

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, October 13, 1989.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): On behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), I would like to table this morning the Supplementary Estimates '88-89 for the Manitoba Department of Urban Affairs.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Manitoba Child Care Association Meeting Request

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, the child care workers are walking out on Tuesday. An overwhelming 84 percent support the walkout. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) has consistently refused to discuss the issue with the Manitoba Child Care Association because he states he will not act under duress.

Will the Premier now agree to meet with the Manitoba Child Care Association on Wednesday, October 18 in order to prevent further walkouts and disruptions to children and parents?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, to begin with, let us understand that we have always maintained a strong commitment to the improvement of the child care system in Manitoba. We have committed over the last two budgets, in the space of 17 months, 13 million additional dollars, a 45 percent increase to funding to day care.

The fact of the matter is we have also set up a working group, not only an advisory committee, but working together with the Human Services Committee of Cabinet with an ongoing dialogue to set in place targets and long-term issues that will resolve all the many problems that exist in funding for day care, including salaries to workers. Under all those circumstances we have shown a very co-operative attitude, a willingness to sit down and resolve those problems.

What we have said is, here we have MCCA wanting to jump the line and put their issues ahead of every other issue in the day care community, and under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, what we have said is that we want to have a long-term solution, we are willing to work at it, and we are willing to put money but we are not willing to do it under a threat of strike. That is not the way to resolve this issue and I will not sit down with them personally. I will certainly sit down with the continuing dialogue between the Child Care Advisory Committee, which includes MCCA and the Human Services Committee of Cabinet, and work out a long-term resolution.

Day Care Walkout Premier's Intervention

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): We must assume that even after the voluntary walkout, the Premier has no intentions of meeting with the child care community. Mr. Speaker, the Premier chose to intervene in the foster parent crisis. Can the Premier tell us why he will not intervene in the Manitoba child care crisis?

* (1005)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I am glad that the Member for Ellice has asked that question, because clearly the foster care situation provides us a good parallel. Under the foster care situation I did not meet personally with them to resolve the issue. I had them sit down with a committee of Cabinet and together we worked out a long-term resolution that did not involve us injecting money immediately, but rather putting together a plan whereby additional monies would be provided over a period of time to resolve the problems outstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I might say to you that when we came into Government and we inherited a budget that had not provided for substantial increases to the foster care people, we sat down with them because we recognized immediately that there was a serious inequity built up over many years. We sat down under those circumstances and we said we will work this out for you.

This is not the case here. We took child care as a major priority. We injected 45 percent additional money, \$13 million over less than 17 months. That was not the case with foster care, so we recognized that and we set out a long-term plan with them. I did not meet personally, but I met as part of a Cabinet committee. That is the process we are recommending today to the MCCA, and they are rejecting it.

Day Care Workers Salary Negotiations

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, yes, the analysis of the Foster Parents Association is a good one because this Government agreed to put money into the system and agreed to a long-term plan. I ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) today, will the Premier put on the record, are you committed to moving towards a long-term plan, and are you committed to increasing the salaries of the child care workers as the pay equity study recommends? You have not told the Child Care Association that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is a small matter to the Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray), but everybody else has to obey the rules around here, and you address your comments through the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) now finally understands the process that we have been proposing for weeks, that we sit down as a Cabinet committee with the Child Care Advisory Committee which includes several Members from MCCA, and we come up with a long-term plan to address all of the problems and challenges in day care, including the salaries to workers. That is exactly what we have been proposing for more than two weeks. MCCA has rejected that, saying no, we do not want that process, we want to strike or else we want a personal meeting with you and us and nobody else involved, and that will not solve all the long-term issues of the child care community in Manitoba.

Budget Guarantees

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Ellice, with a new question.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, the Premier is saying that he is willing to move towards a long-term plan, yet his Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) publicly admitted on television that she cannot even guarantee that next year's salaries will even meet the rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker: And the question is?

Ms. Gray: My question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is: can he indicate to this House today why he is paying lip-service and saying that he believes in the long-term plan, when his Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) has specifically said that she cannot guarantee anything for next year's budget?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) has never been in Government. I know that she has never been involved in managing anything, but surely she can understand that the Minister does not act alone. She gets her authority from the Cabinet committee that has been set up to deal with this, to establish a long-term plan, to establish targets, meaningful commitments on the part of this Government. But she could not go and make guarantees of those sorts of things without first having established the plan. That is exactly what she is trying to say, and the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) just simply will not understand.

* (1010)

Funding Formula Amendments

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, only 4.7 percent of the dollars are actually going to the child care centres. This is why they are not able to increase the salaries of their staff. The Premier has admitted—my question to the Premier is: can the Premier indicate in this House today why he has failed to correct a faulty funding formula, which he has publicly admitted because he has said that the salaries are not getting to the child care workers. He has had two budgets to do it. Why has he not corrected that which would have averted this crisis?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Again I thank the Member for Ellice for giving me the opportunity to give her some information that I hope she will understand. Yes, the centre has gotten a 4.7 percent increase in their overall funding plus the salary enhancement grant increases, Mr. Speaker, plus additional funding that they continue to get from other grants. That is the issue that she does not understand.

Second, why we have not corrected the funding formula is that part of it involves legislative change and part of it involves the fact that the day care community itself is not unified as to what changes have to be made in order to ensure that there is adequate funding on a long-term basis. That is why we set up the Child Care Advisory Committee with representation from all of the child care community, including several members from MCCA. That is why we are working to the long-term plan. I wish that she would try and be a positive, constructive part of the solution of this problem.

Day Care Revenue Decrease

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, the revenues of the child care centres are steadily decreasing each year. Can the Premier of this province indicate why he has not addressed that problem? The revenues are decreasing. They cannot afford to pay their staff. Can he indicate to us why he has not addressed that problem?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I just invite you and all Members to read Hansard to see how ridiculous she is now becoming. Just one question ago, she acknowledged that the revenues were going up 4.7 percent. Now in the next question, she says they are going down, Mr. Speaker.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Filmon: If MCCA is getting their advice from that Member, I can understand why we have a problem, Mr. Speaker. She is totally confused. She does not understand what funding is being given. We have increased funding 45 percent—13 million additional dollars in two budgets over 17 months and we have increased funding to day care. She acknowledged it in the last question. She has now changed her mind. I think that the Member for Ellice ought to sit down and let somebody else ask some legitimate questions because she is totally confused.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Child Care Task Force Recommendations

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Government over a year ago created the Child Care Advisory Task Force. It had a number of excellent recommendations in it and it did represent to some degree a consensus on the major issue and dispute in the public today. That is the issue of child care salaries. The Minister took those recommendations and presented them to Cabinet, and Cabinet rejected the recommendations to implement the MANSIS recommendations on salaries.

Can the Premier tell the province today why the consensus position on child care salaries was rejected by him and his Government leading to this confrontation today?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the Child Care Task Force did put in a recommendation that day care salaries be increased. It did not say that they be increased in one jump overnight. We immediately proceeded to ensure that there were increases put in, 4.7 percent in the overall funding to centres, plus the additional increase in the salary enhancement grants. Those salary enhancement grants, under two budgets and in 17 months under our Government, have been increased by some 35 percent. We are committed to reach the targets that have been set out in the report and all we need to do of course is set in place a plan over an acceptable period of time in order to achieve that.

Average salaries for trained day care workers, according to the latest information available from our department, are at the present time at \$18,000.00. We know that is not enough and we have to move towards the increase of the targets that have been set for us. We have said we are committed to do that over a long-term process with a plan that we are going to be putting in place in consultation with the entire community. I think that is a very acceptable way of moving and I would hope that the MCCA will join us in that process.

* (1015)

Manitoba Child Care Association Meeting Request

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Advisory Task Force came in with a long-term recommendation, the Minister came into the Cabinet with a long-term recommendation and you have rejected this position, Mr. Speaker. Now we are on the course unfortunately, in this province, of confrontation because you had set up the task force, you had raised the expectations. We had put the issue on the table and you have totally fumbled the issue and have declared war on the child care community.

My question to the Premier is: in light of the vote yesterday and in light of the confrontation that is pending this Tuesday, why would the Premier not now agree to take the high road and meet with the child care community before the Tuesday demonstration and

before the turmoil that is going to be caused across this province in this confrontation with the Government and the child care community?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have already taken the high road. I have already met with the child care community. I met with the advisory committee, which includes several members from MCCA, for more than an hour last week.

In that period of time we laid out our plans and our commitment to a long-term program to address all of the issues, including salaries. We took that position, and I have said further that if the MCCA also wants to meet on an individual basis with myself and the Minister, because they do not want to just deal through the advisory committee, I will do that as well provided they remove their threat of strike, Mr. Speaker.

When the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) talks about causing conflict with the child care community, it is he and his Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) who are going out there every day whipping up and agitating a strike. They are the ones who are causing the conflict with the child care community.

Day Care Walkout Conciliator

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): We are finding out how totally out of touch this Premier has become. The Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) yesterday placed a very, very excellent recommendation before the Government, one of the third recommendations to de-escalate this issue, to deal with this issue intelligently instead of declaring war on the child care community.

The Member for St. Johns yesterday proposed, why not appoint a conciliator acceptable to both sides to look at the salary discrepancy, to look at the task force report, to develop the long-term plan that is lacking. The Member for St. Johns proposed that yesterday in this House.

Would the Premier now give us a definitive position on a conciliator, somebody like Jack London who co-chaired the national task force, somebody like Wally Fox-Decent, somebody who is acceptable to both sides to resolve this, instead of a war with the child care community?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): What the Member wants to do is to remove one element out of a long-term plan for funding for a better funding model, for a better funding mechanism over the long term for day care, because we are going to have these problems year after year after year if we deal with only certain elements on an isolated basis.

The only way is to remove this kind of ad hoc thinking that the NDP used to put in place an inadequate model, an inadequate system. It was their system that is failing today. We want to correct it on a long-term basis.

We not only have set in place the mechanism whereby we can work with all elements of the child care

community, we actually agreed at that first meeting to put together a small working group that would come together to look at the outstanding crucial issues and give us some recommendations for the next budget cycle. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to do anything reasonable, but the child care association, the MCCA, only wants to deal with threats, and we will not deal with those threats.

