

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 30 May, 1986.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a ministerial statement.

Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of members of the House a special anniversary that is occurring today which marks the 50th year of operation of the School Safety Patrol Program in the City of Winnipeg,

Nearly 8,000 school patrollers from across the province, and 100 special guests from Ottawa's School Patrol Program are assembling on the grounds of the Legislature this morning to take part in a mammoth parade.

The special events that are occurring today have been organized by a committee representing all 11 Winnipeg School Divisions, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Manitoba Motor League, parents, and police.

The School Patrol Program was initiated in 1936, by Louise Stapler, a teacher at Greenway School in Winnipeg. The Safety Bureau of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, forerunner of the Chamber of Commerce, later organized these patrols on a city-wide basis. These patrols, the first of their kind in Canada, which came into being over the last 50 years, see over 200,000 individuals, representing hundreds of communities and school divisions across the province, participating in school patrol programs.

The School Safety Patrol Program has provided a valuable opportunity for children to take their lessons of safety education learned in the classroom, and apply that knowledge to assist their community.

In addition to the nurturing of safe traffic habits, the School Patrol Program has developed the skills of our children in the areas of citizenship, leadership, and responsibility.

These young people seldom receive the recognition they justly deserve for the dedicated service they provide within their communities.

You can see them at their stations before most of their classmates are at school in the morning, and on duty after most of their friends have gone home in the afternoon.

These young ambassadors provide a priceless service that enhances the lives of children, parents, and motorists, making our communities a safer place to live.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to add the congratulations and the support of this very worthwhile program from the members on this side of the House and to support what the Minister has said. We agree that giving the students the opportunity to learn about the safety and the problems of the highways is important; we also believe that the key ingredient to this program of asking young children to become involved in the care and responsibility of their colleagues only helps and enhances their leadership and responsibility levels. It's a worthwhile program and we salute the young ambassadors who are coming from outside the province, and those who have gone through the program in the past, and those who are presently in it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK introduced, by leave, Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Planning Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire.

HON. A. MACKLING introduced, by leave, Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les courtiers en immeubles.

HON. J. STORIE introduced, by leave, Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques.

HON. G. LECUYER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 10, The Manitoba Hazardous Waste Management Corporation Act; Loi sur la Corporation manitobaine de gestion des déchets dangereux. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

HON. R. PENNER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les conflits d'intérêt au sein de l'Assemblée législative et due Conseil exécutif.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we move to Oral Questions, I'd like to direct attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 18 students of Grade 5 from St. Francois Xavier School. These students are under the direction of Miss Dawn Bohonof, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

On behalf of all the members, I'd like to welcome you to the Legislative Assembly this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

**Ft. Garry Women's Resource Centre -
decision of**

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Madam Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Community Services.

Last night I understand that the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre Board held an emergency meeting to discuss the affairs of letting staff go and whether they would close the centre.

I understand they have set a deadline of June 19, while terminating four positions and stopping all direct services, leaving a staff of one-and-a-half.

Could the Minister assure the House and the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre that a decision will be made by that date so that this valuable service will not be lost to the community?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the proposal will be going to Cabinet and will probably be completed by that date. I, of course, can never give absolute assurance of that.

Agreements between colleges

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education.

There are a number of special agreements between the Province of Manitoba and the provinces to the west of us, relating to specific educational entitlements of Manitoba children to be trained and obtain their educational degrees in the western universities. In particular, I am referring to children being allowed to go to a veterinary college in the west. My question to the Minister, are the number of agreements between these provinces in full effect and up-to-date?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry with a supplementary.

MR. C. BIRT: Yes, Madam Speaker. While the Minister is making inquiry on that particular point, I'm wondering if he'd enquire as to the reasons why the agreement between the Province of British Columbia and the Province of Manitoba has not been renewed to allow the audiology program that is offered in British Columbia for Manitoba students to participate and attend that school.

HON. J. STORIE: I will take that as notice as well, Madam Speaker.

Child abuse

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. Mercier: Madam Speaker, a question to the Minister of Community Services.

She, having met with a number of people vitally interested in the whole question of child abuse, I wonder if she could announce to the House whether she is prepared to take any interim steps to deal with this question of child abuse.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, we did meet with the medical people, police people, Child and Family Service people last night to go over the current situation and identify any problems from their perspective in the way the current situation is operating.

We did discuss with them the terms of reference of the study which I had already announced would take place as an independent review and got their comments and suggestions.

At the same time, we told them that we would be issuing an interim directive, prior to the time when we get a recommendation from that consultant, to resolve the way the different experts in the field of child abuse work together. Naturally they bring different experience and concern and one of the problems that seems to be emerging is that, when there is a dispute, there is not a clear understanding of who has the legal authority and responsibility, or as to how the different opinions could be constructively resolved.

We have found in working with the Native children's issue, that a directive which provided for a rapid dispute resolution process, whereby if there was an irresolvable difference of opinion in the people involved in the decision, they could immediately request, from the director, mediation service to resolve the issue, hopefully to everyone's satisfaction, but to allow that second stage of review and discussion.

Also attending the meeting was the newly appointed Winnipeg Co-ordinator for Child Abuse and the Provincial Co-ordinator. I am also very happy to say that the Winnipeg Co-ordinator will shortly have at his disposal two trainers who will be working to train the workers in the field better to understand the issue. Some people still are arguing that you need a very small core of experts.

But the extent of the problem we're finding, some estimates are that up to 40 percent of the cases in the Child and Family Service system have an element of child abuse. So although we do need the central expertise, we also require training of the workers in the field.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I would ask the Minister if she would undertake to table in the House, for the information of members, a copy of the interim directive and also advise the House in due course as to the results of the — pardon me, I don't think the Minister heard. Madam Speaker, I would ask the Minister if she would undertake to table in the House,

for the information of members, a copy of the interim directive and also advise the House when the inquiry has been completed.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll be happy to do that. I think our estimate at the moment of when we will have the agreement is around Tuesday, and I'll be happy to table the terms of reference. We are looking at a November reporting date with the tabling of the report in the next Session. We've also included though, in the terms, if there are interim recommendations for any action, they would be welcomed. But, in addition, we are putting in the interim directive to help sort out.

One of the problems, I guess with the child abuse area, is that, although a lot of leadership is coming from the Child and Family Service area, those workers alone can't begin to deal with all of the problems. It's very important that we build a co-operative approach. There has been progress made, but I guess the complexity and the enormity of the problem does call for an extra type of directive to help guide the multidisciplinary teams.

Bilingual Statutes - cost of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

A question to the Attorney-General, Madam Speaker. On December 4, I wrote to him requesting him to advise me as to the amount of the additional cost caused by his undertaking to publish the laws of Manitoba in a bilingual double-column format so that both texts will appear on the same page, rather than the present practice, particularly in view of the demand to date for statutes in the French language. On December 23, 1985, the Attorney-General advised me that there is no additional cost to the proposal to publish the laws of Manitoba in a bilingual, double-column format.

My question to him, Madam Speaker, is: could he then explain to the House why the cost of a complete set of statutes has risen from \$645 last year to \$1,219 this year, and why the annual cost of updating the statutes has been doubled?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The cost to which the member refers has nothing to do with the way in which the bilingual statutes are printed, but are just normal price increases because, in fact, we have not yet begun to print the continuing consolidated with the bilingual. There will be one or two bills in bilingual format, but the continual and consolidated statutes will continue in the way in which they are for the rest of this fiscal year. So the cost increases to which he refers do not relate to the cost of printing the bilingual statutes.

I don't know what figures he has there, but I am willing to examine the figures that he has, and relate it to what is actually taking place in this fiscal year.

I should say, finally, Madam Speaker, that the order of the Supreme Court was that the statutes from now on, and that will follow when we redo the continuing consolidated statutes, be in the same way that the

Canadian statutes are; that is, English on one side, and French on the other. That's what we mean by the double column. The Queen's Printer has estimated, on the basis of estimates received, that in fact is the cheapest way of doing the bilingual statutes. But that will emerge in the following fiscal year.

Highways construction - status of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Highways. While I'm on my feet, I would like to thank him for responding to my individual requests in my past. But, given the fact that approximately \$12 million has been cut from the Department of Highway's budget, what then is the status of those highways and provincial roads which, until recently, were under construction? What is the status of those which had been proposed, some of them as recently as the last provincial election?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, that is a very broad question. This will be dealt with in detail during the Estimates process. I understand that the Department of Highways and Transportation will be in Committee in Estimates, the first department in the next week, so the Opposition members will have an opportunity to discuss those projects.

MR. G. ROCH: Will the repair and maintenance of the existing network of provincial roads and highways suffer from the cutbacks announced on Budget night because, at present, repairs and maintenance of existing roads have been sparse and minimal.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I should point out that the maintenance portion of the Budget is receiving more dollars than it has in the past, so there will be no reduction at all in the maintenance function.

Insofar as the construction element of the Budget, I indicated during my Budget speech that there is not a \$12 million reduction in the actual expenditures, only about \$3 million from last year, Madam Speaker. There are a number of other factors to consider, the fact that oil prices have reduced substantially, asphalt price have been reduced, which should result in about an equal amount of work being done this year, as was done in the past year.

MR. G. ROCH: To be more specific, Madam Speaker, will those roads which were currently under construction in Springfield, and those which were either proposed or promised by the former MLA for Springfield, both before and during the recent election campaign, will they be constructed, as originally planned and proposed, or is this government going to try and punish the people of Springfield, as in the case of the closing of the Falcon ski slope, cancellation of Cook's Creek diversion project, to name but a couple of examples?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, as I've indicated, the details of the construction budget will be discussed during the Estimates process.

Community Mental Health Course - eligibility and funding

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Community Services.

The government has announced the closing of the School of Psychiatric Nursing at Portage la Prairie and that left a terrible gap, I believe, in the availability of adequately trained people in mental retardation.

