



First Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

---

39 Elizabeth II

---

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



**VOL. XXXIX No. 15 - 1:30 p. m., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1990**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARR, James	Crescentwood	Liberal
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CONNERY, Edward, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Cliff	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, October 31, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to table the letter to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba pursuant to Section 13 of The Trade Practices Inquiry Act, being Chapter T110 of the Statutes of Manitoba, 1970. I have the honour to report that no inquiries were subsequent to the last report.

I have another letter to the Lieutenant-Governor. In accordance with Section 114(4) of The Insurance Act, Chapter I40 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1970, I hereby submit a report that Orders-in-Council Nos. 670 and 671 were passed on June 20, 1990, and the copies are enclosed.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a Report to the Legislature pursuant to Section 56(3) of The Financial Administration Act relating to Supplementary Loan and Guarantee Authority.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### BILL 6—THE BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner), that leave be given to introduce Bill 6, The Business Practices Act; Loi sur les pratiques commerciales, and that the same now be received and read a first time.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of this Bill, recommends it to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

**Motion agreed to.**

### BILL 11—THE RESIDENTIAL RENT REGULATION AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), that leave now be given to introduce Bill 11, The Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le contrôle du loyer des locaux d'habitation.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Martindale:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose and intent of this Bill is to prevent landlords from gouging tenants on capital cost passed through as exorbitant rent increases.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (1335)

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Repap Manitoba Inc. Agreement Renegotiation

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, we understand there is going to be a "major announcement" today by the Premier on Manitoba's Round Table on Sustainable Development. All Manitobans look forward to that announcement, and we are very aware of the principles contained in sustainable development, that a balance must be struck between today's decisions and tomorrow's impacts.

My question to the Premier is: In light of that philosophy, which I am sure most Manitobans support, will the Premier now agree to renegotiate the Repap Agreement so that Manitobans will not be subject to chlorine bleach, which is a known carcinogen, that it causes long-term and long-lasting environmental damage to Manitoba rivers and to our environment? Will he renegotiate it in light of his announcement today?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, what the Member opposite is advocating is a return to Manfor. Manfor were some of the worst polluters that this province has ever seen. There have been millions of dollars that have been spent thus far, since Repap took over, in cleaning up entire areas

in which harmful chemicals, very harmful chemicals, were just dumped indiscriminately on the land, soaked through and polluted the water table so that the water supply in the area was polluted, dumped entire raw chemicals from the process directly into the river systems. When they wanted to repair their equipment, they just—bunker oil dumped on the ground. All of these kinds of pollutants were done by Manfor, under his administration, with no retribution, with no criticism and with no attempt to rein them in and clean them up. If he is advocating that we go back to that, I reject that totally, as do the people of Manitoba.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, there is no question that Manfor was not perfect, and indeed a long way from being perfect on the environment, but my question deals with an irreversible decision of cancer-causing materials that are now affecting mother's milk in Canada.

My question to the Premier is: Will he take his stewardship responsibility seriously and renegotiate the Repap deal to prevent chlorine bleach, dioxins and cancer-causing material from entering into Manitoba's environment? Will he lead, or will he follow?

**Mr. Filmon:** Manfor was not only not perfect, Manfor was a disaster. It was an embarrassment. It was the worst polluter in this province, thanks to the NDP who not only allowed them, turned a blind eye to their operation but, Mr. Speaker, allowed them to operate for years without any environmental licence. If you want to talk about a disaster, if you want to talk about an administration that had no concern for the environment, that was the NDP administration.

When they had a national survey of the condition of the environment in this country for two successive years in the '80s, they were rated tenth out of 10—tenth out of 10 because of their disastrous approach to the environment. We will not return to that. We have been taking leadership from the time that we came in Government, and we have cleaned up the Manfor situation entirely.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. I am not standing here for the good of my health.

### Oak Hammock Marsh Environment Licence Appeal

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr.

Speaker, let us assume that everybody is guilty on Manfor, including the Member that used to be the Minister of Environment, because we have a choice. We have an option now to stop cancer-causing goods. The Premier's words will be pretty hollow later on in the press conference today on his so-called stewardship.

\* (1340)

My question is to the Premier. The Naturalist Society of Manitoba is now appealing the licence that has been issued on Oak Hammock Marsh. The Premier is in charge of Treasury Board, which is funding this project by a million dollars of taxpayers' money. The Premier asks us continually, what would you do as an alternative to the budget?

Why will the Premier not redirect the \$1 million from the Oak Hammock Marsh to the parent-child centres that are being closed down by the Minister of Family Services and show environmental leadership as well as good people skills at the same time?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** I have to go through every aspect of his preamble and his question, because the Leader of the Opposition deliberately puts misinformation on the record, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is—

### Point of Order

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Opposition Leader, on a point of order.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have already had a number of points of order this Session, and a number of Members have I think diverged somewhat from Beauchesne's. I believe that the statement made by the First Minister is definitely in contravention certainly with the spirit in Beauchesne's. I would ask that you ask Members to use more temperate language and not the type of unparliamentary statements used by the First Minister.

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the word "deliberately."

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would like to thank the Honourable First Minister.

**Mr. Filmon:** I recognize that is unparliamentary.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Filmon:** The Member for Concordia has unknowingly put on the record false information.

The fact of the matter is that neither this Minister nor this Government withdrew or cut off funding from the parent-child centres. They never did receive funding from the provincial Government. It was funding from the Core Area Initiative. It was not provided for by the former NDP administration and it has not been provided for by this administration. It has not been provided for by the provincial Government in the past.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the appeal on Oak Hammock Marsh, that appeal will take place, and there is a process in place under The Environment Act that was passed by the former -(interjection)- will they please listen to the answers so that I can give them food for their next question?

The fact of the matter is that that appeal process is in place under The Environment Act, and we abide by that appeal process. The fact of the matter is that any funding that is to be put forth by this administration in any form whatsoever towards Oak Hammock Marsh, whether it comes under the partnership agreement of the Canada-Manitoba tourism agreement or under the funding that is provided for the interpretive centre under Natural Resources, they are subject to them receiving all approvals necessary under the clean environment process and the Clean Environment Act. That is sacred and will prevail, Mr. Speaker. That will prevail if they do not receive their approvals, if they do not withstand the environmental scrutiny, they will not get the money. If they do—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order please.

### VIA Rail Route Cancellations

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, today we have learned that the National Transportation Agency has given VIA Rail approval to eliminate routes, whether or not they are mandated.

My question is for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Driedger). Will the Minister table in the House today his response to the National Transportation Agency request for submissions concerning their plan to eliminate the need for any public review before cutting VIA routes and service?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Let me first of all express some concern about the ruling that came down from the National Transportation Agency regarding VIA Rail services. I can only indicate that I received a commitment from the federal Minister

of Transportation less than two years ago that there would be guaranteed transportation services to isolated communities. I still consider that a commitment on behalf of the federal Minister; however, I will be pursuing this and meeting with the new Minister of Transportation to make sure that we have that ongoing commitment.

\* (1345)

Mr. Reid: This cutback has potential consequences for the people of Manitoba considering that currently going through the country is the Royal Commission on National Passenger Transportation. They have yet to make their report and it is—

An Honourable Member: What is the second question?

Mr. Speaker: Question, please. Order, please. Question now, please.

Mr. Reid: My question is to the same Minister: Why has this Government not taken a public pro-active stand to stop their federal Conservative colleagues from going ahead with such cuts? Where are the results of his so-called consultations with the federal Government?

Mr. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to this Member that if he studied Hansard for the last two years, he would become aware of the involvement with my department and this Government, with the federal Government, with VIA Rail. Maybe he should not avail himself of the information when the unions and the city and the Government jointly made presentations to the federal Government about these issues. We have been doing that on an ongoing basis and will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I want to indicate I will also make available a copy of our presentation to the National Transportation Agency that we have submitted. I have a report, and I will make that available to him as well.

### Northern Route Protection

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): I am appalled that the communities currently served, communities such as northern Manitoba, communities such as Dauphin and Swan River have the potential to have their service cut.

My question for the same Minister, Mr. Speaker: What has he learned from his consultations with the federal Conservatives on how soon will the

protected Manitoba routes be eliminated, and what alternatives is his Government considering for northern and rural residents who will lose this VIA service?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** I do not know whether that question is in order or not, but I want to indicate that we have always put our position forward very strongly in terms of guaranteed services for the isolated communities and will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I will try and get my staff to put together all of the involvement we have had with the federal Government, with VIA Rail, with CN. I will try and make that information available to him so that he knows the position that this Government has continually put forward and will continue to put forward.

### Conawapa Dam Project Clean Environment Commission

**Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood):** My question is to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings): Can the Minister tell us when he expects a decision from the Clean Environment Commission to grant a licence or not to grant a licence for the construction of the Conawapa dam and the Bipole 3 transmission line?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, we are only now embarking on that process. It will unfold as the utility is able to bring forward their requirements under the assessment. I am not going to lock myself into a predetermined date at this point.

### Conawapa Dam Project Delay Penalties

**Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood):** Mr. Speaker, the answer is important, because there is a schedule of penalties.

My supplementary question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. What is the penalty for the taxpayers of Manitoba if the Clean Environment Commission says no to a licence for Conawapa and Bipole 3 by the end of 1991?

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Hydro Act):** There are a number of processes that have to take place before any construction begins. The first one is of course now being conducted at the Public Utilities Board. The next process will be, if the recommendation comes

down the capital project shall go ahead as has been proposed by Manitoba Hydro; then the next process of course will be the environment licence. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) has already said that he is in the process of starting that process.

Manitoba Hydro is confident that the submission it will put forward to the environment will be sufficient to allow it to go forward. Both Ontario Hydro and Manitoba Hydro have agreed that if by the end of December of this year they have received certain licences or certain approvals or certain comfort levels, they can go forward, but the end of December of 1991 of course there will be a penalty to both Manitoba Hydro and Ontario Hydro. -(interjection)- I am not going to give you the exact number of that penalty now.

**Mr. Carr:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would consult the contract that was signed by Manitoba Hydro and the Premier of Manitoba he would know the answer. It is \$50 million.

\* (1350)

### Conawapa Dam Project Delay Penalties

**Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood):** My final supplementary question is to—

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood has the floor.

**Mr. Carr:** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Finance. It is not a \$50 million question, it is a \$5.5 billion question. Will the Minister of Finance guarantee to Members of the Legislature that they will have an opportunity to question the chief executive officer of Manitoba Hydro after the recommendation of the Public Utilities Board and before December 31, 1990, which is the last date after which there will be penalties to Manitoba Hydro?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot make that commitment. The commitment I can make is, the greatest responsibility of every Member of this House is to give clearance to the Government or opposition to the Government with respect to loan authority, indeed to the entering into a loan agreement whereby monies are borrowed in support of any capital project including hydro development, in this

case specifically Conawapa. There is a small portion in The Loan Act this year that is to be directed towards Conawapa.

The Member at that time will be able to exercise the greatest responsibility he has, indeed the greatest power he has with respect to calling forward information from the Minister responsible and ultimately deciding whether or not to support by way of his vote the expenditure of those funds, the democratic system that has been in place for 400 and some years.

### Heritage Buildings Community Concerns

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mr. Neufeld). Over the past 20 years local and national heritage—

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Ms. Friesen:** Over the past 20 years local and national heritage organizations have worked hard to preserve the downtown buildings of Winnipeg. We are, Mr. Speaker, today in the process of losing some of those very significant buildings.

The Minister has met with the Manitoba Historical Society, with Heritage Winnipeg, and I gather has received letters from them and from the City of Winnipeg.

Can the Acting Minister tell this House what the response of the Government has been to these community concerns? -(interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) has asked a question, and I believe she would like to hear an answer.

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Acting Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** Obviously, Mr. Speaker, our best kept secret is a secret no longer.

I will take that question as notice and have the Minister bring it back to the Member.

### Preservation

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** I have a supplemental, Mr. Speaker, to the same Acting Minister. I would like the Minister to realize that we

do have an emergency situation here. The heat is being turned off. The buildings are in danger. The Capital and Metropolitan buildings in particular have significant interiors that are going to be lost.

Will the Minister assure us that some measures will be in place to protect these and other buildings in downtown Winnipeg this winter?

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Acting Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

### Heritage Buildings Preservation

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** My final supplemental is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. What immediate steps is he prepared to take to ensure that the celebrated historic character of Winnipeg's downtown is preserved?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, to the Member across the way, if she would look at the Estimates process and look at the Urban Affairs, we have a six year capital program that the city can tap into at any time at their wish and come forward to the province. That is the idea of that capital works program, to come to the Government on those particular types of urban issues.

\* (1355)

### Parent-Child Centres Funding

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** For more than a year the future of parent-child centres has been in jeopardy as a result of this Government's unwillingness to support the work of these valuable programs.

Today I am tabling in the House a letter received yesterday by all five parent-child centres, in which the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) finally admits he will not be funding the centres.

Considering that in his letter the Minister recognizes the effective support the centres offer families, why did he decide to take this action which will inevitably result in the closing of these centres?

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services):** Mr. Speaker, as already has been indicated, this department has not funded child-parent centres in the past. The letter was in

response to a request, and we are unable to fund those centres.

I can tell you, in some of the travelling that I have done to meet with organizations that interact with this department people talk about the NDP record. They say that anything worth doing was worth doing badly, that there was a tremendous underfunding of such things as foster parent groups, shelters and day care. We have now added some stability to that system and we are funding these necessary services.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, since maintaining the programs at these five parent-child centres, which had more than 24,000 visits from parents and children this last year, would cost only \$300,000, how can the Minister square his Government's \$1 million subsidy for office space at Oak Hammock Marsh with his refusal to assist parent-child centres when he himself says in this letter, they provide unique programs with minimum funding?

**Mr. Gillehammer:** Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, our commitment is to front line services—the funding of foster parents, of day care centres, of shelters. We have put in place a commitment to fund those institutions.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister tell the parent-child centres that they do not qualify as a Government priority when for five years they have provided family support services and encouraged parent-child relationships, but his Government is willing to give an additional \$8 million tax break to this province's biggest corporations?

**Mr. Gillehammer:** Again, I would repeat that our commitment is to stabilize the funding for the people who deal with the front line problems that this department comes into contact with, funding that was not there before, a system that was not there before under the NDP Government. We are very proud of the commitment we have made and the steps that we have taken to fund such things as foster parents, the child care community and also the shelters.

### Environmental Project Reviews Federal-Provincial Panels

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment. Recently, the Minister sent a letter to members of the environmental community suggesting that joint environmental assessment reviews with the federal

Government were the way of the future. However, the letter and its attachments, which I will table, go on to contemplate not only joint reviews, but joint panels, which would produce joint reports. The timing of this initiative is extremely suspicious.

Why is the Minister now, just when the federal Government is dramatically reducing its environmental standards and the federal Auditor has just lambasted the Mulroney Government for its environmental irresponsibility, promoting the acceptance of federal panel membership criteria and inevitably their reduced standards?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, we obviously have the Liberal mentality, seeing shadows behind every tree here. The fact is, and I would table it if the Opposition would be interested, I have a letter from the Honourable Mr. Bouchard indicating that he supported joint reviews going back to his short tenure as Environment Minister in this country.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if there is ever going to be a clear and defined process so that the concerns of both federal and provincial authorities can be met in assessing environmental issues in this province, this is one of the few ways that we will be able to get it, not only here, but across the country.

\* (1400)

### Standards Reduction

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows full well that Mr. Mulroney has just gutted the Environment Act. Now he is jumping on the bandwagon with him. This letter goes on to cite four specific projects in Manitoba that will be covered: Conawapa, bipole, the north central transmission line and Repap.

Is the Minister also willing to accept the new approach of the federal Government, which is to build now and study later with respect to these very important major projects in Manitoba?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, this Government has fully committed itself to environmental assessment prior to construction, and we will stand by that. We believe that environmental issues have to be clearly enunciated, that the concerns have to be identified, that the mitigation methods have to be identified. Whether or not a project can then proceed is a decision as a result of those examinations. That is the standard by which we will operate.

I clearly reject the idea that this in any way compromises environmental standards in this province.

### Conawapa Dam Project Delay Penalties

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, finally, for the same Minister, does this Minister truly believe that an unbiased environmental review of the Conawapa project can take place when the provincial Government has tied itself into millions of dollars in penalties if the environmental panel dares to find environmental fault with that project?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the Member in fact cites the very reason why it is evident that we have a very strong commitment to environmental process in this province. We have said that this project will not proceed unless it gets all of the correct environmental clearances. I think we are seeing an increasing demonstration on the part of the Members opposite that they are opposed to the Conawapa in any form. They do not want to listen for the process; they do not want to hear what the assessment might bring forward. They just want to dump on it.

### Judicial System Probation Breach

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** My question is directed towards the Minister of Justice. In light of the revelations in this House last week, Mr. Speaker, and insofar as programs at the Justice Department probation area have been frozen as a result of this budget, will the Minister assist the court process and Probation Services by instructing Crown attorneys to utilize Section 738, sub 4 of the Criminal Code, which allows the court to sentence probation violators on the original charge rather than the present practice whereby the offenders receive a slap on the wrist or simply the charges are often dropped for breach of probation?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** The question the Honourable Member puts, the assertion he makes about the budget of the department, is something that he and I can discuss in detail during the Estimates process in this Legislature.