Mr. Doer: Any independent study of the child care system that we left this Government was the best in North America. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) knows that.

An Honourable Member: Not the funding.

Mr. Doer: The Premier keeps talking from his seat about the funding. Let the record show that the budget that was defeated had a higher funding for child care than the budget the Tories came in with, but that does not solve any problems. That does not solve the problems of the floating subsidies.

Day Care Long Range Planning

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is: he has rejected the advisory task force recommendation on salaries, he has rejected the meeting prior to this demonstration taking place, he has rejected the idea of a conciliator. How does he propose to solve in a long-term way the salary confrontation between the child care community and his Government. Rather than leaving this situation in a war setting, why does he not have a peace solution to this problem in our child care community?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, No. 1, the Member for Concordia is wrong. We have accepted the Child Care Task Force's report, and we have said we will implement the recommendations over a reasonable period of time.

* (1020)

Number two, I have accepted the offer for them to meet on the condition that they remove their threat of strike.

Number three, we have also said that we are going to address the long-term planning by virtue of the mechanism that we have put in place that includes an operating working group that will come up with recommendations for the next budget and beyond as to how we address the critical issues, while at the same time putting in place a long-term plan to resolve all of the outstanding problems that the child care community faces.

Aids Prevention Programs Needle Exchange Program Funding

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). AIDS is rapidly growing. The prevention of AIDS is a

very complex issue and must be attacked from all angles. The federal Minister of Health recently made available \$50,000 to each province to fund a needle exchange comprehensive program.

Can the Minister of Health tell this House what step he has taken to access this special fund and save lives in Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in further discussions with the federal ministry and the federal Department of Health, that offer was not narrowly provided for a needle exchange program as my honourable friend is wanting to lead us to believe.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, this Minister even does not listen to the questions properly. I said the company has a needle exchange program. He should answer my question. If he does not want, a simple question, is he going to access this fund or not?

Mr. Orchard: As I indicated, the initial reporting of the concept of participation with the provinces was narrowly focused and left the impression that needle exchange was the only outreach program to be funded with the federal Government. That is not the case, and we are exploring appropriate joint venture funding on AIDS outreach with the federal Government at this time.

Outreach Workers

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): This Minister's record on AIDS is very disappointing, nine months for a brochure, one year for a campaign. Mr. Speaker, that speaks the truth. Can he tell us now when he is going to fund these three worker positions, to reach the kids who are at greater risk of falling victim of AIDS?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): My honourable friend the Liberal Health critic is somewhat confused today. When the ad campaign came out, my honourable friend the Liberal Health Critic, and I presume he was speaking on behalf of his Party, said that the television advertising, the radio advertising, the brochures, the pamphlets, were excellent and he welcomed them. Now today he is saying that we do nothing. The man is confused, Mr. Speaker. I regret that he does not want to work with this Government in dealing with the most serious problem of AIDS.

We have done it in a progressive fashion. Our advertising, our television message is one of the most direct and forthright in Canada. It received acclaim in Winnipeg by the Canadian Public Health Association annual meeting. Representatives all across Canada said that it was one of the most progressive pieces of public information and most direct information pieces of public information available in Canada.

At one time, my honourable friend of the Liberal Party agreed with it.

Bill No. 37 Minister's Support

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): On June 2 of this year, the courts ruled that off-reserve lands owned by tribal

councils are no longer subject to property taxation. Since that ruling came down, municipal bodies and organizations, most of whom are almost exclusively dependent upon property taxation for revenue, have expressed their concern to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) about the potential ramifications of this ruling.

My question to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) is: given the fact that he has refused to deal with this issue and has continually tossed the issue into the Opposition's lap, will he tell this House today whether or not he will support Bill No. 37, a question he refused to answer in Estimates yesterday?

* (1025)

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): The Honourable Member for Springfield raises a very interesting point, that 2(2)(b) was a ruling that we are going to have to address. The communities, specifically in rural Manitoba, are concerned about the ruling on 2(2)(b) in the case of the Keewatin Tribal Council versus Thompson.

It is important to recognize that if and when a Government is in a situation like we are, in a minority position, when an important issue such as this comes before this Legislature and is brought to my office, I consult with the Opposition Parties and ask for co-operation in dealing with an issue such as this.

I have met with numerous communities. I have indicated to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) that I am willing to sit down with any organization and discuss this matter with them, and how to come to a resolve on this.

I had indicated last June to both Parties opposite in writing, questioning and asking them to support a change in the legislation that would resolve this issue. I have yet to officially hear a response from the Liberal Party indicating that they will support it. Instead, Mr. Speaker—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Tax Exemptions Legislation

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the facts are that we met with the Minister on two occasions that he requested. Two other occasions he requested, the Minister himself did not show up. It is incumbent upon—the Minister did not show up at meetings that he requested.

Mr. Speaker: Order—and the question is?

Mr. Roch: It is incumbent. My question to the Minister is: given the fact that he is the Minister responsible, it is incumbent upon Ministers of this Government to bring forth legislation, not to just ask for written proposals from Opposition before they initiate anything.

Why did he not, given the fact that several municipalities are writing in support, many letters of which he has copies of, why is he—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) that he should pose his question through the Chair. The Chair has not heard your question.

I will tell the Member for Springfield to kindly put his question now, please.

Mr. Roch: My question to the Minister is: given the fact that he is the Minister responsible for Rural Development (Mr. Penner) and he was requested by several different municipal organizations to initiate action, why did he not bring forth a Bill to rectify the situation rather than requesting the Opposition to do it for him, which we had to anyways?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been put. The Honourable Minister of Rural Development.

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I object to the reference the Honourable Member makes to a meeting I had called that I did not show up. I had indicated on numerous occasions and in writing twice to the Honourable Member opposite and to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs)—Monday I will table the response in writing to you, and if the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) does not read his mail that is his—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. I would like to remind Honourable Members this is Question Period, not a time for debate.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Springfield, on a point of order.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe it is not within the Rules to put erroneous information on the record.

The fact is that the Minister sent a letter to the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member is aware that a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

* (1030)

Treaty Rights Extension

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Springfield, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): I would like to pose a new question to the First Minister -(interjection)- Well,

the last time he had to bail out his Minister, so I might as well ask him directly.

Given the fact that there are potential ramifications down the road that if the courts should rule that Treaty rights extend off reserves, it then becomes the responsibility of the federal Government to fulfill its obligations as the guarantor of these new rights—it is a new question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's preamble is very hypothetical. Will the Honourable Member kindly rephrase his question, please?

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister is: given the fact that municipalities have the right to be compensated for the services that they provide, will the Premier intervene as the need arises, with his Conservative colleagues in Ottawa, to assure that the rights of all Manitobans are respected and fairly dealt with in this matter?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, regardless of the issue, I have said that this government will protect the rights of all Manitobans. - (interjection)- It was only you who took six months to get an appointment with me, Gilles.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. May I remind the Honourable First Minister that answers to questions should be as brief as possible and should deal with the matter raised. The Honourable First Minister.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) that this Government will do everything within its power to protect the rights of all Manitobans.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to see that the Liberals are finally joining us in asking questions about the critical issue of day care.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Friday the 13th, oh, boy.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): The Honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor), from his seat, referred to the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) as the member for hypocrisy. Beauchesne's refers to "hypocritical" as being on the list of unparliamentary expressions. While it actually appears on both lists, it is definitely unparliamentary to refer to Members as anything other than Honourable Members representing their constituency.

Mr. Speaker: Did the Honourable Member rise on a point of order?

Mr. Ashton: I would ask the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) to withdraw.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, I was on a point of order, but I do not believe you probably would have heard that above the noise we were hearing at the time.

Mr. Speaker: How was I supposed to hear it? You are right, exactly.

Mr. Ashton: It was on a point of order that I asked the Member for Wolseley to withdraw that comment.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Wolseley, on the same point of order.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the comment was made and the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) rose.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair may not rule on the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Thompson at this time. The Chair did not hear the remarks. We will attempt to peruse Hansard—

Some Honourable Members: We heard it.

Mr. Speaker: Well, who is making the ruling here, you or me? The Chair will peruse Hansard and will report back to the House.

Day Care Long Range Planning

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with her question now, please.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the furor in the House. I was simply expressing gratitude for a little company on this issue so I would not be single-handedly accused of agitating this issue.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns is attempting to get her question on the record. The Honourable Member for St. Johns, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: The Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) has said the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) said publicly she cannot guarantee any kind of increase or plan for day care workers, yet today the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has said he has a plan, his Government has a plan for dealing with this critical situation.

Assuming that the Premier is right, that her Leader is right, I would ask the Minister of Family Services, given her comments recently at an MCCA open house, to have open lines of communication, and given her recent visit to the Machray Day Care Centre where I am sure she learned about the professional demands on day care workers, if she would commit herself today

to tabling that plan as soon as possible and if she would urge the Premier to meet with MCCA—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: —and release the plan—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question has been put. The Honourable First Minister.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, because the Member for St. Johns has misrepresented what I said, which was very clearly that we were sitting down with the advisory committee to develop the plan to address all these issues, that is the issue.

We have a commitment to develop a long-term plan to address all of the issues and concerns in day care, including salaries. That is what we are doing as a Government. The Minister is part of the Human Services Committee of Cabinet that has met with the child care advisory committee and will continue to meet. We have a working group that is being established to resolve these issues, and that plan will be developed in consultation and co-operation with the entire day care community. That is the way we think it should be done.

Budget Planning

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Family Services. Given that Julia Kucey, the head of the Private-for-Profit Operators Association has said publicly that she believes there is a plan and that the Private-for-Profit operators will benefit, and she is optimistic that grants will go to workers in those profit centres, my question to the Minister is: why is it that she has been unable to share her budget plans for next year with the non-profit sector representing 92 percent of care in this province, yet able to indicate, very clearly it would appear, her plans regarding salary enhancement for Private-for-Profit operators?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): The Member seems to think that I had given budget plans to the independent day care operators. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. I have met with all the groups that represent child care in this province on various occasions over the last 17 months that I have been in office, and I have also visited a lot of day care centres to apprise myself of just how they operate. I have appointed members from all walks of the day care community to an advisory committee on child care and we are forming a working group to come forth with a concrete plan for the future and the funding of child care.

