



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

37 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXVII No. 53 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1988.

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, October 7, 1988.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

Mr. Clerk, William Remnant: Your Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, your committee met on Thursday, October 6, 1988, at 10 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative building. Your committee elected Mr. H. Pankratz as Chairman.

Your committee heard representations on Bills as follows:

Bill (No. 1) — The Court of Queen's Bench Act;
Loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine.

Dr. Jay Brolund - Vice-President of the Psychological Association of Manitoba.

Your committee considered:

Bill (No. 4) — The Re-enacted Statutes of Manitoba, 1988, Act; Loi sur les Lois réadoptées du Manitoba de 1988.

Bill (No. 5) — The Statute Re-enactment Act, 1988; Loi de 1988 sur la réadoption de lois.

And has agreed to report the same without amendments.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill (No. 10) — The Court of Queen's Bench Act; Lois sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments all of which is respectfully submitted.

* (1005)

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): I am pleased to present the final report of the Commission of Inquiry into Gasoline Pricing in Manitoba.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery, where we have from the Bernie Wolfe School, 27 Grade 6 students under the direction of Mrs. Stara Gooljarsingh. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson). On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this morning.

Seeing as how it is Friday, do you want to call it 12:30 p.m. now?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Home Care System Funding Cuts

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Statistics show, Mr. Speaker, that our seniors population is growing in number and that Government programs and services must reflect that trend. Fortunately, many will be able to look after themselves, and others will not. It is indeed alarming, and I am sure many seniors woke today feeling very uncomfortable at a Government which should be recognizing their needs, and instead here is the announcement of a Health Minister (Mr. Orchard) who is threatening to dismantle a program that has enabled thousands of our seniors to live in dignity.

Can the Minister of Health please tell this House the meaning of his statement: "The program was never designed to create dependence." Does he not understand that certain chronic ailments do not get better, and is he prepared to doom these people in this province to a life in an institution?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): I am very delighted that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) would ask some questions. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to the Estimates process where we can discuss the Home Care Program and its direction.

I am not very pleased with a headline which indicates, "Disabled to pay for home care," which is not a correct statement. It is not a correct direction that came out of the Price Waterhouse report, or the press conference yesterday. However, as happens from time to time, one cannot have anything to do with that.

This Government has increased the Home Care budget by 23 percent. It is now at \$43.7 million per

year. That Home Care Program will provide to senior citizens needed medical services as it has always done. That Home Care Program will continue to provide to senior citizens needed homemaking services but it will also allow, as has been the case since the inception of the program, reinforced by the NDP in 1985 when they approved a community support program for seniors which would enhance the availability of not-for-profit homemaking services throughout Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the objective of that was to carry on with the original program mandate. Where non-profit home cleaning services are available, the Government will back out of those and they will be provided in the community by non-profit home care service. No Manitoban will be cut off from home care, as the Leader of the Opposition so wishes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1010)

Housekeeping Services

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a supplementary question to the Minister, and he might be interested to know that my quote came from his press release, not from an article in the paper.

Can this Minister tell this House how no one in need is going to suffer under this new initiative that he has announced when he has informed seniors that they will no longer be provided with housekeeping services, services which many chronic patients need in order to stay in their homes, and they are on fixed incomes and they cannot otherwise afford it?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Let me attempt to be perfectly clear with my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs). There has never been the intent of the Home Care Program—and I want to tell my honourable friend that the Home Care Program provides services to several distinct groups of Manitobans, some of whom are seniors, in fact, the majority of whom are seniors. Those seniors who are chronic requirees of care will continue to receive that care.

But the Home Care Program also provides services to seniors who are ill, who are discharged from hospital, and need services until they regain their health. That is what Home Care will provide, has provided and will continue to provide under a \$43.7 million budget. But when a senior or any Manitoban discharged from hospital or recovering from illness is well enough to look after their home-keeping needs, naturally Government is not going to continue to provide that service. It was never intended that be the case, and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has not suggested we create that kind of dependence of seniors on Government.

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

Funding Cuts

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Health Minister (Mr. Orchard) stated that management was so lax he did not know how many people would be affected by the cut.

How can a Minister of the Crown, responsible for good physical and mental health, announce cuts if he does not know how many will be cut or how their health will be affected? How does he explain this dereliction of duty for the Minister of Health for the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, with all the patience I can muster, no one will be cut from services of the Home Care Program. The budget provides for continuing home care where needed by senior citizens, where so assessed by the Department of Continuing Care in the regions, in the City of Winnipeg. What I indicated is, as homemaker services is non-profit, as has always been the case, as was reinforced in 1985 by the NDP, where those services become available in the community, I cannot tell my honourable friend how many people will access, not for profit home-cleaning services because we simply do not have those numbers. That is not a function of management. That is a function of not knowing how many people will be able to access that service when available in the community. Clearly, not everyone can afford to have their homemaking services removed, and will not be.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with a new question.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, with a new question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), every major study in the health care field conducted in the last 10 years has stressed the need to move away from a hospital institutional model of health care delivery in order to get costs under control. Inherent in that policy is the need for more community services to provide for the individual who has been discharged early from hospital, the patient returning from day surgery and/or the chronic patient who, only with help, can remain in his or her home.

Will the Minister of Health tell this House how this Government intends to move to a more community-based model of health care delivery if he intends to cap the funds for continuing care?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I have two suggestions for my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs). First of all, read the Price Waterhouse Report so she is more informed instead of ill-informed. Secondly, with a 23 percent budget increase, services to the seniors who need home care services will continue. The chronic care need senior citizens and others who require home care on a continuous basis will continue to receive that. There is no cutback by this Government. There is no cutback in that regard under the program. If the Leader of the Opposition is alleging that needed home care services are being cut back, she is absolutely incorrect.

Seniors' Housing New Facilities

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), if this Government is unwilling to provide services to physically and mentally disabled seniors with limited incomes, services which enable them to remain in their homes, will this Government begin immediately to build more senior citizens' residences and personal care homes where these services can be accessed, since they are not going to be accessed in the community.

* (1015)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Again, with as much patience as I can muster, maybe the Liberal vision of Home Care is to cut seniors off the program. Maybe that is where the Liberal Party wants to go. But as I have repeated for two weeks consistently in this House, \$43.7 million of funding has been allocated by this Government, to provide home care services to those Manitobans in need. Whether they be seniors or citizens discharged early from hospital, whether they be chronic care seniors who need some support services in their home, those services will be provided with a \$43.7 million budget by this Government to those in need.

Home Care System Appeal Board

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): A final question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Since I arrived in this Legislature, I have been asking the previous administration, and now I will ask this administration.

Will the Minister of Health immediately establish an appeal board for those who receive continuing care services, an appeal board which now will become absolutely necessary, so they will have an avenue to approach if they are denied services or, if those services and the level of those services, quality is not maintained.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): That is obviously one section of the report that the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) has read correctly. The appeal process has been unknown in many cases to those clients on the program. The appeal process and the recommendations to improve it are one of the initiatives in the Price Waterhouse Report that is already being undertaken so that (a) citizens receiving Home Care are aware of their appeal process should they not be satisfied with either the level of the service or the discontinuation of that service after they have regained their health and their ability to live independently.