With respect to those who breach probation, the rules are there. The Honourable Member's question

was long, and he and I may take an opportunity later to discuss the specifics of his proposal. I would be pleased to hear what comments he would have to make.

### Dismissal of Charges

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** My supplementary is: In light of the recent announcement from the Attorney General in Ontario that the Ontario Government is reviewing its practice of dismissing charges to ensure that sexual offenders and impaired driving charges are not dropped, will the Minister undertake to also have a review of similar dismissed charges in this jurisdiction?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** It is not clear which policy the Honourable Member is referring to. Is he referring to policies similar to the charging policy here in the Province of Manitoba respecting domestic violence and applying that policy to other offences? I wish the Honourable Member would make himself clear so I could give him a clear answer.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Mr. Speaker, for purposes of clarification, I will indicate to the Minister that the Province of Ontario is reviewing the dismissal of charges in the Province of Ontario in light of revelations in the province that certain sexual offenders and certain impaired drivers have had their charges dropped. I am asking the Minister to undertake to assure this House that similar circumstances have not happened in Manitoba and perhaps to undertake a review to ensure that that is in fact the case.

**Mr. McCrae:** I am having a problem. I do not think the Honourable Member is making very clear the circumstances prevailing in the Ontario situation. Dismissal of charges is something that happens that is occasioned by judges. Charges being dropped are sometimes referred to as stays of proceedings and that is done by the Crown.

In the case of dismissal of charges, we review the adjudications of judges on a routine basis with respect to dismissals and with respect to sentences in Manitoba, but if we disagree with a dismissal or if we disagree with the sentence, there is an appropriate way to deal with that and that is by way of appeal to a higher level of court. We apply very strict standards when we make decisions about staying proceedings, dropping charges, in this province. That is subject to a written policy directive in the Crown prosecution's area.

### Family Violence Restraining Orders

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** My final supplementary is: On October 15, the Minister indicated in this House, and I quote, without very much time passing, there will be further announcements with respect to a revision of the policy of restraint orders and other matters dealing with violence towards women.

Can the Minister give undertaking as to when this announcement will take place?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** A bientôt, M. le président. (Soon, Mr. Speaker.)

The issues surrounding the review that we are proposing have been the subject of discussion between myself and various people in the shelter network in the Province of Manitoba and others involved in prosecution. I can tell the Honourable Member that very soon an announcement will be made about the review.

### Manitoba Cultural Council Anti-Racism Initiatives

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister responsible for multiculturalism. Although this Government is trying to minimize and deflect damaging comments of one of its Ministers to ethnocultural communities, we in the public are taking these comments seriously, and we—

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Unfortunately we were all reminded this morning of the divisiveness of these comments when we entered the Legislature and saw the graffiti painted on the walls of the Legislature.

We now have a new urgency to deal with racism in this province because of comments made by a Minister of the Government.

Will the Government tell us why they are delaying, since mid-September, to put forth an action plan from the Manitoba Intercultural Council to deal with anti-racism initiatives? Will they tell us when this report will—

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

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Acting Minister of Culture,**

**Heritage and Recreation):** Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

### Manitoba Hydro Affirmative Action

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Radisson, with her supplementary question.

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** How can this Minister of Energy and Mines and the Acting Minister for multiculturalism and culture effectively administer employment equity programs in the area of hydro when he says that aboriginal groups come time and again for more, and insinuate that they cannot be trusted?

### Point of Order

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that identical question was asked, not yesterday, the day before, with respect to the affirmative action in Manitoba Hydro. That was fully a question asked at that time, and I ask you to rule it out of order.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, first of all if the Government House Leader would have cared to listen to the question, I am sure he would have found that it is quite different.

I realize there is some sensitivity on part of the Government that we now find out that the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) is the Acting Minister responsible for multiculturalism. I can understand the sensitivity of the Government—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. To the point of order.

**Mr. Ashton:**—House Leader and this Government. They are trying to deflect from the very real questions we are raising to that Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister did not have a point of order.

\*\*\*

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Hydro Act):** Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) wants to put a question on the floor to me about pay equity at Manitoba Hydro or affirmative action in Manitoba Hydro, I will be glad to answer the question.

As far as the question she poses to the Minister of Heritage and Culture, I will take that as notice.

\* (1410)

### Multicultural Policy Contradictions

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson):** My final supplementary question is for the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey).

Does this Minister, who negotiates most of the Government's agreements with northern aboriginal groups, share the views of his colleagues—the Minister of Energy and Mines—that Native people cannot be relied upon to fulfill commitments that they make when they are at the bargaining table?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, our policies have spoken very clearly in our dealings with the Native people over the past two and a half years. I fully support my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), in our cultural policies.

### Economic Growth Stimulation

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). Today Statistics Canada has reported that the level of Canadian real domestic output declined again in August. This was the largest single contraction in eight years.

Now we have data from Statistics Canada showing that housing starts in Manitoba were down by 30.8 percent in the third-quarter of this year compared to last year. Also, Manitoba manufacturing shipments were down by 2.9 percent in August.

Given these deteriorating situations, will the Minister now be prepared to take appropriate measures to stimulate the economy in order to offset the downturn in our business cycle, or is he going to sit idly by and watch the situation worsen even further?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I suspected that the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) might pose a question in this vein.

Let me indicate that the forecast of the national growth of the economy is down, yes, as indicated. That is because the result of Ontario's growth is only by 0.3 percent, Quebec only by 0.9 percent, whereas Manitoba's growth is now increasing by the

forecast of 2.2, some sevenfold greater than Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, further to that end the Member may be interested to know that the forecast, as far as economic growth in the Province of Manitoba, falls within a relatively narrow range, but they certainly are all above the national forecast. The Conference Board now, I understand, is about to release a 3 percent growth, Informetrica, 2.2; Bank of Montreal, 2.8; Bank of Commerce, 2.5; and of course the TD Bank, as the Member has indicated as one of those forecast, is somewhat lower in the range of 1.5.

Mr. Speaker, by all accounts, by all forecasts the Province of Manitoba is doing better than any other province except one in Canada.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister can quote all the forecasts he wants, but the real data shows today manufacturing is declining in Manitoba and so is the housing industry.

### Sales Tax Revenues Forecast Revision

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Will the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) be revising his own provincial revenue projections, those that were presented in the budget, given that statistics now available for August indicate that our retail trade is seriously declining in this province which will negatively affect the retail sales tax revenue?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, why would I revise the Estimates of revenue when we just did them basically three weeks ago to put forward into the Estimates of revenue and include it in the budget?

Mr. Speaker, we have indicated the sales tax revenues for the year are going to be up. At this point they are 4.5 percent above last year, but by the time the year blends out they indeed still will be positive, more so than most other provinces in this country.

It is foolhardy for the Member to ask me to start to do a revision now when we just did the numbers three weeks ago. That is an absolutely ridiculous request.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister did not hear. I am talking about data that has just been released within days since his forecast was tabulated in the budget speech.

### Economic Growth Five-Year Forecast

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, my final question, in talking about forecasts when can we expect this Minister to provide his three- or five-year forecasts of revenue expenditure, which he called for many a time in Opposition? He has had three opportunities and we still do not have a five-year forecast.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Where has this Member been? Do I have to send a budget over to him? I did provide three years this year, for '90-91, '91-92 and '92-93. That is one, two, three—three years, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

### Seniors' Housing Shelter Supplements

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). Since an increasing number of people, especially in the inner city, are faced with housing affordability problems will the Minister explain to seniors why this Government has budgeted less money this year for Shelter supplements?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, the Member across the way must realize that all the programs he is talking about, the program he has questioned, is a forecast level. I would be glad to go over last year's actual expenditures with him when we get to the budget process. I will go through the total line with the Member when we get to that process.

### Department of Housing Administration Cutbacks

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** My supplementary is: Will the Minister explain why, given that his new legislation will require hiring staff to staff a kind of housing court, there has been a cutback in administration in the Housing Department?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman across the way wants to go back to the budget again, he can go through the budget and see that our subsidy costs are also up this year. Our program amounts are also up this year. If his particular Government had not done a

disastrous effect on the land banking, he will also see in the budget that cost us \$6 million this year due to their incompetence.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of Honourable Members to the loge to my left where we have with us this afternoon, M. Jean Allard, the former Member for Rupertsland.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### BUDGET DEBATE

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), the amendment thereto, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), who has 20 minutes remaining.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as I ended my remarks I indicated to the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) that I had something positive to say about what he was doing. I indicated that there were a few things I wanted to point out to him that I thought were on the correct track for the first time in this Government. I am afraid though when I received a copy of this letter this morning, I have had to revise my considerations somewhat, although I still want to point out one policy decision that he has made that I think has the potential of bearing some fruit.

I want to preface those remarks by referring to a cartoon that appeared in the paper. I am not certain, I think it might have been the Financial Post last week. The cartoon was a picture of a large Russian bear on crutches. The trainer, who was holding onto a chain that was around the neck of the bear, was a caricature of Mikhail Gorbachev. The trainer was saying to the bear, dance. The problem, Mr. Speaker, was that the bear had no legs from the knees down.

Now, the Minister of Family Services has been saying repeatedly in this House that it is time that the Family Services agencies and the boards of those agencies made their own policy decisions. -(interjections)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am having great difficulty hearing the remarks of the Honourable Member for Osborne. Honourable Members wishing to carry on a private conversation can do so outside the Chamber.

\* (1420)

**Mr. Alcock:** Mr. Speaker, when the Child and Family Services agencies were set up, they were set up to meet a very specific need. They were established in the way they were because a great many people had a great deal of concern about the nature of the changes that were taking place in our community, about the fact that divorce and separation was increasing at an alarming rate, about the fact that families no longer had a parent at home, about the fact that families were separating and remarrying and about the creation of what they began to call in Family Services the disposable child, children who were not firmly rooted in any particular family, but in fact were being parented by a number of combinations of people.

One of the things that we noticed as we went through the statistics, looking at apprehensions under Child and Family Services—Mr. Speaker, might you call the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to order, please. I am having a little difficulty speaking over his head here.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have reminded all Honourable Members that I am having great difficulty in hearing the remarks of the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Alcock:** Mr. Speaker, my jogging partner from the Reh-Fit is a little concerned about the legitimate questions that the Opposition is raising of the Government.

One of the things that we did in Family Services was that we looked very carefully at where children were coming from, why children were coming into care, what sort of families they were coming out of. We discovered very early on that a significant number of the children that we were taking into care were coming into care not for reasons of abuse, not for reasons of severe neglect, but were coming out of largely single parent families, because the parent, the custodial parent, simply was having difficulty providing basic care. A great many people felt that we were inappropriately apprehending children. We were apprehending aboriginal children at an alarming rate and not offering any alternative supports.

It was felt that one agency serving the City of Winnipeg with a board drawn from the elites in the south end of the city was not being the least bit sensitive to the legitimate needs of parents throughout the city. It was felt that we had to set up agencies that had boards that were broadly representative of the communities served so that they could reflect the values expressed by those communities and that those values would be expressed in the apprehension policies of those agencies.

I believe that those boards were correctly constituted. I believe those agencies were properly set up and I believe at the time that they were set up in 1985 that there was an opportunity for that to work.

I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP Government, who had the right idea, who established a very progressive and forward-looking policy, made one fatal mistake and that is, they would not step back from the management of that system. They would not step back and do as the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) is suggesting and let the boards manage. They continued to centralize all the decisions in the department. The department grew from a department of 19 staff to one of 58 at one point, and they continued to run de facto the affairs of those agencies. The agencies quickly began to slip into debt and that debt problem was never resolved.

Now some five years later the Minister of Family Services is saying, go out, boards, and make your own decisions. It is not my responsibility. I will stand back, you spend your resources in the way that you think is most appropriate, and I support that decision. Those agencies today are in the same position as that Russian bear. They are so saddled by debt that they are simply unable to make any effective policy decisions. Until that debt problem is corrected it is simply hypocritical of the Minister to suggest that they and they alone have to make those decisions, because there is not a financial decision that is made in Child and Family Services today that is not approved by the Minister's own department.

This Minister has an opportunity to make some very significant changes in this community. One of the remarkable things about the position he is in right now in this Government is, he has an opportunity to produce significant change in this community. He has an opportunity in his office to

positively affect people in this province. He is abrogating that that responsibility. He is refusing to act on behalf of families and children in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is shameful.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to talk a little bit about where the money comes from, because that is a question that the Government raises legitimately and I think there are answers to that and I think there are examples of where that money has been available in the past. The first thing I want to say is that we have a problem in this province, as do most provinces across the country, in that as our community has become more aware of the effects of the abuse on children, the physical and sexual abuse on children or physical abuse of women, in particular, we know the devastating effects that this has on families and on future generations. We know that those who abuse today are most likely children who were abused as children. We know that a very high incidence of those who commit crimes of violence were themselves abused as children. We know that if we were to have a gentler, more caring society we have to intervene now with those things that lead to abuse.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at our provincial budget and we look at all of the programs that we have in this province, all of the programs to detect and to intervene in cases of abuse, to investigate and take to court, to provide support and counselling and treatment to victims of abuse comprise less than six-tenths of 1 percent of this entire budget. It is that six-tenths of 1 percent that provides children in this province with any kind of rights and any kind of protection against abuse.

It is that six-tenths of 1 percent that this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is choosing to attack. -(interjection)- The Finance Minister raises the question, he says, is it shameful that 10 percent goes to interest? Yes, it is absolutely shameful, and it is equally shameful that you try to recover that 10 percent on the backs of abused children and women in this province, but you have options. -(interjection)- Well, you just sit in your seat and you will hear them right now.

Let me go through a few of them in this particular service. I am going to talk about Child and Family Services. I am going to talk about several areas, and if the little Minister from Springfield now would just keep his nose out of it I will get to him, okay?

Mr. Speaker, the first thing that the Finance

Minister (Mr. Manness) can do and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) can do is what I suggested he do when we talked at Interim Supply. They can close Seven Oaks Centre for Youth—\$1.9 million to violate the rights of children, that is how much we spend, \$1.9 millions to incarcerate children who have committed no crime. There is not a province in Canada that does that, not one, except for Manitoba. We spend \$1.9 million on that and we cut Family Services programs and family support programs that could help prevent abuse.

You want another suggestion? I will give you an example. Northeast Child and Family Services, four years ago -(interjection)- Just hold on, hold on, Mr. Minister of Finance, just listen for awhile. There is another one and it comes back in a sense to what the Minister said. If you let the boards in these agencies manage, if you truly let them manage and if you rewarded good management instead of punishing good management you would see some efficiencies.

Now, some of these examples, I admit, go back to the former Government. I am going to use one of them. One of the things we noticed, as I said when I started, in Child and Family Services, was that we were apprehending large numbers of children from families whose only problem seemed to be that they did not have any support and rather than simply theorize about that the board and the staff in the Northeast region undertook a research project. They had a \$70,000 family support budget that they believed that if they were to act aggressively in family support that they could reduce the number of kids coming into care—not increase, reduce—by providing more appropriate support to families before they needed care.

\* (1430)

So they did; they started a very aggressive family support program. They spent their entire annual budget in three months, \$70,000; but they saved \$230,000 in foster care—\$230,000 they saved for a \$70,000 expenditure. They went back to this Government, the former Government, not the current Government, and they said, look what we did. We spend more heavily over here, we can save heavily over here. The number of kids in care went down dramatically, and I can show the Minister the graph. This Government said no. The former Government said, no, we will not allow you to do that. We will not reward you to operate prevention programs. What we will do is we will pay the heavier

costs on the tertiary care side. I think that was a foolish decision. I think it was a decision that hurt families in the northeast region of this province. I think it was a decision that contributed to the debt problems that the agencies currently face.

The reality is that there are a number of small, elegant, low-cost decisions which can go a long way to providing support to families. The reality is that those early prevention decisions, Mr. Speaker, can save us money, not cost us money.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), who comes from the area served by Child and Family Services of western Manitoba, should be aware since he is willing to yap a little bit about this particular service area of what is happening in Child and Family Services of western Manitoba. There is an agency—you know, there was a lot of concern raised.

I have heard comments made by the current Government about the Child and Family Services agencies in the City of Winnipeg, which was created by the former Government. The Child and Family Services of western Manitoba has been configured in the way it is for some two decades. It is an agency that is prudently and conservatively administered, and it has continually had small surpluses until the last two years. Now all of a sudden an agency which has been operating in the black for a long time, which did not go through all the horrendous changes that took place in the City of Winnipeg, is running deficits in the order of a quarter of a million dollars total.