She subsequently announced a Community Mental Health Course at Red River Community College. Will she tell me how the course is being funded and who will be eligible for the course?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the Community Mental Health Course at Red River does not come under my jurisdiction.

The psych nursing training that's related to the Portage la Prairie Psych Nursing School, the delivery of that program, is being carried on in two centres, rather than three, but with the same number of students, the same mental retardation component in theory and practice, plus the development of an additional speciality component and practicum placement from the other centres.

The supply of psych nurses, measured against the demand in our system and in the mental health and geriatric psychology areas, is being monitored, and at the moment we feel the supply does match the demand.

If the member, however, is referring to training required by the community, delivery of mental retardation services, the training there is in quite a variety of forms, some of it on-site, being delivered to the caretakers; some is occurring in the day activity programming; and there may be some people who are attending the course he identified who will find their way into that system, because there's some very common elements in support of disabled people who are living in the community.

MR. E. CONNERY: A supplementary, Madam Speaker. A specific question was asked. The question was asked: how is the course at Red River College being funded and who will be allowed to attend the course? I am told it is being restricted to residents of the Core Area, therefore, precluding other residents of Manitoba from taking this course. Would somebody give me a direct answer?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, given that that falls under my jurisdiction, I will take that question as notice and report back to the House.

MR. E. CONNERY: A further supplementary. There is a concern from the Registered Psychiatric Nurses that the course will not be up to the normal standards and,

therefore, the service to the mentally retarded. Will they assure us that the standards will be there?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I indicated that I would be taking that question as notice, but I can assure him that Red River Community College, or any other community college, would not be offering a course unless it was up to standard.

Water Rates - Winnipeg Hydro

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs.

In the Budget Estimates, it indicated that water power rental rates to the City of Winnipeg would be increasing some 67 percent. Presumably, that money, Madam Speaker, is in the Budget, as government policy, and is unlikely to be changed.

Can the Minister first indicate if he is going to be meeting with City of Winnipeg officials in the very near future?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Yes, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance and myself will be meeting with the mayor this afternoon to review the provisions in the Budget, not to change the provisions in the Budget, but to look at other factors, such as, the surplus of profit over Budget from last year; to look at the impact of the Budget on the city; and to look at the fact that the anticipated charge from Manitoba Hydro to Winnipeg Hydro was \$33 million last year and it only came in at \$29, and what will that be for this year.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you very much for the answer.

The fact of the matter is, though, I wonder what the purpose of the meeting is, if simple discussions are going to take place, and the fact that there is going to be a \$5 million shortfall in the City of Winnipeg Hydro revenues as a result of this Budget situation. Can the Minister explain really what they are going to talk about, apart from beating around the bush?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, the member opposite is using different figures than the city is using. We have figures and projections, we're going to sit down and discuss what we anticipate will be the surplus, based on the direct cost of water and the indirect costs through Manitoba Hydro. We think it is fair to sit down and compare numbers and we're going to do that this afternoon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood with a supplementary, with no preamble.

MR. J. ERNST: As a matter of fact, I have a question for the Minister of Sport, if I may, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Proceed.

Baseball Stadium - status of

MR. J. ERNST: In light of the fact that it's apparent the Tuscon Toros will not be coming to Winnipeg and the fact that the Minister had announced at some earlier time a substantial program for sport facilities for Winnipeg, can the Minister tell the House, is that going to continue? Will that program proceed regardless of whether AAA baseball comes to Winnipeg or not?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Sport.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Madam Speaker, if the negotiations that we had with the city were in good faith, I think it will continue. I think that the province always stated that the first priority was facilities for amateur sports, although if we could help bring professional baseball here, that was a plus.

The city, the mayor stated also, agreed that Winnipeg was lagging behind any of the other cities in Canada on facilities for amateur sport and also said that they had been neglected in the past.

We are ready to discuss with the city the option, I would hope, of following with the agreement that we have had as dealing with amateur sport.

Drivers' licences - suspension re failure to honour time payment

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. Earlier in this Session, the Minister indicated that a penalty of removing the driver's licence for failure to pay an insurance premium was necessary. I've subsequently learned that neither Saskatchewan, nor British Columbia, who have similar schemes, find it necessary to impose such a penalty.

Will he undertake a review of the inappropriateness of this penalty?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The optive section is found in The Highway Traffic Act. I believe that particular section is being reviewed at the present time.

Seat belts - crackdown on use

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to ask a question to the Minister of Highways that follows upon the question I posed yesterday, that dealing with seat belts.

I'm wondering if the Minister can now disclose to the House what the 1984 results were versus 1983, of deaths and injuries, given the fact that within this province, seat belt usage jumped to 60 percent from roughly 10 percent in 1983.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, the statistical basis does not hold true necessarily from year to year. The assumptions vary and it is clear that the usage was not maintained at a high level of about 80 percent, which was certainly one of the assumptions that went into the statistical predictions that were made on the saving of lives because of the use of seat belts.

So there was additional deaths. However, I pointed out yesterday that 70 percent to 75 percent of those deaths occurred with people who were not wearing seat belts at that particular time. That is of grave concern, obviously, and one of the reasons we are undertaking to improve the seat belt usage in the province.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister indicate to me whether or not the two facts I am about to give are accurate? I may tell him — it probably comes as no surprise to him — they have been developed by Mr. Martens of Sanford, who has a vital interest in this area.

In 1984, there were roughly 14 more people killed within the motor vehicle, and that there were 924 more people that were injured in 1984 than in 1983 when seat belt usage was six-fold higher.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. Beauchesne, Citation 362 states that: "It is the Member's duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings it to the attention of Parliament."

It is not in order to ask the Minister to ascertain the truth of statements a member is bringing.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will assume, then, my numbers were correct and ask the Minister when members of this House, and when the province, might expect a report on the 1985, preliminary or otherwise, 1985 statistics regarding deaths and injuries on the highways of Manitoba?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I will undertake to get that information. I believe the 1985 statistics are available and we should be able to provide that to the House, Madam Speaker.

Free trade - trucking industry

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is also for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. In view of the fact that there have been various statements recently expressing concern about the impacts of proposed deregulation and free trade in the trucking industry, most recently statements made by the Manitoba Trucking Association, I would like to ask the Minister what contact he has had with his provincial colleagues, with the Federal Government, and with industry and labour with regard to this very important matter.

Friday, 30 May, 1986

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, there has been extensive consultation undertaken by the department, by my department and myself, with other Ministers across the country, and the Federal Minister, as well as industry and labour on the issue of trucking deregulation particularly, although deregulation of all of the transportation modes.

We do have a great deal of concern, and we have expressed that on numerous occasions to the Federal Minister and to the other provinces, with regard to trucking deregulation because we have so much at stake here in the Province of Manitoba. Nine of Canada's 15 largest trucking firms are headquartered here; there is a lot of employment and we are concerned about the impact that this will have on the viability of Manitoba trucking firms, and the potential for U.S. domination of trucking firms in Canada and Manitoba, in particular.

I've been disappointed with the reaction of the Federal Minister and other provinces at times, Madam Speaker, but we have continued to put forward the position that we should move cautiously and prudently and slowly with regard to deregulation in order that we ascertain the implications on all segments of the industry before we move ahead, to ensure that safety is protected and jobs are protected in the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson with a supplementary.

Train derailment, Northern Manitoba

MR. S. ASHTON: No, Madam Speaker, it's another question this time for the Minister of the Environment.

I'd like to ask the Minister if he could give this House an update on the recent train derailment in the area of Pikwitonei.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yes, as of Wednesday night, I believe some 4,000 gallons of oil had been recovered from the spill in the area. It appears, Madam Speaker, that there's close to one complete car that has emptied into the pond which is blocked from draining into the water supply of the Town of Pikwitonei; and as well the department has ordered two other dikes be put up to further afford additional protection. We expect that the fuel will be pretty well completely recovered and the area cleaned up by early of next week. The work in that area will continue throughout the weekend. Any damage that is evident appears to be minimal as we had expected.

Northern Flood Agreement - settlement outstanding liabilities

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, on Friday, 16 May 1986, the Leader of the Opposition asked a number

of questions in this House about the Northern Flood Agreement, one of which I took as notice, and that related to this question. He asked if the Attorney-General could indicate whether or not the province assumes total liability under the Northern Flood Agreement. He said that Manitoba Hydro was default. His premise was, Madam Speaker, knowing that there are three parties to the agreement; first of all, there are four parties to the agreement, not three.

Secondly, in response to the question, no, the Manitoba Government does not assume liability under the agreement should the Manitoba Hydro default on its commitments.

Home Economics Directorate - status of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Health. On Wednesday, the Minister indicated to the Member for Pembina that he would find out why the four home economist specialists were told they could not attend the June 3 major program planning and training annual workshop. In light of the fact that it is the annual planning and training and the major workshop for home economists in health and agriculture, and that these specialists train the field home economists, could the Minister inform the House if that directive has been changed and that they will now be able to go?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, the situation was when it was decided that the four home economists would no longer be served in the department, although the situation is — supposing the people are still there — the employees are still there until the decision is made where the expertise and where the services would be coming from, either Community Services or Agriculture and so on.

The agenda, unknown to me, of this meeting — you have to remember that this conference is internal — is for the Department of Health, financed by the Department of Health. The agenda was changed. There was a request to change the agenda and there was no longer any reason for the home economists to attend this meeting because they were dealing with questions concerning the department at this time. The chief economist will be attending the conference also.