* (1040)

Manitoba Child Care Association Meeting Request

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with her final supplementary question.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I, too, sense a note of optimism from the Minister of

Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), so I am going to ask her, given her expressed concern, given the knowledge she picked up at her visits to day cares recently, is she able and can we help her in any way to urge the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to meet with the Manitoba Child Care Association or to appoint an independent conciliator before October 17, so that tens of thousands of children and parents will not be inconvenienced and put at risk?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, nobody needs to urge me to work for the day care community. We made a commitment of 45 percent increase, an additional \$13 million in two budgets. Day care received, if not the highest priority, one of the highest priority increases ever since our Government has been in office.

We will continue to work to resolve all of the issues on day care, including the issue of salaries to workers. We will do it co-operatively. We will plan, in collaboration with and co-operation with all of those people who work in the day care community representing MCCA, representing Manitobans for Quality Child Care, representing those people who provide home child care, and all of those issues, we will resolve the problems together. That is our commitment. Nobody needs to urge me to work for the child care community.

Shelter Allowances Cost of Living Increase

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). It took awhile, but I was glad to hear that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) has finally seen the light and finally has admitted that the SAFER Program should have been indexed according to the cost of living increases. What applies to the SAFER Program should also apply for the Shelter Allowance for our families. This affects approximately 2,000 families across the province. Will the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) agree today that, too, should be having cost of living index increases?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we said in running for office, and we have carried out as part of Government, a commitment to the SAFER and SAFFR Programs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I am having difficulty with the laughter of the people on the other side. They seem to ask their questions for entertainment value and I am telling you that this is a serious matter. We instituted and developed the SAFER and SAFFR Programs. They are acknowledged to be the best Government programs for rental supplement anywhere in the country.

The program, because of the way it was carried on by the former administration, did not automatically raise the levels of rent that were eligibility in the SAFER and SAFFR Programs, Mr. Speaker. Our Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) has indicated we recognize that as a weakness and a detriment to the program. He is going to address it and he will be happy to debate it with

the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) anytime he wants to raise that matter in committee.

Funding Re-instatement

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Inkster, with a supplementary question.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, my question again is for the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). These two programs alone facilitate the needs of approximately 6,000 Manitobans. Will the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) today support and restore the cutbacks and allotments to this year's budget?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I invite the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to discuss all of those matters and ask his questions—(interjection)—The Member for Inkster asked a question. He does not have the courtesy to listen to the answer; he wants to shout me down from the seat.

We are committed—(interjection)—This must be Friday morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Oh yes, and I am on my broom.

Mr. Filmon: Now the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) wants to shoot me down, Mr. Speaker, or shout me down, whatever. I would think that the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) would hide his head in shame after he spent \$26 million on a bridge to nowhere, the worst boondoggle this province has ever seen in its history. I would think that he would never again want to show his face in public.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Co-operative Housing Program Cuts

Mr. Speaker: I will allow the Honourable Member for Inkster one very short question.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, again the question is for the First Minister. This Government has axed the Co-op Home Start Program—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A very short question.

Mr. Lamoureux: My question to the First Minister is: given this program provides the needed funds to start up housing co-ops, why does this Government not support housing co-ops in this province by cutting back this good program?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would invite the Member for Inkster to raise all of those questions in the Estimates review of the Department of Housing. He will have an opportunity to debate priorities. He will have an opportunity to debate which of the selections that Minister has made in his budget.

Mr. Speaker, all we get from the Liberal Party is spend, spend, spend, spend, throw money at anything. In their

judgment there is no bad program, everything is deserving of more money. Last year they advocated \$700 million to be added in taxes and deficit to this province. This year they are going even faster. The cash register is mounting. Every time they say spend, spend, spend—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, might I have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last night to participate in the official opening of Winnipeg's newest theatre facility. Prairie Theatre Exchange, after 16 years of working out of abandoned warehouses, now begins a new phase in its history in a beautiful new home in Portage Place.

PTE has done much in its 16-year history. It has produced 142 plays, 91 of which were original works. It sold three-quarters of a million tickets to those plays. It has toured the province and the nation, and over 3,500 students have attended its school. These are impressive accomplishments, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly a credit to PTE's management and staff that while making these achievements, the company has remained debt-free.

PTE now becomes the first Canadian theatre to be housed within a retail shopping complex. I am sure it will continue as a theatre company famous for firsts.

The new theatre opens to the public on October 19. I would like to encourage all Members to take the first opportunity to visit the theatre and take in the latest production of *Village of Idiots*, by John Lazarus. I should note that the theatre's seating capacity is now almost double what it was on Princess Street. There are plenty of extra seats for those who might have been disappointed before.

On behalf of Government, I salute Prairie Theatre Exchange and wish the company much continued artistic and financial success in its new home. Congratulations to PTE, its staff and management on this important occasion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Osborne.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this. As a past president of the board of the Prairie Theatre Exchange,

I was delighted last night to sit in the audience and watch this theatre that has been so much a part of this community for the last 16 years celebrate its move to these new quarters.

Mr. Speaker, this theatre grew out of the old Manitoba Theatre Centre's theatre school and was first known as the Manitoba Theatre Workshop. The people who started it had a dream of creating a theatre that would showcase Canadian works and would support the development of Manitoba writers and plays about life in Manitoba. They have been incredibly successful in doing that.

Over the past 16 years, Mr. Speaker, they have produced some 141 plays, 91 of which are written about prairie life and about events that have occurred here in Manitoba. They have supported the work of Canadian and Manitoba writers such as David King, Wendy Lill, and Bruce McManus.

* (1050)

As we sit here today, Mr. Speaker, there is a play playing in Halifax about life in northern Manitoba written by Wendy Lill. It is that kind of work that this theatre has brought to this country, not just to Manitoba. They have opened plays at the National Arts Centre. Their plays are produced in small theatres right across this country. Finally Manitoba has a voice in the arts community here that speaks to the rest of this country and I believe throughout the world about things that are important to the life of Manitobans.

I think all levels of Government, past and present, are to be congratulated for the way that they have worked together to see this thing come into being, and I was delighted to see the Minister of Culture (Mrs. Mitchelson) for this province rise and cue the opening of the play. I should say, Mr. Speaker, the play "Village of Idiots" is not a political satire. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I too am delighted to rise on behalf of my colleagues and say how pleased we were to participate in whatever way we could to provide the support, both moral and financial, for an organization and very, very creative group, very brave group, very innovative group, that has brought to bear all of the things that we would want to see in theatre in Manitoba, which is the development of our artists, our producers and our Canadian talent, the providing of a platform for our artists, and for the development of this very creative and very important, not just cultural but economic activity in our province.

I think the involvement of young people, the taking out to the schools, the involvement of young people in appreciating not just theatre but Manitoba theatre, Canadian theatre, is a very important step that was taken. While we are all delighted, I think, with the move, and thrilled for them that they are in such a wonderful location and such a wonderful facility, I want to say we

were awfully glad when they first set up that they were to be involved in having them go into the core area of the City of Winnipeg and be brave enough to begin their development in their activities there, which made it available to many people who would not ordinarily be able to enjoy theatre. They have been innovators on all fronts, in the location that they chose, in their willingness to go into the inner city, involving students and giving a showcase for Canadian theatres, writers and producers. We applaud their past work and look forward to their future.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, might I have leave to make another non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Also last evening, on behalf of the Premier and the Province of Manitoba, I had the distinct honour and privilege of presenting the Order of the Buffalo Hunt, the highest honour the Province can bestow upon its citizens, to four individuals and their families who have a long history of dedicated community service.

These men and their families, Martin Bergen, Ernst Keller, Rubin Spletzer, and the late Ernst Hansch, received the recognition they so rightly deserve as leaders in their community and in particular their contribution to Manitoba.

They came to Canada as German pioneers. They shared with us their culture and heritage and contributed to the multicultural mosaic which exists in our province today.

They had a dream, Mr. Speaker, and most recently established a chair of German-Canadian studies to add to the quality of education in Manitoba and in Canada. By example, it encourages other ethnocultural groups to consider similar action. It becomes a dynamic force for nurturing multiculturalism in this province.

I would hope that my colleagues in the House will join me today in congratulating the families of Martin Bergen, Ernst Keller, Rubin Spletzer and the late Ernst Hansch in achieving this honour, the Order of the Buffalo Hunt, in recognition of their outstanding community service and their dedication to improving the educational and cultural lives of all Manitobans. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Selkirk have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too had the pleasure of attending the dinner in recognition of these families given the Order of the Buffalo Hunt last evening. It was a warm, friendly and enjoyable evening overall where the warmth of the community was given out to all of us in attendance there. I enjoyed the remembrances that many of the recipients gave in recognizing what has gone on in their

lifetime in Canada, and how they relate it to family members left at home.

I feel that we have been very lucky in having this marvellous huge community of German descendants being part of the Manitoba mosaic. We will look forward to the day when each of the multicultural societies within Manitoba will have the same strength in numbers, will have the same abilities, to be able to stand up there and say we have begun a university course and that we are recognized as a major component of our population.

I give honour to those receiving this award to the Government for recognizing them, and to the whole community of the German society and all the members with it, and look forward to many more accomplishments in future endeavours that we can all recognize and enjoy. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Logan.

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to join with other Members of the Legislature to pay recognition to the individuals and the contribution they have made, and to their families.

Also to make the point that it is very nice to see recognition being given to new Canadians, to people who came to our country as new Canadians, who feel the privilege of being Canadian perhaps sometimes more than we do, the people that are born here, and that take it for granted and who, from not just the German community but from many others, have made contributions to our province and our country that are so outstanding that we would not be what we are without their efforts and work, and their volunteer activities.

We congratulate the families and say to the Government that we think this is a very good initiative that they have taken. We will be pleased to see other members of other minority groups and other new Canadians recognized for the tremendous contribution that they are making and will continue to make.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some changes to the standing committees.

I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Ducharme for Penner, and Gilleshammer for Pankratz.