What has changed? The management of the agency has not changed. There are two things that have changed. One is that the conditions in the community are such that the caseloads continue to increase, and the second is that the current Government completely refuses to recognize any kind of preventative program, completely refuses to support any kind of programming that will provide alternatives to taking kids into care, because that agency had a very innovative program. That agency had a program that used to reach out quickly when they noticed situations in the community where there were young parents or single parents who were getting into some trouble. When it came to the attention of the authorities in the school that there were some questions about what was happening in the program, this agency would move very quickly to link that parent with another parent, and to see that they had some very simple, very basic social

support. They found that their caseload was very flat, their intake was flat, that they did not have to bring into care the number of kids that they had to previously.

This Government that speaks about being fiscally responsible has cut the very programs that provide some opportunity for these agencies to positively affect their caseloads. How do you do that? What are the things that bring children into care? Well, one of them is abuse. In an abusive situation sometimes you want to get those children away from those parents as quickly as possible to protect them, but more often than not, children come into care for reasons of neglect or reasons of unmanageability, that they are having difficulty remaining hooked to their family structure.

The impact of teenagers, now you look at an area like south Winnipeg where you have a very large proportion of teenagers in care. Now it is reasons that need some early intervention and counselling that will allow those children to remain in their homes, remain in their homes rather than becoming a drain on the public purse, if you like, but those programs require a couple of things. They require an agency that has the capacity to reach out to the community, not in a massive way, but in an elegant way that allows them to network with all of the churches and at the schools and at the community centres so that they become aware very early on when there is a family in trouble so that they can reach out to that family and offer some support at a very early stage.

This Government, this fiscally responsible Government, refuses to support any prevention program and has been consistently cutting back on prevention programming while at the same time denying it and ruining any opportunity that they have to control costs in child welfare.

Our Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) has surprised me, because I thought he was a little more clever than he is proving to be. His response in social services has been a traditional, blind, niggardly and thoroughly stupid traditional Conservative response to social services. Do we deal with the professionals? Do we deal with the research? Do we deal with the knowledge that we have? No, we do not. We send in the accountants, because somehow the accountants have some greater knowledge about how to run these agencies. Somehow this Finance Minister believes

that the accountants know better how to deal with abused children.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

What have we done? What is this Finance Minister's (Mr. Manness) creative response to what is happening in Family Services? He has recreated a system which we threw out seven years ago. He has recreated the agency relations division of the department so that they can scrutinize budgets. He has recreated something that divorces program and the needs of people from the resources available to meet those needs. It is a gigantic backward step. It is one that children and families will pay for into the future.

If there is any advice that I can give this department and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) it is to quickly and immediately step back from that decision. Even someone as narrowly focused as the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) knows that you have to work to prevent the causes of disorder within families, within the communities. He spoke yesterday eloquently I would say about the need to promote prevention programs in Health. While one Minister is speaking out of one side of his mouth, the Finance Minister and the Minister of Family Services are doing exactly the opposite in cutting back in those services.

I see, Mr. Acting Speaker, that my light is flashing. I will save the remarks that I have on Housing until we have The Loan Act or supplementary before us again. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Acting Speaker, Honourable Members who do not wish to hear me speak of course are free to leave the Chamber, such as the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

I want to say first of all that we have a budget that is generally a lacklustre budget in many ways, because it is something, as some members of the media have observed, with very few surprises in it in a sense. Really what we have here is a product of a minority Government situation. This is something that has been with us for a long, long time, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) will be the first to admit I am sure. This budget was prepared many, many months ago. There could have been some perhaps last minute finishing

touches and so on, but basically we have a budget that has been underway for months.

We are well into the year; we are halfway into the year. Half of the money or whatever has likely been spent or committed and as such it does not tend to be as interesting as budgets usually are.

As I said, by some accounts in the media, they do not consider it to be a very significant budget. I would say though, that it is a budget that sort of has kept the previous Government on its particular track. It is the same budget that has had them on track for the last, three years, two and a half years.

It is something as I said that came out of the minority situation and, therefore, it is going to be very interesting to observe next March or whatever, when we get the 1991-92 budget, as to what kind of revenues and expenditures this Government will present to us, exactly what kind of a budget situation we will get from a truly majority Government.

\* (1440)

I maintain that this budget does not reflect a majority Tory Government. This is a reflection of a minority Tory Government. It is going to be very interesting to see what happens in a few months from now when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) stands up and presents it to us.

I find it amusing, some of the speeches that have been made by Members of the Tory side, Members of the Government. On the one hand I hear them complaining about underspending by the New Democratic Party Government, complaining that we did not spend enough in child care, or we did not spend enough on highways.

Yes, it was the Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) yesterday who went on at some length to complain about the lack of spending by the New Democratic Party on highways, and yet only moments before we had complaints about the deficit, the debt that the NDP had left, the deficits that they had.

On the one hand they brag, they complain about our spending, they complain about our deficits, and then they turn around and start bragging about the money they are spending. They are trying to have it both ways or they have a very short memory, that somehow or other spending by the NDP is inadequate, not enough here, too much there, and then they turn around and start bragging about where they are spending money.

I would say that in this budget there is a great deal of exaggeration coming across from the other side as to how their approach has been so different from that of the New Democratic Party Government. You have to look at the evidence. You have to look at the facts. What exactly was in the previous budgets? What is in this budget that is so different?

There was an article in the Free Press last week, I guess, referring to the "tax blues fade," that there was such great improvement in the tax situation in Manitoba. I took a look at the Government's table on this. Yes, here is the—"Manness croons jolly tune as tax blues fade". I should bring my accordion to accompany it.

When you look at the document itself and look at what changes we have had since we were last in Government, since when the last NDP Government existed, there are relatively minor changes that have been made. Probably the most dramatic was the drop of two points of personal income tax, but frankly, Mr. Acting Speaker, that is down two points, that eliminated around \$60 million, \$61 million, the two points of personal income tax as I read the documents.

When you look at the amount of revenues that are raised in the Province of Manitoba that is as welcome as it may be by those families and we supported the budget for that reason, nevertheless it is a relatively small reduction in revenue when you look at the total revenues of the province of \$4.8 billion. This is still a relatively small amount.

The other area, of course, is the payroll tax. Again we get a minor adjustment. There is reference made here to employer payroll taxes in Manitoba being eliminated for small firms which were defined as those with a payroll of \$200,000 or less. We are certainly not against exempting small firms, as a matter of fact our Minister of Finance originally exempted small firms.

**An Honourable Member:** Ninety-five percent.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Yes, the bulk of small industry, small enterprises in Manitoba had been exempted. This Government has taken it forward a bit, but it has not eliminated the Health and Education Levy which, as I understood it, was going to be eliminated by a Conservative Government. The payroll tax that they refer to is still here. All we have had are minor adjustments of the payroll tax and again you can look at the budget document and look at the revenues and see that the revenues are still

substantial, the revenues from the payroll tax are one of the more significant revenue sources to be found in the document.

Certainly income taxes is one of the greatest, and retail sales tax is very significant, but here we go, the levy for health and education is expected to be \$180 million. Well, that is quite a bit of money, Mr. Acting Speaker, they are still going to get \$180 million. Last year they estimated they received \$191 million, so they have shaved off about \$11 million. Well, frankly, it does not take any wizard, all you need is a small calculator and at the rate that this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is eliminating the payroll tax, we will be well into the 21st Century. We will be into the 21st Century and we will still have the payroll tax here at the rate that this Government is going.

They just do not want to admit that it has benefits for the treasury of Manitoba because it obtains needed revenue from large corporations, national corporations, from the federal Government departments and agencies, monies that we would not get otherwise. Incidentally, it is not original on the face of the earth, Quebec certainly has had this tax for years. Ontario has moved into it. You can look at the United States of America where there are examples of this and so on, and I am sure nobody wants to discourage business, because that is the argument that is being used across the way. We do not want to discourage business investment. In fact you could argue every tax discourages business, you could say retail sales tax, you could say corporate income tax, you could even say personal income tax discourages business. You could look at any kind of tax as being a discouragement and no Government likes to increase taxes, no Government likes to levy taxes, but the fact is that it is here. It has provided a necessary revenue for the treasury of Manitoba and it was needed for health, it was needed for education and whatever.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there are no other changes in the taxes so what is so different about the tax regime? Of the three years that this Government -(interjection)- Well, you talk about the tax blues fading, that is my theme right now. There is no change in the flat income tax, the two points, still there. You did not like it, it is still there. Corporation income taxes are still there at the same rate, sales taxes have not been shaved back, they are still there. So I say, really, what is different about this budget? Very, very little. -(interjection)- The Minister

says other provinces have changed. Yes, they have changed but they have changed in both directions as well.

So I say that there is a great exaggeration on how their approach has been so different. -(interjection)- Even if you look on the spending side, the Minister says, well, look how we controlled spending. My God, Mr. Acting Speaker, there has been a substantial increase in spending. I am not criticizing that increase in spending. I am just saying let us recognize that -(interjection)- Well, the Minister would like me to criticize the increase in spending. Frankly, we have again, according to the budget document, a 5.8 increase in total expenditure by this Government. There have been larger increases in the past, but there have been smaller increases in the past as well. I say that this is a budget that reflects a minority Government situation.

\* (1450)

You know, Mr. Acting Speaker, this is also a budget that really causes me to come to the conclusion that this Government has failed by its own standards. I believe that there is a failure by its own standards because this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and this Premier (Mr. Filmon) and this Government has so often talked about the need for lowering the deficit, how we should lower the deficit, or better still, we should try to get surpluses so that eventually we can work on the debt. The only way you are going to reduce the debt, of course, is to have surpluses.

I want to go on to say, that this is the approach of this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). That is, their objective is to look very closely at the financial balance sheets and concern themselves with those rather than really looking at the economy—the real economy out there—which I and my colleagues are concerned with, because we think ultimately the budget of the Province of Manitoba can play a significant role in affecting the level of economic activity in this province.

When I say that this Government has failed by its own standards, Mr. Acting Speaker, for example, I point to the debt increase that has occurred under this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). It is quite substantial and it is because we have had this increase in the deficit of 5.6 percent so that today the total net debt per capita is \$10,151.00. It is the highest—the highest—debt per person ever

achieved in the Province of Manitoba's history. Under the Filmon Government—

**An Honourable Member:** You created it, Leonard.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Well, we created it. Mr. Acting Speaker, after three budgets these people want to say we created my—the fact is that this Government has brought down three budgets. They have been in office over two and a half years. They have been re-elected and they have come up with a budget that causes them to fail by your standards, not by my standard. That is not my standard of judging the success of Government. My standard is quite a bit different from your right-wing economic approach to Government and your particular approach to budgets.

I say, Mr. Acting Speaker, by the standards of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), the Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), this budget is a failure. This Government is a failure by your own standards. You have raised the per capita debt to the highest level ever, ever achieved in the Province of Manitoba. I say we have got a budget that is a total failure. It deserves an "F". It is a failure by their own measuring stick, as my colleague for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) states.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we are concerned with the real economy out there which is something that this Government seems to be ready to ignore. We are concerned that 1991 is going to be a far more difficult year than this year. While the Minister likes to refer to various references and research organizations as to their projection, one can look at other organizations such as the Royal Bank, which according to the statement I received, predicts an increase of real growth of only one-third of 1 percent—very, very inadequate.

There are projections by other organizations—the Conference Board is one—which says that unemployment is going to rise next year from 7.6 to 8.2, so the fact is that our economy is going to be in worse shape in terms of unemployment, in terms of lack of growth. So, Mr. Acting Speaker, there are these concerns. I, for one, am concerned that this Government is somehow or other ready to bask in a few projections of a couple of organizations that say, well, maybe we will have a growth faster than the national average next year so everything is fine.

You should know this about the Manitoba economy if you do not already, if you do not

appreciate it already. We tend to operate a fairly low level of economic activity. When there is a boom in this country, we tend to lag behind. When there is a recession in the country, we tend not to fall as far. We, therefore, tend to always look relatively good in times of recession or economic contraction, but the fact is that this is not good enough, because unemployment is going to rise and because we are going to have more business failures. God knows we have had enough this year.

We are going to have more industrial plants close. Some have already been announced, some have closed. Some are announced to close next year, such as the Campbell Soup plant in Portage la Prairie. There are a lot of other examples of industries which have given notice that they are going to be closing shop for all kinds of reasons. Free trade may be one, but there are other reasons; the other reasons being the lack of effect of demand.

Really, Mr. Acting Speaker, I am disturbed and distressed that this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) with this Government is not ready to look at how this Government might stimulate the economy to improve the business, conditions for business, to stimulate the demand for the output of Manitoba businesses. -(interjection)- Well, we have had lots of suggestions. We have had lots of suggestions.

Mr. Acting Speaker, when we were in Government, we had the Manitoba Jobs Fund. The Manitoba Jobs Fund helped many small businesses in this province. -(interjection)- Well, the Member mentions McKenzie Seeds. The one reason that it is profitable now is because we refinanced to the tune of \$12 million in 1982. We wiped out the debt and turned it into equity. That is the key reason why it is showing profits today.

At any rate, Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to go on and talk about the budget in terms of the surpluses and deficits. Frankly, this Government was blessed with a great deal of luck when it took office. It obtained federal transfer payments that were not expected. It got the bonanza of additional revenue increases because of some hard decisions that we took in Government to increase taxes.

On that account, this Minister of Finance was ready and was able to take \$200 million out of revenue and put it into a rainy day fund. He took the \$200 million out of revenue and, therefore, turned what could have been a surplus for that year, for

'88-89. We could have had a surplus of \$59.7 million. We could have had a surplus of about \$60 million in that year. Instead we said, no, we are going to forget we got this as revenue, and we are going to put it in this fund. So really they could have had a surplus as a result of hard decisions made by the previous NDP Government. They could have had a surplus in that year. Instead they put it in the fund and now, in 1990-91, we have a deficit of \$283.4 million being shown. It should really be \$366.4 million, because we have taken \$83 million out of the rainy day fund to shave down the deficit. So what we are doing, Mr. Acting Speaker, is playing with figures.

In reality we could have had and did have a surplus in '80-89 and now a couple of years later under this Government, we should have had a deficit of \$366.4 million. It was our Government making the tough decisions on the tax side that put us into a surplus position. It is your Government, after two and a half years or so and three budgets, that have brought us to this position, where we have one of the biggest deficits ever and the highest debt per capita ever.

So I say, Mr. Acting Speaker, we have some hocus-pocus going on here, and if it were not for the rainy day fund and the monies that they had available from both the NDP tax revenue increases and the federal transfer payments, they would not have had that and our situation today would have been a lot worse than it has been. But come next year, you know you have run out of this bonanza; you have run out of these payments; you have run out of this bump in revenue from the previous NDP Government. You are going to have to face the music and next year people in this province are going to be crying loud and clear how unhappy they are with the budget.

\* (1500)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I get a little tired about the Members opposite always complaining about how bad the debt situation was in Manitoba under the NDP, how out of line our expenditures were, how great the burden of the debt was.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this is really a myth perpetrated across the way because every Government has debt, every Government has interest on debt to be paid, every Government has been increasing spending, every Government has been forced to increase taxes. When you look at

Manitoba compared to the rest of the country, you see that we were not out of line.

I look back to the Budget Address of 1988 that was tabled by the Honourable Eugene Kostyra and there are a number of charts prepared by the Department of Finance showing how Manitoba compared. It is really interesting. On page 10 in the Financial Statistics section you see revenue per capita and you see that Manitoba at that time was well below the 10-province average. In other words, what was happening, our taxation, our tax take was not out of line; our revenues per capita, Mr. Acting Speaker, were well below the 10-province average. I refer Honourable Members to this document prepared by the Department of Finance, if they want to look at it.

What about our spending, Mr. Acting Speaker? What about the expenditure per capita? We were such big time spenders presumably. Well, again if you look at the figures Manitoba is well below the 10-province average in spending. Nova Scotia, P.E.I., Alberta, Quebec, Newfoundland and New Brunswick all spent more per capita than the Province of Manitoba. Only three provinces spent less per capita than us, namely British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario. So again, we were not out of line in terms of spending.

What about our deficits? What about the deficits per person in Manitoba? Well again, we were slightly above the national average or the 10-province average, we were smack in the middle. We had Saskatchewan, the Government of Premier Devine, which certainly has gone into debt more quickly than any other province I know of in this country. Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Alberta all had deficits per capita higher than the Province of Manitoba.

So I say, Mr. Acting Speaker, our deficit per capital was not out of line with the Canadian situation. We were right there somewhere in the middle, we are right there in the middle. If you look at it in terms of the interest payments, again the debt service costs per capita, where were we? Again, right in the middle, we were right around the 10-province average. The interest on the debt, per person, was higher in Quebec, P.E.I., New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and, therefore, again we had a situation which was average, it was not out of line, and this is after years in Government.

If you take it as a percentage the interest paid on the debt, as a percentage of the expenditure—and Members across have often referred to that, look at all the money we are putting into interest on the debt—but we have lots of company. We are right again in the middle, we have got Ontario, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Nova Scotia whose interest charges, as a percentage of their budgeted expenditure, are higher than that of Manitoba.

It is interesting that the Minister of Finance has not chosen to give a similar chart to see where we were in '89-90—or 1990-91, it would be interesting to see how we rank. I do not know whether we will have changed; I doubt if we will have changed very much from this particular picture.