They are no longer dealing at the conference. There's nothing on the agenda dealing with money management, housing and those things, so there's no reason for these people to attend this conference . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Madam Speaker, is the Minister telling us that the conference, that is the major planning and training event of the year for 28 home economists in health and agriculture, that the agenda has changed and that the home economists will not be dealing with any training at all at this conference? Maybe the Minister could tell us why the conference is being held?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is a conference being sponsored and held for the Department of Health. In the future, certain services that were rendered by staff in the Department of Health will be changed and go to another department. When that was announced, the organizer of the program felt there is no point in dealing with that particular subject which would no longer be the responsibility of the Department of Health. Anything else, there's a lot of other issues, and we are retaining some home economists in the Department of Health dealing with nutrition and so on. Money managing, housing and the other subjects are no longer. Normally, they would have all attended, there's no doubt about that, but that because these people would be leaving the Department of Health, that was changed. The agenda was changed. There's no point, at a time when these people were no longer with the Department of Health. I'm not saying it was the right decision. It might have been a misunderstanding. They didn't realize that the people would be there for that time. This has been changed and then they felt there was no reason for certain economists, certain people to be there at that time, because the subject would no longer be discussed at this area; talking about money management, and housing in these areas. A lot of other things will be discussed and the head economist, who stays with the department, will be there also to get any information and pass it on.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Madam Speaker, my question now is to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

Has the Minister been involved in the discussions re the home economist specialists and, if so, will she be recommending that these positions be kept?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have been working very closely with the Minister of Health, with the Minister of Community Services, with the Minister of Agriculture to ensure that we put in place the best possible program to meet the needs of home economists in the field. We are in the process of reviewing that whole area. We are consulting with the Home Economists Association; we are consulting with the Women's Institute. We are hearing their concerns and as they have indicated by a press release, they are feeling positive about the process of consultation. We will continue to seek their input and advice and we will form our decision on the basis of their input, and on the basis of the most efficient way to deal with service to the home economists in the field for this government.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park with a supplementary?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, with a supplementary to the same Minister.

The Member for Pembina tabled the letter from a home economist saying that they had thought, following the meeting . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, a supplementary, as the member well knows, needs no preamble, it is to follow on the answer that the Minister has just given.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Then, my question to the Minister is, in light of the not to allow the home economists to go to the training and workshop, there has been a change in feeling of some of the women in the Women's Institute and the home economists. Will the Minister now put aside the fact that they are going to be consulting, and give a commitment to affirmative action and not to allow four senior positions held by women to be terminated?

MADAM SPEAKER: I'm not clear as to which Minister the honourable member is directing her question.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: To the same Minister I indicated . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister responsible for the Status of Women?

My understanding is that the people you are referring to are not in that Minister's jurisdiction.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Madam Speaker, the Minister involved is the Minister for the Status of Women. I was asking her if she would keep a commitment to the Affirmative Action, and not allow these positions to be terminated.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As my colleagues have indicated previously, this government is very committed to the services provided through some sort of central co-ordination, research training function. We have made a commitment to the people in the field, to the home economists and to those on staff that we will try to find the best way to provide that service. They have expressed concern in the past about that service being somewhat disjointed in terms of different departments being involved. They would like to see us carry out this review to ensure the best consolidation of service and the most sensitive service to this home economist in the field.

As the Manitoba Women's Institute has indicated, through a news release, which I will be glad to table, they recognize that this government is in agreement that a central home economics resource director be maintained. That is consistent with what we have been saying, that the services will continue to be provided, and that the present positions are frozen until the matter is resolved; and that we will continue to consult with all of the representatives involved, including the Chief Home Economist.

Abuse of Dial It 900 service

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Telephone

Friday, 30 May, 1986

System. On Tuesday, the 13th of May, a question was asked about the use of the 1-900 Service for accessing what is ostensibly a sex message. Concern was expressed about that service, and the Minister indicated at that time, some two-and-a-half weeks ago, "I have asked the board to consider that matter and to give me a report on what they propose to do with it."

My question to the Minister is: has the board considered the matter and have they reported to him on the matter?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: The board, Madam Speaker, did give some consideration. They discussed the matter, and I had a discussion with the chairperson of the board about that question. I asked her for further information, and further consideration of the question, I believe, is going on by the board, and I expect that I will be in a position, or the board in a position, to make an announcement on that fairly early next week.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my further question then to the Minister is: can he indicate whether or not it is possible, technically, to block access to those 1-900 numbers within the technology of the Telephone System?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, have other provincial jurisdictions blocked access to these sex messages through that vehicle of the Telephone System technology?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether he has, personally, listened to some of these messages. I say that, Madam Speaker, in regard to a sincere concern on his part which I believe that he should have with respect to the content of the messages which are filthy. I have had one of the media outlets provide me with a tape of it. It's the sort of thing that I know that no one would like to think that any of our children are accessing freely in Manitoba today. I wonder if he has taken the opportunity to listen to the messages and make a judgment as to whether or not he thinks that's fair for Manitoba children to be allowed to continue to access those messages.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, the short answer to the Leader of the Opposition would be, no. However, I think I want to make it clear that I have formulated the view that the use that is being made of that service is offensive. I formulated that view on

the basis of the representations of people that were made to me, and organizations that were made to me, and I believe those people to be true and responsible. I don't have to make personal use of that service in order to verify what they say.

I'm satisfied that it is offensive, and I have asked the board to determine whether the service should be disconnected. They have shown some concern about the board becoming a censor, and I have discussed that with them. I expect to be making an announcement some time next week on that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to draw attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 17 students of Grade 9 from the Souris school. These students are under the direction of Miss Dianne Plamondon, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

On behalf of all the members, I would like to welcome you to the Legislature this morning.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, prior to Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Government House Leader if he could outline government business for next week.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would be pleased to do so. After some discussions with the Opposition House Leader and some of the representatives of different committees in his caucus, and discussions with the Member for River Heights, I can indicate that, on Tuesday, we will be holding committee hearings on Public Accounts at 10:00 a.m. on June 3. Of course, that evening will be the Budget vote and the conclusion of the Budget Debate.

On Wednesday, June 4, it is my intention to call Interim Supply. We may also proceed with one or more second readings at that time, but may not, that would be known on that day. Of course, Private Members' Hour will begin on Wednesday, June 4, as well.

On Thursday, June 5, if required, Public Accounts would be continuing their review. As well, it would be our intention to have the commencement of the departmental review of the Estimates, starting with Agriculture in the Chamber and, according to the schedule as outlined to me by the Opposition House Leader, the Department of Highways and Transportation outside of the Chamber.

MR. G. MERCIER: One further question on House Business, Madam Speaker, would the Government House Leader undertake to review the reports that have

not yet been tabled in the House that are required to have been done by the legislation, and indicate to the House next week when those will be completed?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: That review is under way now. There are several that still require some tabling. Some of the legislation is not exactly clear as to when that tabling is required. But it is our intent to have all the reports tabled as soon as it is possible and I can provide a report directly to the Opposition House Leader early next week as to what is outstanding and when we would expect them to come forward.

ORDERS OF THE DAY BUDGET DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs has 12 minutes remaining.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In speaking to the Budget yesterday, I reached the point at which I wanted to deal with the matter of the issue of public debt. I was listening to the remarks from the Member for Fort Garry and he had made some reference to the Federal Budget presented some time in February. As I recall, it was at that time that a large number of people in Manitoba started paying attention to the matter of the public debt. Unfortunately, I think that a great number of Manitobans do not fully understand the meaning of the public debt and may lack some knowledge as to the situation in Manitoba vis-a-vis the other provinces in Canada.

Quite often we have the figures thrown at us as to the absolute amount of the public debt. I think what is more important is the province's ability to service that public debt rather than the absolute amount. Its akin to a person who may buy a \$500,000 farm, one should be more concerned with the buyer's potential to service that debt rather than the debt itself whether it be \$400,000 or 500,000.00. The Opposition thought it had a big issue in the last few weeks of the campaign because there was this focus by the media on the national debt. Lacking any targets in the Provincial Government's campaign, they latched on to the issue of public debt and wasn't Manitoba going to hell in a hand basket and there were certainly being some questions being asked.

(Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

The reality is, and it's documented in the Budget Address, that Manitoba's public debt — well, let's look at expenditures first of all. Expenditures per capita, it seems that there is a myth, and I'm sure it is purposely perpetrated by opposition parties, the New Democratic Party Government is a wild spender, so often recall the term used by the former leader of that party about spending like drunken sailors.

Well, the reality is that when you compared Manitoba with the other nine provinces, we have the third lowest

expenditure per capita in 1985-86, the only provinces that have a lower expenditure per capita being British Columbia and Ontario. So there are six others that have a higher rate of spending.

In terms of the public debt itself, I think far too often people do not realize that a good part of that public debt is a self-sustaining debt and a large portion of the provincial debt is as a result of the expenditures that have been incurred in the development of our hydro resources. In fact, more than 60 percent of the public debt is debt incurred through Manitoba Hydro and self-sustaining debt. Public debt has been used to build assets in our province, to serve our province, to develop our province and to sustain the economy, and programs for people.

In terms of the ability of the province to service the debt, it is noted from the material provided in the Budget Address that Manitoba spends some \$246 per capita to service the debt charge. That is the fourth lowest debt charge per capita in Canada. Only Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan have a lower per capita charge. All provinces to the east of Manitoba have a higher dollar per capita charge.

In terms of whether we have mortgaged the future of our children — I hear that so often about — let's not worry today, but what are we doing to our children, this millstone that we have placed around their neck? Again the reality is that the total debt per capita in Manitoba has increased at a rate that compares favourably with the rest of our country.

I note from the information provided, that last year, British Columbia had a 34 percent increase in its total debt per capita. I noticed that Nova Scotia had a 14 percent increase; that Saskatchewan, a Conservative province I believe, had a 17 percent increase; that Ontario had an 11 percent increase. Manitoba's increase of 10 percent is somewhere in mid-range, certainly not out of line with what has been taking place outside of the province.

In closing, I'd like to again commend the Minister of Finance for a fair and responsible Budget, one that considers our priorities and that is to create jobs, to maintain a vibrant economy, a Budget that deals with a major crisis that is found in the province at the present time and that is in the agricultural sector. I know that the province will continue to do as much as it can and will continue to pressure Ottawa for further assistance. This is a Budget that continues to provide services for all Manitobans in health, education and other social programs.

I know that, as we deal with the Estimates, there will be plentiful opportunities for all of us to determine what changes may have been made, where improvements or expansions have been made, and certainly there is a need to review all our activities. However, the Budget is presented by the Minister I think very responsibly addresses the needs of Manitobans and provides us with the opportunity to continue with the mandate that was provided to this government on March 18 of this year.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

When I got up to give my initial Throne Speech address, I was remiss — I guess I was a little nervous of the Speaker and I did miss two important things. I must have flipped an extra page and not known I was doing it. I was really remiss in not making mention that I have the pleasure of succeeding the Honourable Lloyd Hyde. Lloyd represented this constituency for eight years less 23 days.

Unfortunately, Lloyd officially announced his not running in the election and suddenly passed away three days later. He had announced that he was wanting to retire and spend some time with his wife and his new pride, the berry patch.

We're very pleased that Lloyd led the Portage constituency back to the PC fold after 15 years of wilderness in the Liberal confines.

Lloyd loved his constituency and he loved his province and he took great pride in representing the constituency in this House. Lloyd was very proud of his country and, unlike some others, enlisted in the army in the Second World War to protect this great country of ours. This pride is carrying on. His son Tom just recently asked me for another flag of Manitoba. The old one was getting worn out and Tom is going to carry on in his father's footsteps.

The loss was a terrible tragedy to Isabel and her family, just at a time when Lloyd was only 65, where they could have enjoyed their retired life.

I'm sure the House will join with me in wishing Isabel and her family well in the future years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also neglected, at that initial speech, to thank the constituents of Portage la Prairie who voted in the last election but, more expressly, to the 51 percent who voted PC; and also thanks to the large, excellent campaign committee who worked very hard for me under probably the worst conditions we've ever held an election in. Really, Madam Speaker, it was inconsiderate or a downright stupid time of the year to call an election in Manitoba.

The Member for Charleswood, who just said, hear, hear, can attest to the fact that it's injurious to your health. Even though we increased our lead over the NDP by a 1,000 votes, I shouldn't take too much pride in it because, typically, he was a very poor candidate and did nothing for the City of Portage.

I'd like to go into the agricultural sector, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Manitoba was very proud in announcing that it was going to be spending \$12.2 million extra on agriculture this year, but it was pointed out by the former Minister of Agriculture that it is not the largest budget that Agriculture has ever had spent on it. In fact, it is \$5 million short of the 1982 one, when there really was a disaster. Although it wasn't in the original Estimates, we didn't know there was going to be a drought that year, but this government, the government that was in power at that time, saw fit to spend \$41 million to save the farm community, and this government now is doing very little to protect it.

We also know what has come out of Alberta and Saskatchewan. There are many suggestions as to what this government could do for the farm community. They've got some excellent programs and even one or two of these would be more than welcome. A reduction of the educational tax also on the farmer would be a beneficial fact, even though the amount we had suggested as a beginning wasn't large, it was a beginning.

Also, the Member for the Interlake isn't here. He was very proud of his Farm Land Ownership Act, but it is now one of the acts that is hurting the farm community very much and I hope that he would repeal it in a short while.

There are some good things in the Estimates in the Agriculture Department. It's not all negative and I wouldn't want to suggest it was all negative. I think the Farm Aid help to farmers is a good one. It doesn't address all of the problems of farmers, but at least it shows some indication that the Minister is aware of the problems.

They've got a good Beef Stabilization Program, but it does not address the needs of the feedlot operators and a lot of jobs and business have been lost because the feedlot operators weren't recognized. Farm Start will also help some young farmers get into agriculture and help some older farmers sell their farm.

The CRISP Program, of course, was just one that's been put back in and we're happy to see it back in for the farm families who really do need help, but it shouldn't have been taken out in the first place, so we welcome at least a little bit of common sense coming back into the government.

I'll turn, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to Business Development and Tourism. During the Budget Address, when it was announced that there was going to be a \$50 million loan fund for business development, the Minister in charge was all carried away and fluttering her hands and thought something was really going to happen. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it just indicates the lack of business sense on that side of the House and especially in the Minister of that department, for business, to think that \$50 million over five years, \$10 million a year, will have any significant impact on the business industry.

We have some statistics here that I would like to make mention of, and it's in the investment, private expenditures, in millions. Going back to 1981 and comparing it to 1985, if you take out the additional housing starts, the additional housing starts in '85, over 1981, you find there is a lower private sector investment in Manitoba today than there was in 1981.

While private sector investment has in actuality gone down, the public sector expenditures have gone up by some 50 percent; so while the government brags about all their job creation and investment, it is government created at public expense, jobs that will not be there in the long term and will put us just further into debt, so it's borrowed money and it's just a bad, bad, bad deal.

When she talks about this \$10 million in one year, it's less or around one-half a percent of the annual private investment. Now what stimulus is one-half of one percent going to do? But it's only a loan, but even if they gave the amount of the interest away, which let's assume at 10 percent is a million dollars, it's .05 percent of private investment. That's if they forgive the interest; very, very pathetic and I think very short-sighted on the part of the government.

There is also a small manufacturing adaptation program which I don't think is really going to be all that good. The tragedy that we are facing in business is that on the other side of the House, and as I have looked and tried to determine what the backgrounds of the various members are, we see people with almost no business background. Their experience has either

been in unions, working for somebody else. I don't see the members on the other side having produced any new jobs with their own money.

The only experience they have, really, in business, would be the Member for the Interlake and I guess you could say he's a turkey farmer; and the Member for Lac du Bonnet — I think it's a tragedy — because the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I think has some real good business experience and municipal experience.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the industry needs now is a climate and I think, as Harry Enns pointed out the other day, he said he was reaching out; and I think really what the industry now needs is a reaching out from the government to try to develop a climate that is going to be conducive to developing business in this province.

I have a scenario, and it's to do with the labour legislation. These people have introduced labour legislation that I feel has cost this province a lot of private investment and a lot of jobs. Labour legislation that precludes the employer speaking to his employees at the time that there is a union organizing going on, I would relate it to make it so that they could maybe understand, and it's got to be pretty simple for them to understand, I admit.

Let's suggest that there was a push to unionize children, and of course the unionizer, the criteria for a unionizer, has generally got to be a bully, not too bright, loud and doesn't care for others, concerned only for his own position. Some here resemble that criteria.

The platform of this supposed union would be, children do not have to attend school. They could drink at the age of 14, have drugs, no curfews, huge increases in allowance and personal care; and all the time that this is happening, the parents can not speak to the children because it would be against the legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the parents know if their children didn't have to attend school that what would it do to their future. Education, as has been pointed out by other members, is very crucial to the future of this province and the future of individuals, but they couldn't speak to them about this to tell them the dangers of what was being proposed.

They also wouldn't be able to talk to them of the dangers of drinking and drugs and what would happen to their morals and their whole well-being if they followed this process.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the huge increases in allowance would be a financial burden on the family, and unfortunately, this family's wage earner is a farm equipment salesman — and you know what it's like now in the farm industry — so his income is down. So what happens is that the marriage breakup takes place and the children end up in foster homes. The marriage breakup is tantamount to the company going broke and the children in foster homes is paramount to the workers being unemployed.

The payroll tax also is another very very regressive labour legislation and I don't think members opposite really understand what this 1.5 payroll labour legislation does. It takes money; they tax people. Anybody within the province that is not competing interprovincially passes it on to the consumer. You bafflewag the people to let them think that you're getting it out of the businessman, but anybody that's not dealing

interprovincially, internationally, passes it on and I've been told this by many people. The unfortunate part is those companies that deal interprovincially or internationally are put at a disadvantage competitively, and therefore you lose that competitive edge. They either deter away from further markets, costing us investment and costing us much-needed jobs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will cite you examples of people who were employees — and good employees — who were continually suggesting that management was not doing enough for the employees, until they went into business on their own and then their wages paid to employees went down. They saw the other side of the fence. It's easy to criticize when you don't know the other side, and unfortunately, members opposite just do not understand.

The corporation capital tax sounds great; 50 percent increase, but this is a tax before profit; it's a tax whether your facilities are paid for. Once again, where it is possible, it is passed on to the consumer, the same guidelines as in the 1.5 payroll tax — and where it can't be passed onto the consumer, puts them in a weaker competitive position, once again, hurting investment and job creation. It's just like companies come to provinces that are going to give them a good business climate. It's like buying a car and I'm sure the Member for Kildonan could relate to that. That's about down to his level. You can understand, if you go to buy a car, you shop around and you look for the best deal you can get, and rightfully you should, and so does business look for the best deal they can get.

I also would like to make members opposite aware of the merchants along the Manitoba border who are being hurt by the withdrawal of some sales taxes in Saskatchewan, and I hope the Minister of Finance would maybe listen and react very quickly to their plight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to draw attention to the fact that for the first time in the history of this House, there are two farmers who have won the "Farmer of the Year" award. I think in one case, they maybe were having a party and made a bad decision, but in the case of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, a person not only elected into the constituency, but a person who was selected as being a top person for the year by his peers, and where does he sit? A person who was selected by good people, he sits in the back benches, when his expertise could be badly, badly used in the Cabinet. It's being wasted. There's very little agricultural input, and I'll tell you, the Member for Lac du Bonnet will find that it's pretty hard to soar with eagles when you're amongst a bunch of turkeys.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Budget, \$37 million was cut from capital expenditures, almost half of it from Highways and Natural Resources, and this is the area that could least afford cuts. It's going to hurt the farm community that they say they're helping, the Overhill Drain in the Portage area, which some farmers will never crop their land this year because of lack of adequate drainage, comes under Natural Resources, I hope that that's not one of the programs that gets eliminated.

So where will these jobs be made up? In the Highways Department alone, they estimate 400 jobs will be lost because of the cut. I don't know where these are going to be made up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I've got some statistics and we have heard members opposite brag

about the employment and everything else. Okay, employment is up 19,000 people over 1981, but the unemployed are up 14,000.

A MEMBER: People are coming back.

MR. E. CONNERY: That's right, the people are coming back to unemployment and also on the Unemployment Insurance, there's an additional 16,400 on unemployment insurance and, as the member over here from Minnedosa said, "Welfare." In 1981, there were 2,436 cases of welfare in the City of Winnipeg. Today there are 8,150 or an increase of 235 percent. They brag about 21 percent increase in the agricultural budget, 235 percent more on welfare, I would suggest is a much much bigger and more tragic thing for people to be on welfare.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Elmwood has a point of order?

MR. E. CONNERY: When they speak about all these things, they are coming home to UIC and welfare.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. There's a point of order being raised.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The current speaker referred a few minutes ago to the members of the back bench here having no experience in business and I wanted to point out that I have owned an insurance agency for eight years now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

MR. E. CONNERY: I'm very pleased that there are members opposite that have some business experience. I question the degree and — (Interjection) — Had been, oh I see. But I do agree maybe if they spend enough time listening to members on this side, maybe at some point in time, some of the facts and information will get through to them. It's going to be a long haul.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, tourism is Manitoba's fourth largest earner of export dollars. Do you realize that in the Budget Address, tourism is only mentioned in the headline where it says, "Business Development and Tourism." There's been absolutely no reference to tourism at all and the Budget has not been significantly increased to look after it. We see how much interest there is in tourism when this year alone, when we had an opportunity to display Manitoba to the world, and our leader was pooh-poohed when he suggested that in the election debate that we have a pavilion in Vancouver. I think the vision of our leader now is coming home and the chickens are coming home to roost that we should have had, in fact, a pavilion there.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

NDP Governments are bad news for tourism. They don't understand tourism; they don't want tourists here. They think there are other rich people coming and taking part. In 1984, \$621 million was received in tourist dollars. They're bragging this year, I think the figure is \$625 million, some big deal. Mr. Deputy Speaker — oh, it's Madam Speaker, thanks, nice to see you back. I was hoping you wouldn't miss all of my . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Wouldn't dream of it.

MR. E. CONNERY: Because the Deputy Speaker is much easier on me and I like a little intimidation, it makes me better.

We have in the new tourist agreement, a fancy looking thing that says, "Go World Class." The concern that I have in this new tourist agreement and it's not 60-40 as the previous one was. It's now 50-50 — they are looking at four major areas of the province, Madam Speaker, the Winnipeg area, Hecla Island, Winnipeg Beach, the Precambrian Shield and the Riding Mountain and — what's the other one up there? — national parks. The concern that I have as this is outside of Winnipeg, is this a way of putting tourist dollars, which shouldn't really be generating tourism, into provincial and federal parks. I hope that this is not the case and I'll be watching very very closely to see that it goes to the entrepreneur who best knows how to generate tourist dollars.

The government should be a facilitator. As you see in other areas when the government gets involved, they bomb out, and I hope that in this area they will leave it to the private entrepreneurs, facilitate them for doing it. But the other thing that I worry about in this agreement is it features on "world class" great big huge projects that very few people can get involved in. They've literally wiped out all of southern Manitoba and southwestern Manitoba, as being able to qualify for any of the tourist dollars — and this is a five-year agreement. The City of Brandon, the City of Portage la Prairie, all the other towns, the ski resorts at La Riviere, etc. will not be included in this agreement, if I read it right. — (Interjection) — Yes, I don't think they're all that happy with it.

Also, I asked a question in the House the other day: how many government employees will be going to Expo? We didn't get an exact number and I hope it's not a holiday for members of the department at government expense. We know suites that have been rented and I think that's a question we're going to have to pursue with great depth that this government is not having a free trip to Vancouver.

In Housing, Madam Speaker, there were some encouraging things, and I appreciate the fact that the Home Renovation Program is an excellent program. I would like to point out, and it's been pointed out to us, that we on this side don't come up with anything concrete. We talked about the competency of the government opposite and going back to an article in the Winnipeg Free Press which the Member for Kildonan does not like and has roundly criticized — but I still think they were accurate — on November 30, 1985, per-house subsidy, \$36,000.00. Madam Speaker, this subsidy alone will cost the Government of Manitoba \$5 million. This is just lack of business sense. There's \$5 million that could be put to Health and Education, Highways or anything else. They blow it on stupid projects that cost us money. If it's going to put people into housing, it should not be at a loss — typical of the management of the NDP Government.

Also, I'd like to know why is public housing not under the Rentalsman? I've had several complaints from people in Portage la Prairie who are saying their rent in the government owned housing has gone up very,

very fast and they can't figure it out. It's one area that I want to pursue. I haven't had the time but I think there should be a common ground for all housing and people in public housing shouldn't be paying more, a faster rate than other people.

Native people, Madam Speaker, is an area that I'm very sensitive about, an area I'm very familiar with. I grew up in south St. Vital, went to school with, friends of, people worked for us, that were of Metis background. I've understood Metis people for all my life since I was able to walk and talk to them; they were neighbours; they were friends, they were employees. Given the right opportunity, and most of these were in our area, they came into the mainstream of society. They're not on the welfare roles in the City of Winnipeg but they're good citizens producing and we're very proud of what has happened to that group of people. When I moved to Portage, I had the opportunity of then hiring Status Indians or true Native people. I hope the Member for Rupertsland might be listening, while he's reading, that I am concerned about his people.

Native people, Madam Speaker, are very capable people. Given the opportunity, they will perform and do all of the jobs — on our farm, they have reached the highest point available outside of our own management people. They're very good people. But Native people have been used and abused; used by politicians to get votes and I think the indication of the Limestone project is a very good one. They used them to get the votes. Once they won the election, they turned their backs on the Native people and now are going to union people who are the backbone of the NDP party.

Madam Speaker, Native people don't need handouts. We can go through the accounts book and we can see all kinds of little handouts to the Native communities to buy votes. This is not what the Native people want; they need meaningful programs; they need jobs. Given that opportunity, their pride and self-respect will return and we'll be quite proud of the Native people.

Last Wednesday, the Member for Rupertsland was criticizing the Federal Government for holding up some program for Native people. This Provincial Government also funds the Friendship Centres, and Friendship Centres are a source of help to the Native people coming off the Indian reserves into the community. Their funds are being held up by the Provincial Government. If that member is so concerned, why isn't he making sure the Provincial Government is funding the Friendship Centres where these people can get some assistance?

In Community Services, Madam Speaker — how's my time doing?

A MEMBER: 40 minutes, lots of time.

MR. E. CONNERY: Lots of time! That's great.

MADAM SPEAKER: The member has 14 minutes remaining.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In Community Services in the new Budget — it was under the Financial Assistance to Physically and Mentally Retarded — they're spending up to \$5 million more this year than they did last. I would assume,

Madam Speaker, that that is going to be to help the Welcome Home Program concept. We have a problem, Madam Speaker, and we see it already in the child abuse area where the infrastructure in the community is not there. We are very concerned as to what's happening with the mentally retarded who are going to be forced to go into the community, many of them not of their own volition, but being forced into it.

Madam Speaker, I've tried to analyze the Minister of Community Services as to the reasons she reacts the way she does. I don't think the Minister is an uncaring person, at least I would hope that she is not, and I'm sure that she is not. She sure is a very misguided Minister in the sense of the programs. What has happened is that she's aligned herself with people of one train of thought. She has refused to consult and listen to people on the other side. We have a case of blinkers or tunnel vision and not looking at the full spectrum of what is needed in the community. When you see people like her own expert, Dr. Lowther, people at the Manitoba School, people that are teaching the psychiatric course there, people I respect, people that are knowledgeable, all say that the program that she is going on is wrong. I've talked to people who have brothers, sisters or children in the Manitoba School who say she is totally wrong — they're very concerned — people that she is forcing to go to court to get committee ship over because she says it will be a voluntary scheme to go into the community on the Welcome Home Program but, in effect, they are forcing them through bullying tactics, badgering, and people have signed, in tears, to have their children go. This is a voluntary program.

What's going to happen to the wards of the court who have nobody to care for them, no parents, no brothers, no sisters? They won't have anybody to speak for them. They'll just be pushed into the community. I'm concerned that the infrastructure is not there.

An article from the Toronto paper and was reprinted in our Daily Graphic about mentally deficit victims in prison. The infrastructure not there, they end up on the streets; they end up doing things that are not their fault, and they end up in prison.

We also have an article from National Affairs and it says, "Abandoned." Madam Speaker. I'll just read one very short little sentence here. "Dr. Leona Bacharach of the University of Maryland concedes a failure in implementation because very little of the hoped-for community psychiatric support was ever provided. That shortfall," she says, "has created a big mess for the mentally ill." I think that is the course that is being charted right now by this government and by this Minister and after our institutional facilities have been demolished, where will these people go? Prisons? They can be abandoned on the streets — not like in the American cities where at least it's a little warmer climate; they don't perish — but I'm sure in Manitoba they will perish. It's almost in my estimation a form of genocide.

Also, they're purchasing housing. We look at the houses they're purchasing for the mentally retarded — they're old dumps in many cases, buildings that are almost obsolete and should be torn down. Madam Speaker . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister responsible for Native Affairs with a point of order.

HON. E. HARPER: I wonder whether the honourable member speaking would entertain a question after he speaks?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Sure.

The quality of housing, Madam Speaker, as I was saying, and I've looked at some of the ones that they have bought and the ones that they're looking at, they're going to give them a quick facelift; they'll give them a quick paint job, and in a very few short years, these houses will not be up to standard. They're not up to standard right now, Madam Speaker, and this is going to be a disaster.

The retarded people need activities. And what activities are they going to get isolated in towns like Alonsa, Somerset? All of these are areas that are far away from the infrastructure that is required. Are they going to get the physiotherapy, the speech therapy that they get at the Manitoba Development Centre? I think we need to look at the Alberta concept, and I agree that, in many cases, the institutions are not very homelike and don't provide a quality of living that they deserve. We could go to the cottage concept around the Manitoba Development Centre where there is adequate space, we could have proper housing, and they'd still be there to be able to partake of the activities, the workshop activities, the recreational activities, and not be left out on their own in the community.

