minority situation, to introduce Bills at a very late date and expect Members to willy-nilly pass them all to committee without even trying to find out what the Bill is about. That takes time and takes resources. The less time and resources we have, the less likely Bills will go on to committee and, indeed, get passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that if a Government were really, really serious, and if the third Party were truly serious about the workers, they would not be supporting a Conservative Government. Despite the fact that I represent a rural riding, because of the fact that I border Winnipeg on the west end and Ontario at the east end, the majority of my constituents are approximately an hour's drive from the City of Winnipeg. The bulk of those people are working people. Although I have a significant amount of farmers— (interjections)-

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order please. The Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) has a difficult time concentrating on what he wants to say. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there seems to be an interesting debate going on in the third Party benches. They seem to be putting all their marbles in one basket, but no one wants to play the game with them. I see the various Members—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would ask the Honourable Members who want to carry on another meeting to do it outside the Chamber, please. The Honourable Member for Springfield has the floor.

Mr. Roch: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) continues to interrupt. It appears that the Members of the third Party are very, very concerned about the fact that, despite all the games they play, the most recent polls show that there has been no increase in the areas which they used to hold.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the Members who are having private conversations would mind going in the loge which is provided for it. Now that I have been disturbed by the Members opposite, I have lost my train of thought. I might have to repeat some of my earlier comments, for the benefit of those who did not hear it. I see there are no translators, so I will continue in English.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are running currently ads on radio saying, not paid for with your tax dollars. Now these are going to run for three weeks. But we are dealing here with a Bill which is spending our tax dollars.— (interjection)- It is okay. It is very difficult to speak in this Chamber when several Members are carrying on conversations out loud and privately. There

seems to be a little bit of worry on the stand they have taken on various Bills and their support remains stagnant at 20 percent, 19 percent in the polls, but anyway, I will try to keep to the Bill here.

One would think that the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) would get up and call some of his colleagues to order here, but it is typical of the mismanagement of this House and the mismanagement of this Government, and I believe the mismanagement of the economy, which is why we are approving Bill 100 at the eleventh hour almost, just in the, one could say, nick of time for the fiscal year end. Because we are looking at a substantial amount of money here on this particular Bill.

You know, a lot of people will say, they sit in their place and they say, pass, pass, pass. We are looking at a Bill that has a total amount of sums of \$69,250,000, and they want this passed in a matter of minutes. They introduced it, when? Just a few days ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We have in here \$1 million for Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation. We have in here \$700,000 for Education Tax Reduction Program for Farmers. That is a total of \$1,700,000 for agriculture alone. There is an amount of \$650,000 for Corporate Affairs. There is an amount of \$49 million for Regional Services to the Natural Resources Department. We have \$17,400,000 for Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures and, of course, the one I was referring to a while ago, \$500,000 for the Environmental Innovations Fund.

It is interesting to see the one about flood control. I may digress from the Bill a little bit. On my way back from Altona today, I must say it was raining heavily and I must say, as I was out there with my colleague, the Member for Rhineland (Mr. Penner), opening their new civic centre and library, we were standing in the rain for the ribbon-cutting. There were a lot of smiles. It was nice for a change to be driving down the highways of southern Manitoba, to see water in the ditches. Hopefully it will not go to a need for this item on flood control, but, by golly, it was certainly a nice change and I hope that in the Member for Arthur's (Mr. Downey) riding, the same is happening right now. It would be a welcome relief. As I said, I think I have digressed from the problems of the Bill a little bit, but I think that it is a happy situation in Manitoba and hopefully it will be pouring for a few more days. I know that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, being originally on the land yourself, can appreciate the seriousness of the situation in rural Manitoba.

It brings to mind comments that were made a while ago, which we do not see reflected in this section on agriculture, that were made publicly by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) about monies the federal Government was going to provide to the provincial Government for this very drought relief.

As a matter of fact, I have a situation in my riding of cases, and I do not have the documentation in front of me, unfortunately, but several cases in my riding where applications were made, especially people on river lots where some were approved, some were not, all in the same area. Some crops were, some crops were not.

Monday, March 12, 1990

You phoned Ottawa, because you could not get through the 800 number. The bureaucrats in Ottawa did not know what a river lot was. Some of them thought because a person was on a river lot, that there had been no drop, they had access to water. They had absolutely no understanding of the river lot system. All they understood was paper and pens, and whatever.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am investigating the matter right now, trying to find out what the yields were for the various crops in the various areas, and I hope that there was no politics involved. There is no doubt I will get to the bottom of it, and we will find out. But the fact still remains that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) did say that his federal Conservative colleagues in Ottawa had promised substantial sums of money to help the farmers of rural Manitoba get through the severe drought we have had. He was telling them specifically that the dollars his department had spent on forest fighting. He said none of those monies had come. They had reneged on it. When we in the Opposition attempted to question him on it, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) kept getting up, cutting him off at the knees, which is unfortunate because that is certainly not the way that particular Minister has been since I have known him.