Also that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: Downey for Neufeld, and Derkach for Connery.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? (Agreed)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills in the following order: No. 27, No. 31, No. 32, No. 42, Bill No. 34, The Loan Act, and Bill No. 53, the remainder as they are listed on the Order Paper.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 27—THE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 27, The Fiscal Stabilization Fund Act; Loi sur le Fonds de stabilisation des recettes, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) wants to speak on that Bill today, but he was just called out of the Session. If it is with leave of the House, could we revert back to that Bill in a few minutes? I am sure he would appreciate that.

* (1100)

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreeable, we will revert back to Bill 27 after a few minutes? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis). Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 32—THE CITY OF WINNIPEG AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), Bill No. 32, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity today to put a few thoughts on the record in regard to this most important Bill encompassing over 60 percent of the population of this province, a unique situation in Canada where such a

large urban centre, just a single urban centre, contains so much of a high percentage of the population of a province.

Before I get into my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity if I could to acknowledge six people, six Winnipeggers, who have chosen not to run again for City Council and who have had distinguished service with the city. I mention councillors leaving at this time: Anne Jorowski, Bill Neville, Harold Macdonald, Eric Stefanson, Helen Promislow, and Magnus Eliason, Magnus who has spent off and on in council almost 21 years now, and a very distinguished person.

I am particularly pleased to be able to mention these names because when I was a newcomer on City Council I got help from each and every one of these people. I was very grateful of that, it made my job a lot easier. I regret seeing them go, but I congratulate them on their years of service to the city and it will be a hard job filling their shoes. It is interesting to note that there is a cross section of all political loyalties there and that is how I think it should be at City Hall.

One of the things that it does bring to mind is the fact that in three years now, from 1986 to '89, there will be, out of 29 councillors, a turnover of at least 19 in that short span. In other words, there will only be 10 veterans remaining. I think one of the problems there perhaps is a frustration on the part of some of them, not only about the system that stifles their creativity but other factors, in particular some of them who may choose to run for mayor but cannot, because they would perhaps lose their seat on City Council. I think that is one thing we would like to explore in committee if there is not some solution of greater use of talent from City Council.

Undoubtedly, the frustration and despair shows through to many members—if not all of them—of council of the many stumbling blocks in the system and lack of direction. We are hoping that after the reports that have gone out, the package by the Cherniack Report and the subsequent White Papers and discussions, that we would have seen a full package come before us in this legislation so that we could deal in its entirety.

I know our Party is extremely disappointed that this has not been the case. What we see here is a patchwork of amendments and changes. It is not surprising because from past experience we know that this Minister acknowledged from his term at City Hall and particularly his term as chair of EPC, administered his positions in a patchwork manner. Although it is disappointing to us, it is not really surprising. I hope that we will have a chance to correct that when it gets to committee.

I might point out the first-hand knowledge of that because I represented an area very close to where that former city councillor represented. He is certainly on the community committee and it was the epitome of urban sprawl in south St. Vital. They broke all the rules out there and expanded the city further and further out, and Qualico just kept building homes helter-skelter with no regard to the infrastructure of the city. This

was aided and abetted by the councillors in the area at the time. The present Minister was one of them.

It was interesting to note that at that time there were no twinned roads going into the 7,000 or 8,000 new homes there at all. Dakota Street was a single-lane major artery, Bishop Grandin was a single lane, St. Mary's Road itself a single. Those have all been twinned now in the last three years to give access to that area. I might say they are now twinned, but at great expense to the taxpayers at large in all of Winnipeg.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

I did not even mention that one of the worse traffic snags that existed in the City of Winnipeg was at Fermor and St. Anne's, and that this urban sprawl went on without any consideration for services, which other cities with planning put in place before a development is started or certainly soon thereafter. We did not have any libraries, which have since been built by City Council. We did not have a community club, and in fact still there is not a suitable community club in that entire area of almost 10,000 homes now.

The sewage treatment plant out in the south was not up to snuff. Certainly the schools—what had happened there is all the new residents who had bought these new homes and paid taxes had to bus their children out of the area into very crowded sections of the central and northern parts of Winnipeg. So I just point that out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to show that again while we are disappointed, we are not surprised that this is the type of Bill that the Minister would bring forward.

* (1110)

I might also point out that in other cities, in almost every city in North America, different plans are made, and I see no mention in any of the amendments that this will be the case here. That is that in other cities, before a company gets a development plan and when they purchase their building permits, they are assessed some costs of local services. They vary from city to city but almost all of them at least provide for things like community centres. Other cities I know in the United States would pay up to \$5,000 or \$6,000 for a new building permit. That would cover almost all the costs of schools, libraries, community clubs, sewage treatment, what have you.

So what happens here in the City of Winnipeg, for the existing taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg, is that these services are put in not at the cost of the developer, but at the cost of the city at large. What it does is put an additional burden on the existing core area and older suburban areas. I think that another thing that has been lax in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the services that do go in that are required now, roads and sewer and water, what have you, are inferior.

We see areas like Southdale for instance where the services have all been replaced, almost virtually all have been replaced, in a development that is less than 15 years old. When you figure out the cost of these services today, of putting in a new water line, you can see that

the people have been paying taxes for 10 or 15 years merely to replace their water. There has been no money left over for the other services, garbage pick up, repairs, administration of the city, and so again the burden goes on to the existing taxpayers in the core and older suburbs, which means that, as the records show, we are as high or the highest of any realty taxes in the country. I would hope that there would be some discussion about developmental plans and making sure that services are provided and not loaded onto the existing taxpayers of the city.

In regard to the powers of the mayor in this Bill 32, Mr. Deputy Speaker, time will tell just where we are going here and I would certainly be a strong advocate, and always have been, for a type of city Government that would give the mayor lots of power.

The only thing I have seen in the past is you cannot legislate power. I think power is not given; I think power is taken. So therefore, as our Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) had said earlier, it is the personality, the traits of that person, the strength of character, their vision of the city. That is where the power will emanate from.

I think that we are kidding ourselves if we think this Bill alone and the hodgepodge of amendments will actually give the type of Government that was envisioned in the Cherniack Report, and give more power to the mayor.

As a matter of fact, and it is not that often I am in agreement with the deputy mayor of the City of Winnipeg, but I think I have to agree when he indicates that the opposite may be true, in that certain groups of councillors will polarize against perhaps a bad decision by EPC headed by the mayor. He will have a worse situation than you have right now.

So I think that under the present circumstances and with the limited changes that are put in effect, we should not hold our breath looking for—that will give more power to the mayor and therefore more direction and more accountability to the mayor, because that is what the exercise is about, to have accountability by the mayor.

Another thing I want to indicate that is not addressed, and it should be addressed in regard to good civic Government, is that we need to address—and part of this can be addressed in the Legislature—the decay in the core of the city.

Some years back we had a Core Area Initiative that had excellent programs attached to it and lots of progress. We have seen where we put people to work by job training in the Core Area Initiative. We have seen where education has been upgraded, facilities have been upgraded, and of course the most important part of it all perhaps is the renewal of residences and districts, both in buildings and infrastructure, to upgrade those areas.

Point Douglas area is a good case in point, because what happens here is when we go in this direction it is not really a cost, it is an investment, because as the statistics show, we are going to reduce the amount of crime, vandalism, and delinquency, and that integrates those decayed areas back into the mainstream of the city and the province.

Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we have seen lately is a lack of planning by the city. We take developments like the North Portage Development, and the Forks Development, and indeed the development on the other side of the river, the Tourist Hotel Development. We take millions and millions of dollars intended for core area renewal and we spend them on projects that, indeed, it may be arguable, they are good projects and they are worthwhile for the city.

My argument is not that. My argument is they should not be touching core area funds to take part in these projects. If they are worthwhile, go to the taxpayers for more money and develop it in that way.

Unfortunately, in regard to North Portage, I think it is the general consensus in Winnipeg that this has not been a very well thought-out and successful plan. It has caused many, many problems in the south end of Portage. So again, the taxpayers of the city and the province are being hit again to pay for those mistakes.

The Forks is a new development, and my public utterances are quite well known. I think I will reserve them right now and say, if you throw enough money on the fan, maybe some of it will stick, and we will see how that development goes. But again, the same thing, there are millions, \$25 million, \$30 million that could have been spent in the core area of Winnipeg upgrading job training, education, and renewal of facilities that we have put in that area.

I tend to agree with many other people that there should be a vision on that thing instead of the promise. What we have here are promises and promises by an elite group of people, but nowhere have we seen an overall vision of that very valuable, very, very attractive and very well-placed property. It was a very lucky thing that became available to the city and the province, but I am afraid that we have taken the wrong direction in developing, as we have done previously on North Portage.

The lack of vision by the Minister will not correct problems that we have seen develop lately, such as the controversy over the City Works Yard. I think that the majority, the vast majority of people connected with all aspects of this project on the lab would agree where it should be placed. Here was a case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an absolute wonderful opportunity to renew that part of the core, to get that dust, dirt, noise and aggravation out of there, and to serve two purposes at the same time, to put the lab where it should be placed. All the experts in North America, indeed in the world, said that is where it should be, in close proximity to there.

But what did we do? We bungled the issue and I hope that saner heads will prevail and that we will have a reconsideration, a revisiting, as the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) meant, on the issue and bring it back, replace those yards. I think we are now seeing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, lower and lower costs of doing that project and I think the figures that were first quoted were inflated. I do not think it needs to be that high.

I think it also gives us an opportunity to revisit the whole idea of the works and operations in the

development of the City of Winnipeg and, indeed, whether more of it should not be contracting out. I am not going to take one side or the other on that, but it certainly gives an opportunity to see that if there are facilities in the City of Winnipeg by private operators who can do the sewer and water work, who can do the repair work, can do this and that and the other, then maybe we should be looking at saving dollars and not expanding to the extent that we have over there now, by some privatization. At least it will give an opportunity for us to study that issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

But once again I want to stress that leadership has been lacking. We need some leadership from the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) and the Government should look seriously at revisiting that item and not missing this very important opportunity to do something really great for the City of Winnipeg and particularly the northwestern part of the city.