So let it not be said that the debt situation in Manitoba was out of line with the rest of the country, that the burden of the debt was out of line with the other provinces. As I said, we have got a myth that is being perpetrated and if we had the figures today we would see that the situation has not changed after almost three years, with three budgets, almost three years. With three budgets the situation is really not changed. -(interjection)-

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member has the floor.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Acting Speaker, the fact is that Manitoba does face serious economic problems. We do not have sufficient economic growth; we have McJobs being created at the expense of permanent full-time jobs. We have a cyclical downturn, but yet we have a Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) whose economic policy reminds me very much of Reaganomics, that is, that the way to get economic growth is to reduce taxes on business and that generally creates a climate for investment, and that is how the economy is going to grow

Now, Mr. Acting Speaker, there is some rationale to that, I am not doubting that for one moment, but you cannot cope with a downturn in the business cycle with that policy. In fact, Reagan tried it in the United States and it did not work. What saved Mr. Reagan in the United States was, whether you like it or not and I may criticize it, was a fantastic increase in his spending on defence, multibillion dollar defence spending which generated a great deal of demand in the American economy and created a

great deal of prosperity in the wrong way. What I am suggesting is that this policy of cutting taxes to stimulate investment is the wrong policy.

There is an article here by a Professor Penner who talks about the positive effects the tax cuts—do you have to go by 3:10 already?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** Yes, two minutes.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, we have a logistics problem here. I was going to talk quite a bit longer; I had some important points to make as the Finance Critic. The fact is that the evidence is that in the long run—

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

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Laurendeau):** Order, please.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** The conclusion of the research done on reducing—Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, this is a very serious matter.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** Order, please. The Honourable Member for Brandon East is attempting to put forward—order.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** The point is, Mr. Acting Speaker, the tax cuts can, in the long run, have a beneficial impact on the rate of investment spending, but the long run has to be measured in decades, not in years, but in decades. So I say that policy is going to fail. The supply side theories, the supply side approach of this Minister is going to fail on that account.

Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, I cannot help but notice the very important words of the Minister. I did read his forecast on pages 15 and 16 where he talks about how things are going to be really tough next year and how we should all pay attention to them—that we should all pay attention to them. I am just wondering, what is this going to translate into? The fact that our deficit by 1991-92 could be very, very high even with taking money out of the fund. By '92-93 he says the deficit could expand even to \$500 million annually even if revenue grows by 5 percent.

So this Government, this Minister, has a very tough challenge ahead of itself. I do not know what it is going to mean. Is it going to mean layoffs in the Civil Service? Is it going to be cutbacks in the field of health care and education?

\* (1510)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I am going to curtail my remarks to allow the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) to take the floor who I understand has some time constraints.

I want to say that all the evidence we have, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that we have a very weak economy. Our retail trade is weak. Our residential construction is down by nearly a third this year compared to last year. Our manufactured shipments are down. The documents that my colleague, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), showed you the other day we have serious declines in export manufactures to the United States from Manitoba. Generally speaking, we have a very, very weak economy. I am really distressed that this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and this Government is not prepared to take any action to offset this.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, I am going to wrap this up quicker than I was planning to. This Government has had a very soft ride for this last two and a half years—very, very, very soft ride. It is going to have to face the reality, however, of slow economic growth next year and slow revenue growth. As the Finance of Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) projected himself, you are going to have a difficult time next year.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I say that there is room to stimulate the economy so that in turn we can generate more revenues for the budget. We cannot afford to have this right-wing approach that is being offered by this Government, by this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). We have a right-wing Government in Ottawa that has caused a made-in-Canada recession with high interest rates, with the free trade policy, with the GST. The economy is going down the tube thanks to a right-wing Government in Ottawa.

Now we have a right-wing Government, we have a majority right-wing Government here, and with two right-wing Governments that the Manitoba people have to contend with. I am very, very fearful for the future of our economy, fearful for the future of our people. We are going to have disaster in terms of program cuts and we are going to have disaster in terms of unemployment. We will see in a few months from now. Members opposite can laugh and make light of this, but we will see a few months from now as to what happens.

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I am certainly glad to be back to address

the budget. As you know, I have been speaking elsewhere and trying to do the job of trying to promote some understanding, some peace and harmony, and talk about democracy in this country in respect to aboriginal people.

Certainly, I find it difficult and amazing to understand that this Government that we have here have just cut back in northern programming and also some cutbacks in respect to the aboriginal programs. I certainly feel that the northern people have not been dealt fairly. I was just reading some of the comments made by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) that the reason for this was because the people did not vote right. Certainly, to me that is rejection of the policies of this present Government. If they do not trust the Government, certainly the Conservatives and their federal cousins in Ottawa, the vote in terms of—

Mr. Acting Speaker, there has been a cutback, I believe over \$2 million in the Department of Northern Affairs. Certainly the kind of leadership that this Government is providing in the North is not indicative of the priorities as needed in the North when they have had cutbacks in northern development. In the Northern Development Agreement itself, we lost millions of dollars because this Government, this Minister could not renegotiate with the federal Government. We spent, I believe, over \$270 million with the federal Government—the cost-sharing program that was made available in the North for economic development, for community development, for transportation and also for human development programs.

We see cutbacks in areas like BUNTEP and ACCESS programs which are needed in the North. Certainly those are indicative of the measures that have been taken by this Government. I think we spent close to \$100 million dollars on human development. In those areas which are to provide education and opportunities for people in the North and also -*(interjection)*- The Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) mentions graduates, but those are ideas that were initiated by the former Government. We initiated a lot of programs, but there has been nothing coming from this present Government in terms of new directions. They are carrying on the present programs that were instituted by the former Government. We had the Aboriginal Development Fund. We had the Limestone Training Program, which was shifted over to the Northern Training Agency.

We need to look at where this Government is going, certainly in the areas of Native programs and Native secretariat. We need some leadership from this Government.

I know that the Members have not been focusing their priorities in the North. Certainly that is going to be hard for the remote northern communities, because the increase in taxation, the GST is going to be implemented.

I know the federal Government says that there is no tax on food or other items, but in the end it will be the people in those reserves who will be paying for those costs, because people who will provide the transportation services will ultimately pass onto the consumers the gasoline plus the transportation costs.

Even though the federal Government says that we are not paying the GST, for some of the northern reserves, ultimately, they will be paying for the cost and other costs, gasoline tax and other increases. One of the commodities that is really needed in the North is gasoline, because people use that for transportation, for fuel to cut their wood and also for trapping.

Of course, when we are dealing with the aboriginal issues in this province, as I indicated in the House—and I am sure everybody knows that we went through a remarkable summer in terms of aboriginal issues, with the extent that people are concerned about aboriginal issues. We have not heard anything from this Government as to how they are going to deal with the aboriginal people in this province, the land claims, the treaty land entitlement which we worked on. Unfortunately, the federal Government did not move on the Order-in-Council which we passed some time ago.

\* (1520)

Certainly people are looking toward this Government for some resolutions to many of the outstanding issues. In the throne speech, little mention was made of aboriginal issues. There was no reference to how the Government is going to deal with the aboriginal people. Certainly, we have had cases involving a hunting case and fishing case that this Government should be addressing, the Sioui case, the Sparrow case. It was not until we pushed this Government to act on the court decisions, and we forced this Minister to do some things because you cannot sit back.

On the hydro development that we have dealt with

for many years we forced him to negotiate, so it is coming—it will be announced pretty soon hopefully. You can give credit to the aboriginal people for working hard on that issue, because we have been left out.

I know that in the throne speech, they said that about two or three years ago when they were in Government, they were going to put the hydro line through northeastern Manitoba, but they are still working at it. Then we have started those discussions a long time ago, and they are still working on it. Hopefully it will be done pretty soon, and we look forward to that. Hopefully, we will have a hydro line into many of the communities.

So anyway, they are the Government and this Minister always says, I was away in Europe and he mentioned that. They are the Government, they have to take the responsibility and if it requires me to be here to push it, I will do it. If they are not going to act like a Government, if they are not going to take responsible actions, they should consider maybe resigning. If you are not serious enough, I mean, so many of the issues that have to be addressed in the North. Certainly the Government, I know, has cut a lot of things in the North.

I just want to reference the fact that a trip that I made to Europe was one by invitation to speak to the European Parliament and it was a great honour for me to speak. I do not know whether any other individual has been invited to speak before the European Parliament. We were addressing the issue of aboriginal people; that was before the European Parliament. They had passed a resolution on September 13th dealing with aboriginal relations in Canada, to deal with the question of the Oka situation, also the other aboriginal issues. Unfortunately the Canadian Government decided to send a delegation of officials from Brussels and Geneva, I believe from Quebec, to lobby European politicians against the resolution, but the European Parliament did pass the resolution to send a delegation to see first hand as to what is happening in Canada. Unfortunately, they were not able to come so we were asked to address the European Parliament. We managed to convince them to come to Canada, hopefully some time in the new year.

I know that we have had the European Parliament delegation here before; we dealt with the trapping issue and hopefully they will come here to Manitoba to address aboriginal issues. As to what we are doing in Manitoba, I certainly indicated that to the

chairman of the European Parliament Committee heading this delegation.

I know that the relations in Canada and Manitoba, across Canada is being addressed by many people. There is great concern, I know. Canada's image has been tarnished in terms of its relationship with aboriginal peoples, its treatment of aboriginal people. I know Canadian people are concerned about that because Canada is considered to be a very humanitarian country. It was thought that it treated the aboriginal people well, but information that has been going out is very vague. More questions are being raised by the European people. Certainly when I was there I spoke on many outstanding issues that have to be dealt with by the Canadian Government and the provinces.

We went to the International Court of Justice to meet with some officials to talk about how as aboriginal people we can use that institution, the International Court of Justice, how aboriginal people in Canada might be able to utilize that great institution. The other group that we were with from the Mohawk nation were considering putting a resolution or putting a case before the international court. What we found out was there had been a previous case put before Canada on aboriginal issues but it was never dealt with. This is the kind of discussions we had with the officials there, and hopefully they were able to maybe take the case to deal with aboriginal issues. We also were in The Hague on a conference on aboriginal people dealing with aboriginal issues.

During that time there was another conference that was held in The Hague. It was a conference that was put on by External Affairs. At least one of the sponsors was the External Affairs of Canada. I believe it was the Canadian Council, International Council of Canadian Studies. It was an all European-Canadian studies conference.

The theme of the conference was Canada on the threshold of the 21st Century. This is European reflections upon the future of Canada. This is where the former Governor General spoke, Madame Jeanne Sauvé, I believe. She was the keynote speaker at that conference. That is when she reflected that the Meech Lake Accord, I believe she said, failed because of the lack of leadership in this country. It was held at the Netherlands Congress Centre, The Hague, on October 24-27.

Also on the agenda they had aboriginal issues.

They had people from Brussels speak on aboriginal issues. They did not have any aboriginal people to speak on aboriginal people and, of course, we took the opportunity to go over there to hear what they had to say about aboriginal issues in Canada. We were very fortunate to go there and be part of a panel at this conference. We just happened to stumble onto this conference while we were there.

There was a very important item on the agenda in this conference. A lot of people expressed appreciation for some of the delegation from our conference attending, going over there to listen to what they had to say. Certainly it was a good thing we had been sponsored by the Canadian Government. We were there to participate in another conference, and we were happy to have been part of that. Although we were invited, the costs that were provided for us were provided by the European Economic Community to be there. This is the kind of treatment that we get.

\* (1530)

When we talk about aboriginal issues, we do not get invited, and this is what we want to get away from. Certainly I feel that as aboriginal people we have to be part of the Canadian society, be involved in the Canadian society, but we have been excluded for far too long. In the last while, I think, we have made major gains being able to be part and involved in Legislative Assembly and other areas of the Canadian society, but we certainly do not need to have Governments cutting back on programs at a time when we are just striving ahead. I know that the primary responsibility with a lot of the programs rests with the federal Government, and certainly that is the question that I believe this Minister has to raise with his federal counterpart in terms of the responsibility the federal Government has.

I know these cutbacks on education, at a time when Native students need to address that -(interjection)-

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** Order, please. Order.

**Mr. Harper:** So those are some of the things that this Minister has to address and certainly has a responsibility here in the Province of Manitoba for the Northerners and aboriginal people in the North. Right now, in terms of his comments and also the cutbacks that have been made in the Department of Northern Affairs, they do not reflect that this Minister is serious enough to put priority on aboriginal people

and their concerns. I noticed the Northern Development program, the ARDA agreement, is gone, the Ambulance Program is cut, which are needed.

**An Honourable Member:** Elijah, do not get caught in the big l-i-e.

**Mr. Harper:** L-i-e. Anyway, in the North, overall, this Government has lost a lot of money, cutbacks, because this Minister has not renegotiated many of the agreements, bungled a lot of the agreements that were cost-shared. In the North, I know that during that time they had a Southern Development Initiative which was signed by this Government.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland has the floor. We would like to listen to the comments.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

**Mr. Harper:** As aboriginal people, I mentioned that we look toward this Government.

I know this Session most of the money has been committed and most of the Estimates that are coming forward are till the end of this year, this fiscal year. I look forward to next year's budget as to what kind of programs, what kind of cuts they are going to make in the following year. I know that there will probably be further cuts in the North next year. This year's Estimates have already been determined and also been probably committed. It is almost the end of the fiscal year.

I look forward to the next introduction of the budget. Let us see where the real program of this Government will come forward. I hope that this Minister of Northern Affairs and Minister responsible for Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) would put priority for aboriginal people and the Northerners in the North.

I notice he mentioned Hydro, and it is something that has been worked on for many years. I hope that this Government will finally deliver and make this project a reality. I know we have been waiting for many years. We have been working on it for some time. It is a matter of time, I guess, when this will come about.

There are other issues that need to be addressed, particularly land claims. Treaty Land Entitlement is one issue that is ongoing, and I hope that it will get back on the agenda for this Government.

I know that we as a Government had worked hard

on it, hard on Treaty Land Entitlement. Unfortunately, we did not get any co-operation from the federal Department of Indian Affairs, the Minister responsible for that. So although we had agreed to pass it through Cabinet, unfortunately, there was no action from the federal Government. I did not get a response until a year later, so I hope this Minister will take this issue seriously for the Treaty Land Entitlement.

I have not seen any kind of statements as to when he is going to move on this issue, or when he is going to make some announcements on the issue, or whether he is prepared with the Treaty Land Entitlement chiefs. We will see how this Minister will handle the issue and also the terms of the issue of self-government. That is one issue that is ongoing.

I know that many people do not understand what we mean by self-government. Certainly, that is an issue that needs to be worked on or to be negotiated with the aboriginal people across this country together with the federal Government. I look forward to his ideas on that. Let us see what he has to provide in terms of resources in those areas. I can talk about the self-government issue, but I think I would leave it at that.

I will be looking toward this Government in terms of aboriginal issues and whether this Government is serious in that. As aboriginal people in the province, I feel that many, not only northern issues, but there are problems in the urban areas that need to be addressed also. I know that we had, as a Government, started the process on addressing the urban issues.

This Government I know had a consultant group do the study and meet with the aboriginal groups in Winnipeg and other urban areas in the Province of Manitoba, and there were many recommendations that were made in the report. We look forward to implementing many of those and what kind of action the Government is prepared to do. I look forward to that to see what action this Government is prepared to take.

\* (1540)

Within the City of Winnipeg, I know there is the Core Area Initiative that was ongoing. I do not know whether there will be funding made available again, or whether a new arrangement had to be made with the federal Government to provide their share, but certainly we, as aboriginal people, do not have the resources to address many of these issues, and we

have to work with the Governments. We have to convince Governments to put Native issues as a priority. Although we are a minority, in the sense that there are not many of us, but we are the poorest of poor and we are at the bottom of the social-scale ladder and many other things.

With those few comments, I had better conclude and sit down. We will see what this Government is prepared to do, and we will see what it does in the next budget when they bring their budget next year and what kind of programs are set forth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface):** Monsieur le président, en matière économique, l'action d'un gouvernement doit permettre d'aboutir à un certain nombre de résultats. Je crois que le premier résultat économique fondamental, c'est de faire du Manitoba une véritable province prospère au sein d'un Canada industriel. Le second, c'est d'assurer certaines mutations nécessaires dans des domaines bien précis, comme par exemple, l'agriculture ou le commerce. Mais, il faut également s'assurer que ces mutations se font dans des conditions telles qu'elles ne créent pas de souffrance.

C'est pourquoi j'attache pour ma part la plus grande importance à ce que l'action sociale du gouvernement soit orientée, en priorité, vers les plus défavorisés et vers ceux et celles qui souffrent, à l'heure actuelle, de la transformation nécessaire, indispensable, de notre économie.

Et puis, il y a un troisième aspect, que je crois être très important du point de vue économique; c'est de donner à l'économie manitobaine une dimension nationale et internationale. Bien entendu, cela veut dire d'abord le Canada où l'échange commercial est bien trop souvent inexistant; ceci est dû entre autres choses, à un problème d'ordre national, un problème que j'appellerai le problème Mulroney.