* (2120)

It is unfortunate that when a person goes public on radio, tells the truth, and is, for whatever reasons, gagged on it. The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) is an Honourable Member, and he would not have made those statements had they not been true. It is unfortunate that the First Minister has once again chosen to defend his federal Conservative colleagues as opposed to defending the interests of Manitobans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is possible, just possible, that if this federation actually worked like a federation, and there were all the monies sent to Manitoba from the federal Government that we were supposed to get as a have-not province, as opposed to the cutbacks that the federal Conservative Minister of Finance has imposed upon us, that we may not be a have-not province.

We have at times it seems enough strikes against us. Some of them are natural, some of them are artificial. The natural ones, we can either try to overcome them by using them to our advantage vis-a-vis tourism; the artificial ones, we have to stand up and fight against them. I can cite various ones. We are all familiar with the CF-18 debacle. But the most recent one that can happen, yet another potential CF-18, is the centre for sustainable development, which was announced by the federal Leader of that Party in New York, saying that it would come to Winnipeg. I believe that was back in September of 1988. We have yet to hear of it, see anything practical, something that we can touch, feel, something tangible, to come out of this yet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the disease-control lab, another promise made to Winnipeg, to Manitoba. Again, they tried to use city council as a scapegoat for not doing it, but when City Council, after the most recent elections, decided that they would want to have it in the

appropriate place that they so chose, then they said, okay, we will do it, but then again we have not heard anything about it since then.

So no wonder the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) gets upset and seems to be very, very cynical of his federal Conservative colleagues because he is not getting the funds—when I say he, I am talking about Manitoba as well—are not getting the funds which were publicly promised by the federal Conservative Leader of this Party.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a lot more to all this than meets the eye. I believe that because the First Minister's (Mr. Filmon) commitment to the federal First Minister of bringing in the Meech Lake Accord in 1988 did not happen, he is trying to punish all Manitobans. And then part of the reason no doubt that was pulled back is because after the federal election of 1988, which the third Party again did not win seats in Quebec, they decided in Manitoba to withdraw the support from the Meech Lake Accord even though they had initially told the Government they would support them.

Now, I never agreed with that decision. In the last election campaign, I spoke out. As a matter of fact, had the previous Government survived and the current Leader—as a matter of fact, every single Member of the New Democratic Party presently in this House today were going to support that accord. At that time, the Conservative Opposition was going to propose amendments to it, was not going to support it.

Although the Government fell quite fast and there was no time for the Party to hold a conference and hammer out a platform on it, I personally could not support it. Several of my colleagues at the time could not support it. The Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) was quite clear and public in her disapproval of it. I went into the election campaign telling people that I would not support it and said so publicly at every all-candidates meeting that I attended.

Then, all of a sudden, once in Government, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) and his colleagues decided they wanted to pass it—and they balked, publicly said so. They would not support it. I wanted a free vote, but they would have none of it. Finally, I decided I could handle it no more. I said, I will go with the people who are ready to stand up for Manitobans. It was only in the latter part of 1988, when the New Democratic Party started having cold feet on that issue and their constituents started phoning in and writing in—they started getting cold feet too—after the First Minister introduced the resolution, and made glowing remarks as to why it should be passed, that he came to the Opposition on his knees almost on the following Monday, asking for permission to withdraw it. Heck, we had no problem with that; we never wanted it introduced in the first place.

Thank you. Mr. Deputy Speaker, my colleague indicates to me that it is no sense talking about the New Democratic Party because again, as usual, none of their Members are present in the House. Oh, I am sorry, apparently it is not in the Rules to state that there are no New Democratic Party Members present

Monday, March 12, 1990

in the House. Therefore I will not state—I withdraw the fact that I stated there are no New Democratic Party Members present in the House, as usual. Mr. Deputy Speaker, might I ask how much time I have remaining.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member has two minutes remaining.

Mr. Roch: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to indicate, in closing, that we sincerely hope that in these last few days, in order to get the business of the House through, that the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) and his colleagues will—whoops, I believe there has been a coup d'etat on the Government side. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have dethroned the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

The Government House Leader -(interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, it appears that the Session could be winding up sometime this month, depending upon how much co-operation the Government gives to the Opposition and vice versa, I suppose. But I would sincerely hope that they learn from their experiences of this Session, that in the future they realize that with a little bit of consultation, with a little bit of negotiation, co-operation, which is needed in a majority situation, never mind a minority situation, they will get their act together, introduce Bills at their proper time.

* (2130)

Hopefully we can get back to the normal cycle and we do not have to be dealing with a Bill, such as Bill 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1989, at

the eleventh hour—substantial amounts of money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which are needed for the Government to carry out their business, items which should and could have been approved several months from now.

Having made these comments, I would look—given the fact that it is an important Bill, dealing with substantial sums of money—I look forward to hearing more comments from Members of the Government, I believe on this very important and very substantial Bill -(interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are certainly several Members of the Government who have not yet spoken on this Bill, and Members of the third Party, and I would suspect, I would hope that they are now willing to give this proper debate once I have concluded my remarks. Thank you for your time and indulgence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if it would be the consensus of the House to call it ten o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it now ten o'clock? (Agreed) Before the House adjourns, I would ask for a clear indication whether there is leave to have Bill 99 remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) and the Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray). Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

The hour being 10 p.m., this House is now adjourned and remains adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).