* (1120)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was disappointed as well in the amendments to not see any clear direction as to the way politics will be addressed at City Hall, or whether there should be groups and the so-called gang that we have there right now that exists and, in my estimation, is not—I can see why the people formed it. I never joined it, but I just think it is harmful for the city and we should have a better direction from the Minister as to what sort of Party politics, if any, should be at City Hall. If the Minister cannot hammer out a policy, then certainly, in my estimation, the present system of decisions behind closed doors should be banned like it is on school boards and other such jurisdictions around North America.

I think also that the amendments fail to address the matter of conflict of interest and at present they are very scanty, too vague, and they must be clarified and they must be clarified for the protection, not only of the public good, but also for the protection of the councillors who get involved. They do not know, at any given time, whether there is a conflict or not and they are always in a turmoil because of that.

I think that there should be, like we have in the Legislature, an understanding of what conflicts are and what role City Councillors have, not only in personal interest, but when they are dealing on behalf of developers such as was the case north of the high line which has been a very, very expensive case for the city in taking this all the way to the Supreme Court to clarify by-laws and regulations that are very unclear, and so unclear in going to the Supreme Court that this Minister has not seen fit to address and to clarify for the future.

While I am on that subject about clarification, I am surprised that this Minister would not have brought in legislation to clarify the position of the various conditional use in Licence Appeal Board, which he knows and everybody knows who has been involved in it, is an absolute travesty and at the present way it functions is retrogressive to the operations of the City of Winnipeg. These are things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that our Party will be bringing up in committee, and hopefully we can see some resolve on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will show my bias in that I have been a very strong supporter of the residents advisory groups. The legislation here in regard to the resident advisory groups is most unclear. If I read the words as they are sitting in there, it is really to the will of City Council whether indeed there will be one or six resident advisory groups. It says when a by-law is passed but it does not seem to indicate that a by-law must be passed by the city to establish resident advisory groups.

What he has done here, the Minister has waffled on the issue. He has been afraid or unable to make a decision so he apparently has thrown it back to the city and said, listen, this is too complicated for me. I am sorry fellas, down there at City Hall, like when I was there, I am lacking leadership, so how about you handling the hot potato and coming out of it?

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not good enough in this particular case because I personally think that resident advisory groups are very important to the function of the City of Winnipeg. I know that we always used ours to advantage, but in this Bill, even if there is a by-law passed that says there is going to be a resident advisory group in St. Boniface, St. Vital, for instance, there is no provision for any responsibility for them, no provision for any facilities for them to operate from, not at present there is recognition that there are expenses, or there is no recognition of availability of any resource or material. They would get their material just like any other taxpayer which is, at times, very difficult.

I think that we will also be taking a very close look at that and examining the role of the resident advisory group and hope that our side of the House will be able to demonstrate some leadership in that very important part of city Government.

I might say that the resident advisory group has one other spinoff benefit in that it is a grounds, a place for the introduction of potential candidates for civic office, whether it be trustees or, more appropriately, City Hall. They get the experience, know how it works, so that if they indeed like the system and want to run for it, they have some background, they do not come in green to the system. I think that we will be very strong in the establishment of very effective and strong resident advisory groups.

I touched on planning earlier and I just want to repeat that we see, in my estimation, a very badly thought-out solution to the Headingley problem. We are giving \$365 rebate back on their water bills, which they haul water in Headingley. That is not the solution to it because what we have done, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is we have created a very dangerous precedent and now we can see people like in St. Germain, who incidentally have one of their top advocates running for City Hall, that they are entitled to the same thing because they do not have those services either. What we have to understand and which the Minister I guess never understood, even with his years of experience, is that the assessment of property has nothing to do with the services that you have.

I will give you a straight example on that. I have a situation in my house similar to—I better be careful

how I phrase this—but I have a similar situation to the one in Headingley. I do not have full services in my property. For instance, I do not have pavement in front of my place. In fact on my property, I have a septic system and I do not have city sewer. Does that mean that I should get a rebate from the city because of that? No, the fact is that my assessment is lower than those four or five streets over because I do not have that service. By giving the \$365—and I agree there should be a solution for the people of Headingley, I agree that the City of Winnipeg had not given them good value, but what I am pointing out to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the solution found by the Minister was not the right solution. In fact it could cost the City of Winnipeg and the taxpayers much disruption and costs all over.

Another omission from the Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is there is no mention at this time, and hopefully we will bring it up in committee and later on solve it, of the financial sharing with the province of revenue. You mentioned before, 60 percent of the population of this city. We know that as far as roads and infrastructure, bridges, et cetera, this city, compared to even cities like Saskatoon, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, we are bankrupt. That is because we have not been getting our share of revenues. Maybe we should be looking at a percentage of the retail sales tax for the city, but something has to be done in regard to more revenue for the City of Winnipeg, because we cannot put the taxes up higher than they are now. It is backbreaking as it is.

I think that we should have some plan, the Government should have some plan, to work toward what other cities—the City of Winnipeg gets only about maybe less than 20 percent of their financing from senior Governments, the province and the federal, and yet the average in Canada is 45 percent. So clearly Winnipeg has not been getting its share and that must be forthcoming.

There are other issues that we would like to bring up in committee. We will have lots of them, like the elections of City Councillors. I might say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in talks with our critic I know that he has many—and we discussed this Bill and the amendments at length—I know that we have lots of constructive changes to the Bill. We certainly will look forward to discussing those further amendments in committee.

* (1130)

I just want to close by saying that again it is unfortunate that we cannot discuss a matter here, a master plan, but hopefully the Liberal amendments that will come forward will rectify that problem to a large extent. I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

BILL NO. 27—THE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND ACT (Cont'd)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By leave, I am reverting back to Bill No. 27, The Fiscal Stabilization Fund Act (Loi sur le Fonds de stabilisation des recettes), proposed by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for

Osborne (Mr. Alcock). Agreed. The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Thank you for the indulgence of the House for leave. Sometimes it is necessary to visit next door.

An Honourable Member: The press gallery, you mean.

Mr. Doer: No, this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were not doing any of that, although, as is part of our job, we have all walked that hall before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, -(interjection)- Well, yes, but some of us have pitchers in our coats and some of us do not. This was a different kind of trolling. I wish I had the nerve to do it, quite frankly. I give the Members credit that do it.

I am pleased to speak about the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. I think there are a couple of dimensions to this fund that I think we want to comment on. It is not a simplistic issue. First of all, I want to talk about the philosophy of a fund, a stabilization fund, and the Member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) is commenting because I will have a specific project in mind for the Member for Rossmere, why I think a Fiscal Stabilization Fund is a good idea.

I philosophically believe, and our Party believes, that when times are good and there is extraordinary revenue, for example, from the mining industry, that it is a pretty good idea not just to take all that money and put it against hydro dams and a lapsed debt, but to take some of that money and put it toward worthwhile public projects that are necessary in a year where there will be less resources available. Some people would call that Keynesian economics that Roosevelt used in the '30s, and Keynesian economics, which has been used by some Governments over a number of years, including Governments of New Democratic persuasion over a number of years, to try to have a situation where you do not have peaks and valleys in your economic spending. You try to as much as possible deal with the realities of good and bad years, whether there are droughts, or mining revenue, or whatever else, you try to smooth out those pressures. Really what we are talking about, when we are talking about spending, is the affect on the public and the people of the Province of Manitoba.

I am not a Friedmanist, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I know that some Conservatives are Friedmanists in their economic approach. They believe in the trickle-down theory and letting the marketplace dictate totally the financial situation. So I thought it a little curious that the Conservatives, the present Government, would come in with a Fiscal Stabilization Fund. It seemed to me to be a bit contrary to classic Conservative philosophy and Friedmanist economics which is usually the predominant determining factor of the Conservative Party. We have heard that through the Lyon years and we have heard that through our years, about spending and spending problems.

We believed, for example, that the deficit should rise in the early '80s to deal with the very, very high

unemployment and the very, very high interest rates. Yes, that places considerable pressure on the deficit and the problems in a province, but also on the other hand, at a time when unemployment was going out of control, at a time when consumer confidence was out of control, at a time across this country where thousands and thousands of families were in a horrible situation, Manitoba had a relatively better position through the '80s by having some cushioning through Government intervention on the economy to deal with the high interest rate policies and the recession that took place through the early '80s.

There is no coincidence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the use of capital spending in Crown corporations, the use of some spending for new careers, the use of some spending for Careerstart, the use of some spending for youth employment, the use of some spending in certain Government departments, was able to give the Manitoba economy a much better relative situation than other economies across Canada.

So, we have absolutely no problem. I have absolutely no philosophical problem. In fact I welcome a proposal that allows for an extraordinary revenue from mining, an extraordinary revenue from other sectors, the federal Government, to be smoothed out over a number of years for needed public priorities. I say that, and our caucus says that, with all clear philosophical vision on spending. I would suggest that in future years, if we knew there was going to be a huge revenue one year and a possible drought and recession and other problems in a year future, yes, we would look at the tools and levers of Government to try to smooth out those peaks and valleys of our finances for the people of the province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the person who is going to be most critical of that is going to be an accountant. This is not an accountant's way to deal with things. Accountants will find this horrible. Accountants—and my brothers are accountants—will think this it terrible that you should take money in a good year and leave it for money in a bad year. I can imagine the auditor's accountants just having nightmares over this idea of taking money for better years for bad years. They commented negatively on our Jobs Fund. I understand from an accountant's perspective that getting people working is not necessarily the debit and credit philosophy of good accounting. I understand that, but we are not accountants in this Chamber. We should look at honest accounting numbers and accurate accounting numbers, but we should make public decisions based on public priorities.

To me, to our Party and to our philosophy of our Party, we believe strongly in taking money from good years and layering it out for bad years. The philosophy of this is absolutely no problem for us because we do have a Keynesian economic bend to us in our Party and have for years. We have articulated that for 25 years in Manitoba and we will continue to articulate that.

We thought it rather odd though that the Liberal Party would take more of a Friedmanist economic approach to it. If you do not have a philosophy, and I understand why you do not have a philosophy, the Member for

Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), you have half your City Council candidates running with the developers and the other half running with this WIN group. I think philosophy—I think we should have a philosophy.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we were to get the Liberals at city council to agree to a—well, we will see how many are elected. We will see how many are elected including in your own riding, I might add to the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose).