Mr. Speaker, that appeal process will be enhanced and it will be enhanced to enable Manitobans to regain their independence because, if there is one thing I think most Manitobans, seniors included, wish to be, it is independent in their own home, independent of Government, independent of outside influences. They want to live to their greatest satisfaction with their own means and we will assure that happens.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment, first of all, that the irony of this issue is that when we raised this issue a week ago, the Liberals totally got into the corner with Mr. Orchard in terms of his user fee policy. Now when the headlines change, their policy changes on this very important item. My question is to the First Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We do not refer to Members by their name. The Honourable Minister of Health, I believe, was what you were trying to say.

Mr. Doer: Pardon?

Mr. Speaker: We do not refer to Members by their name.

Mr. Doer: The Minister of Health, yes. Right.

An Honourable Member: Honourable.

Mr. Doer: We will see about that.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Home Care System User Fees

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Last week when we raised this question in the House, we were accused of creating an issue where it does not exist by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), and we were accused of stating that the policy has not changed when clearly, in his embargoed, closed press conference yesterday, the policy is changing and the examples we cited in this House and indeed in writing to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), the examples were clearly implemented with a user fee in this province. Will the First Minister—(Interjection)—Well, if you do not consider \$7 an hour for services which were formerly provided by a universal health care system not a user fee, the seniors of this province consider it a user fee.

My question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon)—not the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), to the First Minister—is, will he immediately order his Minister of Health to halt the implementation of this new policy and have public consultations with the most affected groups, the seniors, the disabled and others who rely on our home care system and indeed with the health care professionals who want to balance their budgets? Will the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) take control of his Health Minister and have a fair set of public hearings on this issue?

* (1020)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): That consultation process that the Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Doer) is now calling for is in process at this moment. It was not in process in 1985 when the NDP and that Member—no, by golly, he was not there then, but his colleagues were there and they approved increased funding through the support

programa for seniors to establish non-profit homemaking services throughout Manitoba. They funded it through Community Services with the specific policy intention that was always in place. Where non-profit homemaking services were available, people on the Home Care Program would access them. That was a policy the NDP put in place. They put money in the community to support it and now they are saying that a decision made in 1985 by their Cabinet, by their Government, is wrong?

Under ordinary circumstances, I would use the unparliamentary word that they are dealing in hypocrisy, but I cannot do that.

Mr. Speaker: You betcha you cannot do that.

Mr. Doer: Dealing with hypocrisy, we will deal with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). He promised in the last election that there would be no user fees introduced in the health care system, clearly there is. He promised in the last election there would be no bed closures pending the review of our health care system. Are those two more examples of badly worded promises that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) stated, or are they reneging on his promise in terms of this very important issue?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, there are no user fees as my honourable friends says in the health care under any policy change that we have made in home care because we have made no policy change. The NDP, when Government, had citizens of Manitoba taken off the Government provided homemaker services and put on non-profit homemaking services when they come on. That happened in Dauphin, that happened in Beausejour and, in 1985, in 1986, in 1987, those individuals, where non-profit homemaker services were available, were paying for it at \$7 an hour. Now, did the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer) and his honourable friends in Cabinet describe that as a user fee then, because that was their policy?

Health Sciences Centre Bed Closures

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the First Minister. Manitoba has had a tradition of honest and forthright health Ministers, whether it has been Desjardins, Sherman, George Johnson, in years gone by.

My question to the First Minister, given the fact that the hospital beds at the Health Sciences Centre are totally closed, all the staff have been redeployed, there are telephones installed, there are four offices, is that the kind of honest and forthright Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that he expects Manitobans to believe in, whether it is on the program that is now being cut and user fees being introduced or whether it is on the health care cutbacks in the hospitals? Is that the kind of forthright policy that he expects from his Minister of Health?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I note a great absence in the Minister's (sic)

list of honest health care Ministers and that was my immediate predecessor, the Member for Transcona.

I would not want to cast that aspersion on the former Member for Transcona, as the Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Doer) has now done. There is nothing in any action taken by myself or this Government that would warrant that kind of vitriolic attack by the Leader of the New Democrats. There has been no policy change. The 1974 inception of policy for Home Care is the same today as it was in 1974. The direction the NDP endorsed in 1985 reinforced to make non-profit homemaker services available throughout Manitoba is still in place as it was enunciated, developed and funded by the NDP. There are no user fees today. There are no changes in policy. There is only—and I hate to use this word because it is unparliamentary and I should not . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Doer: My final question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Would he take 10 minutes and join me on a tour of the bed closure site that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has told Manitobans does not exist? Would he join me to view the offices, the telephones, the redeployed staff, contrary to the word that the Minister of Health has given in this House and contrary to what he has given to Manitobans? Let us see who is telling the truth, this Minister or this Opposition critic?

* (1025)

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I suppose when you get caught in your own rhetoric of now accusing a new Government of doing something wrong, which is simply following the policy that you put in place, that the NDP put in place in Home Care, I suppose it hurts to have your own policy brought back to you and explained to the people of Manitoba so that Manitobans know there has been no change in policy, that there has been no change in the ability to access Home Care service, that the circumstance exists as always existed, even when the NDP were in office. Nothing has changed in terms of bed closure policy that the NDP are now saying is changed. Nothing is changed. The only thing that one has to remember is that, in the management of the health care system in the Province of Manitoba, every other Government in the history of this province has opened hospital beds. Only the NDP closed hospital beds.

Woodhaven School Leasing Guidelines

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). The Dr. Jesse Saulteaux Resource Centre for Native Ministry in the United Church of Canada has recently had its lease application denied by the St. James-Assiniboia School Board with respect to Woodhaven School. As I am sure the Minister is aware, under ministerial guidelines, the school board is mandated to make every reasonable effort to lease the property within certain subject areas. The Dr. Jesse Saulteaux

Resource Centre would appear to have fit into at least three of those. A processing of entertaining and reviewing lease applications is set out in these guidelines.

My question is to the Minister, has the Minister investigated the sequence of events which appears to have led to some bitterness and divisions in that community? Is he concerned about the process which seems to have led to this? If he has not investigated, will he do so in light of his own guidelines?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what the Member is suggesting, but the guidelines are very clear. That is, when there is a school that is not being utilized by a school division, it is up to that particular school division to enter into agreements with those groups who may be interested in leasing that particular space. The Department of Education nor the Minister get involved in those kinds of issues.

I might indicate that St. James-Assiniboia did indicate that they were interested in leasing that school and at that point in time we concurred that, yes, the school was in a surplus position, it was not required, and that they in fact could enter into agreements with those parties interested in leasing that space as is outlined by the guidelines. The guidelines do not suggest subject areas, as is indicated by the Member opposite. They suggest groups who have specific interests, and that is the way the guidelines are mentioned.

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

Mr. Edwards: If the Minister would reread his guidelines, they quite clearly suggest certain subject areas in which the school board is mandated to consider applications, and those subject areas are then taken out when the school becomes the property of the Government for that very reason that those areas are presumed to have been covered by the school board.

My question was, is the Minister convinced that these guidelines, these subject areas, have been studied enough by the school board and the application has been dealt with in a manner that is entirely consistent with his guidelines? I point out again that it appears that this sequence of events has left some bitterness in the community, and I would ask the Minister to respond specifically to the question of investigating the sequence of events which has left the Dr. Jessie Saulteaux Centre, having done renovations between \$13,000 and \$15,000, having had the keys for five months to the school, and then having the decision reversed on very short notice in September.

* (1030)

Mr. Derkach: It is very clear that the Member opposite does not have the facts on this entire issue because in fact the decision to rent or not to rent was not made until September. So there was no decision, to my knowledge, that was made prior to that date by the school board in terms of a motion whereby a decision had been made.