We have seen too many cases of the mentally ill, the retardates, being physically, financially, verbally and sexually abused. We also see unfortunate circumstances where proper medication wasn't administered and out of control, one of these people has done something tragic in the community, the community pays, and this individual is then labelled for the rest of their lives — a real tragedy.

Also, Madam Speaker, I asked a question this morning in the House on the Community Mental Health Program at Red River. I am told that this is a program funded by the Core Area Program and for core area residents only. I'm hoping for that answer, I'm hoping that before that answer comes, the Minister responsible will make it available to all residents of Manitoba, not just a few from one area. The people of Portage, now that the school is being closed in Portage, if they had to drive to Selkirk or Brandon which would be much further if they wanted to enter in the same program, it would be much more costly and maybe preclude them going.

There also is the concern of the RPN's, what are the standards? The Minister said the standards will be there. Standards compared to what? Will they be the standards of the RPN's? The people who really understand what is needed, or is it going to be another quick-flip training program?

We see the amount of child abuse that's going on and so we know that the infrastructure is not there, that their program is not working. Do we want the same thing to happen when it comes down to the mentally

retarded? We all know that governments are great at starting programs and do them for awhile, but after awhile they want to drop them so they can start a new program. I think this is the fate of the mentally retarded in Manitoba, they'll be put into the streets, the infrastructure will dry up, and they'll be then some of the pathetic people that just should not be there.

We talk about financial responsibility of government and we talk about the fact that we must reduce the deficit. Members opposite pooh-pooh and hee-hee about how are you going to do it? I think, first of all, you learn to look after the nickels and dimes of any kind of business and you find out that the dollars fall into place pretty quick. I don't know if the members opposite know that, because they don't run their own business. In most cases either they have government jobs — union organizers or whatever — have never had to go through that analyzing of their own financial statement and to see where they can cut costs. There's an awful lot of costs that can be reduced, but I just looked through The Civil Service Superannuation Act where the amount of money spent on that pension plan is up \$1.7 million, or 15 percent in one year. I wonder if all employees of Manitoba are privileged to have something in that magnitude, and I think if one group is, then I think all groups should be. In 1980-81, it was \$4,910,000, today it is \$13 million. Quite an increase. — (Interjection) — No, I didn't; I'm sorry; but I will be.

To reduce the size of the Cabinet is one of the areas you can reduce your expenses in. We've got the largest Cabinet of all time, do we need a Cabinet of 21 people? Or can we have a Cabinet size of somewhere around 15 or 16 competent Ministers who are able to do the job. I insist on the word "competent." We have an indication, Madam Speaker, of the incompetency or the inability with the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation. Last year the amounts for the Minister was 9,000-and-something. This year it's 10,000, which meant that it was a shared portfolio. This year it is now a single portfolio, by one person. Also we see the salaries of the Executive Committee have gone up dramatically, and I forget what it is, \$41,800 — now we know the Minister keeps her baby in the office — I hope, Madam Speaker, this is not a high-priced baby sitter, but I still question the fact, why would the salaries have to go up when the Minister only has the responsibilities of Culture and Heritage and Recreation? That is a good area where you can start cutting costs. Very good area. — (Interjection) — Yes.

But if you peruse through the Budget Estimates, we find that almost everywhere — not exclusively, but almost everywhere, salaries are up, the other expenditures are down. To me it looks like they're buying a horse and they don't have a cart to hook on to it. How do you reduce the other expenditures and raise the salaries? Do you need more people to do the same job? I think that is exactly what you're doing.

We have the poorest credit rating in Western Canada, and if we continue to raise our deficit, the interest costs will continue to rise and we already have heard what is happening in interest and the almost one-third of the extra monies of deficit this year going to debt repayment. Still the First Minister continues to fed-bash over transfer payments. I'm opposed to this sort of fed-bashing, but at the same time what does he do to the City of Winnipeg? He didn't just cut their

increases; he has slashed at their budgets, at their income. Not the fed-bashers who are reducing the increase, and then turn around and reduce the income for the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker, I'm going to be winding up very shortly. The transfer payments, I feel, show that we are a have-not province, because it's only the have-not provinces that get transfer payments. As a citizen and as a member of this Legislature, I would like to see us work awfully hard to try to work ourselves into the position where we are not receiving transfer payments, where we are the full participants in this country of Canada. Maybe they're proud and maybe they want this, but that shows the ineptness, and, as one member said, they've been in power for the last 12 of 16 years; and this province reflects an NDP Party being in party for 12 of 16 years. — (Interjection) — That's right. And with enough bafflewagging, you've convinced them.

Madam Speaker, the other day when they were talking about the trees dying in this NDP plantation, and somebody said what are you going to tell the kids when they drive by? The Attorney-General said don't do it this way. I'm sure in the future, when his grandchildren come along, we'll be able to say the same thing, don't do it this way.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Native Affairs with his question?

HON. E. HARPER: Yes. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in his speech remarked that we, the government, were giving handouts to the Native people to buy votes. Is he prepared to be more specific and inform this House as to these allegations? Because I reject the implications that Native people can be bought and I personally regret this implication.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: If you read through the evidence, you'll see many areas where I believe there was money spent that wasn't meaningful. What the Native people of this country want are jobs, not just little make-shift things that get them through for a few months. They've got to have meaningful, long-term jobs and I would be prepared to see the government lose money and providing jobs to Native people in communities that are not accessible to the market. I think then we're going to put pride back into the Native people. This is what the Native people want, not little platitudes, little wee programs that do nothing for them. but it gets you votes. What about at Limestone? Why are they not being still a select few? Why are the unions taking over the Native people? If you were concerned, you'd be fighting with your government right now over the Native people being rejected in their own backyard, where they belong, and we're bringing in people from other areas in southern Manitoba, and you're accepting that, that's a shame. You have neglected your people.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment. — (Interjection) — Order please.

The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Merci . . . Thank you, Madam Speaker.

If the Member for Sturgeon Creek will quiet down . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please!
The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Merci Madame la Présidente. C'est la première fois durant la présente Session qu'il m'est permis de parler soit dans l'un ou l'autre de ces débats sur le Discours du Trône du budget; donc je voudrais profiter de cette occasion en premier lieu pour vous souhaiter, à vous même . . . vous féliciter d'abord d'avoir été élue au poste de Présidente de la Chambre, le poste certainement le plus important et je veux en profiter aussi pour faire cette remarque à l'effet que vous avez accompli, jusqu'à maintenant une tâche très admirable. Et je souhaite que, de ma part et de la part de tous mes collègues, nous pourrions faire en sorte que nous puissions faciliter cette tâche plutôt que de la rendre difficile comme nous savons tous, elle peut certainement l'être. Je veux en profiter aussi pour féliciter tous les nouveaux membres, les nouveaux députés de cette Chambre et ceci, des deux côtés de la Chambre, et je souhaite . . . je leur souhaite . . . je souhaite qu'ils trouveront l'expérience des plus profitable et qu'ils sauront bien représenter les contribuables de leurs côtés.

De ma part aussi, je voudrais remercier les citoyens du comté de Radisson qui m'ont réélu à cette Chambre et je voudrais m'engager, comme je l'ai fait la première fois en 1981, à les représenter du mieux que je puisse le faire.

Madame la Présidente, je voudrais aussi féliciter le Ministre des finances qui a présenté à cette Chambre un budget qui, à mon avis, est bien balancé et qui saura tracer le chemin de cette province . . . ou maintenir cette province dans le chemin à l'avant de plusieurs autres de ce pays. Nous avons durant les dernières années, Madame la Présidente, . . . le Manitoba s'est placé durant les dernières années à l'avant de plusieurs autres provinces de ce pays et je pense que, avant de nous proposer son budget, le Ministre des finances a tenu en considération les besoins et les capacités de cette province et ce budget donc, est balancé . . . est bien balancé et je lui en félicite.

Comme le Ministre des finances l'a dit dans son Discours du Trône, il visait pouvoir avec ce budget, maintenir au Manitoba une économie provinciale forte et assurer des emplois et une sécurité économique aux Manitobains. Et ceci, nous avons choisi de le faire en assurant et en soutenant des programmes sociaux progressistes qui pourront maintenir chez nous, pour tous les Manitobains, un haut niveau de qualité de vie.

Nous avons choisis aussi en tant que Gouvernement, de le faire en tant que partenaire avec les citoyens du Manitoba avec qui nous partageons cette vision d'une province prospère. Et donc, nous voulons avec les Manitobains travailler ensemble pour atteindre un niveau de justice et de dignité qui a toujours été mon objectif personnel et aussi l'objectif de ce Gouvernement.

Nous n'avons pas de choix, Madame la Présidente, il nous faut choisir les orientations, les pistes qui vont

nous permettre d'aller en avant . . . et de le faire dans deux directions en même temps. Nous avons dit dans le passé, Madame la Présidente, que selon notre philosophie, il n'y a pas des programmes sociaux d'un côté, des programmes économiques d'un autre et que d'aller de l'avant dans une voie était au dépens de l'autre. Selon notre approche, les deux vont main dans la main . . . vont de paire. Donc, en autant qu'il y a du progrès économique, ça nous permet de réaliser aussi des progrès aussi du côté des programmes sociaux.

Il s'agit donc en maintenant ces programmes, de les appuyer donc en vue de stimuler le progrès économique au moyen d'une productivité accrue pour nous donner à tous un meilleur niveau de vie.

Les priorités dans ce budget sont comme elles doivent l'être. D'abord, la création et le maintien de l'emploi et l'amélioration de la situation économique. Nous avons aussi choisi de maintenir en position de priorité les services dans le domaine de la Santé, du côté de l'Education et nous avons choisi de placer cette fois et surtout cette fois-ci, beaucoup d'emphase sur l'Agriculture . . . le domaine agricole qui est, je crois, le secteur qui a reçu la plus haute augmentation en terme de pourcentage dans ce budget.

Nous savons tous, Madame la Présidente, que l'agriculture au Manitoba est en situation de crise et je pense qu'il est aussi vrai de dire qu'elle l'est tout partout au Canada. Tous les niveaux des Gouvernements doivent faire un maximum pour assurer l'avenir des exploitations agricoles familiales et c'est pour ça, Madame la Présidente, que nous avons placé une haute priorité sur ce secteur. Nous croyons qu'à ce moment-ci, le problème le plus urgent . . . et à tel point même, Madame la Présidente, c'est que ce sont les jeunes fermiers, hommes, femmes . . . qui font face à ces nombreux problèmes . . . alors que ce sont, c'est ces jeunes fermiers que nous sommes en droit d'attendre le plus pour l'avenir et malheureusement, dans la situation qui prévoit présentement, plusieurs d'entre eux ont déjà fait faillite et plusieurs autres sont peut-être voués à la faillite et ce faisant, mettre en péril toute cette tradition d'exploitation . . . de petites exploitations au Manitoba.

Malgré les bonnes récoltes des dernières années, la crise financière du côté va en augmentant et on sait que c'est à cause de la montée continue des prix pour les produits dont ils ont besoin . . . par exemple, les fertilisants, les produits chimiques, les machines agricoles et face à cette situation, les céréales et autres récoltes de spécialisation qui sont leurs produits . . . leurs productions à eux vont vers la baisse sur les marchés internationaux. Donc il en résulte non seulement des difficultés dans le secteur rural mais aussi les répercussions se font sentir dans le secteur urbain. Parce que ici au Manitoba, comme nous le savons, que ce soit du côté emploi, transport, commerce, industrie . . . tous les secteurs sont d'une façon ou d'une autre sont touchés et, dans certains cas, plus que touchés, mais leur survivance dépend de la vitalité, de l'activité agricole, donc, dans la mesure où il y a des problèmes, des faillites, il y a plusieurs

emplois qui sont aussi perdus, non seulement dans le secteur agricole mais aussi, bien entendu, dans le secteur urbain. La crise est nettement nationale et je pense que, à partir de cela, il faut en effet, en exiger qu'il y est un effort et des solutions nationales pour assurer l'avenir de la petite ferme familiale.

Durant les dernières années, notre Gouvernement a mis sur pied plusieurs programmes visant à stabiliser les revenus des fermiers et à venir en aide aux fermiers en difficulté financière. Et je suis heureux de constater et que le Ministre des finances dans ce budget a annoncé de nouvelles mesures pour venir en aide au secteur agricole et même de placer sa première priorité de ce côté.

J'ai dit, Madame la Présidente, tout à l'heure, que nous avions aussi choisi de placer une haute priorité sur le secteur de la Santé et de l'Education et autres programmes sociaux. Car, en général, notre jeunesse, nos personnes âgées, nos personnes qui sont en difficultés . . . c'est eux qui dépendent donc sur ces programmes sociaux et, dans le cas des jeunes, c'est l'avenir qu'ils sont appelés à bâtir . . . donc nous pouvons nous permettre de mettre en jeu l'efficacité de ce programme.

Hier, Madame la Présidente, le député de Brandon Ouest a fait allusion, à partir de statistiques démontrant, par exemple Madame la Présidente, que le Manitoba s'est très bien situé par rapport aux autres provinces depuis que nous sommes au Gouvernement en 1981 et à cet effet, il a utilisé des tableaux et des statistiques qui dénotent que dans la plupart des secteurs qui démontrent que dans la plupart des secteurs . . . dans la plupart des secteurs qui démontrent où à partir desquelles on mesure la vitalité économique du Manitoba . . . nous nous sommes très bien situés généralement dans une position mieux que la moyenne des provinces de ce pays . . . généralement et souvent dans les premiers rangs. Qu'il s'agisse de l'investissement privé ou publique, la croissance des emplois, du peu de chômage, par exemple, ou de la valeur de construction, etc. des ventes en détails, le Manitoba a très bien fait durant les quelques dernières années et c'est à partir, par exemple, d'une performance telle que celle-là que même la Banque Royale indiquait, se prononçait sur la perspective économique du Manitoba en ces termes et je cite: "Le Manitoba devrait être à la tête du pays pour ce qui est de la croissance économique réelle, de maintenant jusqu'à 1994." Ces choses-là, Madame la Présidente, n'arrivent pas par accident. Ils arrivent à partir d'un effort et d'une volonté concertée et c'est ce que ce gouvernement fait depuis qu'il est au pouvoir en 1981.

Le budget qui nous est présenté maintenant veut continuer dans cette voie dans les années à venir. Je sais que certains ont fait état avec beaucoup de verve quant au déficit qui est proposé dans ce budget; même si c'est un déficit réduit, considérablement réduit à partir de celui que nous avons dû connaître dans la dernière année fiscale.

Plusieurs des députés de l'autre côté de la Chambre ont dit qu'ils déploreraient par exemple l'insuffisance des investissements voués par exemple au secteur agricole, l'insuffisance de capitaux voués à l'Education. Je sais que ces remarques ont été faites par le député de River Heights. Ils l'ont été par à peu près tous les députés du parti Conservateur, pour un projet ou l'autre qu'ils

veulent voir choyé en particulier dans leur comté. Et moi, je me pose cette question, Madame la Présidente, comment est-il possible d'accorder à chacun ce ces petits projets ou à chacun de ces secteurs, des sommes considérables plus élevées de celles que nous avons accordées dans notre budget et toujours arriver à maintenir ou à atteindre le but qu'ils proposent aussi, c'est-à-dire un déficit qui va vers la baisse.

C'est la perpétuelle dicotomie. C'est comme la chanson qui dit . . . tout le monde veut aller au ciel, mais personne ne veut mourir. Ou on dit aussi en français chez-nous . . . on voudrait avoir notre pain beurrer des deux côtés. C'est peut-être facile, Madame la Présidente, qu'on est pas dans une situation où on a à être responsable ou à rendre compte de ce qu'on fait, de se prononcer de cette façon, mais je pense que tous les Manitobains sont en droit de s'attendre à mieux que cela. Des membres qui ont été élus pourraient représenter dans cette Chambre, même si ils ne sont pas au Gouvernement, et qu'ils sont en opposition, ils ont quand même la responsabilité d'agir de façon responsable. Et tous les Manitobains, je pense, s'attendent à mieux que ça de leurs parts.

On ne peut pas dire, d'un côté, dire qu'il faut dépenser des sommes énormément plus considérables et espérer que nous allons atteindre un niveau de déficit qui est deux, trois fois moins de celui que nous avons présentement. Nous sommes les premiers à admettre de ce côté ici et le Ministre des finances l'a mentionné dans son Discours, Madame la Présidente, le soir de sa présentation qu'il acceptait que le déficit demeurait beaucoup plus élevé que nous le souhaiterions, mais que comparativement à ce qui se passe dans d'autres provinces, comparativement à la dette per capita de chacun des Manitobains par rapport de celle des Canadiens en général ou des citoyens des autres provinces, nous ne sommes pas dans une situation critique et il a aussi fait remarqué, Madame la Présidente, que une partie énorme de ce déficit était dans des investissements qui vont continués à rapporter des bénéfices à contribuer au développement économique de cette province à long terme pour des générations à venir et c'est pour ça que nous ne pouvons attendre d'avoir en poche, tous les sous pour entreprendre quelque chose. Parce que nous serions à réduire cette province, ou l'économie de cette province, à paralyser l'économie de cette province, un peu comme l'a fait, a choisi de le faire l'opposition dans les années 1977 à 1981, ce qui nous avait mené, ce qui avait mené cette province au dernier rang dans la plupart des secteurs économiques.

Alors, Madame la Présidente, je sais qu'il est inévitable qu'il puisse y avoir des différences dans les philosophies de base d'un parti et l'autre, mais je ne crois pas que l'opposition, que les membres de l'opposition soient des magiciens et puissent arriver à rejoindre ces deux poles opposés, c'est-à-dire un déficit, c'est-à-dire un budget ou une économie provinciale, sans déficit et dans la possibilité d'accorder des sommes plus considérables à tous les secteurs qu'ils voudraient voir avancer. . . que ce soit du côté de la construction des routes, que ce soit pour permettre à l'agriculture d'aller de l'avant, que ce soit pour offrir des programmes dans le secteur de l'Education plus variés, plus nombreux, mieux financés, peu importe. Il n'est pas possible de faire de la magie ici.

Je pense que l'approche que ce Gouvernement a adopté en faveur des différents secteurs économiques permettra au Manitoba d'atteindre ou de se situer tel que prédit par la Conference Board ou la Banque du Canada de bien se placer par rapport aux autres provinces dans les années à venir.

Madame la Présidente, je ne voudrais pas manquer cette occasion de faire quelques remarques en particulier qui touchent plus particulièrement mon secteur de responsabilité, c'est-à-dire l'environnement et la sécurité et l'hygiène au travail.

Madame la Présidente, surtout en rapport avec ces derniers jours où on entend tellement de commentaires par exemple en rapport avec une question et je voudrais y toucher si pour rien d'autre, apporter quelques précisions. Les médias, entre autres, ont parlé beaucoup ces derniers temps, par exemple des moustiques. Parlons des moustiques et je vais relier ça à une question beaucoup plus importante. Parce que, Madame la Présidente, je pense que jusqu'à maintenant, on a peut-être pu faire du développement économique, social, commercial, sans se soucier trop de quelles pourraient être les impacts sur l'environnement, sur la sécurité et l'hygiène au travail. Et je crois que nous sommes arrivés à une époque où il serait irresponsable de continuer à fonctionner dans ce sens parce qu'on sait très bien aujourd'hui quels sont certains de ces impacts. Pendant trop de cas, nous ne le savons pas encore, mais nous savons, par exemple, que nous ne pouvons continuer, par exemple, à ajouter à l'eau à l'atmosphère que nous respirons, à l'eau que nous buvons et au sol qui produit la nourriture que nous mangeons . . . Nous ne pouvons commencer à ajouter des polluants sans se poser la question à savoir est-ce que nous ne sommes peut-être pas en train de contribuer à toutes ces maladies que nous connaissons aujourd'hui, que ce soit le cancer, que ce soit la sclérose en plaques, Reye's Syndrome, que ce peu importe. Alors, je veux faire allusion à ceci parce que je lisais ce matin dans le journal, entre autres que mon collègue, le député de Niakwa, que peut-être je me plaisais dans une situation de conflit par exemple, en personnellement penant position sur cette question de vaporisation. Je me dis, Madame la Présidente, est-ce que je suis responsable moi-même si, comme Ministre de l'environnement, je ne prend pas position lorsque je sais que je mets en jeu non pas seulement ma santé, non pas celle de ma famille, non pas celle des citoyens de cette province, mais aussi que je mets en péril l'environnement lorsque je laisse faire toutes ces choses sans dire. On me dira, mais tu ne mourra pas pour une certaine chose. Evidemment je ne mourrai pas pour une certaine chose, même si c'est un poison qui est destiné à détruire les mauvaises herbes, ou que ce soit destiné à détruire une variétés d'insectes et ça va aboutir à ce but . . . ça va les détruire les moustiques et les autres insectes, etc . . . et ça ne détruira pas moi. Mais il en restera un résidu dans l'eau. Il en restera un résidu dans le sol, donc qu'il s'ajoutera à tout la chaîne alimentaire.

Ce résidu s'accumule dans le système humain et il résulte toutes sortes de choses qui sont encore plus ou moins connues, des effets plus ou moins connus. La semaine dernière, Dr. Davies de Toronto soumettait un rapport qui indiquait que, dans toute la chaîne alimentaire, que ce soit dans les viandes, les légumes,

etc . . . elle avait pu déceler à partir d'une étude, qui est la première étude de ce genre qui s'est faite au pays, qu'il y a des dioxines à peu près dans tous les aliments qui font partie de la chaîne alimentaire. Et nous voulons aujourd'hui continuer à ce processus de façon un peu sans se poser de questions . . . parce qu'on dit on ne mourra pas. C'est suffisant . . . on ne mourra pas. Insuffisant, je ne le crois pas. Alors, de plus, Madame la Présidente, naturellement on joue à la petite politique avec tout ça, parce qu'on ne dit pas la vérité non plus. Ce qui est peut-être plus malheureux, c'est que même avec une certaine zone de protection, on sait très bien que tous les citoyens de cette ville, par exemple, vont être vaporisés, même ceux qui se sont objectés parce que ça ne s'applique sur la rue dont ils habitent et non pas sur la rue du côté est ou du côté ouest ou aux rues perpendiculaires au sud et au nord . . . toutes ces rues donc seront vaporisées et donc, il n'y a pas une seule propriété malheureusement, même ceux . . . et c'est ça la malhonnêteté de ce qui a été dit dans les journaux depuis un certain temps. Même ceux qui se sont objectés vont tous être vaporisés. C'est ça qui est malheureux. Parce que si ce n'est pas sur leurs rues, c'est sur la rue voisine qui à 30 mètres plus loin et non à 100 mètres plus loin.

Alors moi je dis, Madame la Présidente, est-ce que . . . et je fais le parallèle. Nous sommes comme citoyens de cette planète un peu tous dans un réservoir dans lequel on peut s'imaginer qu'il y a soit de l'eau ou de l'oxygène . . . deux éléments nécessaires à notre survivance. Malheureusement il y a dans ce réservoir un énorme trou par lequel s'échappe l'oxygène ou l'eau si vous avez choisi de faire le parallèle avec l'eau. La population augmente mais les deux éléments nécessaires s'échappent. Est-ce qu'on peut continuer donc à prendre des décisions qui sont purement des décisions pour aujourd'hui parce que on va se défaire d'une nuisance comme les moustiques par exemple, sans attendre quelques jours de plus et ça va peut-être se faire de façon toute naturelle par les éléments climatiques. Est-ce qu'on peut donc faire des décisions qui sont purement court-terme ou est-ce qu'on a pas l'obligation peut-être pour les générations futures de prendre des décisions qui sont long-terme. Et donc, c'est à partir de ça et c'est dans ce sens

Madame la Présidente, j'ai eu le bonheur de participer la semaine dernière, à une conférence, à une rencontre, pardon, de la Commission mondiale sur le développement et l'environnement. Ce sont tous des experts qui viennent de plusieurs pays du monde qui se, avec qui les Ministres de l'environnement provinciaux et fédéral, se rencontraient la semaine dernière à Edmonton. Ils ont comme mandat de soumettre un rapport aux Nations Unies en 1987 dans lequel rapport ils vont recommander de nouvelles options du côté environnemental pour le monde. Ils ont donc une tâche donc très importante qu'ils ne peuvent se permettre de mal faire parce que cette occasion ne se présente pas souvent, ne se représentera peut-être pas dans ce siècle et il est urgent que le monde entier puisse adhérer à de nouveaux principes du côté environnementale. Et à cet effet, pour ceux qui n'ont pas encore compris quelle était l'importance de l'environnement dans leur vie, qui placent, de tout autre côté, qui placent la priorité par exemple soit dans l'exploitation de nos ressources,

qu'ils soient naturelles, ou qu'ils soient des ressources que nous développons, je voudrais que tous et chacun se rappellent que si nous détruisons l'environnement, le seul que nous avons, c'est notre avenir, notre survivance qui en dépend. Nous savons très bien déjà, Madame la Présidente, ce qui se passe dans les zones arides de l'Afrique. Nous savons très bien ce qui se passe du côté de la disparition de nos sols fertiles. Je lisais tout dernièrement que nos sols fertiles disparaissent de 19 millions d'hectares par années. 19 millions d'hectares par années. C'est le rythme où nos sols fertiles disparaissent. Est-il pas urgent que nous entreprenions des mesures radicales pour arrêter soit cette avance du désert. Peut-être qu'il est déjà trop tard, mais il y a lieu de prendre des décisions importantes. Il y a lieu de prendre des décisions importantes par exemple chaque fois qu'on décide dans la planification urbaine de créer un nouveau développement, d'agrandir par exemple en marge de nos grandes villes, en construisant des routes et des bâtiments sur les terres qui étaient autrefois utilisées pour l'agriculture. C'est un petit exemple, mais c'en est un pour illustrer ceci.

Est-ce qu'il n'a pas lieu de prendre décision importante dans l'utilisation par exemple de nos sources énergétiques, que ce soit l'exploitation de notre, de notre hydrologie pour refaire de l'électricité, de nos ressources minières pour fabriquer par exemple une source énergétique pour nos réacteurs nucléaires, l'armement nucléaire. Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas lieu de considérer dès le début avant même que nous exploitions ces ressources, avant même que nous manufacturions de nouveaux produits de commencer tout de suite à considérer ce que nous allons faire avec les déchets de ces produits, de cette utilisation et c'est ainsi qu'on se serait posé longtemps avant même la création d'un premier réacteur nucléaire, longtemps après la première fabrication qu'une bombe nucléaire, on se serait posé peut-être la question, quel va être l'impact des déchets que nous allons accumuler.

Et naturellement, l'impact ultime serait justement une guerre nucléaire qui, tout de suite, en soi, détruirait cette environnement que nous avons. Alors il y a là une importance capitale pour tous de voir à ce que notre environnement soit protégé parce que parmi toutes nos ressources, c'est la plus importante qui nous a été accordée.

Et relié à ceci, Madame la Présidente, nous avons comme Gouvernement, tout récemment, adopté de nouveaux principes fondamentaux que j'ai présenté à la Commission mondiale sur le développement et l'environnement la semaine dernière à Edmonton que mes collègues dans le ministère de l'environnement ont présenté aux audiences publiques aussi cette semaine, nous proposons une série qui, donc, mèneront une considération à plus long terme chaque fois que nous prenons des décisions et à savoir quel sera l'impact environnementale. Nous proposons d'apporter durant la présente session un projet de loi pour discussion dans la période inter-session, un nouveau projet de loi sur l'environnement. Nous venons ce matin d'introduire en première lecture un projet de loi pour la mise sur pied d'une corporation de la Couronne pour la gérance des déchets dangereux. Du côté, dans le secteur sécurité et hygiène au travail, Madame la Présidente, nous avons présentement en cour une

Friday, 30 May, 1986

révision de la loi sur les accidents au travail et nous sommes en train de finaliser un règlement, un projet de règlement concernant la santé au travail et ce dernier aura des répercussions importantes, permettant aux travailleurs manitobains de pouvoir rehausser de nouveau leurs connaissances des matières et des produits avec lesquels ils travaillent et pour connaître quels pourraient être les effets de ces produits sur leurs santé et quelle mesures ils doivent prendre pour se protéger.

En ce qui concerne mon ministère à l'heure actuelle, plusieurs activités importantes pouvant affecter non seulement pas les décisions que nous allons prendre dans l'avenir, mais la façon que nous allons agir dans l'avenir sont à être prises et toutes ces décisions auront des impacts importants très près de nous. Alors nous sommes à une époque importante et je suis fier que nous sommes en mesure de prendre les décisions et les démarches comme gouvernement que nous devrions prendre si nous sommes conséquents et comme parti néo-démocrate, nous le sommes et nous allons le faire. Donc, ce qui a été dit à plusieurs reprises durant la période électorale et qui a été répété durant le Discours

du Trône et même dans le Discours du Budget, Madame la Présidente, c'est que nous ne craignons pas prendre position en faveur du Manitoba et en faveur des Manitobains.

Translation will appear in a subsequent issue of Hansard.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: With leave of the House, Madam Speaker, could we call it 12:30?

MADAM SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park adjourning debate?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it 12:30? (Agreed)

The hour being 12:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. Monday next.