It is not bad to have a little bit of a philosophy to look at these Bills because I do not believe in the Friedman approach to the economy and I was surprised that the Liberals were adopting this slavish trickle-down theory in the market place. I guess the John Anguses and the Bob Roses in the caucus, the Members for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) and the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) had more influence on the caucus than the old Axworthy crew, the Members for Osborne and Fort Rouge, on the philosophy of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we do have some problems with the way in which this fund was established and I have said that in the press conference—

An Honourable Member: You have lots of problems.

Mr. Doer: I do not have any problem with the philosophy, Mr. Deputy Speaker.— (interjection)— Well, we will see about that. If the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) would get up and ask some questions, we could find out where his morality is, no backbone, I do not know about morality. He is great at chortling from his place, but you sure do not see him standing up in the House and asking questions and raising the issues of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the underspending, and it is an issue we have raised all along, of Health, Family Services, Agriculture—there he is again chirping away. You will have your day. We are opposed to the underspending in Health. We are opposed to the underspending in Family Services. We are opposed to the underspending in Agriculture. We are opposed—well, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) does not understand it. Three times the Liberal Party in this province in this Chamber have asked the Government to spend part of the \$200 million, and the next day the village fools from the Liberal Party say, defeat the fund. You do not understand the legalities of it. You are talking two ways on the same issue on the same day, and I cannot understand the collective ignorance on it.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, sooner or later that catches up with you. I know in the short run you can get away with taking an ambiguous position or a contrary position. But let me remind you, and I am glad the Members from the Liberal Party, I was going to talk about this fund, but the Members from the Liberal Party have chosen to heckle because it reminds me—and I have a lot of respect for the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), I think he is a very fine Health Critic, and I think he does a great job.

I support the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) when he said to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), why

do you not spend some of this money from that Fiscal Stabilization Fund? In June I remember him raising the question. I thought it was a great question. Why does the Minister of Health not spend some of that money for needed fiscal priorities? What I could not understand is why the Member for Kildonan had a different position than the Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), the Leader of the Liberal Party, when she said defeat the fund, defeat the fund. I agree with the Member for Kildonan.

Last week the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) said spend some of that money for the child care system. I agree with her. I agree with her totally. Take your long-term plan if you have it, I do not think you do; take the reports of the Advisory Task Force on Child Care; take that money for the child care community; and the Member for Ellice said, take some of that \$200 million and spend it on child care now. Bravo! But how does that fit with the Member for River Heights' position on the Fiscal Stabilization Fund when she says, defeat the fund. Defeat the fund—you cannot spend it.

* (1140)

The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) does not understand it. We are dealing with 101 Economics. If you defeat the fund you cannot spend the fund. That is what I am trying to tell—(interjection)—Mr. Deputy Speaker, again this week the contradictions continue.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) came up with another good idea. Take some of that fiscal stabilization money and spend it on the asbestos pipes at the University of Manitoba, I think it should be done. We announced a \$20 million capital fund for the university a couple of years ago, and quite frankly, these asbestos pipes were probably put in during Doug Campbell's days. I do not know, but whoever did it, it should not have happened. We know a lot more now and that should be corrected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to point out one thing. If you defeat the fund and defeat it in the House, you cannot spend the money because it goes against the accumulated deficit of the province and it goes against the Hydro dam built built at Kelsey 25 years ago. It cannot go to child care, it cannot go to health care, it cannot go to the universities, it cannot go to education and, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we should be fundamentally honest. It cannot be—

An Honourable Member: It can be converted.

Mr. Doer: Not if you defeat it.

An Honourable Member: No, no, why can you not administer more money into these departments . . .

Mr. Doer: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is exactly the position of the New Democratic Party. We believe there are three positions on this Bill, well, there are four positions. There are the two Liberal positions, there is our position and there is the Conservative position. It is true, I mean it is very true.

An Honourable Member: You just have the two on that one?

Mr. Doer: No, there is two—

An Honourable Member: Well, we only know about two.

Mr. Doer: There is the two-position defeat the fund and spend the money; financially impossible, but they have two positions.

The second position is the Tory position, and I would grant anybody in this Chamber criticism of the Tory position. They want to put it in a sock, a Tory sock, and put it under the bed, even though if the Bill itself provides the authority to spend money in this fiscal year. The Bill itself provides the authority for the Government to do what we are saying and spend money in the fiscal year. Yes it does, I would suggest to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) he look at his own Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Tories want to put this money in a sock. I would agree their primary objective is not people; their primary objective in terms of this fund is a jagged line on a campaign pamphlet and, quite frankly, I think most Manitobans know that it is not going to mean anything to them. They know the deficit was going down when the Tories took office. I think the Conservatives will feel good about what the Conservatives are saying to themselves, but most of us know that there was \$200 million put in a sock. It is going to come out next year and actually, rather than lose the money for people, I have no problem going door to door with the idea that really the deficit was—we had a surplus this year, we are carrying over money next year and really the deficit is going to go way up. I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is going to find a lot of financial analysts and a lot of other people will be able to show that fund for what it is going to be, and that is a bit of a flimflam in terms of the province.

Now, as I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe the unusual revenue from the federal Government, the unusual revenue from mining revenues, the unusual revenues from an improved financial situation that we left the Conservatives in the province should not go to rainy days and tough times that the Conservatives, both federally and provincially, are leading us into now. We believe that in many of the projects, the money should be spent today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe that the health care system, it is raining now. It is raining now at the Concordia Hospital, it is raining at the Municipal Hospitals, it is raining in terms of Outreach for AIDS, it is raining in terms of psychiatric care, it is raining in terms of Dauphin, the personal care homes in Dauphin, and it is really raining inside the Minister's department because the Minister cannot get anybody to work with him. He is not a bad little guy, I mean, I do not know why he cannot recruit anybody to work with him. I guess they really do not see past that foaming, speaking, speechifying the real warm fuzzy heart. We offer ourselves to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to help him recruit some people because he cannot get anybody to work for him anymore. It is really quite tragic. Sometimes I speak with tongue-in-cheek, as the Minister of Health does.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is raining in our health care system now, and what do we see? The task force Minister. No wonder nobody wants to work for the Minister, he has task forces to study the task forces to study the task forces. Yesterday, a person who we thought would be decisive in decision making, you know this John-Wayne-imitate from Pembina, the hero of the Wagonwheel Cafe. What can he do? Oh, when in doubt I will create a task force. If that task force does not work, I will put in a subcommittee on the task force.

Ask the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema). What a disgrace! There was not one decision in that announcement on health care yesterday. It was task force after task force after task force. I will tell you, you cannot run a farm like a task force. I thought you would start making decisions. Yes or no to Concordia; yes or no to the Municipal Hospitals; yes or no to Outreach—

An Honourable Member: He is running the Health Department like a farm anyway, he is shoveling a lot of manure around.

Mr. Doer: Thank you, that is what the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) wants for Concordia, and I will pass that on to the Minister of Cultural Affairs (Mrs. Mitchelson).

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thought we would get yes or no answers from this Minister, and this mush coming out of his mouth, I cannot believe it. I do not know what has happened to the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard). I think getting in that big broadloom carpeted office and those little potted plants that are watered every day, and somebody washing his car before, I think has made him soft. The plush velvet seat has turned him into a plush velvet-brained Minister of Health. We have no answers in terms of the Department of Health and no answers in terms of the direction of this health care system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe the money should be spent on the health care system. I agree with the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) and not the Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs). I believe the money should be spent on our health care system now, and that is why we are not going to defeat the fund. We are going to spend it on priorities now. We will have issues of principle and we will act accordingly. To us, this is very clear. Having good times deal with bad times is no problem with our Party, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have absolutely no problem with that concept at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the child care system in this province—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

An Honourable Member: You would not recognize content if you saw it.

Mr. Doer: I thought we had enough content on the Concordia Hospital two minutes ago from the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) from his seat, something that reinforces the city's opinion of how this Cabinet is

dealing with the health care facilities in our communities. I thank the Minister and Member for Arthur for those unfortunately very negative comments, but at least it is much clearer than we had from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) in the last 18 months.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe that the \$200 million should go to the child care system of this province. The child care system is in dire straits. Both Members, the federal Minister and the Conservative then-Leader-of-the-Opposition now-Premier (Mr. Filmon) stood in front of a place called Western Glove. They all went to Western Glove to make their great child care promises.

It is rather ironic that the Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney, almost a year ago in fact it was a Friday, a year ago today, before he spoke to the Party faithful about free trade, and the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition, went to a place called Western Glove to make their day care announcements. It is rather ironic because I had to fight Jake Epp, I remember, to get a day care in that centre when we were on the Core Area Agreement. The city was in agreement, the province was in agreement and of course the federal Minister; we had a lot of trouble with him on that child care position. Finally we were able to get that child care centre in that garment factory and I think it is a very, very good example for child care.

Look what has happened in the last year and a half since those announcements. First of all, money is being taken away from the universal non-profit child care centre. That is why when the Premier talks about the percentage increase, he is missing the point. Where is the money going, what is it doing, and why do we have the confrontation? He will go on like a broken record with the 45 percent number. I guess it has been given to him by his handlers, failing to note that most of that money was in last year's budget which was our budget. Where we had it going was different places than where it is going now, and that is why they are in so much difficulty.

The second reason why they are in so much difficulty, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is because they created a task force. They raised the expectations, they had Conservative appointments and other appointments from the community on that task force. They came out with a very, very intelligent report. It dealt with the issue of salaries. The Minister took it to Cabinet, and who in the Cabinet said no to the Minister and left the situation in a crisis situation today?

An Honourable Member: The whole front bench.

Mr. Doer: The whole front bench. The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) is absolutely correct. They have left the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) high and dry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They refused to meet with the community. They refused to deal with this problem. They refused to table a long-term solution to this problem. They refused to even accede to a conciliator that would not bind the Government. Conciliation is not the same as arbitration, but it would provide some way of getting rid of their stubbornness and giving us a long-term solution rather than having

a potential war situation. We proposed the peace situation, and the Conservative front bench and the Premier has rejected that.