In terms of investigating the matter, as I said, there are schools all over the province that school boards do lease to various organizations or groups when they become surplus. Mr. Speaker, that is not something that the department nor the Minister gets involved in. To this point in time, it is our understanding that the school board has not come to us and indicated that they cannot find a group that is not interested in leasing that particular property.

Dr. Saulteaux Research Centre

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): A final question for the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), does the Minister deny that his officials were involved with the Dr. Jessie Saulteaux Resource Centre as early as February of this year? Does he deny that keys were given to the resource centre in March of this year? And does he deny that the school board officials had knowledge and indeed impliedly sanctioned renovation works in July and August in the amount of \$13,000 to \$15,000.00? Does he deny those facts? Is he concerned about them? Is he concerned about the fact that this money has been spent and there was an abrupt reversal in September, leaving that charitable organization \$13,000 to \$15,000 in the lurch? Is he concerned about that? Will he investigate it? Does he not see it as his duty to investigate?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education): That was an interesting barrage of questions, Mr. Speaker. I just might indicate that it is kind of curious that the Member who is the critic for Education is not asking the question, who is the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo).

Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate that this is a matter that is within the jurisdiction of the school board. Now whether the school board turned the keys over or whether authorities of the school board turned the keys over to the particular group is certainly not something that I get involved in, nor is it something that the department gets involved in. It is a matter that is at the local level, at the school board level, and that is how it is being dealt with.

Economic Stimulation Unemployment Rate

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): My question is for the Acting Minister of Finance, I assume the Premier (Mr. Filmon). For five months now, the Liberal Party has been pressing this Government to stimulate Manitoba's weakening economy. The Minister has been saying that his Budget plan has all the stimulation needed. Someone had to be wrong, Mr. Speaker. Today we see that after five months of Conservative Government, Manitoba's unemployment rate has leapt well above the national average, which I point out is declining.

Mr. Speaker, given that Manitoba's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate is now 8.7 percent, does this Minister have any confidence at all in his Budget prediction of the 7.5 percent unemployment rate?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I might point out to the Member that Manitoba's unemployment rate was above

the national average in March of this year during the election campaign. Mr. Speaker, I might point out to the Member, if he would like to analyze the figures that were put forth by Statistics Canada, they showed that we have had a major decline in employment in a number of sectors, firstly, agriculture. The Member may not be aware, but the effects of the drought, of the weather conditions, over which we have absolutely no control, are such that people are not being hired in the harvest in the numbers that they -(Interjection)- Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) continues to interrupt. I recognize that I am guilty of from time to time heckling across the House.

I think that the question that has been asked is a legitimate one. It deserves a legitimate answer and it deserves a reasoned answer, and I would like to give that answer. If the Members opposite are not satisfied—the effects of the drought, of course, are known throughout this province. They may not be known to the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), but the fact is that there are not as many people involved in the harvest in September this year for potatoes, for sugar beets, for all of our grain crops. There are not as many people who have been hired. That sector is down in employment over last year at 7.1 percent. That is very serious, Mr. Speaker.

There is a decline in employment in construction of over 13 percent. Now, we have taken some very significant actions in our budgetary measures. We have in our Budget this year funds that have unfrozen the freeze that was put on by the NDP on health care, hospital care construction. Personal care homes and hospitals were frozen under the NDP. That health care budget, Capital budget which will be presented by my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), contains plans for spending in capital works and health care that will stimulate construction. There is a significant chunk in that Budget for hospital construction, for highways construction as well.

We have had in the past few months the notification that Manitoba will be the site of a virology lab, of an agriculture lab and of a sustainable development centre, all of which will involve major investment in construction in this province to overcome the neglect of the last six years of policies under the NDP.

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

Deficit Forecast

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): A supplementary for the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has admitted to this House that capital investment in Manitoba will fall far short of his Budget prediction. Unemployment is up, interest rates are up. Does the Premier (Mr. Filmon) have any confidence at all in his Budget prediction of a \$196 million provincial deficit?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The Member refers to interest rates. If he were keeping track of what this Government has said, what I have said, he would know that I wholeheartedly supported all of the communique

that was issued by all of the Premiers of this country urging Ottawa, urging the Bank of Canada to get rid of its high interest rate policies, to get those interest rates down, so that we could have some positive effect on our economy.

We are looking at both sides of the balance sheet. We are ensuring that we are controlling costs within Government. Within that Budget, there was a combination of departments to eliminate the kind of duplication of bureaucracy, to eliminate bureaucracy and to make sure that our money went into services.

I can say to the Member opposite that, yes, we are confident that we can meet or better the target of \$196 million deficit.

Budget Predictions Mini-budget

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): A final supplementary for the Premier (Mr. Filmon), none of us are in politics to do nothing but point fingers and say I told you so. Will the Premier admit that week after week, month after month, his Budget predictions come crashing down around him, and will he now produce a mini-Budget to stimulate Manitoba's weakening economy?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): If the Member opposite wants to look at the positive side of things, and I am sure that is difficult for the Liberal Party, the Party of gloom and doom, the negative Party that every day comes here and wants to paint Manitoba as a have-not province, as their Leader did in the televised debate this April, refer to Manitoba as a have-not province. We do not believe that.

If he would look at these figures, he would see that despite the fact that some of our areas have been adversely affected by items outside our control, and I refer to agriculture, there are some very positive signs. Manufacturing employment is up 10.8 percent over September of last year. Other primary industry employers, employment is up 9.6 percent. That includes mining. That includes many other areas that are significantly doing well in this province. There are other areas that are up by 7 percent and so on.

We are moving on a positive agenda. We believe that our Budget figures continue to remain substantive, and I have said to him -(Interjection)- Will the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) stop shouting "order"? Clearly I have the right and the responsibility to answer questions in this House, and I will not be shouted down by him or anyone else.

* (1040)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon) that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I say to him that the Budget target of \$196 million deficit will be met or bettered.

Employment Programs Job Creation Policy

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment Services (Mrs. Oleson) relating to the dismal figures that we received this morning from Statistics Canada on our unemployment situation.

Given the fact that our unemployment rate is up significantly both in seasonally adjusted terms and in actual terms, given the fact that there are fewer people working in Manitoba today than there were a year ago, given the fact that there are 7,000 more people unemployed today who I am sure find the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) words very hollow—he may get away with it in the Chamber of Commerce but not with working people of this province—given the fact that our unemployment rate is now above the Canadian average, given the fact that our youth unemployment rate is higher than last year, and given the fact that our youth unemployment rate in fact is higher than the Canadian average, will the Minister of Employment Services (Mrs. Oleson) now reinstate the very successful program, Job Training for Tomorrow, that they have cut that provided hundreds, in fact thousands, of new permanent jobs in the private sector, in the non-profit sector? Will she reinstate this program or establish some other type of employment program to help create some jobs for our people in the few months ahead?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty listening to the kinds of words that are being put forward by the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Evans) whose Government's policies resulted in the deterioration of employment that we see here. These kinds of difficulties do not happen in a matter of six months or five months. They happen because of six years of neglect and specific policies that were put in by the NDP Government: the payroll tax, a tax on jobs that destroyed employment in this province; the continuing huge deficits that year after year after year, at a half billion dollars a year, destroyed capital in this province, destroyed initiative in this province and destroyed job creation in this province.