Il n'est pas concevable en matière économique, de prôner une politique d'échange commercial orientée exclusivement vers un pays étranger même voisin, tout en ignorant les provinces avoisinantes et qui constituent les autres composantes constitutionnelles de notre nation.

Monsieur le président, c'est pour ma part ce que je crois être l'objectif fondamental, parce que je ne vois, pour une province de la dimension du Manitoba, que deux issues : ou bien se refermer à nouveau sur elle-même, et vivre, à l'abri des

humeurs américaines de l'Accord du libre-échange, et par conséquent dépérir, ou bien alors être en mesure de participer pleinement au marché international, avec ses dimensions actuelles qui s'ouvrent déjà, pour englober non seulement le monde occidental, mais aussi le monde de l'Est.

Il va de soi que cela suppose une transformation des esprits, que cela suppose un effort d'investissement considérable, et que cela suppose des ententes interprovinciales et la création d'entreprises de taille nationale dont il existe très peu encore au Manitoba.

Le Manitoba a trop longtemps vécu dans ce protectionnisme interprovincial qui a été véhiculé successivement par les Néo-démocrates et les Conservateurs. C'est contre le protectionnisme qu'il faut agir, et c'est sur ce point que pour ma part, je ne cesserai de répéter que le budget, déposé par le ministre des Finances, ne maintient pas le correctif social indispensable afin d'assurer un équilibre économique stable au Manitoba.

Monsieur le président, en matière de renouveau économique pour notre province il s'agit d'une transformation énorme, et le gouvernement démontre une nouvelle fois qu'il craint de ne pas être en mesure de prévoir et de prévenir les conséquences sociales de cette transformation.

**(Translation)**

Mr. Speaker, in the economic area, a government's actions must enable it to achieve a certain number of results. I believe that the first basic economic result is to make Manitoba a truly prosperous province within an industrial Canada. The second is to secure a number of necessary changes in specific areas, such as the agricultural or trade areas, but it also must make sure that these changes are carried out under conditions that do not entail suffering. That is why I, myself, believe it is of the highest importance that the social action of the Government be directed, on a priority basis, to the most disadvantaged people and to those who are suffering at this very moment from the necessary and indispensable transformation of our economy.

There is also a third aspect that I think is very important from the economic point of view, and that is to give the Manitoba economy a national and international dimension. Of course, that means, first and foremost Canada, where commercial trade is far too often non-existent. That is due among other

things to a problem of national import. A problem that I shall call, the Mulroney problem.

It is inconceivable in the economic sphere to preach a trade policy directed solely towards a foreign country, even though it is a neighbouring one, while ignoring the adjacent provinces, which happen to be the other constitutional components of our nation.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I, myself, believe to be the fundamental goal, because I see, for a province of Manitoba's size, only two ways out: either to isolate itself again and scrape by, sheltered from the American whims of the Free Trade Agreement and consequently go downhill, or else be in a position to participate fully in the international marketplace with its present structure, opening up as it is to encompass, not only the western, but also the eastern world.

It goes without saying that that implies a change in mentality, that implies major investment activities and that implies interprovincial agreements and the establishment of businesses on a national scale of which very few yet exist in Manitoba.

Manitoba has for too long lived under this interprovincial protectionism that was supported by successive New Democratic and Conservative Governments. We should be moving away from protectionism, and it is on that point that I, for my part, will never stop reiterating that the budget introduced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) does not maintain the indispensable social corrective measures that would secure a stable economic environment in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, regarding economic renewal in our province, that will require a major transformation, and the Government is once again demonstrating that it is afraid of not being capable of foreseeing and preventing the negative social consequences of this transformation.

**(English)**

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to go into lengthy response rhetorics to the budget presented to this Assembly's First Session of the Thirty-Fifth Legislature. There is nothing in this budget that is positive enough to comment about.

The contents of this "no news budget" were unveiled by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in the last election campaign. Furthermore, the economic goals as set up by the Government are really confused. On one hand, we are being told the

economy of our province needs creative solutions; while on the other hand, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) announces that he will allow the deficit to grow by safekeeping of 50 percent of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. Moreover, the same Minister warned the Members of this House that the real budget will be coming early next spring.

It is now obvious that the Government has been had at its own game. The Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba—if it is still the official name of the political Party in power—made so many promises during the last election campaign that they already know that they are unable to deliver and after six weeks back in power, they try to hide from Manitobans. As a matter of fact, we are already aware that this Conservative Government will cut health services, it will cut education, it will cut social programs.

Mr. Speaker, therefore this situation is alarming for the economy of the Province of Manitoba. We have to worry about the future of the financial situation of our province after this present recession.

(French)

Monsieur le président j'aimerais mentionner certains domaines bien précis qui semblent être, dans ce budget, quelque peu délaissés, oubliés, ignorés. J'ai bien peur qu'entre le Petit Larousse et le Petit Robert, il n'y ait pas assez de mots dans le vocabulaire français pour dire que ces secteurs ont été purement et simplement abandonnés.

Quand on dit enseignement supérieur, on pense d'habitude à une institution communément appelée *l'université* et cette université donne à l'heure actuelle à notre province un sentiment d'incertitude qui, quelquefois, l'étonne ou même l'inquiète. Le fond du problème pour nos universités, c'est de repenser leur propre substance et leur propre finalité, en même temps que leurs méthodes.

Je pense que les universités manitobaines à l'heure actuelle, comme toutes les universités du Canada d'ailleurs, se cherchent et se trouvent à être brillantes pour enfin aboutir à une classe de renommée internationale.

\* (1550)

Monsieur le président, tout en estimant qu'il est capital que l'enseignement secondaire soit la base solide de nos universités, je tiens à souligner qu'il est essentiel que les enfants qui franchissent avec succès la porte de l'enseignement secondaire en sortent avec une formation solide leur permettant

soit d'aborder la vie active du travail, soit d'aborder les études supérieures.

Monsieur le président, naturellement cet enseignement supérieur étant en évolution constante, et il est de rigueur d'attendre de la part du gouvernement, une élaboration de politiques qui s'adressent particulièrement aux exigences de qualité de l'enseignement supérieur dans les universités.

Ceci dit, je tiens à insister particulièrement sur l'urgence du besoin de restructurer le secteur de l'éducation.

Monsieur le président, le gouvernement semble vouloir penser que tout va bien dans le domaine de l'éducation et qu'aucun changement n'est nécessaire. L'élémentaire, le secondaire, l'universitaire, on mêle tout ça et on espère qu'il sortira de ce mélange quelque chose de meilleur; c'est l'histoire des sorcières de MACBETH<sup>®</sup> remuant leurs chaudrons en disant: "Le mélange sera bon".

Monsieur le président, dans la mesure où il s'agit de l'avenir de notre province, nous ne pouvons pas nous permettre de refuser l'adaptation de nos systèmes à l'évolution constante de la société économique en même temps que des connaissances scientifiques. Je pense qu'il est impératif qu'une restructuration administrative et de fonctionnement soit effectuée dans le domaine de l'éducation dans les plus brefs délais, afin que les universités maintiennent leur assiette, la certitude de ce qu'elles sont, de ce qu'elles doivent être, de ce à quoi elles se préparent et des méthodes par lesquelles elles s'y préparent.

C'est pourquoi, Monsieur le président, je trouve déplorable que le gouvernement du Manitoba ne prenne pas les dispositions nécessaires, ni dans le discours du Trône, ni encore moins dans le premier budget de cette trente-cinquième Législature pour faciliter le rendement intellectuel de la société manitobaine, facteur indispensable à la santé économique de notre province.

Toujours dans le secteur de l'enseignement supérieur, j'aimerais faire quelques commentaires sur le financement accordé par le gouvernement au Collège Universitaire de Saint-Boniface.

Communément appelé la pierre angulaire de la communauté franco-manitobaine, le Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface a plus que doublé sa clientèle en moins de dix ans. En guise d'encouragement et de remerciement pour des

efforts bien appréciés par la population manitobaine, la Commission des subventions aux universités lui octroie quelques 2% du budget affecté aux universités, c'est loin de polir la pierre.

Monsieur le président, la francophonie est tellement absente, tant dans le Discours du trône que dans ce premier budget, que je commence à penser que la sorcière de l'Halloween n'est pas loin et, "Trick or Treat", elle va nous sortir quelque chose de la citrouille pour s'envoler ensuite sur son balai volant.

Sérieusement, Monsieur le président, on sort à peine d'une crise constitutionnelle qui est encore loin d'être résolue et dont les blessures encore fraîches prendront des années sinon des générations à être guéries. Et déjà le gouvernement conservateur de Monsieur Filmon met l'accent sur la notion d'ignorer totalement les besoins de la minorité de langue officielle de sa province. Le gouvernement chuchote dans le Discours du trône qu'il va obéir à l'ordre de la Cour suprême du Canada en rapport aux lois du Manitoba.

Il est de mon devoir, en ma qualité de député francophone à cette Assemblée législative, de soulever certaines questions face à la désinvolture du gouvernement vis-à-vis la francophonie manitobaine, et ce à la veille de l'Assemblée générale de la Société franco-manitobaine les 2 et 3 novembre prochains.

L'existence de la minorité de langue officielle manitobaine a-t-elle été ignorée dans le Discours du trône et dans ce budget simplement parce que le Premier ministre Filmon a décidé de participer à l'Assemblée générale annuelle de la S.f.m.?

Monsieur le président, j'oserais en suggérer que si la population francophone du Manitoba reste bien sage dans son coin, la bonne sorcière de l'Halloween va lui distribuer des bonbons.

Monsieur le président, si cela est le cas je dis non comme Canadien, je dis non comme Manitobain, je dis non comme Franco-Manitobain et je dis non comme député francophone, héritier symbolique de Louis Riel.

Le 4 novembre 1989, il a été déclaré à l'Assemblée annuelle de la S.F.M. et je cite, « Les francophones sont un élément dynamique, non seulement dans leur propre milieu, mais aussi dans la vie de la province toute entière. » Fin de citation.

Ces paroles ont été prononcées par le Premier

ministre Filmon lui-même qui semble maintenant en avoir oublié la signification.

Le Discours du trône ne faisant non plus aucune mention de la francophonie, je m'inquiète jusqu'au point de me poser plusieurs questions bien précises, à savoir: le Premier ministre Filmon va-t-il annoncer samedi prochain la coupure de 2.4% du budget affecté à la Direction des ressources éducatives françaises qui, soit dit en passant, cherche en plus de cela de nouveaux locaux?

Monsieur le président, Monsieur Filmon va-t-il annoncer les démarches que son gouvernement entreprend actuellement afin de voir, à nouveau, une présence francophone à la Cour d'appel du Manitoba?

Monsieur le président, Monsieur Filmon va-t-il dévoiler les stratégies qu'il a utilisées afin d'assurer la nomination d'un francophone au Sénat pour Saint-Boniface, en remplacement de l'Honorable Joseph-Philippe Guay?

Monsieur le président, le premier ministre va-t-il expliquer les raisons pour lesquelles le gouvernement s'assoit sur le rapport des services en français dans les établissements de santé et de services sociaux au Manitoba et traîne à le rendre public?

Monsieur le président, le Premier ministre va-t-il annoncer la nomination d'un juge francophone à plein temps à la Cour provinciale, car il réalise que le système d'un juge à temps partiel n'est pas la réponse à l'accumulation croissante des dossiers?

Monsieur le président, le Premier ministre va-t-il mettre à jour le dossier de la Partie III de la Loi de la ville de Winnipeg, et quelles garanties les résidents et résidentes de Saint-Boniface peuvent-ils s'attendre à recevoir de la part du gouvernement en cas de réduction du nombre de sièges au Conseil municipal de la ville de Winnipeg?

De quelle façon Saint-Boniface bénéficiera-t-elle de la prochaine entente CORE?

Je suis d'avis que dans le cadre du programme de décentralisation du gouvernement, les services du Bureau de l'éducation française devraient être déménagés à Saint-Boniface; Monsieur Filmon est-il prêt à considérer cette opinion personnelle?

Qu'arrive-t-il de la bilinguisation de la signalisation routière promise le 4 novembre 1989?

De mon point de vue personnel, le gouvernement devrait finalement reconnaître Saint-Boniface

comme endroit idéal pour y implanter un centre de traduction juridique desservant l'Ouest canadien; le Premier ministre est-il prêt à se pencher sur ma suggestion?

\* (1600)

Le gouvernement est-il prêt à étudier la création d'un centre touristique permanent à Saint-Boniface?

Saint-Boniface va-t-il être soumis à un plan à long terme pour le déménagement des industries afin d'y favoriser le développement résidentiel et commercial?

L'Association des municipalités bilingues va-t-elle recevoir l'aide financière nécessaire afin de pouvoir s'équiper d'un système de communications adéquat?

Quand le projet de refuge pour femmes battues "Maison Térésa" sera-t-il agréé par le gouvernement provincial?

Quand le Service de Conseiller sera-t-il reconnu par le gouvernement à ses mérites et sa juste valeur, et incorporé dans les programmes du Ministère des services à la famille?

Non, Monsieur le président, les francophones ne resteront pas tranquilles tant qu'ils ne seront pas considérés d'égal à égal. C'est une erreur de penser que l'on peut les endormir avec des promesses sans chiffres à l'appui et j'espère que Monsieur Filmon annoncera samedi prochain à Saint-Boniface, des choses concrètes avec des chiffres et des échéances à l'appui et qu'il ne va pas flâner dans le passé plein de promesses. Le thème de l'Assemblée générale, *«Je fais du chemin en français»* est un thème qui se vit présentement pour l'avenir.

En conclusion, Monsieur le président, ce que le gouvernement a présenté jusqu'à présent à cette auguste Assemblée est peu prometteur pour l'avenir économique du Manitoba.

Les faiblesses du gouvernement Filmon face aux tempéraments impétueux et arrogants de Brian Mulroney sont maintenant bien évidentes.

Monsieur le président, quant à la francophonie, la sincérité et l'engagement du gouvernement Filmon pour peu qu'il y en ait dans ce domaine, viennent de se dissiper de la même façon que la substance contenue dans le Discours du trône a disparu avec les mots.

Pour finir, j'aimerais néanmoins permettre au

Premier ministre Filmon de bien se préparer à son discours de samedi prochain à la S.f.m. J'aimerais l'inviter à méditer sur une déclaration faite le 25 mai 1971 à Bruxelles par Monsieur Georges Pompidou, alors Président de la République française. Dans son allocution sur la francophonie, le Président français disait *«Le rôle de la langue n'est pas un simple moyen d'expression, c'est un moyen de penser, un moyen d'influence intellectuelle, et c'est à travers notre langue que nous existons»*. Monsieur le président, je vous remercie.

#### (Translation)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a few specific areas that in this budget seem to have been left aside, forgotten or ignored. I am afraid that in the Larousse and Robert dictionaries there are not enough words in the French vocabulary to say that these sectors have been purely and simply abandoned.

When speaking of post-secondary education we normally think of institutions commonly called universities, and these universities are currently causing a feeling of uncertainty and sometimes surprise, and even anxiety in our province. The essential problem for our universities is the rethinking of their own substance and ultimate aims and their own methods.

I think that Manitoba universities at this time, like all universities in Canada moreover, are seeking to be, and finding themselves to be centres of excellence with the hope of becoming world class institutions.

Mr. Speaker, although I believe that it is imperative that secondary education constitute a solid basis for our universities, I wish to stress it is essential that the children who successfully enter the secondary school system be able to leave it with a sound training that allows them either to take up a job immediately or to commence post-secondary studies.

Mr. Speaker, naturally, because post-secondary education is constantly evolving, it is normal to expect that the Government draft policies that specifically address the need for quality post-secondary education at our universities. That said, I particularly would like to emphasize the urgency of the need to restructure the education sector.

Mr. Speaker, the Government seems to want to think that everything is going well in the education

field and that no change is needed. The elementary, secondary and university sectors are all mixed up together, and it is hoped that something better will come out of this mixture. That is the story of the witches from "Macbeth", stirring their cauldrons and saying, "This will be a good brew."

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is the future of our province that is at stake, we cannot allow ourselves to refuse to adapt our systems to the constant evolution of our society's economy and scientific knowledge. I think that it is imperative that an administrative and executive restructuring be carried out in the education field as soon as possible so that universities can maintain their bases, a certainty of what they are, of what they must be, of what they are preparing for and of the methods applied to that preparation.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I find it deplorable that the Government of Manitoba is not taking the necessary steps, either in the throne speech, and even less so in the first budget of this Thirty-Fifth Legislature, to facilitate the intellectual productivity of the Manitoba society, an indispensable factor in the economic health of our province.

Still in the post-secondary education sector, I would like to make a few comments regarding the funding granted by the Government to St. Boniface College.

Commonly called the cornerstone of the Franco-Manitoban community, St. Boniface College has more than doubled its enrollment in less than 10 years. By way of encouragement and thanks for efforts that are highly appreciated by the Franco-Manitoban population, the Universities Grants Commission is granting the college some 2 percent of the budget for universities. That is far from a shining example to give.

Mr. Speaker, La Francophonie is so absent both in the Speech from the Throne and in the first budget, that I am beginning to suspect that the Halloween witch is somewhere nearby and, Trick or Treat, she is going to take something out of the pumpkin and then take off afterwards on her flying broom.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, we are barely coming out of the constitutional crisis, which is far from being resolved and of which the wounds are still fresh, and are going to take years if not generations to be healed, and already the Conservative Government of Mr. Filmon is putting the emphasis on totally

ignoring the needs of the official language minority of his province. The Government whispers in the Speech from the Throne, that it is going to comply with the order of the Supreme Court of Canada in regard to Manitoba's laws.

It is my duty as a Francophone Member of this Legislative Assembly to raise certain questions in the face of the Government's casual attitude regarding Manitoba Francophone issues, and this happens to be on the eve of the General Assembly of the Franco-Manitoban Society, which will be held on November 2nd and 3rd. Was the existence of the French-language, official language minority of Manitoba ignored in the Speech from the Throne and in this budget simply because the Premier decided to participate in the annual General Assembly of the SFM? Would one dare to suggest that if the Francophone population of Manitoba stays in its corner and behaves, the good Halloween witch is going to pass out some goodies? If this is the case, I say no to it as a Canadian, I say no as a Manitoban, I say no as a Franco-Manitoban, and I say no as a Francophone member who is a symbolic heir to Louis Riel.

On November 4, 1989, it was stated at the Annual Assembly of the SFM, and I quote, "Francophones are a dynamic element not only in their own milieu, but also in the life of the entire province." These words were pronounced by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) himself, who now seems to have forgotten the significance of them.

Since the throne speech did not make any mention either of Francophone issues, I am concerned to the point that I am asking several specific questions. These being, firstly, is the Premier (Mr. Filmon) going to announce next Saturday the budget cut of 2.4 percent imposed on the French Language Educational Resources Branch, which I will add in passing is additionally seeking new space to be housed in? Is the Premier going to announce the steps that his Government is undertaking at the present time so that we will see once again a Francophone presence on the Court of Appeal of Manitoba? Is the Premier going to unveil the strategies that he used, in order to ensure a Francophone appointment to the Senate for St. Boniface, to replace the Honourable Joseph-Philippe Guay?

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier going to explain the reasons why the Government is sitting on the report on French language services in health care and

social service facilities in Manitoba and why it is delaying making this report public?

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier announce the appointment of a Francophone judge on a full-time basis on the Provincial Court, because he realizes that the system of a part-time judge is not the answer to the growing accumulation of cases?

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier going to provide an update on the matter of Part III of The City of Winnipeg Act, and what guarantees can residents of St. Boniface expect to receive on the part of the Government in the event of a reduction of the number of seats on the Winnipeg City Council?

In what way is the next CORE agreement going to benefit St. Boniface?

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that in the context of the program of decentralization, being carried out by the Government, that the services of the Bureau de l'éducation française should be moved to St. Boniface. Is the Premier prepared to consider this personal opinion of mine?

What has become of the bilingualization of road signs, which was promised on November 4, 1989?

Mr. Speaker, in my view the Government should finally at last recognize St. Boniface as an ideal place for the establishment of a legal translation centre which would serve the Canadian West. Is the Premier prepared to examine this suggestion of mine?

Is the Government prepared to examine the creation of a permanent tourist centre in St. Boniface?

Will St. Boniface be given a long-term plan for the moving out of industries so as to favour residential and commercial development there?

Mr. Speaker, will the Association of Bilingual Municipalities receive the necessary financial assistance so that it can be equipped with an adequate communications system?

When will the battered women's shelter, called Theresa House, be approved by the provincial Government?

Mr. Speaker, when will the Service de Conseiller, the counselling service, be recognized by the Government for its true merit and value, and when will it be incorporated into the programs of the Department of Family Services?

No, Mr. Speaker, Francophones will not stay quiet as long as they are not considered equals. It is an

error to think that one can put them to sleep with promises without backing them up with real numbers, and I hope that the Premier will be announcing next Saturday, in St. Boniface, some concrete things with real numbers and deadlines, and that he is not going to wander aimlessly in the promise-filled past.

The theme of the General Assembly, "I am on my way in French", is a theme that is being lived in the present for the sake of the future.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, what the Government has presented up to now to this august Assembly holds little promise for the economic future of Manitoba. The weaknesses of the Filmon Government in the face of the impetuous and arrogant temperament of Brian Mulroney are very clear now.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to Francophone issues, the sincerity and commitment of the Filmon Government, if indeed there is any in this area, has simply dissipated in the same way as the substance contained in the Speech from the Throne disappeared as the words were spoken.

To close I would like, however, to permit the Premier to get properly prepared for his speech next Saturday at the SFM. I would like to invite him to think upon a statement made on May 25, 1971, in Brussels by Mr. Georges Pompidou, who was at that time the President of France. In his speech on La Francophonie, the French president stated, "The role of language is not as a simple means of expression. It is a means of thinking, a means of intellectual influence and it is through our language that we exist."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker -(interjection)- I have already lost all my public hair pulls. I am getting down to the nitty-gritty.

Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pleasure I have an opportunity to speak in the debate on the budget. I did not speak on the throne speech, so first of all may I congratulate you on becoming Speaker and the other Members who have been appointed as Deputy Speaker as well. I wish you well in that appointment.

I want to extend a word of greeting to the new Members of the House as well. Free advice is worth exactly what you pay for it, but frankly I have tried to make my tenure here one whereby I recognize the fact that the electors of Ste. Rose have given me

both an honour and a privilege to be in this House. It is up to me to be smart enough to understand the difference between the two responsibilities.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the budget and look at the position that the Government has put forward in the budget, most of which has already been spent, and we have to recognize that as we go through the debates in this House, that the Government has spent a very considerable amount of time thinking through and planning the expenditures of this province.

We are in a situation where, whether we want to talk about the fact that we are spending a million and a half daily to pay the interest on the debt of this province or whether we want to talk about what the priorities of the Government are, it all comes down to one simple question. That is the establishment of our priorities and the willingness of the Government and the willingness of the Legislature to put priorities in place and live by those priorities.

I would want to go on record that we very clearly stated in the budget speech that we are prepared to make health, families and education the priorities of this Government. The health care of the people in this province is, despite the complaints that we hear from time to time from critics opposite, one of the best health care systems in Canada and probably in the world.

There are tremendous demands out there that our society puts on social services. One of the more important and practical ways that we can deal with the concerns that come up from time to time and the success that members of our society can achieve is dealing with their problems through the services that we provide but also making sure that education and training is readily available and strongly supported for those people who are looking to make their way within the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba and have an opportunity for that comfortable life in what I think is one of the best parts of Canada, a province and a country that I intend to spend the rest of my life in, and one of which I am very proud.

When we look around and look for leadership, then I believe that the people of Manitoba have spoken quite clearly for the direction and for the leadership that they expect from Governments today. When you look at the television news, and you look at the poll that was recently released that speaks very disparagingly of politicians as a whole, I think that it is very important to consider that we, in

this House, no matter which chair we occupy in this House, were elected. We were elected during a period of time when there was turmoil in this country, when there was a great deal of concern being expressed about the thoughtful process that politicians are supposed to go through in providing leadership for whatever jurisdiction they are within.

That, Mr. Speaker, I believe speaks well of the Filmon Government, but let me be magnanimous enough to say that it speaks well of every Member who has been returned to this House. We did come here under that public mood that says, we expect a little bit more of you as politicians than what you have been giving us, or at least what we think you have been giving us.

I guess I can relate that very directly to something the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) did when he put together the financial plans for this province over the last two years. It has been affectionately referred to by Members of the Opposition as Clayton's old sock. It has been referred to as Filmon's slush fund, but we like to think of it as the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. In fact, it has made a tremendous difference to the ability of this province to control its deficits and how we manage the money within this province over the next couple of years.

We know that there are going to be fluctuations within the fiscal capabilities of this province. The other speakers have outlined the concerns that they see to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). That does not mean that the Province of Manitoba needs to pull into itself and decide that they are going to turtle for the next three years or four years in terms of how this province will grow and develop.

We just returned from 254, at the end of the hallway, where we had the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province present a document for public discussion that I think is one of the things that shows that there is leadership and that there is a future the people of this province want to be part of. It will be up to us, as Members of this Legislature, to provide the leadership but through the principles that are presented in that document to make sure the people of this province recognize the potential that is out there and are able to achieve it within affordable means.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak from the perspective of the Minister of Environment. We need a strong economy to make sure that we can do the things that we want to do environmentally. I am pleased to

see a number of the Members of the House and some of the Opposition Members nodding in agreement because that is a critical and important step in dealing with the direction that this province will go.

\* (1610)

As I know, there are always dangers in drawing parallels. I have seen some other comments made during this debate that some people said were inappropriate comparisons. I believe what I am about to say is an appropriate comparison. When we saw the countries of eastern Europe beginning to emerge, the people of those countries were saying, we now want to take hold of our future, and we want to establish the kind of leadership and the kind of country that we want.

Some of us saw for the first time what can happen environmentally when countries do not have the economic clout to deal with the problems that they are faced with. I am not going to get into the philosophical political argument which I am sure one or two Members here are waiting with bated breath for me to do.

Let us talk about the economic reality of not being able to look after their environment. They could not do it. People who have been there will report that going into Eastern Germany, within one block walking distance from within the industrial district, they start to feel the effect in their lungs, that they know that the air pollution is there. They have no problem in identifying that there is a problem, they know that things have been neglected.

There are companies today in the western world, who have technology, who are starting to say, here is an economic opportunity for us, and there will be those who will say taking that economic opportunity is taking advantage of somebody. The fact is, if you are going to take technology and information and important processes that are beneficial to the environment that have been developed—no matter where they are developed and there will certainly be processes and ideas that will come as an exchange; I readily and truly admit that—but there are people today who are saying that there are two sides to the question. One argument will always be, well, if you are going to have any kind of a development you are degrading the environment, that technology is bad for the environment, that having industrial smokestacks is bad for the environment.

Let us look at the information, the technology that

is available that we have to control those things that we do that have an impact on the environment, and that is the context in which I say that we need to make sure that we recognize that the information, the knowledge, the technology available to allow us to have less of an impact on our environment in the things that we do, here and abroad, is important. It is critical, as a matter of fact, to the survival of the lifestyle that we have become accustomed to in this country and particularly on this continent and in virtually all of the developed countries around the world. We have to be able to make sure that our interaction with the environment is one that we can control, but should we go back to the horse and buggy? With cities the size that we have today, the biggest problem would be controlling the horse manure. That is not the type of society we want to turn back to our children.

**An Honourable Member:** We have difficulty with that now.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, it is all centred right here in one part of the city today.

**Mr. Speaker,** let me take that on to talk about the fact that the Department of Environment, the Department of Industry, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Rural Development, the Department of Education—a large number of departments that have an impact on where we go environmentally in this province—all need to be looked at when we look at this budget and look at whether or not this Government has provided for environmental leadership within the structuring of this budget.

There are those who would look at the budget of environment and say, aha, there is the one standard that I am going to judge them by. The Member would say, ah, that is only one standard, that is all I need, and go tearing off to decide, to cry out to the world that they think the Government needs to be doing more. I see one or two Members across the way, they are saying, yes that is what they did.

Let me put it into context, Mr. Speaker. Natural Resources, money spent through Natural Resources, is there anyone in this room who will stand up and say that a big share of the responsibility for natural resources is not related to environmental protection and enhancement? Where is he? Let him stand up; let her stand up. Let us look at the fact that education will be one of the most important components of how our future

generations grow up to deal with environment in this province and in this country.

As a matter of fact, I just had a discussion with a reporter who was asking about the educational component of recycling. He knew as much as I did, or perhaps more, about the fact that there are some jurisdictions in North America that, through education and public attitude, have developed a recycling system that is self-contained, is not supported by Government programs and has a very high return rate on recyclables. Equally, there are other jurisdictions that have used other systems, but let us—just on that one area, on recycling and education, you can draw a very distinct linkage.

Let us talk about environmental awareness. That is part of education. I had an opportunity to sit as part of a panel at the WEEEEK—World '90 conference that was held and organized by—I would like to say very proudly—teachers who come from my home town, who were the lead proponents in putting together the World '90 conference. I had an opportunity to take part in a panel where a gentleman who is very highly regarded in the educational circles and who is responsible for curriculum development said that his idea of how to teach environmental awareness to the public and to the children might be to ask them to imagine themselves naked in a dark room with a bunch of people and what would they do for entertainment.

Well, after the twittering and the guffaws were finished, then he used that as a premise as to how they could start thinking about how they did not need this material world. They could entertain themselves with poetry. They could sing. They could exchange ideas with each other. Then he said: Well, now you have \$50 to spend. How would you spend that \$50, and what would you do when you went back to your room? This was his concept, very strongly held on his part, but this was his concept on how he would teach environmental awareness to the general population and to the students that were involved in the curriculum which he was preparing.

I am being a little overly harsh, but as a matter of fact, I took some umbrage with his approach to how we would bring environmental awareness to the youth of this country. -(interjection)-

The Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), without being in his seat, would like to engage me in some discussion. If you want to go to your seat, I will answer your question.

Mr. Speaker, when I take some umbrage -(interjection)- Not now, Reg.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member has just indicated that he would entertain a question. I wonder if I might have your permission to ask him a question.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, I will entertain a question as I get closer to the end of my time period.

**Mr. Alcock:** You mean I have to stay here?

**Mr. Cummings:** The Member for Osborne must be aware that there is a certain amount of punishment that has to be inflicted before he has the opportunity to ask a question.

Mr. Speaker, without being overly abrasive with this gentleman who genuinely held this view, I have to ask him the question: If that is the way you feel, then what about the people in parts of the world who, simply going and gathering firewood to save themselves from perishing in the cold nights, are expanding the desert which they are living on the edge of and barely surviving? In my opinion, the lineup started not too far away if he wanted to spend the rest of his life living on \$100 a year worth of disposable income?

\* (1620)

Then we went on to talk about the concepts of sustainable development and how we have to use all the tools available to us in order to protect the environment and make sure that the development on the use of our resources is done in a very environmentally sound and careful way to ensure the well-being of future generations. The only response that I was able to get was that after the forum was over this person came around and said, it is pretty hard, I have five kids and a wife, I have a house with a mortgage, and you are asking me to live on 100 bucks. Let us get real.

How are we going to draw the comparisons as to what consumptive society can draw against the environmental resources of our world? That means that we have to make sure that all of our developments are done in a sustainable way unless we wish to send a great many of our upcoming generation back to a standard of living that our families have worked for a number of generations to try and improve on. The standard of living that we have attained today, I think, needs to be considered in that light. Therefore I take some considerable interest in discussions that come up in the House here from time to time about whether or not the

Department of Environment, whether or not the Government, is doing what needs to be done in terms of environmental leadership in this province.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of things that the Opposition Members choose to ignore. I guess I would like to start by simply going back to a meeting that I had the pleasure of being part of not very long ago in the city, bearing in mind all along over the next few minutes that this province was rated 10 out of 10 not very long ago, shortly before the Filmon Government came into office, this province was considered to be 10 out of 10 in being environmentally conscious in the way they did business.

Mr. Speaker, an opportunity to take part in an open forum on the Seine River, and at that forum a number of people raised jurisdictional issues about who is responsible for the river, the City of Winnipeg, the province or even the federal Government, whether or not they had jurisdictional responsibility in dealing with the problems of the Seine River. I had this sheet with me then, and I chose not to get into a partisan discussion of whose responsibility had been usurped in terms of dealing with the Seine.

There are a number of things that need to be put on the record to remind the people of this province that there have been dramatic changes and steps taken forward in dealing with the environmental issues within the boundaries of the city. The department in 1989 issued an order to the city to change its dumping practices. Now we have the snow dumping soon to be eliminated from the water courses of this city. The Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) was kind enough to say when I introduced that, that in fact I was assuring his re-election. I hesitate to say that appears to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, we also are seeking from the city now licences for all of its sewage treatment works. The city has since then, as of January of this year, begun to file applications and the licensing process is underway. Some people might say, well, licensing process, what does that mean? Does that really make any difference? All it means is that you have some paper to say that what you are doing is right, or is not, if you are not doing it as the licence would prescribe. The fact is that this is something that the previous administration had not even begun to talk to the city about.

We have to recognize here again, the city has had some enormous problems to deal with. Their

combined sewer, for example, is not something that I, or you, or this Legislature, or the City of Winnipeg Council is going to be able to deal with in a quick and efficient manner. We need to embark on a plan to deal with it. We have had those preliminary discussions with the city. We now know that when the Clean Environment Commission meets, which has been directed by myself through the Government, when they meet to set water quality objectives for the Assiniboine, the Red and the Seine, that there will be a public forum for all of the people of the community to have their input and suggest what standards they think should be achieved.

That is an opportunity that has not been afforded to the people of this city previously. They do have a right to say what standards they want and how they want their rivers to be developed. They have a right to know what the costs associated with that might be. I guess that is why I take some umbrage at those who would suggest that this Government is not embarked on an open decision-making process when they suggest that perhaps we have some kind of another agenda, that we are not bringing forward in terms of environmental matters.

An open and clear decision-making process is the very basis upon which the people of this province will be able to say how they want the development of this province to proceed. The opportunity for that input, in a very open and public way, will have the forum provided for them so that they can feel part of that decision-making process and truly have some input into it because once Government has heard those complaints publicly, once the public has had the opportunity to express publicly to Government, Government will then be held accountable for how they decide on the basis of that information.

They may not decide or may not be able to make decisions that fit completely with all of the expressions of concern. That is what decision making is ultimately about. That is what the production of this document, Mr. Speaker, towards a sustainable development strategy for all Manitobans, that is what this is all about, the opportunity for the public to be part of a decision-making process and have an understanding of where certain decisions will ultimately impact on us and on our environment.

We brought private discharges within the city under control, Mr. Speaker. They will be licensed under the Act as quickly as we can identify them, as

quickly as we can get on with the process of bringing them together. They were, in fact, exempt or never brought under the provincial control previously.

We have drafted a regulation under the Act to control the city's discharge from their boats on the river. The fact is that the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) and I have been involved in this process. It is not a big item but it is important that those who would use the water courses make sure that any discharge of pollutants into the river be eliminated.

I do not want to see, 10 years from now, the people standing on the bridge at Selkirk to make the kind of cracks that they have been making about the quality of the water coming down the Red. In case there are some of us here who are involved in agricultural endeavour feel that perhaps the only problem with the Red River is the city, we should look at some of the water quality data that my department collects.

The fact is that the water quality coming into Canada is better than it is when it gets to the City of Winnipeg. Of course, we will not make any comments about after it goes further down the river. The fact is that we all across the province, and not just the City of Winnipeg, have a responsibility in making sure that we do everything possible to improve the water quality of what are considered two very important water courses within the City of Winnipeg. The fact is, as well, that across western Manitoba, western Canada as well, but across western Manitoba, the water quality is probably as bad as it has ever been historically because we have just come through virtually 10 years of drought. -(interjection)-

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) would like to talk about my meeting with Mr. de Cotret. Perhaps this is an opportunity for me to discuss the fact that there seem to be some Members of this House who would like to disparage the idea and criticize the idea of having a joint environmental assessment process.

I think that is absurd that we would have people in this Legislature who would suggest on one hand that we have got to have the federal environmental process, because that is the only true and righteous process. When something goes wrong that they do not like with the provincial process, they say, well, we have got to have a federal hearing, but now that we have an opportunity to say we want to co-operate

with the federal hearing process, we want to make sure we meet the highest standards, whether it is federal or provincial, now they are saying, well, you are circumventing the process, you are damaging the process. All you are damaging is the opportunity for some lawyers to throw wrenches in the works that have nothing to do with environment, but only with the interpretation of in-term guidelines. -(interjection)-

Well, the Member from his seat says that includes Alameda. The fact is Rafferty-Alameda is a prime example of bungling in terms of applying environmental law—and I cannot condone the things that have happened there—but that is a reason, and that is an example of why we as a province have to move and move strongly in this direction.

\* (1630)

I happen to believe that the type of environmental relationship that we have with Ottawa, not only in Manitoba, but with other jurisdictions across this country, will have a great deal of impact on how the future of this country proceeds and how we develop as a country.

If we cannot reach agreement on environmental law, where the hell can we reach agreement? There is no boundary that water, air, respects and if we cannot have interjurisdictional co-operation then we have got ourselves a far bigger jurisdictional entanglement than what I think we have today.

As a matter of fact, as I indicated in the House earlier today in response to the Member from the Liberal Caucus, I had an agreement in principle going back last spring to the concepts of interjurisdictional co-operation and the fact that the two jurisdictions should be able to align their environmental assessment processes.

There are still some jurisdictions out there who are fighting range wars. Manitoba is not one of them. We are at the table trying to negotiate respect for environmental concerns so that both parties are satisfied, so that the environmental issues are the issues that are dealt with and not the legal niceties that keep the lawyers of this country in the treasuries of the provinces and the federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, when I look across and look at the—we have talked briefly about what has happened in terms of water courses within the city. From time to time I ask the department to update me on the initiatives that we have taken in the last 18

months, and I have six sheets of paper here with about five line paragraphs on them, five to six initiatives on each page, that we have undertaken. -(interjection)-

I remember the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) asking me the same thing the last time I was up here to speak, which brings to mind the fact that Lake Dauphin is not even included on this because that is a process that was undertaken by the Minister of Natural Resources. I wonder if he would like to talk about his record on improving the quality of the water in Lake Dauphin. I think that he would rather not talk about that. -(interjection)- Of course, but it is not included in this list because there are a number of things that have been the direct responsibility of this department, Mr. Speaker, that I have included in this humble list.

The fact is Lake Dauphin is probably a pretty good example. Do you recall the people from Lake Dauphin who have been worried about water levels? They have been worried about discharges. They were worried about the alluvial fan and silting problems that they have. They have been worried about beach development. They have been worried about agricultural erosion. They have been worried about their fishery. Lake Dauphin has had a very good commercial fishery. It is an excellent recreational lake. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot name one single initiative that was taken by the present Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), and he has been the Member for a number of years including being part of Executive Council of the previous administration. So perhaps he should just relax and listen to the initiatives that the present Government is taking in terms of dealing with Lake Dauphin.

We did spend a lot of time in Dauphin, Mr. Speaker. Being from a neighbouring constituency and in sharing some of the shorelines of Lake Dauphin, I hate to see him taking credit for some of the good things that are going to happen in and around Lake Dauphin when it is this administration that has taken the initiative and has finally done something about a problem that he was either unable or unwilling to deal with during his tenure.

It seems to me he was in Natural Resources for awhile. Previously when he was Minister of Natural Resources he started the initiative on Lake Dauphin. The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) who even filled the same chair for a very brief while—albeit not as well—did not even deal with the issue when he had the opportunity. As soon as we had the present

Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) and the present Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), as soon as they came into the office of Natural Resources, they started to deal with this problem.

The people of Dauphin could not even get the previous administration to bring together all of the studies that have been done on the lake. They could not even put them in one room and compile the information. Well, they had the information but they did not know what to do with it. They did not even take the administrative responsibility to bring together the information in one report so that the people who have the concern about that lake could have them addressed. -(interjection)- The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) says that was delaying tactics. I am sure that his people back home will be glad to know that he was using delaying tactics in order to avoid dealing with the problem at Lake Dauphin.

#### Point of Order

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

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** A point of order, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the point made by myself is that the current Minister and his Government were using delaying tactics by drumming up more studies and compiling studies rather than getting on with the action that was required. That is what I said the Minister was doing—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister has six minutes remaining.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, the Member is a little sensitive about the fact that he was unable to do something about Lake Dauphin. He should go back to the people who are now sitting on that committee. Perhaps they would enlighten him about the fact that there has been a fair bit of money starting to move there in terms of projects.

Well, it will take a long period of time. I am sure he would agree that the realms of possibility in turning around the problems of Lake Dauphin are a fairly lengthy time frame. When you get all of the

players together, when you are prepared to listen to the public, prepared to listen to the people who have the decision-making authority at the local level, you can start to accomplish some of the things that need to be done whether it is in Dauphin, whether it is in any other watershed in this province, the way those kinds of concerns can be dealt with. I would hope that is the way we can deal with the concerns of the Seine River, as well, by bringing in the people who are involved and concerned about what is happening in their own backyard.

Mr. Speaker, the -(interjection)- would you like to try another topic, John? No, we are done with the Seine. Actually, there is a little editorial here from the Brandon Sun. -(interjection)- Yes, this is interesting—this one refers to—Well, it does not have a very nice heading, I do not know whether you would like me to read this or not.

It says, Mr. Doer's rhetoric, it says. -(interjection)- Did he use this one? -(interjection)- Well, maybe I have a better perspective on it. Well, one of the things that I find that Mr. Doer approaches and you know he has the best 30 second clip in the building pretty near. It is the first time I have heard him referred to as a machine gun approach, but the long and the short of it is that the editorialist says, you cannot have it both ways. That is really what I am trying to say.

Mr. Doer, the Leader of the Opposition, cannot have it both ways, and that is really what I am trying to say to the Member opposite and any other Members that might want to listen. The fact is that on the one hand we have people who are saying that there should be an expansion of service, an expansion of the programs, while at the same time we were expected to make sure that there are ways of dealing with the intolerable deficit left to us by the type of administration the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) was part of.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation for a minute. Another area of responsibility that is one of the most interesting areas that I have responsibility for, and one which I believe was unfairly maligned by the Members opposite when they looked at the budget.

The fact is the figures shown in the Environment Department budget, and I will be quite pleased to get into this in the Estimates process, but the fact is that today the budget for Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation is the same as it was last year,

and certainly a better understanding of the process of providing funds to that corporation will help explain why those two figures are not the same. I can assure you, and I will give you the fullest explanation in Estimates, that in fact they have the same size budget this year, but it is not necessarily the issue of budget.

\* (1640)

The issue is that we have a responsibility in this province to deal with the wastes that are here, and if we deal with them properly, we have an economic opportunity, whether it is dealt through Hazardous Waste Corporation or through other private opportunities or entrepreneurs who may want to get involved. The fact is that industry will go today, industry that cares one whip about its environmental responsibilities will go where the planning process respects that, where the population respects that, and where we have an opportunity to make sure that they can safely dispose of their hazardous wastes. That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the spinoffs from being environmentally conscious that far too often we do not deal with in this Legislature.

All we hear from time to time, Mr. Speaker, are those who would be keen to leap on an issue where someone is inappropriately dealing with their wastes. Those who would see only one way of dealing with environmental issues and that is by regulation. Regulation is part of that, education is the other part, a policy and a principled approach to how we deal with the environment is the most important part. Now the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) may like to chuckle, but I hope that when he goes back, he will start looking at Lake Dauphin, and say to himself, gee, you know, I really blew my opportunity, and he did. I want to tell you that we are prepared to make sure we make use of the opportunity we have to provide the leadership, the financial leadership, the environmental consciousness the people in this province expect.

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech Debate which I indicated, I felt this Government lacked a sense of leadership, that they abdicated leadership to the marketplace. This budget confirms these suspicions. This budget reflects our concerns that this Government has abandoned its moderate image. There is no vision here, Mr. Speaker, no representation from all segments of society, no common sense initiatives, no made in Manitoba solutions. All we have seen is an abandonment of decades of moderation and a

move toward the marketplace pay as you go, and if you cannot pay, you cannot go.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a schizophrenic budget. I have the distinct impression that if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) had his way he would have hacked and chopped his way through Manitoba's society in an indiscriminate and ideological fashion. It would now have been Sterling Lyon II, the sequel. Fortunately, the events of the election served to constrain our slasher and hacker. This was a budget where expenditures were in place prior to the election, and hence the Minister could not show his true colours. Unfortunately, a few of the people of Manitoba will suffer the consequences of the unholy pursuit of the deficit grail of the provincial Tories. In other words, I fear for all of us in the spring.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government could be classified as a psychological person, I would classify this Government as an obsessive neurotic obsessed with the deficit to the extent that they cannot rationally contemplate anything else. All Governments are concerned with deficit. It is a reality of life in the latter half of the 20th Century. My fear is that this Government, in its single-minded approach, will attempt to do what their mentor and economic theoretician, Ronald Reagan, did to the United States. Reagan cut and slashed indiscriminately. He allowed the marketplace to dictate. Medicare, such as it is in the States, is now being cut back. Wealth has increased, and the poor are increasing in greater numbers.

Despite all of that, despite all of the Reagan rhetoric and all of the Reagan action, they have a \$3,000 billion deficit—a \$3,000 billion deficit after years of slashing. I fear the same mindless manner that this Government will approach the deficit. They seek to solve the deficit dilemma by cutting indiscriminately and freeing up the marketplace. Mr. Speaker, we have seen the results of Reagan's legacy, and Mr. Manness is continuing to follow his mentor.

Let us just talk about one component, the Justice Department, Probation Services specifically. Now this section is not popular with the public. It is not high profile like getting tough with drunks and other aspects of the provincial Government's program. We, on this side, have supported the provincial Government's initiatives in this regard. We, on this side, very much enjoyed seeing the Minister on television and seeing the billboard ads of the last few months, yet this department or branch could, if

handled properly, result in decreases in Government expenditures but, no, in their mindless pursuit of the deficit, they look at this branch and say, it only deals with criminals, so they have frozen most aspects of programming in that branch.

I will admit salaries are up, but the expenditures indicate the programming is frozen. At Adult Corrections, with the exception of salaries, all programs are frozen. At the correctional Youth Centre, it is frozen. Community Corrections is frozen and the result—well, aside from low morale—is that convicted persons, because they do not have support, have a tendency to get re-involved. It is not just me stating that. It is the people in the department; it is the John Howard Society. Probation officials, who often overwork and do things on their off hours, cannot get the expenditures to go and attend courses in order to upgrade themselves, in order to do the kind of work that would prevent these people from getting re-involved. So they say, the heck with it and morale plunges.

Abusers and alcoholics, who are required by the court to seek treatment, sometimes have to wait four to five months. While they are waiting, what do they do in the interim? Unfortunately, many of them get re-involved. They get re-involved, and we in society pay the price, not only economically, but in social costs.

I must also state, Mr. Speaker, that I was terribly unimpressed with the comments of the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) and the lecture of revised history that he provided us during the Throne Speech Debate. To me it sounded like the kind of speech that comes from an Opposition Leader, something I recognize that the Leader of the Government has had much experience in, but I also think his speech was more appropriately designed to that. Hopefully in four years he can go back to that particular kind of activity.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I thought as a result of the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) comments and his revision of history I should do a little bit of research in terms of the Premier's background. After all, he spent most of his speech revising history and lecturing us on history. So I took a little look through Hansard.

\* (1650)

March 10, 1982, the then NDP provincial Government, those free spending and reckless Members, gave a 3 percent increase to community

colleges. The Member for Tuxedo, the present leader of the Government, our Premier, stood up and he criticized that increase. Here is what he said, page 268, March 10, 1982, and I quote: Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that this will not even cover the cost of salaries, since the major portion of budgets in the community colleges are salary based, this will not cover the normal increase in salaries that are being projected, Mr. Speaker, this Government is prepared to cut programs to redirect its priorities away from those areas that they can provide skilled people with opportunities for employment in the province. Their priorities are indeed not what they said during the election campaign, not what they said during the recent throne speech. (end of quote)

Mr. Speaker, we just had an election campaign as well, and this Government has come in. Has this Government raised the community colleges by 3 percent? No, they have cut, in fact. We do not see a 3 percent increase, we do not see a 2 percent increase, we do not see a 1 percent increase. We see an actual decrease, and this Premier (Mr. Filmon) stands up and says that education is a priority.

That same budget in 1982, following a provincial election, what did the Premier say in addition? Let us take another look, Mr. Speaker. March 24, 1982, and I will quote the Premier, the then Leader—well, he was not Leader of the Opposition then: "Education, which is presumably a priority, which they are presumably interested in supporting to whatever extent they can is only getting 12.9 percent and that breaks down into several different areas. It breaks down into an increase of about 16 percent to universities, an increase of only 3 percent to community colleges; despite five references in the throne speech to the fact that technical training and community college-type training is very important to the needs of Manitobans because it provides people in the skill-shortage areas and it provides people for jobs that are there, and so on and so forth. Five references in the throne speech, but a 3 percent increase. Which, as we well know, will result in a programming decrease at the community college."

Mr. Speaker, this Government, this Premier stated that in 1982. What has his Government done? That was a 12.9 percent increase. That was a 16 percent increase to universities, and he criticized the Government of the Day. We would be thankful for such an increase today, but the Premier,

the Member for Tuxedo, said then something that I hear him not saying now, spend, spend, spend.

Let me quote the Premier from March 24, 1982: So I am concerned about their priorities because when I see cutbacks in areas like Environment, like Education, like Economic Development, Community Services and Corrections, and so on, and give them much less than their average increase across the board. (end of quote)

Mr. Speaker, I find this almost remarkable. Today in this budget the tragic underfunding of the education system has created a situation with a special levy already highest in history will be forced to increase as a result of this Government.

Let me quote some appropriate words of wisdom from the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) in 1982. At that time, March 24, 1982, the Member for Tuxedo said, and I quote: "There will be a ratepayers' revolt and they will let her know"—that is the then Minister—they " . . . will let this Government know that all their posturing and all their rhetoric during the election campaign amounts to nothing in terms of their ultimate credibility because it's their actions that they'll be judged upon, Mr. Speaker."

That was the then Member for Tuxedo, present Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon), speaking in 1982, and that was a 12 percent funding increase.