* (1150)

We believe that some of that money in that rainy day fund, the Fiscal Stabilization Fund, should and could be used today. That is another reason why we will not defeat the fund, because we will argue that should go to creating more spaces and fairer salaries in our child care system. That is what we will do in terms of that argument of the child care fund and the Fiscal Stabilization Fund.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard a lot of questions in this Chamber on rural development and rural economic development. There is no question and nobody can deny that the quality of life and the infrastructure in rural Manitoba and rural Canada is being decimated day after day by, not just the marketplace, not just the provincial Government because I do believe it is sincere in its potential efforts on improving the state of affairs for rural Manitoba, but it is being totally decimated by the federal Government.

I believe the present federal Government, the Mulroney Government, makes all its decisions on polls. Those polls are usually generated by high population urban centres, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Vancouver, and there is absolutely no attention being given to the priorities of the rural quality of life. I believe this is something that all of us share in this Chamber, the concern for the way of life that is being decimated by continual decisions to ruin the infrastructure of this province. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in all fairness, I believe that all of us, all 57 of us, from all political Parties, want to do more for our rural infrastructure and to do more for our rural communities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think none of us had any pride in watching parts of the story that was done on television this week of the changing realities in rural Manitoba. I think everyone of us in this Chamber is committed to giving more opportunities to our rural way of life, the quality of life, the standards of life that I learned a little bit about when I was a child growing up outside of Neepawa. But quite frankly, I have learned a lot more as an elected Member of this Legislature visiting communities and listening to people on their quality of life, and the decimated effect of decisions of a federal Government nature that are destroying the opportunities for our communities and destroying the opportunities of our rural way of life.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe that again what a great opportunity. It is raining in rural Manitoba now. It is very, very important that rural Manitoba get needed long-term economic development. We believe that sewer and water projects in places like Dauphin, Portage and Brandon are good ideas. They are good ideas because they allow for industry to locate in those communities. I do not care whether it is a Conservative riding, or a New Democratic riding, or a potential Liberal riding. I believe in rural Manitoba. I believe that we should have a real look. The strategy that the Cabinet

is developing should include that \$200 million. Why wait? Why put it against an adjusted line in a budget vote?

I would rather take that money and invest in opportunity, invest in jobs and economic opportunity using the private sector and the public sector. I would like to see the Government announce as part of that fund next month for that \$200 million. Oh, yes, people will say, oh, it is politics and they are just trying to buy votes. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not argue that is happening if there is good economic opportunity in Portage and Dauphin. I will not argue that. I will say, good. Good, let us go with that money, let us get the plan, let us get it going now. We cannot wait six months. We cannot wait one year. We cannot put that money just against the deficit. We have to invest now and we will lower our deficit over time through jobs and opportunities and income tax revenues from corporations and people, a lot better than we will by just taking numbers in the Finance Department's books and juggling them around year to year.

Invest the money in rural Manitoba this year with that fund and take some of that money and announce it tomorrow for rural development in Dauphin and Portage. That is what we would support, that is again why we are not voting against that fund, and that is why we will advocate to spend it this year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other area which we believe this fund should be used for is northern economic development. We have a situation now where we do not know what is happening with the LynnGold mine; we do not know what is happening with one of our communities, Lynn Lake.

An Honourable Member: Very sensitive.

Mr. Doer: It is a very sensitive issue and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will note we have not raised that this week because we know there are sensitive negotiations going on and we want them to succeed. We want a success story with Lynn Lake. We do not want a negative story, get our 10-second clip about how insensitive the Government is and have hundreds and hundreds of people and families destroyed with the closing of that mine. We want a success story. We want to say, good for the Government on Lynn Lake because it is good for that northern community and it is good for those families.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that the millions and millions of dollars that are put into this rainy day fund, this Fiscal Stabilization Fund, should go back to a community like Lynn Lake. Northerners have put hundreds of millions of dollars, extra money, into the coffers of Government through extra mining revenue. Mining revenues go up and they go down based on the marketplace. They go up and down based on the commodity market.

It seems to us, when gold prices are down the way they are and they are down, and we know that gold prices will go up eventually which they will, and we have the orebody in Lynn Lake and other adjacent communities, that we should take the money that we

have, the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars that we have gained from revenue from mining corporations from northern Manitoba and give it to provide for a private sector-public sector bridging of the commodity market at Lynn Lake, so that we will not have a ghost town, but we will have a meaningful northern economic development.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again we believe that we should not defeat the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. We believe that we should use that money today to return some of the money that northern Manitoba has provided to our provincial coffers, and return it back for a bridging project for our province today. Why wait for a recession? Why wait for a recession in rural Manitoba? Why wait for a recession in the urban centres? Why wait for a recession in northern Manitoba? Oh sure, the recession will be good for us to argue against the Government politically, but it is awful for people and it is awful for our communities. That is why this money should be spent now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what about the trappers that have been burnt out by the forest fires? We believe there should be compensation not only for the equipment loss to the traplines, but we believe that the compensation should be made available for the trappers based on previous years' harvests of furs in northern Manitoba. Again we believe it is raining with the horrible situation, with the devastating fire in northern Manitoba, and it is a terrible situation. It is one which needs Government attention. It is one that needs Government resources. There is Government resources to deal with it. There is that \$200 million and, yes, we disagree with this Government. We believe that many of these priorities should be developed now. Sure, save some money for future fiscal years, but take some of the money out of that fund and deal with the priorities of health care, child care, rural development, northern development, trappers, et cetera, and now.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe our economy can wait. We have had zero growth last year. Yes, the Government will say, look at how many jobs we have created. We can point to look at how many jobs are lost. Zero growth, and we are heading towards, I believe nationally and I think all economists believe in their predictions, a worse situation in the spring of 1990. I believe that we should take some of that money now, because if we start investing the money now, we are going to start getting the dividends into 1990 in terms—

An Honourable Member: Like on Highway 75.

Mr. Doer: —well, that is another idea but you cannot defeat the fund though and build Highway 75 out of that fund. That is another idea.

An Honourable Member: Are you going to vote for or against it?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, there is no big mystery about what we are going to do. I had a press conference—let me see the date—June 7 we had a press conference—

An Honourable Member: It is Clayton that is asking, it is not us. We know who you are in bed with.

Mr. Doer: Well, we will see about that, Mr. Speaker. I would be very careful. I would not want to have an election right now and have the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) lose his seat.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Doer: You had better be very careful, you know. The last thing we want to do is—well, I do not want to even talk about the last thing we want to do. Just because you are not being careful over there does not mean that we are not going to be careful over here.

An Honourable Member: As if I would not have something interesting to do.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for St. Norbert is eyeing his palm tree and I do not blame him as the weather gets a little colder; so is the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery), but we are in here a bit for the long haul because there is lots of work to do, and the longer we are in here the more animated we have the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Maybe we will even get an answer in six months, maybe one answer. I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, we do not like the way in which some of this fund was established with underspending in Health, but we will not defeat this fund. We will not defeat this fund and have it go back to some previous year debt adjustment to go back to the Kelsey Dam adjustment. We are going to be very consistent. We are going to argue that the fund should be here in such a way that the priorities of Manitobans should be met. We agree with the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), we agree with the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo), we agree with the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) that there are priorities for people now, health care, child care, economic development priorities, the universities and therefore we will not defeat the fund and have it go in last year's budget.

We will argue strenuously with this Government that it is raining now on Manitoban's health, child care, and that the money should be spent in this fiscal year. Much of the money should be spent in this fiscal year, not all of it, but should be spent for people's priorities now, not just be a jagged line on a deficit reduction chart. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

* (1200)

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, this matter will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock).

BILL NO. 42—THE RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), Bill No. 42, The Residential Tenancies Act; Loi sur la location

à usage d'habitation, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). Stand?

Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Finance.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into a Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in the Chair.

SUPPLY—CAPITAL SUPPLY

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Mark Minenko): The Committee of Supply come to order, please.

The question before the committee is the following resolution:

RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$328,200,000 for Capital Supply for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1990.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Acting Chairman, what we are doing here is embarking upon the very formal system of bringing forward The Loan Act for this year. It is a significant amount of money.

What I have attempted to do over the last two Sessions of the Legislature, within this Legislature, is give Members of the Opposition an early opportunity to debate matters under The Loan Act, instead of waiting until the last part in the Session which had become the tradition over many years.

So I am trying to give Members opposite an opportunity to ask specific questions to our very many Ministers who are supporting a request to the Legislature for additional loan authority with respect to capital plans under their jurisdiction.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Minenko): Is the committee ready to pass the resolution?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

* (1210)

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Minenko): Agreed. The resolution is accordingly passed.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Mark Minenko (Acting Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered and adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS SUPPLY—CAPITAL SUPPLY

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Mark Minenko): The Committee of Ways and Means will come to order, please. The question before the committee is the following resolution:

RESOLVED that towards making good Certain Sums of money for Capital Purposes, the sum of \$328,200,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Is the committee ready to pass the resolution? (Agreed) The resolution is accordingly passed.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Mark Minenko (Acting Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the committee has considered and adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS BILL NO. 34—THE LOAN ACT, 1989

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 34, The Loan Act, 1989; Loi d'emprunt de 1989, to be ordered for second reading immediately.

SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 34—THE LOAN ACT, 1989

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) presented, by leave, Bill No. 34, The Loan Act, 1989; Loi d'emprunt de 1989, for second reading, to be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, the Bill is intended to provide borrowing and expenditure authority, as well as guarantee authority in some cases, which is required for non-budgetary capital programs—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

The Honourable Minister of Finance, speaking on second reading of the Bill, I inadvertently put the question to the House which has already been agreed, so I will just revert back. Right, fine? (Agreed)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before you, Bill 34, is intended to provide borrowing and expenditure authority, as well as guarantee authority in some cases which is required for non-budgetary capital programs for the fiscal year which began on April 1. These expenditure requirements are included in the capital Estimates for non-budgetary capital programs which were tabled earlier in the Session, with the exception of \$10 million which has been added for the University of Manitoba.