I say to the Member that in March of this year our unemployment figures exceeded the national average for the first time in more than a decade because of his policies, and we are doing everything possible to ensure that does not happen in future.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Will the Minister, or maybe I should ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon)—the Minister seems to be very silent on this matter—convene a meeting of their key Employment Services staff and develop a plan of action? Will she go to Cabinet and get some action, or will they ignore the situation and let our unemployed remain frustrated, jobless and likely candidates for welfare this winter, given the fact that for three months in a row Manitoba's unemployment situation has deteriorated significantly, very significantly?

Mr. Filmon: This Government finds it unacceptable to have one person unemployed in this province. One is too many. Mr. Speaker, we want to do everything

possible to ensure that we reduce unemployment and create opportunities. But what the Member opposite is doing is repeating and repeating and repeating demands for policies that fail, that were an abject and total failure under the short-term, make-work initiatives that were gone after a matter of months, after the Government funding was over, were gone and resulted in nothing positive in long-term happenings in this province and were a disaster for this province.

That is why we are working on the areas that we believe are important, a 10.8 percent increase in employment in the manufacturing sector, a 9.6 percent in the other primary sectors, areas that are long-term jobs for the people of this province, where they will build a base of financial security in this province that will be important to the future, not the kind of short-term, make-work jobs that he advocates day after day after day.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Brandon East, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Is this Premier (Mr. Filmon) telling the people of Manitoba, and those unemployed people of Manitoba—

An Honourable Member: 7,000.

Mr. Leonard Evans: —7,000 people more unemployed today than a year ago? Is he telling the people of this province, and particularly the unemployed, that his Government is prepared to take no action whatsoever in the field of direct job creation, again I say, working with the private sector and the non-profit sector to create permanent new jobs as we did with the Job Training for Tomorrow Program?

Mr. Filmon: The people of this province told the New Democratic administration what they thought of their wasteful, short-term mentality, their short-term, make-work jobs that were a total failure for this province. They told them they were not happy with it on April 26.

We are putting our investment in long-term job creation. That is why we are working with the manufacturing sector; that is why we are working with the primary industry sector; that is why we are working on Manfor, on HBM&S, on Alumax, on all of those long-term things. That is why we have taken off the freeze that they put on health care institution construction—personal care homes, hospital expansions—those things that we have started to announce, that we will be announcing when this House approves our Capital budget, as it will, I am sure, in the Estimates process.

We are looking at the long term because we had enough of the short-term and unfortunate attitude of the previous Government that has resulted in where we are today.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Loan Guarantees

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): My question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). I am glad that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) was able to reference their long-term investment strategy particularly with respect to Manfor and Alumax and HBM&S. The question I have for the Minister and for his Government, when will his Government stop playing politics now with the lives of northern Manitobans? Manfor has been valued at \$1, but we do not know to what end. Aluminum smelters come and go, it seems, just before every election but, when it comes down to actually making a commitment, when it comes down to HBM&S, all we hear is that negotiations will not be conducted in this Legislature.

Why then is the company being forced into negotiating through the media? Is this Government satisfied to allow the future of Flin Flon to become an election issue, or will it demand of the federal Government a decision on the loan guarantees for HBM&S?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, I do believe I answered the question fully the last time it was asked in this House. If the Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) wishes a repeat of that answer, I will do so.

The provincial Government is monitoring the negotiations between the federal Government and HBM&S. Before we can make an announcement, I do believe that the federal Government and HBM&S must make the announcement. The fact that the president of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting spoke to the Chamber of Commerce on Monday of this week has nothing to do with our negotiations.

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills as listed on page 2 of today's Order Paper.

* (1050)

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS BILL NO. 6—THE FIRES PREVENTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: Debate on second readings, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery), Bill No. 6, The Fires Prevention Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la prévention des incendies, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch).

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise today to speak on Bill No. 6, The Fires Prevention Amendment Act. The purpose of the

Bill is obviously to amend what has apparently been an incorrect situation. The way I understand it, people from out of province have been coming in and been able to take advantage because of a loophole in the Act and take the course free of charge, and then taking it back to their jurisdictions, therefore leaving the Manitoba taxpayers to foot the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If Honourable Members would like to carry on with their private conversations, like I have said in the past, we do have some anterooms off to the side.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) says I did not do my homework but, according to his comments, the Government wants the ability to charge those groups who are not within the fire system of the Government of Manitoba for firefighting training. It appears from the comments that he made in his speech that the Government would like to charge the Government of Canada, other provincial Governments, private industry, and I would presume other Governments from other states or other provinces for tuition fees, which at present is prohibited under the amended Act. Is that not the case?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health): Partly.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, I am having great difficulty. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) is getting kind of chirpy, but I am getting up to speak in support of his Bill. This is basically essentially a housekeeping Bill. I am trying to get a few comments on the record in support of it and the Minister is not happy. Is the Minister saying that he is not in support of his own Bill? If that is the case, let him get up. Mind you, given the recent flipflops that he has made in these past few weeks on PCBs and other matters, maybe I should rightfully refer to him as his colleague, the Minister of Industry (Mr. Ernst) calls him, the Minister responsible for pink slips. That applies to both the public and private sectors. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I believe I am getting off the relevancy of the Bill here, and I am sorry.

Anyhow, the main concerns, because of the way the Bill was worded was that the wording of the amendment is not totally precise in outlining the Government's intention of who will pay the tuition fees. I would suggest that the amendment leaves open the possibility that all Manitoba firefighters, both the professional ones and the volunteers, could face tuition fees for additional firefighting training.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I am losing order again. The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) is making allegations to other Bills here and I do not see what relevancy—

An Honourable Member: The Human Rights Act, did you change your mind on that one?

Mr. Roch: No.

Mr. Speaker: I know it is Friday. I know the long weekend is here. I know Honourable Members want to get going, but we would appreciate the fact if you

would give the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) the courtesy of listening to his remarks.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) says nobody takes me seriously anymore. Given what is happening in the Land Titles Office, I do not think anybody takes him too seriously either. Anyhow, for a Government who has come in to try and attempt to clean up the previous Government's mess, it is kind of ironic that they have to keep on, to a certain extent, on their agenda in order to maintain their support. Anyhow, I was just answering to a few comments he made from his seat and again, because of that, I am deviating from the Bill. - (Interjection)- The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) just said something. Would he care to rise and say it into the record? I guess not.

Essentially, we on this side are supporting this Bill. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) laughs. Why he does he laugh at his own Bill? I do not know. It appears that he does not want support for it. I do not see it as a very contentious Bill; I see it as a very legitimate Bill. The only concern is that volunteers, we have to ensure that when this Bill goes through that people who take this course and go on to become volunteer firefighters are not charged the tuition fees for providing a skill which they will do so on their own time and on their own volition. Essentially, we endorse this Bill. It merely calls for the ability to charge tuition fees for students who are out of province.

However, I would go on to say that these people who take this course and will later go on to make it a career, I think, as in other professions, as in other studies, should be required to pay a part of their tuition fees; that is a norm. Basically, the whole purpose of this Bill, the whole intent of it, is good and we on this side, with the concerns expressed, will have no trouble supporting it. Thank you.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): It is a pleasure to be able to join the debate on The Fire Preventions Act. Of course, I appreciate that the Minister has brought forward amendments to this act which allows an opportunity to discuss the whole issue of fire prevention in this province, one that, of course, affects every person in this province, whether they be in the small rural communities throughout Manitoba, in major cities, individuals on farms or people in remote communities in northern Manitoba. All have a need to have their property protected and their lives protected through adequate fire prevention measures.

Of course, it takes a great deal of training and organization to ensure that there is an effective fire prevention system in place in this province and in all provinces. So any improvements to that system that are made through legislation are very significant and ones that certainly bear the right, I would believe, to have a major debate and discussion and consideration before making final decisions. I do not think that the amendments in terms of their intent would cause any disagreement for myself. However, I do agree with my colleagues who have raised concerns about the open-ended nature of this amendment.

The fact is that it allows for the prescribing of fees which can be charged to anyone. The purpose, of

course, is to allow for the charging of fees, as stated by the Minister, for other organizations and agencies throughout the country who may want to use our facilities—our fine facilities, I might add—particularly the Brandon Fire College which was established in 1983 by our Government, one that I am very proud of and one which involved a great deal of debate. I want to talk about that a little bit before closing my remarks today.

* (1100)

I am concerned that the purpose of the amendment is not clearly outlined in the amendment itself, because it leaves it open to charge others, including northern communities or others. Of course, it is not intended. The Minister says it is not intended. I do not believe that is his intention, of course. With pressures of deficits and pressures to provide services that people demand in all areas, in health care and education and social services, it makes it - (Interjection)- The Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) says that it was a deficit that was caused by our mismanagement. The fact is that deficits have been out of control to a much greater degree in such provinces as Saskatchewan and British Columbia, the national Government, the Mulroney Government and the Trudeau Government before, and the Reagan Government of the U.S. It is not a phenomena that is unique to Manitoba and cannot be blamed on mismanagement of the New Democratic Party while in Government. Clearly, that is not a fact, and the Member for Arthur should get his head out of the sand and ensure that he knows the facts before he makes those kinds of statements that get put on the record, inadvertently perhaps, but certainly do.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of pressures to charge for services. I am very much afraid that the Government is not saying what it means in this amendment and that what they are doing is saying that they want to open-endedly have the right to charge for training at these facilities when that could be abused. It could, in fact, be charges that are placed on Manitobans. I would not like to see that because this service is too important and training is too vital to so many people, especially with the hazardous goods that are now transported and stored in various places in this province. It is fundamental that we have adequate training, thorough training of modern substances and methods to deal with those substances in this province, throughout the whole province, whether it be in southern Manitoba or in the more remote areas. It is a big job to do that. It is a very expensive job, one that we undertook to a large degree while in Government, and I want to speak about that as well.

I do not think the Government should leave this open-ended. I believe they should stipulate why they are doing this, why they are putting this forward in the Act so that it limits the powers to charge for services at such facilities as the Brandon Fire College.

Our Government recognized the importance over the last number of years of firefighting readiness and training, and therefore undertook some major efforts to improve the readiness and training of firefighters throughout the province, and emergency workers and ambulance workers.

I should point out that in many small communities in the North, firefighters and ambulance attendants are one and the same. They do both of those functions. In other words, they are dedicating a tremendous amount of their time to be on call for both fires and for life-threatening emergencies where ambulances are required. They are one and the same person, or persons who are volunteering to do both of those services, to provide those services to the communities.

Therefore, there is a need to integrate their training rather than duplicate their training, to require training for ambulance attendants and to require training for firefighters on separate occasions, because it is too expensive to do it that way. It is much more efficient to train them together, since they are the same people who are being trained.

I want to indicate that we had indeed made a number of efforts towards that end, insofar as the training is required, at various locations in this province. We had put in place the Brandon College and provided, through those facilities, trained people. We have provided a great deal of training for volunteers.

I want to just mention that volunteers make up, by and large, the vast majority of our firefighters and ambulance attendants across this province, and emergency workers. Without volunteers in those areas, really the service could not be provided to the extent that it has been at all. It would be a shame to see that their training would be charged for by the Government of Manitoba in the future for these volunteers to be trained. That is what is wrong with this amendment, although the principle of charging other locations, other jurisdictions, for this training is, of course, one that all of us can support.

It is similar to the Arnprior, Ontario facility for emergency training that has served Manitobans as well as all of the provinces for many years. Through our Emergency Measures Organization, we have trained many, many people in emergency preparedness at Arnprior, Ontario, at their facility there, and of course those services are charged for by that facility.

The fire college was actually envisaged to provide similar kinds of services in Manitoba for emergency training, for ambulance training, for firefighters and so on. I think that this amendment is a move in that direction which allows us to indeed develop this into a world class, a national centre for training, and therefore help to pay for the costs of maintaining that facility in providing the services that Manitobans need. That is an important step forward insofar as that is concerned.

We have to remember that many departments of Government are involved in training and that leads to some inefficiencies. I have to point out that it is the Department of Labour, through the Fire Commissioner's Office, that is responsible for the operation of the fire college, but that was not a given when that college was established.

As a matter of fact, there was a great deal of debate between a number of departments, including the Department of Health, the Department of Government

Services who was responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization, as well as the Department of Labour, as to who should be responsible for the operation of this fire college, or what some would call an emergency training facility in Brandon.

It was not initially thought that it should just automatically be called a fire college. I am not sure that was the right decision. I believe that it should be much more than that. It should be an emergency training facility that provides integrated training in all of the areas of emergency response, not just for firefighters, but for ambulance training and for emergency training for natural disasters that might happen that are coordinated through the Emergency Measure Organization.

There is a great deal of debate as to who should be responsible. In the end, the Fire Commissioner's Office won out insofar as running and operating this facility. I can tell you that there were a lot of civil servants in the other areas, in the other departments who were very concerned about having an integrated facility, and I thought that was a good idea. I think the Minister might want to consider moving in that direction to integrate the training system to a greater degree than it is now at this college as he gains additional revenue from the charging for training from other jurisdictions.

As those jurisdictions come to realize that we have a fine facility, they will want additional services provided, additional training opportunities. The demands will be there, the money will be there and Manitobans will benefit because they too will be able to have access to those sophisticated training methods that can then be provided through the charging of fees at that college. I believe that there will be a move to integrate the training for all emergency responses in the future. I think this Minister should move in that direction as quickly as possible in the name of efficiency for training.

Mr. Speaker, I had mentioned that our Government had taken major steps forward. One of the things that we had done is made a major effort to train volunteer firefighters, ambulance attendants and drivers throughout the remote areas of our province. That had been neglected for many years. They did not have the facilities and it became a priority because, when a family in a remote community was subjected to a fire, they were doomed essentially to lose their property—that was a given—and maybe lives were going to be lost as well because there were no support services, no assistance that was available in an organized way for that community. In fact, that still exists in many of the reserve communities in northern Manitoba and northern areas, remote areas of the country generally and has to be dealt with, has to be administered to by Governments.

We had made, as I said, a number of improvements and during the time of our Government we had seen that many remote communities had developed very sophisticated emergency response teams. Firefighters had honed their skills at such things as firefighters' rodeos which are quite an attractive event in many communities. I have attended a number of these fire rodeos in Waterhen which is in my constituency. I frankly can tell you that it is a major event in that community.

It is a major event for many communities who attend. Those teams compete against one another for the top prizes and they attach a great deal of importance to winning the rodeo in the various events. At first, when they talked about a rodeo, I thought I was going to something resembling a bucking bronco and bullriding competitions, and I wondered how they fit firefighting into that. When I got there, I soon learned pretty quickly that there were many different events that were involved.

The teams have a great deal of spirit. There are a number of women involved, I should tell you as volunteers in firefighting in northern areas. They have become very proficient and, of course, a welcome addition to the team of emergency service providers in those communities. I can tell you that in many cases women have won, women on teams have won those firefighters' rodeos.

* (1110)

Not only do they have the competitions but they have a dinner in the evening and then a dance, the prizes are given out and it becomes a major event in the community, one that creates a great deal of community spirit, allows these people to develop their skills, these volunteers who are so essential in these communities, and ensure that these services are going to be provided in the various communities over the years to a greater and greater degree. Greater awareness by the community of the importance of those volunteers is also one of the outcomes of the rodeos that are held in these areas.

I want to compliment the people who have worked in this area, the volunteers who have given of their time over the years, who have put in so much effort insofar as training. The community spirit that has resulted has truly been something that we can all admire.

In addition to the training and the greater awareness that has taken place under our Government in the area of fire prevention, Mr. Speaker, we also had undertaken a major effort to provide equipment, ambulances, fire trucks that were necessary. As a matter of fact, with large distances between hospitals and nursing stations in northern areas it is very important. It is actually more essential to have ambulances that are in good condition, that can provide this service as quickly as possible. So we have provided the air ambulance that has helped to ensure that the lives were protected in northern communities, in remote communities as much as in southern areas that have access to our major hospitals, not to the same degree. You can never provide equal service but you can try to do your best to move toward providing a level of service that is certainly a great improvement over what many of the people in these areas have had to live with and die with over the years.

What we did was to provide through Northern Affairs funds to purchase new ambulances. I know in my own constituency at Waterhen their ambulance was derelict. It had pretty well run out its last mile and they desperately needed a new ambulance. We went to work with the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs and got some funding. They raised some money of their own and together they were able to purchase another used

ambulance which was in very good shape from, I believe, Yorkton, Saskatchewan, which now provides them with very reliable ambulance service.

In addition to that, fire halls were very important, training areas, areas in the community, facilities in the community where people could meet, the firefighters, ambulance attendants and drivers, to discuss the service and to practice their skills. We had put in place through the Northern Communities Places Program one which has been greatly reduced by this Government, which is of great concern to me, a program which would allow for the costs of fire halls to be paid for through the Northern Communities Places Program, which was a Jobs Fund program.

The First Minister (Mr. Filmon) today was talking about make-work projects and short-term. In northern areas it is very important to have these essential facilities that we all take for granted. A lot of the firefighters in those areas had no facilities, no place to put their fire trucks and ambulances. We realized the importance of that issue, that the Government had to assist and deal with this issue, that we had a responsibility to provide these facilities. So we provided 100 percent of the costs of building those facilities, at the same time providing some short-term jobs. The fact is though that now this Government has decided that they must provide 50 percent of the funds for projects in northern areas, which is absolutely unthinkable. There is no way for these communities to raise these kinds of funds to the same extent that southern communities can with the greater wealth base than these remote communities have.

In many cases they have 90 percent unemployment, how can they raise the funds to 50 percent to match the Government's funds to build a fire hall, for example? That is unreal and it is impossible for them to do. I hope this Government and these Ministers that are here will take another look at that issue and say some of these vital services and facilities have to be provided to a greater degree in northern and remote communities than they are in southern areas where there is a greater degree of wealth and ability to raise funds to match the Government's programs?

I ask them to reconsider that issue in the next while because it is fundamental to what we are discussing today, and that is The Fire Prevention Amendment Act. Clearly, if we are going to ensure that services are available, we must ensure that they are available in the communities because that is where the emergencies occur, in addition to the training.

That is why I have raised the concern that I have and my colleagues have that none of these people, these volunteers in these communities who so desperately need assistance, be charged for training that will be provided at the fire colleges in the various areas of this province. They in fact should never be charged and we will certainly serve notice to the Government that if that was their intent at any time we would object in the strongest terms as hard as we could.

In closing my comments on this Bill then, although it has been called minor, it is very important. It deals

with a very fundamental area insofar as emergency services. I would urge the Government to provide as much information to other provinces, sharing of information, to let them know that this service is available, that this facility is available, to encourage them to get their training here, in other words, to market the fire college and of course then have the ability to raise funds through the assessment of fees that are applied for in this Act, because only through that will we improve the services and training for all of our people in our own province.

I would ask them to ensure that we develop a world-class facility in Brandon at the Fire College there so that indeed we will realize a great deal of revenue from this provision.

I also ask the Minister to ensure that he protects the services of northern remote communities, and that he does whatever is necessary to develop those services further.

In closing, I want to also make reference to the firefighting volunteers and ambulance service workers, emergency response workers in my community of Dauphin and Winnipegosis, some of the communities that I represent. They have one of the finest brigades, I think, of any community in the province. Many, many people have dedicated their lives to ensuring that lives and property are protected. This is similar throughout the province. We should all hold them in high esteem, thank them and extend our appreciation to them for the work that they do on an ongoing basis on behalf of all of the citizens of our province.

I can tell you as well that as Minister of Government Services over the years, I had an opportunity to be responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization and the Emergency Measures Organization has vastly improved the sophistication of emergency response readiness in communities throughout the province and in northern communities. Although it is not strictly related to fire prevention the fact is, when disasters occur, communities do have to have an emergency plan. They have to be ready to respond in an organized way, not in a haphazard way, not with confusion and chaos. They have to know exactly what their responsibility is. The mayor has to know what services he can draw on, or the reeve in a rural municipality. They have to know what is available, and those plans that have been put in place in many communities and are required with the new Emergency Measures Act that we put in place last year, that my colleague, the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), as Minister, brought forward to this House. Those plans will be mandatory in every community throughout the province but, on a voluntary basis, many of these plans are already in place.

* (1120)

If any Members of this Assembly have an opportunity to discuss with the local community councils in northern areas, as well as municipal councils, they will find that these councillors and Reeves and mayors and staff are very proud of the efforts that they have made to prepare themselves for emergencies, in development of their emergency plans.

That has come as a result of the initiatives of the Emergency Measures Organization and the Disaster Assistance Board that we had enhanced tremendously during the time in Government, and one of the accomplishments that I feel very good about, and I am sure I share with many local people throughout the province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would support this Bill as it was explained, the intent. However, I feel again that the Minister should review the possibility of limiting the powers of this amendment with his department, look at limiting so that charges could not be made on a holus-bolus basis, widespread basis to Manitobans for training that is so essential for protecting lives and property in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the second reading of—

The Honourable Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery).

Mr. Connery: I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. Speaker: Might I remind the Honourable Member that when he does speak to that he will be closing debate? I remind the Honourable Minister that when he does speak to the said Bill he will be closing debate.

Mr. Connery: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 8, The Court of Queen's Bench Small—

The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), that debate be adjourned on Bill No. 6.

Mr. Speaker: It has been adjourned by the Honourable Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery).

Mr. Lamoureux: He is going to be debating on it, for clarification?

Mr. Speaker: That he has closed debate on it.

Mr. Lamoureux: We would like to have someone else speak on this particular Bill. We ask leave to reopen debate on this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Inkster have leave to reopen Bill No. 6?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I was wondering if the Member opposite would care to indicate how many more speakers he would anticipate having if leave is granted. Mr. Speaker, I

would be prepared to grant leave on the informal condition that we have one more speaker from the Liberal Party and then the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) be allowed to close debate the next time this Bill is called.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): I move, seconded by the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), that this matter be adjourned.

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): The Official Opposition is indeed pleased to let the matter remain adjourned in the name of the Honourable Minister of Labour and Environment (Mr. Connery).

Mr. Speaker: By leave, I believe we will have one more speaker from the Opposition side. It is my understanding that I believe that when this Bill is next before the House next Tuesday, that will be the time for the Honourable Member to ask for leave to get his remarks on the record. That will be the time to ask for leave.

BILL NO. 8—THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH SMALL CLAIMS PRACTICES AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 8, The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles). (Stand)

BILL NO. 9—STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 9, Statute Law Amendment (Re-enacted Statutes) Act; Loi modifiant diverses dispositions législatives (Lois réadoptées), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway). (Stand)

BILL NO. 11—THE CHILD CUSTODY ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 11, The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan). The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Although this is standing in the name of the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), I am prepared to say a few words at this time on this particular legislation.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill? (Agreed)

Mr. Evans: I do not pretend to be any expert on family law and indeed this particular piece of legislation, you

could say, fits in to the umbrella of the concept that we know and refer to as family law in Manitoba. We live in a very fast-changing society and certainly in that fast-changing society we have seen the family unit affected very much by that. We have changes in the kinds of families we have with us it seems. Regrettably, we have seen an increase in the number of divorces, an increase in the number of separations and, for whatever reason, situations that cause children to be held by others, looked after by others, in a form of custody.

* (1130)

I do not know how to explain the phenomenon. What is happening in Manitoba is not special, it is not singularly different from what is going on elsewhere in Canada, indeed the Western World. We, as a Legislature, over the years have tried to cope with some of these changes by bringing in various pieces of family law and have tried to change our laws in order to come up with some solutions to help us as a society to cope with some of these changes. It covers the whole spectrum. It includes even changes of names, the ability of women to have their child registered at birth in the name of the woman, as opposed to the name of the husband, the male, making it easier for women to change their names if they so wish; other aspects of the family law legislation respecting the splitting of assets at the time of divorce and many other elements.

This, I guess you would say, is just one small item in this umbrella of family law change. As I understand the Bill, Bill No. 7, The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act, is meant to work as a kind of a pilot program to help parents better access children and, secondly, to help the custodial parents to have the access parent live up to his or her obligations. I guess it somehow or other reflects the situation where there is conflict and where it is difficult for one party or the other, one parent or the other, to get access to the children. I do not have the figures, but I suspect in most cases it is fathers trying to get access to the children of a family.

Surely this legislation is meant to enhance the interests of the child or the children, because I believe there is an assumption here that it is good for the children to have both parents available to them, not knowing exactly how much time or how often or when, but it is good. I think there is agreement that there has to be better provision for access by parents.

There are a lot of detailed questions one could ask regarding this. Some Members opposite and on this side, both sides, have asked questions as to how this project will work. What about the supervision of access? Should there be supervision? What about a case of the matter going to court? Who will undertake the court costs? Poor people involved, how can they possibly pay court costs and so on? There are a lot of detailed questions that could be asked.

I think that there have been groups in our society, in Manitoba, who have spoken out on this particular problem from time to time. Included in that is the coalition dealing with matters pertaining to families.

The various groups are: the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Charter of Rights Coalition, Manitoba Branch. Incidentally, that coalition makes up many groups including the Elizabeth Fry Society of Manitoba, the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba, the Junior League of Winnipeg, The Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Manitoba Association of Women and the Law, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Provincial Council of Women, the United Church of Canada and the Young Women's Christian Association. So indeed, it is a very broad spectrum of society, many, many groups in this coalition who have concerns about this aspect of family law and about the general question of access enforcement.

We have some concerns generally about the Bill. We want to be sure that there be full passage of these amendments and implementation of its various parts, various components before the pilot project is actually under way by the staff. We do not want to allow for any starts that may be deemed to be false later. We do not want to see any chaos in the system. It would not do well if we did not get this legislation firmly established before the program itself took off. We are concerned also about adequate funding of the program to ensure that there is adequate compensation and specifically as it relates to custodial parents. We want to make sure that compensation provisions do prevail.

Both sections of Bill No. 11 refer to compensation apparently. There is mention of—I am quoting, “reimbursement to the applicant for any reasonable expenses actually incurred as a result of the wrongful denial of access.” I think there has to be some clarification of that. We want to ensure that this particular Bill adequately compensates whatever that may be, both the child care costs and the inconvenience. We want to ensure that it includes compensation for such things as job loss or loss of seniority as a result of parents who, for whatever reason, do not show up, for late shows or no shows.

We have another concern and this has been raised by the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, about the referral of the custodial parent to the access enforcement lawyer. It is their view that it is essential where access enforcement through the program is denied to the access parent, because the caseworker assesses enforcement to be detrimental to the child. The representation made by the Charter of Rights Coalition, I believe they have made representation to the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), and in their document they state, and I am quoting, “the Charter of Rights Coalition, otherwise known as CORC”—C-O-R-C—“remains of the opinion that referral of the custodial parent to the access enforcement lawyer is essential where access enforcement through the program is denied to the access parent, because the caseworker assesses enforcement to be detrimental to the child.”

I think what this is saying is that where the worker assesses that a child is at risk and where access has to be enforced, surely there is responsibility on the part of the Attorney-General or whatever Government

department, perhaps the Department of Community Services, to make sure that any risk is alleviated if not eliminated entirely.

We are also concerned about the confidentiality and privilege aspects. How can we be sure that the data that is brought forward, is in confidential mediation, remains private, remains privileged. If it is subpoenaable, how can we guarantee that necessary and appropriate variation in orders occurs, if the caseworker reports are not subpoenaable?

We have been able to ascertain from the press release and from the legislation, we have been able to ascertain that the legislation does not really indicate whether the caseworker reports would be subpoenaable. So there are some of the specific concerns we have. I think it is important that we all take a serious look. However, as I was indicating earlier at our entire family law protection, to ensure that both parties are being treated fairly. I do not have any proposals to bring forward by way of an amendment at this time. However, there may be other Members on this side who may wish to move amendments, but we have to continue to find ways to improve, to enhance, to somehow or other update and renew our commitment to legislation and programs in the family law area. We will be urging the Government also to be tabling the White Paper on Family Law.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down and perhaps other Members of the Legislature may wish to contribute to the debate.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that it will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan). (Stand)

BILL NO. 14—THE REGULATIONS ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 14, The Regulations Act; Loi sur les textes réglementaires, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): I do not intend to speak at great length about this Bill. I think it is largely, if the term can be used, a housekeeping piece of legislation. However, it is very important and I want to speak briefly on the importance of regulations, in general, as a specific type of legislation which, in my view and I think in the view of many, is largely the most important in that the body of regulations in this province and in this country impact on all of us on a day-to-day basis. They are the bulwark, if you will, of our legal system.

* (1140)

The statutes and indeed the Charter of Rights and our Constitution are the more well known and certainly the more discussed, but the regulations are the vast majority of pages and print and sections in regulations. They are the day-to-day workings of how the thoughts and the principles of our statutes and our Constitution are worked out in day-to-day life.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Parker Burrell, in the Chair.)

This body of law is no exception in Manitoba. It is an extremely large body of law, for the purposes of expediency and in allowing Governments to deal with situations as they arise and deal with all of the many, many things which our boards and our senior officials in our departments in Government must come up with. In order to ensure the efficiency of the working of statutes, it is necessary to delegate the authority to make regulations. It is necessary to delegate them to the particular boards that we set up as a province. It is also necessary, in certain circumstances, to delegate them to senior officials with the understanding that within certain time frames those regulations will be brought to the attention of Cabinet and, as well, the House.

This piece of legislation deals with those specific concerns that we all must have as citizens in a country where we want political accountability for every law that impacts on us. We want to be able to know that our elected representatives, if not involved directly in the making of a regulation are at the very least very shortly thereafter involved in the approval of that regulation and in the review of it.

As I have said, we are for purposes of expediency and efficiency in our society forced to trust our boards and our senior officials. That has not proven obviously a great problem. It simply allows Governments to continue to function in very complex societies in which the level of regulation of all of our activities, and the regulation of business and the regulation of all sectors of our society has continued to grow. I think many of us wish that it was not so cumbersome, and wish that we had not so many regulations and that we were not so regulated. But I think if we stop and reflect, we will see that certainly there are examples of ones that are not needed and that go beyond what any reasonable Government would want.

But by and large, in that we have become a more complex society, we have become a more sophisticated society, and the role of Government has increased of necessity, I would say, in many sectors as different problems arise and as we become better as a civilization in a society at protecting rights and ensuring that we all can function in as much harmony as is possible.

Traditionally, in the regulations area, there has been a problem with accessibility in organization of regulations. As the biggest body of laws in this province and in most common-law jurisdictions, and I do not think Manitoba is any exception, the body of laws that arguably has the greatest impact on the day-to-day lives of Manitobans, this problem of accessibility and of organization has been the subject of intense study throughout the common-law world.

I am not sure that there have been any absolute conclusions come to. I think what comes to mind in the ultimate answer is it is one of cost. Do we, as a society, want to make the cost, make the commitment to ensuring the accessibility of these regulations to non-lawyers, primarily because you go to law school and one of the things you learn—and believe me it takes many months if not years to do that—is how to use a law library. Really many say that is the best thing you learn in law school. Frankly, probably the most

useful thing you learn is how to find your way through the various consolidations of statutes and abridgments to find out what the law is. We are all, I think, working in this day and age to make that simpler and to allow accessibility to the laws to people who simply have an interest, have a concern so that they can find out what the state of the law is.

The second aspect of that is what role does Government play in specifically informing members of the public as to what laws and regulations are coming into effect? I see the gentlemen on the other side are making comments about farmers and turkeys. I assume they are talking about the regulations impacting on that area and I can sympathize with the number of regulations which cover that area. The regulations in this province have not been outside of that criticism. They have been inaccessible to many. Today they still are and they remain that way.

One suggestion that I would make is that the laws of this province, including the regulations, be made further accessible through the computer systems or through actually placing them in the major libraries in this province. That is something that I have always been concerned about. The laws are here in this House. They are in the great library over at the courthouse. They are in most of the major law firms. They are in the law school, but they are not in the public library.

If we believe that people have a right to know the state of the law, we should be placing these in the public libraries. We should be training people in the public libraries to help people weed their way through the jungle, the maze, and find what they are looking for. It is extremely important that we protect that. I recall my own experience and I think that of many others who perhaps want to find out something about the state of the law and go to find it, and it literally does take hours, if not days, to find it. It is a very important exercise to promote amongst the citizens of any common-law jurisdiction, and I think that is something that we want to look at in particular with respect to regulations.

This Act, in that it provides in Section 2(4) for the availability of regulations for inspection with the Registrar, somewhat addresses this concern but, to my mind, having a copy with the Registrar of Regulations, that is another thing that the non-legally trained Manitobans are simply not going to do. They are not going to know about the Registrar of Regulations. They are not going to attend the office during office hours and find out the regulations. That really is, in my view, a lame attempt to make the regulations accessible to Manitobans.

I go back to the opportunity we have, I think, in the public library system to make those accessible to every day Manitobans. Let us face it, that is a stated thrust of this Government in their Speech from the Throne. That is a stated thrust behind The Small Claims Amendment Act which we have seen before and I have already commented on. That is a thrust that we should be looking at, and it is a thrust that I think is progressive and that I will hope to bring forward at the committee stage.

Again, Section 4 talks about publication in the Gazette. The Gazette sounds like the name of a

magazine that everybody gets, but that is not true. The Gazette is a very foreign document to most people in this province. Lawyers know what the Gazette is because they read it. It comes out and it tells you all the new things that have happened with respect to the state of the law in Manitoba. The fact is, the Gazette, despite its name, is not something that everybody knows about or everybody reads and, even if we did send it to every home in Manitoba, I suspect most, if not all, would not read it because it tends to be fairly boring reading.

However, if you are looking for something, for a specific regulation or something in a specific area that you are concerned about, you should be able to find it. The Gazette is poorly indexed and the state of the regulations as published in the Gazette therefore are largely inaccessible.

* (1150)

Section 5 talks about the dispensing with publication in the Gazette. Even though I have criticized the publication of the Gazette, I would hope that minor attempt at accessibility is not dispensed with on a regular basis. I would hope that is very sparingly used. I would suggest that really both the publication in the Gazette and the specific informing of affected groups that can be identified be done, not just relying on notice through the Gazette but rather for every regulation. I suspect this is done in most if not all cases, looking out into society, seeing what groups will be specifically affected by this regulation and making the effort, taking the initiative to advise them and put them on notice that this is coming forward and that this is going to be the state of the law.

In most of these regulations, we also all hope that the officials in charge of coming up with the regulations have done consultation and have looked out into the community prior to bringing in the regulation to solicit opinions as to the need and what the actual content of any regulation should be.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

Section 8 points out that basically the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has to have the regulations brought to his notice. That in effect is the Cabinet, one would think and hope. On a monthly basis, in essence, one would hope that Cabinet reviews these regulations and each particular Minister looks at them for completeness so that particular Minister can be completely up to date on what the state of the regulations are.

Ultimately, all or most, if not all, regulations are brought to the attention of the House and that is set out in Section 12. Again because of the sheer volume of regulations, the House does not debate these on a regular basis, but one hopes that the Cabinet and the Minister in charge does take the initiative and specifically review these and keep up with the state of the law and understands who or what board within his particular portfolio has the power to make regulations. It is an extremely important function but it is also a function of great power. We tend to think that only the

Legislature can make laws. In fact we have all kinds of boards and officials out there who make laws on a daily basis. We, as a Legislature, in a particular Cabinet being responsible for those departments, have to continuously keep that in mind that ultimately the buck stops in the House, and that the ultimate political accountability is to your elected representatives and to the Cabinet.

I have referred briefly to a pet project of mine for some time which has been the installation of Manitoba's laws and regulations in major public libraries in this province and I simply reiterate that for the consideration of this House and the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), and I will bring it forward at the committee stage. I think it is important. I think we should have the trained people in public libraries to help Manitobans find laws which impact on them and which they are particularly interested in.

This Bill, we are, on this side of the House, pleased to support in that it continues in the dealing with regulations and again, as in many of the other ones that I have spoken to, we appreciate the thrust of this piece of legislation. We look forward to further developments and some innovation and some imagination in this field, which I think the overall area of the Attorney-General's Department could certainly use. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 15—THE COOPERATIVE PROMOTION TRUST ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act; Loi sur le fonds en fiducie de promotion de la coopération, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a willingness in the House to call it 12:30 p.m.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I believe Bill No. 15 can stand in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), and I believe he is correct that there is a will amongst Honourable Members to call it 12:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed, therefore, that Bill No. 15 will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

It appears to be the will of the House to call it 12:30 p.m. The hour being 12:30 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Tuesday.

I would like to wish everybody a good, long weekend, the Thanksgiving weekend coming forth. Heavy on the turkey, guys.