I go on. April 5, 1982, what did the then Member for Tuxedo have to say about the offloading of taxes onto the backs of ratepayers in the Province of Manitoba? I am quoting from page 1129, April 5, 1982: "We have, this year, almost every jurisdiction, almost every school division in this province, looking at an increase in mill rate for education property taxes, an average from the figures that are made available to us . . ." It goes on later to say: Throw it onto the property taxpayer where it shouldn't be; where they have argued in the past that it's inequitable, that it doesn't bear any relationship to anyone's income. (end of quote) Et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Now what have they done? They have taken, they have frozen budgets and they have thrown it on the backs of the ratepayers—something that they criticized us for in 1982—but now on the other side of the House, note that the situation is different, and at a way, way, completely reduced rate of funds.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have heard lecture after lecture from the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and Members

opposite. They have talked with us in the House. Every time we ask a question, we hear the comment about spending and "roll out the Brinks' trucks". We hear that over and over and over again.

March 3, 1982, the then Member from Tuxedo stood up in the House and asked the Government to spend more money. The Government had provided some loan assistance for energy conservation. He complained it was too low. The job costs \$5,000, he said, page 86, March 3, 1982. This job may require anything from \$10,000 to \$20,000. What does he intend to do for this problem on behalf of Manitoba homeowners? (end of quote) Spend, spend, spend, but now we hear a different tune.

Mr. Speaker, we really have nothing to learn from Members opposite and in particular the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon), because they have spoken—and as the Member for Tuxedo said himself: It is not the words that they will be judged upon but it will be their actions, Mr. Speaker.

If the situation were not so serious it would be funny. Here is a Government obsessed with a deficit, a one-track policy, single-minded devotion to deficit control, and they bring in a deficit of close to \$400 million. If it was not tragic it would be funny.

In pursuit of this single-minded objective they have blurred everything out of sight. They have forgotten to consult. They have forgotten to work with all aspects of society. What is worse, and what I find somewhat disturbing, is that they have fallen into the trap of the weak and the insecure and that is to blame—they blame the NDP Government for everything that has happened bad in this province. They blame the NDP for every single economic dilemma facing us.

This is not new. Blame is the first response of the weak, the insecure and the powerful, Mr. Speaker. In fact I did some other further research—and I do not have the quote with me, but I noted that in 1981 the then Member for Tuxedo was blaming all of the dilemmas of the Sterling Lyon Government on the preceding Schreyer Government. So the pattern is quite consistent; it never changes, Mr. Speaker.

If there are problems in health care, Mr. Speaker, they blame the patients, blame the nurses, blame the doctors. When there are problems in social services blame people on social assistance

**An Honourable Member:** Do you ever take responsibility?

**Mr. Chomiak:** No such thing as responsibility on

that side, and that is really distressing, that is very, very distressing. It is really a sign of the insecure to not take responsibility.

If there is a problem in the collective bargaining system, Mr. Speaker, they blame the casino workers. Are the casino workers to blame because they want a proper standard of living? No, and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) blames everybody. In the end they accomplish nothing but working each person against the other. The tragedy of all this is we should not be blaming each other, we should be pulling together, we should be in this together to solve our problems. There is no doubt that expenditures must decrease, there is no doubt that the '60s and '70s saw Governments increasingly involved in people's lives and that has changed somewhat, and there is no doubt that new solutions are required, new alliances must be formed. Above all, co-operation must be the hallmark of all governments in society if we are to have the public regain confidence in our institutions.

The Member opposite, the Government, I believe has failed to learn this lesson. It is they who are captive of an ideology, it is they who are failing to try new methods and new approaches. The last NDP Government in Saskatchewan in 1982 brought in a balanced budget. Eight years later and billions of dollars in debt, the people of Saskatchewan face an even greater debt than we do in the Province of Manitoba. Does that make the Saskatchewan Tories socialists, to hear the way the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) describes anyone who has any kind of a debt? They, like all Governments, were caught in the same whirlwind of economic change that we have all been caught in. I do not blame them.

The Minister of Health, in comparing NDP Governments to fascist regimes in South America, ought to be chastised and should be put in his place by the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), Mr. Speaker. I find it quite sad that the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) had to stand up yesterday and compare Governments in this country with Governments in South America, and I believe the First Minister, if he was able to control his Cabinet, should bring this matter to the attention of the Member for Pembina.

Mr. Speaker, there are some aspects of this budget that I do like. I am in favour of the initiative on the goods and services tax to prevent the cascading of this unfair and inequitable tax imposed on us by an insensitive federal Government, and I believe that trucking firms in this city require some

kind of assistance. I am also happy, as I said earlier, that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) did not see his way to hash and slash, as I am sure he wanted to.

\* (1700)

Mr. Speaker, this Government talks about hands off, non-involvement in society, and they carry it to such an extreme that some difficulties have occurred, except when their friends, their big corporate friends, say otherwise. Take, for example, page 17 of the budget. We look at page 17, time lost to strikes and lockouts in the Province of Manitoba 1985 to 1989 the Province of Manitoba is way below the Canadian average, in fact, I believe we are third best in all of Canada, and what does this Government do? We are third best in Canada and this Government calls for a revision and a change in our labour laws. It is working, and they want to change something. What is the old saying, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to one of the other areas in the other departments that I have as one of my critic responsibilities. I would like to turn to the Department of Education and Training.

I want to remind all Members of this House of the comments referred to by the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) earlier. I want also all Members of the House to draw a parallel to the situation in 1982 and today. Then we were in a situation following an election. Then things were tough in an economic sense. There was also a recession.

At that time, what did the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) criticize the Government for? He criticized the Government for not prioritizing the area of education. He decried the shift of taxes on to the backs of local taxpayers, Mr. Speaker. What would he have said at that time if the overall increase had been 4.1 percent as it is in this Tory budget? He would have been outraged and rightfully he should have in an area that is supposed to be a priority.

If we are to get out of this mess, Mr. Speaker, if our children are to have a chance to compete worldwide with Europeans and those from the Far East, we have no choice but to prioritize our education system. We all know it. We all say it, but this Government does not do it. As I have stated already, to state that the budget increases to Education and Training are 4 percent is probably being charitable, but let us give them the benefit of the doubt.

I want to however look at the areas of funding to public schools in the public school system. The budget indicated, Mr. Speaker, an increase of \$37 million. That looks fairly substantial but when you cut away, when you look at the smoke and mirrors, when you see what this Government has done, you discover that in fact that is not what the increase is. They said \$37 million. Of that \$37 million, we on this side of the House calculate that approximately \$23 million of that was the redistribution of the property tax as a result of the education levy being taken off of rural property, something which we approved of.

Instead of a \$37 million increase you have to subtract \$23 million which is actually no new money into the system. On top of that, we calculate on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that \$5 million is new funds going to private schools. Therefore the total increase to the public school system in the Province of Manitoba on this budget is, to be charitable, \$10 million. That does not amount to any more than 2 percent—a 2 percent increase.

The bad news does not stop there because if you look at what is happening next year, the GST is coming into effect and school boards have calculated, Mr. Speaker, that the increase in cost to school boards will be at least 2 percent as a result of the GST. Consequently the increase in real terms, and in real dollars, to school boards as a result of this budget is nil—zero.

This Government says that education is a priority. No increase. They should stop trying to cloud the issue, Mr. Speaker. Why do they not just come straight? Why do they not just come forward and say, look, admit there is no increase, forget the smoke and mirrors? Tell us what is in fact true. Tell us what taxpayers of this province are going to find out next year when the special levy has to go up to new heights. They might as well do it. The levy is going to have to rise again just to cover costs.

We are not even getting into the issue raised by the Honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) yesterday of current dollars versus constant dollars. It is not just farmers who are suffering the effect of current versus constant dollars, Mr. Speaker. What about post-secondary education? I will not deal with the litany of cutbacks and misguided policies, but let us face it, most of the money for university education comes from two sources, the federal Government and student tuition.

Let us deal with the first of those sources, Mr.

Speaker, the federal Government. How can we deal with a federal Government that offloads onto the provinces? What wisdom can we obtain from the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon)? Well, I happen to have a quotation from the Member for Tuxedo—March 5, 1982. What at that time did the Member for Tuxedo have to say about the offloading and about dealing with the federal Government?

Let me quote: "What is happening is obviously that his Minister—that is the NDP Minister—is not a very strong Minister in dealing with the federal Government. He's wringing his hands and he's telling us about how terrible it is, all this money they are going to lose from Ottawa in the established programs' financing plan, and he's telling us how much money they're going to lose in the Equalization Grants, but he's not telling us that he isn't putting forth a very strong case on behalf of Manitoba, and it's obvious that they're going to lose a great deal because that's exactly what the federal Government wants to deal with—weakness—and they now have it." They certainly now have it, Mr. Speaker. The silence on this issue from the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) and from the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) speaks volumes.

Let me make one other point, Mr. Speaker, with regard to education. In this province education is not the responsibility of the private sector. Manitobans did not elect a Government to have the Government hand over our education system to the private sector. We are seeing that happening now, not in drabs and dribbles, we are seeing it happening on a wholesale basis: contract busing; private training rather than community college training; direct grants to university faculties; increased grants to private schools at the expense of public schools.

Mr. Speaker, education is not the responsibility of the private sector. It might have been in 1860. It might have been in 1870. It might have been in 1890, but Manitobans do not expect the private sector to be responsible for education. They may provide input and they may provide reasonable assistance—no question—but it is not their responsibility. By abdicating their responsibility to the private sector, this Government is showing its lack of leadership and its lack of understanding of the needs of Manitobans. Manitobans did not elect this Government a mere two months ago to allow to abdicate to the private sector and if they continue this process, I fear what will happen in the education system 10 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, post-secondary education spending is down but, yes, I am happy spending is up to the universities. I am happy but I am afraid that the effect, the continued effect of nominal funding is resulting in not just the maintenance of a system but the actual decline of a system. Atrophy is setting in and amputations, to use a bad parallel, cannot be far behind.

\* (1710)

This, Mr. Speaker, does not take into account something the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) referred to again yesterday in his speech in this House and that is constant versus current dollars. When I look at the state of the University of Manitoba, for example, I am alarmed. When I look at their figures, the Department of Agriculture is funded at 81.5 percent less now from a base line of 10 years ago, continuing education 77.3 percent, education 75.8 percent, social work 78 percent.

I suppose Members opposite will say, well, Mr. Speaker, it is the fault of the NDP. I am sure they will do that. We will have to take some responsibility for that. We all have to take some responsibility and Members on this side of the House are not afraid to say that.

This Government has offered no vision, no five-year plan, no means by which the universities can even internally try to deal with the funding crisis and no leadership, Mr. Speaker—no leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the other source of funding to our universities is the funding that is obtained from students. What have we seen on that basis? A 21 percent increase in the last two years, and more important, we have seen no increase in the minimum wage. This impacts very, very, negatively on students, many of whom rely on these minimum-wage jobs to pay their tuition. So we have an offloading, in addition, onto students.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking, in the field of education, for an investment. If there is something Members opposite should understand, it is the term investment. The investment in the infrastructure, in our students, in our education, is necessary to the future of this province. It is not just rhetoric; it is not just words. It has to happen. It is necessary to keep graduate students present here in order to carry out research and development necessary to attract business that Members opposite and Members on this side are anxious to attract to this province.

Members opposite should know that without an R

& D base in this province businesses will be reluctant to expand and to come to this province, Mr. Speaker. It is necessary to have proper facilities to keep our students here, to allow them to work so they do not have to continue to vote via their feet and move out of the province. It is necessary so that we can compete in the world.

Mr. Speaker, in other areas of education, I am also quite concerned. I am thankful that I have a healthy three-year-old. In two years he will be entering the public school system, and hopefully, he will have no learning handicaps or disabilities, but if he should, I would want programs in place to allow him to do just as good as anyone possibly can. Hopefully, he will not be in that position, but maybe my neighbour's child across the lane or across the street will be in that position.

I would hope that we will have programs in place that look after the special needs of exceptional children. I fear, if one looks at this budget with virtually no increase to the public school sector, that these programs are going to be seriously hurt, Mr. Speaker.

Manitobans believe that their Governments should be involved and should take the lead in two areas, Mr. Speaker—health and education. What we have seen in this budget is an abdication to the private sector, and we have seen cutbacks. What have the people of my constituency, of our constituency of Kildonan, the people of the north end, what have they to make of this budget? Life goes on, but it gets a little bit tougher each day.

In the north end, senior citizens continue to have to pay for home care. As a result, more end up in hospitals at greater cost and greater expense. Mr. Speaker, I know someone who needs an operation on his eyes. When can he get this operation? November, December—no; January—no; June—June of 1991.

In my throne speech, I mentioned the fact that I have a constituent who needs a component part. It is a cushion for her wheelchair. She has to pay for it, Mr. Speaker. If she could not pay for it, she would end up with bed sores, and she would end up in a hospital, in a hospital bed, paying far more each day and suffering far more.

In the north end, kids drop out of schools often, because they cannot afford the tuition and often because they have to work at a minimum wage that has not increased for several years. The senior

citizens in Kildonan—and Kildonan, because of the changing demographics, has a large percentage of senior citizens. They continue to see their children and their children's children forced to leave the city, because they cannot find jobs.

The people, not just young people, but middle-aged men and women, wait and look for jobs, jobs that are not there because they are waiting for the trickle-down effect of Tory economic policy. They are going to have to wait a long time, because I am afraid it just does not work. On top of all of this, the taxpayers in Kildonan are going to be waiting for the big hit, a couple big hits, Mr. Speaker. Despite all of the rhetoric of the Members opposite, there is going to be a big hit because of the offloading of the tax burden on ratepayers as a result of this Government's cut back in the education system.

Mr. Speaker, last month 5,000 of us people were working full-time in this province, and I am terribly afraid that it is not going to get any better going into this winter. Does this Government have a vision? Does it show leadership? No. It blindly follows the model of Ronald Reagan and the people suffer. What is really the failure of this budget is, it is a failure to plan, to look ahead, to take account of the economic climate. Like their federal counterpart, they blindly follow their ideology of deficit cutting, and they have mired us in economic misery.

They have no long-term plan, other than to cut the deficit. They do not ask what our societies should look like in the year 2000, they do not ask what our schools should be looking like in the year 2000. What kind of health care will we need? This Government and this budget fails to address those needs. What about the average Manitoban?

When I was campaigning during the election campaign, I ran into a family. That family had been hit not just by a double tragedy but by a triple tragedy, That man had lost his job because of the Free Trade Agreement, directly as a result of free trade. Not only that, he was having trouble because he had an occupational related disease, and he was having trouble collecting from Workers Compensation. What does this budget do for that man, that average Manitoban, that family? What do we tell that family? What do we tell the children? What do we tell the wife? What happens in five or ten years when they cannot afford to send their children to schools in the two-tiered education system that this Government is going to be creating.

What happens if they cannot afford to get the health care that they require as a result of the system this Government is creating? What do I tell him, his wife and his family?

What this budget means to me, Mr. Speaker, is one thing; it is a failure.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** That is what you are.

**Mr. Chomlak:** As usual I hear the comments of the Member responsible for northern Manitoba (Mr. Downey), who has no recourse but to attack personally, cannot deal with the issues but must attack personally, must yell comments across this House underneath his breath. When he does put comments on the record he gets into trouble, trouble in northern Manitoba and trouble in the province. So I invite him to put his comments onto the record, rather than making personal attacks and personal accusations across the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this budget does not reflect the spirit

and the hopes of the people of Manitoba, and I have no choice but not to support this budget. Thank you.

## HOUSE BUSINESS

**Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that many Members here have families and that the Government of the Province of Manitoba are strongly supportive of the family unit and today being Halloween and many Members may want to take their families out to the traditional activities of Halloween, I would suggest we should call it six o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** Will the House call it six o'clock? (Agreed) When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) will have 40 minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

# Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Wednesday, October 31, 1990

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Tabling of Reports

Letters to Lieutenant-Governor re:  
Inquiries under The Trade Practices  
Inquiry Act; Orders-in-Council Nos.  
670, 671 under The Insurance Act  
Connery 581

Report re: Supplementary Loan  
and Guarantee Authority under The  
Financial Administration Act  
Manness 581

#### Introduction of Bills

Bill 6 - The Business Practices Act  
Connery 581

Bill 11 - The Residential Rent  
Regulation Amendment Act  
Martindale 581

#### Oral Question Period

Repap Manitoba Inc.  
Doer; Filmon 581

Oak Hammock Marsh  
Doer; Filmon 582

VIA Rail  
Reid; Driedger 583

Conowapa Dam Project  
Carr; Cummings; Neufeld; Manness 584

Heritage Buildings  
Friesen; Neufeld; Ducharme 585

Parent-Child Centres  
Barrett; Gilleshammer 585

Environmental Project Reviews  
Edwards; Cummings 586

Conowapa Dam Project  
Edwards; Cummings 587

Judicial System  
Chomiak; McCrae 587

Family Violence  
Chomiak; McCrae 588

Manitoba Cultural Council  
Cerilli; Neufeld 588

Manitoba Hydro  
Cerilli; Neufeld 588

Multicultural Policy  
Cerilli; Downey 589

Economic Growth  
L. Evans; Manness 589

Sales Tax Revenues  
L. Evans; Manness 589

Economic Growth  
L. Evans; Manness 590

Seniors' Housing  
Martindale; Ducharme 590

Department of Housing  
Martindale; Ducharme 590

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Budget Debate

Alcock; L. Evans; Harper;  
Gaudry; Cummings; Chomiak 590-623