The Loan Act for 1989 has been restructured to provide the Legislature with a more comprehensive review of the total amount of both borrowing and expenditure authority required for the delivery of non-budgetary capital programs. Traditionally, authority provided within each Loan Act served as an increment to authority provided under previous Loan Acts which remain unabated. Being incremental and non-lapsing in nature, the authority to be voted did not bear an obvious relationship to either the overall magnitude of gross capital programs or to the actual amount to be borrowed within a given year.

(Mr. Mark Minenko, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The Loan Act for 1989, Mr. Acting Speaker—I would ask Members to note, if they would, the next two or three sentences I am about to read. The Loan Act for 1989 includes both the incremental and existing expenditure authority requirements for each of the non-budgetary capital expenditure programs, including amounts required to cover any existing commitments for expenditures to be made in the subsequent fiscal year. The Loan Act of 1989 also provides for the lapsing of previously voted expenditure authority for non-budgetary capital programs which is surplus to current requirements, or is not required for the purpose for which it was voted. Therefore, The Loan Act, 1989 will present the entire amount of non-budgetary capital expenditure authority available to the Government.

The amount of borrowing authority being requested is the amount required to fund the estimated

expenditures of non-budgetary capital programs during the fiscal year, plus an amount to provide sufficient authority to take advantage of favourable market conditions to pre-fund future expenditure requirements. This borrowing authority will be supplemented in each annual Loan Act to reflect the incremental authority required to cover the actual capital expenditures made, and the estimate of expenditures to be made in the fiscal year.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in essence, what we are proposing to do is to bring before the Legislature an estimate of the non-budgetary capital authority needed in this year only. From time to time Governments have passed authorities, they have not been used, they continue to sit on the books. Indeed there has been a case, and I can think back when I was sitting in the Opposition side, where in 1975 the Manitoba Development Corporation, MDC authority was used for the divestiture of Flyer Bus in 1985 or '86 in that period of time.

Mr. Acting Speaker, to us this represents sloppy bookkeeping. It represents at times a temptation for Governments not to come to the Legislature for authority, with respect to non-budgetary capital, but to pass it now, leave it on the shelf and use it if and when it is needed.

What we are proposing in this Act is to lapse all of those funds where there is not an identifiable need. In the large capital projects such as, for instance, Hydro Limestone, where the Limestone project would require capital funding over several years, that funding will not lapse from year to year because it is specifically project related.

Mr. Acting Speaker, when the Bill reaches the committee stage, I and my colleague can provide any necessary explanations for the information of Members.

I commend Bill No. 34 to the House.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to address this Bill 34. I have special questions if the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) would like to answer.

They are asking for approval for the non-budgetary items for this year. As we were in the opening statements of the Health debate yesterday, there was not even a single word from the Minister of Health's speech which outlined any capital expenditure for this year. It is already six months into this year and we have not heard any planning at all.

Mr. Acting Speaker, how can we just approve and say, let us go ahead with this when the number of places, I will give you an example, start with Klinik. Can the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), tell us why they are not funding Klinik in this year's budget? This is a prime example—

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Acting Speaker, on a point of order, I certainly do not want to put the Honourable Member off, but this

is second reading stage of debate on the principle of the Bill. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is here and is happy to answer the Honourable Member's question, but at the appropriate stage, that being committee, which follows.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): The Honourable Member for Inkster, on the same point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): On the same point of order, this is a debate on Second Reading. The Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) is entitled to refer to the Health Department because it is a major expenditure of this Bill. There is nothing wrong with him stating the remarks that he has thus far.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): The honourable Member for Thompson, on the same point of order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Acting Speaker, in terms of second reading, it is quite common practice for Members to ask brief questions for clarification from the Minister. If the Member is asking questions in debate on second reading, it is also common practice for Ministers to respond in closing comments following the reading of the Bill.

I would suggest that the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) certainly is in order, but that the Member should not expect the type of back and forth in terms of questions that is properly suited for committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): I would like to thank all Honourable Members for their advice, and as the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), and others—I would like to thank all of them for their advice and advise the Member that perhaps the principle of the Bill at this time should be debated, and if the Member does have some specific questions that perhaps we can just wait until this matter goes to committee. At that time, I believe the Ministers are in a better position to more fully answer the Member's questions. The Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), to continue his remarks.

Mr. Cheema: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker, I will give my questions to the House, but I will continue with my speech.

As I was saying, yesterday we did not hear a single word in the Minister's opening statement in regard to the capital expenditure in terms of the health care budget for this year. It is already six months into this year and a number of projects are waiting for a statement from this Minister.

A number of times a question has been asked in this House by both the opposition Parties in terms of the capital expenditures, in terms of what is happening at Klinik. Klinik has been operating under very stressful circumstances. A number of individuals are providing a very essential service along with a professional and also with volunteer organizations and by not providing

the funds, by not giving them any indication, it is causing a lot of stress among the patients, families and the staff, because—

* (1220)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I would like to remind all Honourable Members that the Member for Kildonan does have the floor. The Honourable Member for Kildonan, to continue his remarks.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Acting Speaker, as I was saying, by not providing an indication to all these projects, the Minister is clearly indicating they do not have any alternate ways of providing health care services in Manitoba. By spending 1.5 billion, by spending 1,500 per person they are not doing a decent job. As I outlined yesterday in the Health Estimates, they are wasting taxpayers' dollars, and most specifically the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has failed to provide, at least for 10 years and also into the year 2000. Why I am saying that is because he even fails to understand how the demographic, how the population is changing in Manitoba. He has not provided even a single indication which way the health care will lead for the next 10 years and later on.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there was not even a slight indication in his speech yesterday what kind of health system he would like, whether a patient-oriented health care system, professional-oriented health care system or a balance of both, there was not even a single statement. What he did, he just slammed both the Opposition Parties for inaccurate accusations. Rather than debating the real thing, he was more, like personal, and that is wasting the time of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Acting Speaker, how can the people of Manitoba and Winnipeg wait for the expansion at various hospitals? The St. Boniface Hospital continues to experience difficulty on the obstetrical floor. They are supposed to have 4,200 deliveries per year, they are already over that number last year and they need expansion at the obstetrical unit, but there was no indication. The Minister has failed a number of times because it is more a political decision rather than a rational decision, because what they are doing, they are wasting taxpayers' dollars. They are wasting taxpayers' dollars, because for him maybe six months more and they will be gone and after that he is going to complain and ask the same questions.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I was going through his questioning for the last six years and he was the most critical Member when he was Opposition Critic, but now he has failed to show any vision in all those areas, not even one improvement. How can he justify that the patient has to be transferred from one hospital to another? It is costing taxpayers in terms of ambulance money; it is costing taxpayers in terms of doctors' fees; it is costing in terms of the nurses' fees; costing an enormous amount of money, and he can laugh, but who is paying for that?—it is the taxpayers of Manitoba.

By making a single decision he could have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars, but no decision has

been made. The Misericordia Hospital had to go on their own and had an ad campaign to tell the public of Manitoba they have beds available, but it was not coming from this Minister. Mr. Acting Speaker, this is not leadership in the health care system.

As the Leader of the New Democratic Party was clearly indicating, this Minister is out of touch with reality with people, absolutely. Absolutely, even his consultation process is so bizarre that the nurses have to have a demonstration in front of the Legislative Assembly. They have to come outside the Legislative Assembly just to have one member on the Health Advisory Network. Mr. Acting Speaker, that Health Advisory Network has cost at least \$750,000 until now, and what has been achieved? He has not even presented a single report in this House from that advisory network. He is not justifying even a single dollar he is spending, and then we are spending 32 percent to 33 percent of the health care budget, and that is a significant amount.

Mr. Acting Speaker, how can he justify every day in the House and say that he has provided the mental health care system?

An Honourable Member: You are not supposed to ask questions.

Mr. Cheema: I am not asking questions, I am telling you all the reality of life. Probably it is the time to understand that there is a problem.- (interjection)- No, there is a problem, it can be dealt with, but if you are not going to listen, it is not going to improve. No one person can do it. There are hundreds of thousands of people who are better than all of us, who have ideas, why do you not listen to them, why do you not talk to people on the street? Are they happy after one and a half years of your administration? No. For good health care, they are deeply disappointed.

An Honourable Member: They are extremely happy, Gulzar.

Mr. Cheema: No, they are not. The Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) is saying they are extremely happy. He should ask people at Brandon, are they happy? Are they happy? Why are they complaining about the Brandon Hospital all the time? Why are they complaining about the Brandon Mental Health Centre? Because of the inaction of this Minister, because of what he did last year and the implications of health now, because you do not have anyone at Brandon, you do not have anyone at Selkirk. Shame on you, because this is a simple mismanagement. You are supposed to be the best person to provide the management.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order. Order, please. I could perhaps understand the enthusiasm by which Members would like to participate in the debate, but the Honourable Member for Kildonan does have the floor. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, the contentious feeling on the part of this Minister. If you read the Hansard there is one simple answer for all the questions. There is all convoluted answers, circumstantial answers, not even a single direct answer from this Minister. He thinks that nobody else knows it. Every Manitoban knows that he does not answer the questions.- (interjection)-

I know I had a good time in San Francisco. It was a beautiful city, but, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make here is that this Minister does not have a vision and based on the facts not on the circumstantial evidence that he has -(interjection)- He gave an example of Pine Falls and he should tell what the people of Fort Alexander are feeling now. He should tell them why they have to do without the system. Everyone should get the health care system not a special section of the community. You are not doing your job in the right way.- (interjection)- You can keep on reading Hansard, everyone reads Hansard. A lot of people do that, but people find things if they are right or wrong, but not the circumstantial evidence. You like to hear yourself, but you do not like to hear anyone else. That is your philosophy of politics, but that is wrong. You should listen to everyone else.- (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, we sincerely hope that the capital expenditures for the Clinic, for expansion of Concordia, expansion of the St. Boniface Hospital and especially the obstetrical floor, the intensive care nursery at both hospitals are required on an urgent basis. This Minister and this administration—and we will give a chance to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), we think he is doing a reasonably good job, but he should teach something to his Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

The hour being 12:30 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday.