



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. 12 - 10 a. m., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 26, 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	Rupert Island	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

Friday, October 26, 1990

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have leave to deal with a matter during yesterday's Question Period, which I would like to deal with at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have leave? No leave.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to table the Annual Report for 1989-90 for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation and the Annual Report for 1989-90 for the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery, where we have from the Grant Park High School eighteen Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Ed Lenzmann. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): May I now have leave from the Members to deal with the matter?

An Honourable Member: You do not need leave.

Mr. Downey: Thank you, Mr. Speaker -(interjection)- I was recognized.

An Honourable Member: He does not need leave.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister on a point of order?

Mr. Downey: No, I am dealing with Question Period, Mr. Speaker, from yesterday's Question Period.

Mr. Speaker: Responding to a question?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear from yesterday's Question Period, it was not my intention while speaking on the point of order to reflect in any way on my friends, the people of northern Manitoba. I want to apologize to them and to the House for my comments. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (1005)

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): First of all, it is not appropriate for this Minister to attempt to abuse Question Period today in the way that he is doing, and if he thinks that standing up today and trying to withdraw those comments, which show the true intention of this Minister, is going to make any difference for the fact that he is no longer anything other than Minister of Northern Affairs in name only, he has another—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. On that same point of order, the Honourable Government House Leader—on that same point of order.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that any Member of this House would rise in his or her place and suggest that a Member, an opposite Member, does not have the right to stand and make an apology, a full apology, to the people of this province. I cannot believe that anybody would want to play politics to that extent, that they would not allow a Member to stand and make a full apology for something that was said yesterday.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, you said "oral questions," the Member stood and was recognized by you. He has the right to stand and make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order please.

The Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) would have had an opportunity to rise on a matter of privilege. In that way the Honourable Minister would have had an opportunity to withdraw his comments or apologize. In that respect, the Honourable Minister is out of order.

The Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), in his point of order, the Honourable Minister, I believe, was abusing Question Period in that way.

I was asking the Honourable Minister whether or not he was rising to respond to a question, at which time I was told that he was. Then he said I am responding to a point of order. There was a point of order which I have taken under advisement—no, I did not—there was no point of order on that one.

For clarification, the Honourable Government House Leader?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, how do we resolve a problem like this? I made a response yesterday that was inaccurate, on the record, with respect to sales tax revenue. Do I have the opportunity, as a Minister, to stand in my place to correct the record? Is that not similar to the Minister of Northern Affairs also wanting to correct the record? I honestly do have to make a change of a figure I put on the record yesterday.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, if the Government House Leader wants to know how a Member resolves matters such as this I would suggest, given the statements made yesterday, it would have been appropriate for that Member to resign as Minister of Northern Affairs—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ashton: . . . Question Period, and the Member has been in this House for nine years. He knows full well that Ministers may rise in response to questions taken as notice. I would say if the Minister had any statement to make to this House, he could have done so as part of Ministerial Statements, which is part of our regular Order Paper. What the Minister did was an abuse of Question Period. Question Period is an opportunity for all Members, particularly the Opposition Members, to ask questions, Mr. Speaker, of the Government, not for Members of the Government to make statements.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader asked me for some clarification. The Honourable Minister, I believe that once you would have the floor, because you have put inaccurate information on the record, would have an opportunity to correct such information, on that point of clarification.

Minister of Northern Affairs Resignation Request

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the belated apology of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) would have been acceptable if it was sincere. Mr. Speaker, my question—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Point of Order

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

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is not any Member's right to stand in this place and call into question the sincerity of any statement of any other Member, and I say he be called to order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the same point of order, the Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, this Member did not repeat this statement accidentally. This Member, the Minister of Northern Affairs—

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order.

Mr. Storie: —yelled from his seat a comment that was derogatory, demeaning and threatening to the people of northern—

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

The Honourable Opposition House Leader, on that point of order.

* (1010)

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I realize we are in a difficult situation, because the Minister rose in an inappropriate time and placed a statement on the record in a way that he should not have, which has not been accepted by this side of the House. I believe that is what the Member for Flin Flon was referring to, was the fact that whatever the Minister said is totally unacceptable to this side of the House and, Mr. Speaker, that it was a response to comments that had been made in fact by the Government House Leader.

I would suggest that we get on with Question Period, because I know, Mr. Speaker, many of us have a number of questions today, particularly to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) in regard to the actions of that so-called Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon was reflecting upon the

Minister of Northern and Native Affairs. I would ask the Honourable Member for Flin Flon to withdraw those comments.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Speaker, the comments that I made were a sincere reflection of what I believe. The Minister of Northern Affairs has travelled northern Manitoba—

Some Honourable Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Storle: and implied the same thing in many conversations—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Speaker, he is denying the people of northern Manitoba the right to vote with their conscience and—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, to withdraw, with no qualification.

Mr. Storle: —and what they -(inaudible)- best interests. The Minister had an opportunity to correct himself, and he—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, to withdraw the reflection made upon the Honourable Minister.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the word "insincere"—

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, question.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In the throne speech and speeches that this First Minister has made throughout the province, he promised the people of Manitoba fair and equitable Government.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday his Minister of Northern Affairs, his Deputy Premier, the second in command in this province, indicated to a region of this province that because they did not vote in accordance with the wishes of the Minister of Northern Affairs, they were going to be penalized.

Will this First Minister remove the Minister of Northern Affairs from his responsibilities and strip him of his responsibilities as Deputy Premier of this province?

Point of Order

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

Mr. Manness: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Rules of our House demand that when Members opposite pose questions to the Government that the preamble and the facts contained therein be factual. At no time—one can search the record—at no time can anybody find within the record a statement by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) that indeed any individuals, any service offered by the Government in the North is going to be penalized as a result as to how they vote.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Opposition House Leader, on that same point of order.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the Minister of Northern Affairs, first in his seat and then on his feet, officially recorded in Hansard, on both occasions made it quite clear, and it says, I will make the comment very clear, and that is, unfortunate they do not know how to vote, Mr. Speaker.

He made it very clear that he felt the Northerners did not know how to vote, and it was very clear to all Members of this House that Northerners were being penalized because they did not vote for that incompetent Government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader did not have a point of order.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Member for Flin Flon insists on playing politics with this issue. I know that they have nothing of substance on which they can criticize this Government or the budget that we brought down. They were absolutely floundering yesterday in both Question Period and in their Leader's speech. It was one of the weakest responses to a budget that I have seen in my history in this Legislature.

To get to the point of the Member's question, the fact of the matter is that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), in responding yesterday, recognized that what he said might have been misinterpreted, might have been taken as a slight or in some way as a criticism or in some way as an inappropriate remark. He rose today to withdraw that remark and to apologize to the people of

northern Manitoba, and it is in my judgment the sincere and the right thing to do.

Now, if the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) wants to be petty and small minded and political about this, he can carry on with it, but if he wants to take this as a representative of those people who have been apologized to—

* (1015)

Point of Order

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader on the opposite side rose on several occasions and corrected me, asked you, Mr. Speaker, to correct myself in terms of impugning motives. Mr. Speaker, I did not raise this matter because I wanted to be petty or small. I raised this matter because this First Minister does not seem to believe that the people in northern Manitoba have a right to vote with their conscience, to vote what they believe is in their best interests.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. That is a dispute over the facts. The Honourable First Minister, to finish his response.

* * *

Mr. Filmon: I have said time and time and time again that I respect everybody's right to vote with their conscience and to vote in whatever way they see as best in their interests, Mr. Speaker. That is the view of this Government. That is the view of me as Premier of this province. I will fight as long as I am in this Legislature for the right of people to do that.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, I will then ask the First Minister to defend the rights of my constituency by removing the Minister of Northern Affairs, who does not believe that the people in northern Manitoba have a right to vote with their conscience.

Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Modernization

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister is: Can this Minister tell the people of Flin Flon why the modernization effort has been held up for two and a half years because of the stalling of this Government? The question to the First Minister is: Does this reflect the attitude of the Minister of Northern Affairs about people in my constituency?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I can tell you very directly that two and a half years ago of course the New Democrats did not commit themselves when they were in Government to this modernization in Flin Flon. We have made a very large and very substantial contribution. In fact, given that there were limited funds available from Ottawa with respect to acid rain abatement, this Government has had to take a commitment that is more than double the commitment that has been laid on the table by the federal Government.

We have made that commitment, Mr. Speaker. If he is interested in truly helping his constituents, he might look to find out why HBM&S is having difficulty putting together their own package of support with their own resources, their funding, their financing package from the banks and the other institutions to whom they have to turn. He would work to try and ensure that that package does come together, but this Government has put on the table a package that is more generous, I believe, than even the company expected to get, because of our commitment to the people of Flin Flon.

Minister of Northern Affairs Resignation Request

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is to the First Minister. Yesterday, we asked the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) and this First Minister to justify a \$400,000 cut to local Government development in the Department of Northern Affairs, to justify other cuts in health care and education in Northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, will this Minister remove the Minister of Northern Affairs so that the people in the North will have some confidence that they are being dealt with fairly and honestly and openly and equitably?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, you know these are questions that are very appropriate for Estimates, where you go into detail as to what were the specific changes. One of the major changes, for instance, in the Department of Northern Affairs budgeting is the fact that the Limestone Aboriginal Partnership Development Board no longer is in operation. Why? Because Limestone is being completed at the present time. All of the things that were involved in training and development for those areas are for a project that has now been completed, so that board no longer exists. Over a half million dollars was taken out because that board no longer exists, because its

mandate was completed. That was a decision that just follows up on the mandate that was given to that board by the NDP Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, this has absolutely nothing to do—every area of the budget there are choices that are made, priority choices, choices as to whether or not you provide the funding to try and reduce the waiting lists—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

* (1020)

Community Economic Development Fund Economic Forecast

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): My question is to the Premier. When I was first elected as a Member of the Legislature, I made a commitment to work on behalf of all my constituents. I never once asked anybody how they voted in a previous election and never once penalized or even considered that, and that is the concern here. There is clear evidence that the North is being penalized by this Government and by the actions of this incompetent Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey).

I would like to specifically ask the Premier, and this is based on the most recent report of CEDF, whether he considers it acceptable that the Minister of Northern Affairs has led to the situation where the most recent report resulted in 31 jobs created or lost, compared to the previous 210 in the last year of the NDP Government—\$700,000 in terms of loans issued instead of \$3.5 million. Mr. Speaker, is it acceptable on behalf of a Minister of the Government to have that level of incompetence of CEDF—

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

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Member brings up CEDF, because there indeed was a Crown corporation that had been totally politically manipulated and had been totally taken away from its mandate of providing economic development for northern and remote communities in this province.

We remember the scandal of that corporation being used to give specific funding to the person who had provided the office space and support for the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) in his election campaign. We remember them totally abusing that corporation by giving a loan to the

former NDP Member for Thompson, operating out of Saskatchewan, setting up a postal box in Neepawa to be able to be eligible for funding under CEDF, a total abuse, and as a result hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars of loan losses because of political decisions being made by the NDP to abuse that CEDF corporation.

We have been working to clean that up, so that corporation has been operating sensibly in a fashion that is I think in keeping with this kind of mandate to do things on a businesslike basis, not to be abused for political purposes by the former administration.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, this Minister went on a witch hunt at CEDF. The loans dropped from \$3.5 million to \$750,000.00. This Minister went and hired his executive assistant as the—

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

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I implore you to bring the Member to order. Not only is he entertaining a supplementary preamble, but his editorializing of the remarks made by the Premier, which are all factual, shows his desperation, and again he is engaging in an argumentative fashion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. On the point of order raised, I would like to remind the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) that I had recognized him for a supplementary question. The Honourable Member is quite aware that a supplementary question should not require a preamble, and I believe the Honourable Member was just about to pose his question.

Minister of Northern Affairs Resignation Request

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is quite simple, to the Premier. Why will he not remove this Minister when the evidence that the record of this Minister is one of political manipulation and incompetence? Why will he not remove this Minister?

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

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we now see the tragic changes in the New Democratic Party from the time when they were a Party of principle, the time in which people like Ed Schreyer really tried

to bring in changes in legislation that allowed for public servants to be able to run for office.

Now of course the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) says that you can only run for office if you run for his Party, if you are a public servant, but if you choose to run for another Party then he is going to condemn you, and he is going to try and make a political issue of it. That is the depth to which this Party has dropped.

I think that is a tragedy to see those people across the way and their political -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that CEDF has been brought on to a businesslike basis, that it has cut its hundreds of thousands of politically motivated loan losses to a point that now it is making investments that make sense, that have a chance of economic survival and prosperity in the future. It is doing so by having virtually changed that corporation back to the mandate that it had when Ed Schreyer formed it, not to the mandate that it had when it was politically manipulated under the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and all of his northern colleagues during the Pawley administration.

* (1025)

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, how can the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) describe CEDF as being run in a businesslike fashion when the average cost per job created went in the last year of the NDP Government from \$5,000 to 45,000 in administrative costs.

Will the Minister now ask for the resignation of the Minister responsible for CEDF, who has proven his incompetence?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, you know when you talk about real commitment to the North, not just rhetoric, not just the kind of flim-flam that we got from the NDP, CEDF is a corporation that was set up for the specific purpose of providing loan capital for corporations and businesses in the northern and remote areas of this province.

Where was it set up? In Winnipeg. Does that make any sense? We changed it and put it up to Thompson. We put it into the North because it was a dismal failure—huge loan losses, huge rightoffs, huge deficits as a result of political manipulation, politically motivated loans that never had a chance of success. Now it is operating in Thompson on a

businesslike basis, directed to what it was always intended. That is providing loan capital and venture capital for northern and remote communities and the businesses in their areas.

Immigration Policy Family Reunification

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this appears to be a day for apologies, first from the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), and we anticipate there will be one shortly from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness).

I am deeply disturbed about comments that our Premier (Mr. Filmon) made yesterday about the immigration policy in this nation, statements which indicate that the focus must change from compassionate grounds to more marketable skills.

Throughout the recent election campaign this Premier made family a focus of his campaign. Indeed, his wife conducted a letter writing campaign indicating the wonderful family skills that this particular Premier had.

I do not question those characteristics, because I think every individual in this House is proud of their family and their responsibilities to their families. I want to know why this Premier would deny those same family obligations and responsibilities to new immigrants in this province.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that I do not deny that. In all of my discussions on this issue I have said that in addition to all of these criteria on compassionate grounds for family reunification -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for The Maples wants to put his comments on the record I would invite him—yes, if you would like to put your comments on the record I would invite them.

I have said that in addition to family reunification, in addition to refugee requirements, we should also be able to target them for the skills. I have always consistently talked about increasing the proportion of immigrants that we were getting this way so that -(interjection)- no, in addition. Do you understand? Plus, in addition, not instead of, never, I have never said—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Filmon: Read them. I did not say that. The headline is not a quote. Read them. I said in addition to the grounds on which we currently have them I want to increase the proportion of immigration, and I want that increase to come from people who have skills that fit the needs of our economic development. I will consistently argue that case everywhere I go in this province and across this country.

* (1030)

Mrs. Carstairs: In quotes, the Premier did say that with family reunification we do not end up getting the skills we want. Can the Premier prove and show proof to this House why family reunification and economic development is in his mind absolutely incompatible?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat for the benefit of the Leader of the third Party that in addition to the criteria for compassionate grounds, such as family reunification and refugee status, both of which are important for us as a caring society, as an open and generous society in Canada, we also need to be considering to a greater extent the skills that people bring so we can add a category that has been virtually lacking in the past decade and that category—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Filmon: In addition to all of those categories, we must have categories that allow us to target for people with the skills that will help us develop our economy in this province and that will also be much stronger in their commitment to this province. Because of the fact that they will have jobs, they will have opportunities that will keep them productive and active here and will be very important.

We have had our proportion of immigration to this province reduced in half as a proportion of the immigrants that we get from across this country, coming into this country. We think that we need more immigrants to help us build the economy, to help us ensure that we have better opportunities in future.

Mrs. Carstairs: Obviously this Premier (Mr. Filmon) does not understand the costs of immigration to this nation, because family reunification is the least expensive immigration in terms of settling, because the families look after their own.

Will this Minister now repudiate his statement that he believes the focus should be put on skills and

away from compassionate grounds for the basis of the immigration policy in Canada?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I believe that as a generous, open and caring society—and I have said this on many, many public forum. When I went to Hong Kong last year, people told me over and over again that Canada was the most generous and open society in the world in terms of accepting immigrants. I believe that is a very positive thing and a very strong recommendation for this country and the kind of nation that we have built and that we want to continue to be.

In addition to that we have to have the opportunity as well to draw on people on an individual basis, in addition to family reunification, in addition to those who come here on a refugee status basis, to people to draw on people who must come to this country to bring skills that we need.

We are short of people to work in a variety of areas that—(interjection)— We have a program to assist those who come with professional skills to practice their professions, to assist them in obtaining their certification of those. Those are special programs that this Government brought into Government since it has been in office.

Mr. Speaker, this is the problem with Question Period—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable First Minister that questions and answers should be posed through the Chair.

ACCESS Program Continuation

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. It deals with both the changing face of Manitoba with immigration and it deals with the issue of priorities that he has identified as the choices that have to be made in the budget.

The ACCESS program has been in a state of confusion over the last six months. We have had word that the program is going to be totally cut back. We have had the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) appear before demonstrations and say there is tremendous support for the Government for those programs, and then we see a letter from the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) saying that this is written notice that the program must be terminated.

My question to the Premier is: In light of his commitment of \$8 million to private sector training in this budget, will he guarantee that the successful programs for social workers, teachers in the inner city, nurses and doctors in the North and aboriginal people and new immigrants under our ACCESS and BUNTEP programs, that the enrollment of those programs and the intake of those programs at the levels of prior intake will be protected by this Government in terms of its commitment to the people that need those programs the most?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we have said and argued publicly the case for BUNTEP, for the ACCESS programs, for those kinds of human resource development programs within our education and training system that we believe are absolutely critical and necessary for the future development of our aboriginal peoples and many of our disadvantaged peoples and are a tremendous investment.

* (1035)

We have backed up that advocacy with dollars—dollars not only to support levels that we have done in the past, but in fact to pick up from some of the offloading of federal cuts in those areas. We have been working very, very hard. I have correspondence as recently as the last couple of weeks with the Honourable Jake Epp arguing that we need to have the federal commitment for next year now.

That letter regrettably had to be sent out for the same reason as our labour laws ask for people to give notice of layoffs. The fact of the matter is that they enter into agreements for staff a year ahead. So if we did not send that letter, staff commitments for next September would have already been made by the universities and the colleges and the training institutions.

Until we know from the federal Government the kind of level of support that we are going to get, we cannot commit all of the funding for those programs. We can commit our share, but we cannot commit the federal share.

We are taking in people for programs that are two and three and four years in length, and we have to at least be prepared to carry through our commitments to see those people through their training. With the federal Government indicating publicly that they are cutting back on their commitments, Mr. Speaker, we have to have some

flexibility in the future staffing of those institutions to ensure that we do not get caught not only with our share and the increased proportion we put in, but the entire share that the federal Government is walking away from.

Mr. Doer: The First Minister did not answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) has blown the negotiations over the last two years. We are left with a huge hole of some \$280 million in terms of our ERDA agreements, many of them under the Northern Development Agreements.

This Minister told us in the House two years ago that he would get more than what the former Government got. Remember those echoes coming through this Chamber.

My question is very specific to the Premier. You are putting aside \$8 million for big corporations for private sector training. If you cannot negotiate successfully with the federal Government, and your Minister does not seem to appear to be able to do that, will you ensure that the enrollment and intake levels are maintained as a higher priority than moving \$8 million in this budget over to the big corporations? Will you ensure that that intake is protected?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, we have indicated in the past, and I invite the Leader of the Opposition to compare, every province in this country has had cutbacks in federal-provincial agreements. The reductions by virtue of the removal of ERDAs and replacement with new agreements has been across the board, cutting every single province and its share of federal-provincial spending, Mr. Speaker.

The federal Government argues that they have put in place now an umbrella called the Western Economic Development Agreement, and that is producing more federal revenues transferred to Manitoba than all of the other agreements combined under the former administration. They provide figures that argue that case. Mr. Speaker -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Western Economic Development is a billion dollars. It is a billion dollars, Mr. Speaker. That is the point.

We are into a situation in which the federal Government, in our judgment, has been negligent

and has been unfair. It has been unfair to every single province in this country, because all of them have suffered major, major reductions in their federal-provincial agreements.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, that is not the question.

My question is to the Premier. What is your priority, money to big corporations, the \$8 million as in this budget or maintaining the ACCESS and BUNTEP programs in northern Manitoba and southern Manitoba and in the inner city?

If you continue to bungle your negotiations, what are your priorities for Manitobans? Is it tax breaks for corporations or is it money to maintain the affirmative action programs that are so necessary in the inner city and northern Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, my priority is training for the people who need it in this province. Regardless of where they live, regardless of what their circumstances, the money is going to go into education and training for people who need it, preferably for training that leads to real employment opportunities.

The most focussed and most targeted that we can possibly become is by having direct training for people on the job that leads to continuation and furthering of their economic opportunities. That to me makes economic sense, not ideology, not hidebound old ideas of who is on what side and who is on the other side, trying—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Point of Order

Mr. Doer: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The First Minister is impugning motives. If he reads the Coopers and Lybrand Report on training, he will find the Winnipeg Education Centre stacks up better than any other training model. He is impugning motives on ideology—

* (1040)

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

Goods and Services Tax Correction

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to correct something that I put on the record yesterday. Is that acceptable?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, in amongst all of the numbers I put on the record yesterday, one was in error. That was dealing with the saving with respect to the tax relief that we provided by this announcement in this budget with respect to taxing the retail sales tax alongside the federal Government proposed GST.

The saving to those users of the telephone system would be in the area of \$2.5 million-\$3 million. The mistake I made as that the saving to our users in removing the present 11 percent Federal tax down to the seven would be \$12 million. So I had made a mistake there. That was under the present Telecommunications Bill as it exists today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make that correction.

Urban Native Strategy Government Commitment

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, the comments made yesterday by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey)—as we are well aware that northern Manitoba is made up mostly of aboriginal individuals. I was very insulted, being an aboriginal myself, by those comments.

My question is to the First Minister. The Minister of Northern and Native Affairs promised this Government would deliver an urban Native strategy. Despite spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on friends and Tory cronies, we have no urban Native strategy.

To the First Minister, is this because the urban aboriginals do not vote right either?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we continue to be committed to developing a joint strategy to address and resolve many of the difficulties and problems that are faced by our aboriginal people in the City of Winnipeg and in our urban centres. We as a Government for the first time ever established a shelter for Native women, Ikwe. The Member I am sure should be well aware of it. Under the former NDP administration they got rhetoric, they got promises, they got a lot of other things. Under us they got a shelter, a real physical shelter—investment in people. That is what we have been doing.

We have given support to many aboriginal and Native organizations. The Indigenous Women's Collective never got any support, not a nickel from the former administration. They are getting funding

from us, Mr. Speaker. We are choosing our priorities wisely. Where there are needs in the aboriginal community, within the scope of the funds that we have available, we are addressing them.

Education

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister point to one concrete program or initiative in the education field for the urban Native population in the inner city?

Hon. Gary Fillmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, if the Member would consult with his colleague from The Pas, who was a signatory to a new program, the Northern Bachelor of Nursing Program, that we developed, again -(interjection)- See now they are choosing who they are helping. They do not want to help the aboriginals if they are in the North, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Point Douglas began his preamble by talking about the fact that he was proud to be an aboriginal person in this Legislature, that he was proud to talk about and represent aboriginal interests. I am telling him that among other things, I have already talked to him about two specifics in urban Winnipeg which he set aside, the lkwe house for Native women, the funding for the Indigenous Women's Collective. Now I am telling him about the Northern Bachelor of Nursing Program that was developed under this—

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

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that answers should pertain to the questions raised. The Member for Point Douglas had asked about education programs affecting native people in Winnipeg. I realize the First Minister had some difficulty in answering the question, but he should recognize the rules and not try and misstate the question placed by the Member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Hickes: Can the First Minister promise urban Native people in my constituency of Point Douglas and the inner city that education and training programs will not be cut because of the attitude of the Minister responsible for Native Affairs?

Mr. Fillmon: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) has demonstrated by his actions during the past two and a half years that he will do everything possible to support the interests, the concerns and the needs of the aboriginal people of this province. He will continue to do that because he is committed to bettering the circumstances of the aboriginal people of this province, unlike the NDP who did nothing but give them talk.

Goods and Services Tax Communication Billing

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Finance for correcting the information he put on the record yesterday, although in doing so he has left another inaccuracy on the public record. From his response he would seem to suggest that by removing the federal communications tax there is going to be a \$10 million saving on taxation, and in fact the reapplication of the 7 percent tax across a broader base is going to result in an increased tax load even after the removal of the cascading. Can the Minister take this opportunity to correct that?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if the Member was listening, I said under the existing tax Bill, naturally when the base expands in January, 1991, the federal Government will take a larger share of tax under the total communications billings that each and every one of us face.

Retail Trade Predictions

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): So people's telephone bills will go up next year as a result of an increased tax load.

I wonder if the Minister of Finance would also like an opportunity to correct the information he put on the record about retail trade.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, people's communication bill may go up as a result of the GST, but because of the action that we took in this budget it is going to go down \$2.5 million-\$3 million as to that amount of revenue which flows into the provincial coffers.

Let not the Member try to paint the picture that somehow we as the provincial Government are going to be responsible for any increase in billings under telephones.

Child and Family Services Funding

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): We are just trying to remove some of the fog in these pictures, Mr. Speaker.

I gave the Minister an opportunity to correct the record relative to retail trade in this province. He did not avail himself of that opportunity. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Family Services. Would he like to correct what he put on the record about the 15 percent increases to Family Services agencies so they can expand services in this province?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, we will have an opportunity in the Estimates to look at the details of that. I would indicate to you that the increase to Family Services agencies has been 15 percent.

*(1050)

Rock Ridge, Manitoba Community Hall Funding

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Yesterday's statement by the Minister of Northern Affairs revealed a great deal about the Government's criteria for funding projects and programs in Northern Affairs communities.

I want to ask the Minister of Northern Affairs why he has not supported the application by the community of Rock Ridge for a community hall, which is so necessary in that new community where they have no place to meet in the area, no place for recreational activities, and this Minister is refusing to support the application that they are making. Is it also because these people in my constituency, in the community of Rock Ridge, do not know how to vote—

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

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to make it absolutely clear that the budget that has been prepared for Northern Affairs has been done under the normal processing of any Government budgetary activities with the departmental staff who have worked for his Government, our Government bring forward priorities.

We were able to move on a major request of the community of Rock Ridge to help the young children

of that community who never had a playground, who never had a community under that Minister or that Government. We gave them their community status. We gave them a park for their children, and we gave them the equipment to play in that playground, something that Minister and that Member was never able to deliver.

As far as the hall is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is like every other community. They deal within a limited budget that is available to all the communities. It is more important to make sure the essential services of water and sewer and playgrounds for children, I believe, and when the time and the resources are available, provide a hall for them, Mr. Speaker. Then it will be dealt with fairly and appropriately.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, that community did not ask for community status until 1988. Now they are asking for improvements. More people want to move into the community in a subdivision, and this Minister will not approve a small amount of money for jobs and brushing so that they can get on doing that work instead of having to rely on social assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister why he will not approve those few thousand dollars so they can provide some jobs this winter to prepare the site for the subdivision that is required in that area.

Mr. Downey: I again indicate it is the department that makes those decisions with available resources; that is correct. I guess the decision was made by the department and by the Government to give his colleague from Flin Flon \$136,000 from my department and a hundred and some thousand from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) to clean up an environmental problem that was left by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), an order that he should have cleaned up when he was a Minister. That is what we are using the resources for, to clean up his continued messes.

Community Status

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): The community of Rock Ridge is waiting for word from this Minister, and I ask this Minister why he will not grant them full community status so that they can elect two councillors and a mayor for that community. He refuses to deal with that concern, and it has been two years since they were granted contact status. When will he give them full community status?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Again, the Member is not very clear as to what information he is putting on the record. If he wants to do a comparison of the community statuses and the communities which were -(interjection)- well, Mr. Speaker, there has to be adequate population. There has to be a proper procedure and timing to go through, as the Member knows.

I am more than prepared to deal with the evolution of these communities as they provide and prove evidence that they are ready for that status. That is a departmental decision working with those communities. -(interjection)- If the Members want something different as they operate it, they will not get it. The department will be fully involved in the development of those communities, in the development of increased status.

Air Ambulance Program Funding

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): I have a question for the Premier (Mr. Filmon). There is clear evidence in the budget that Northerners are being singled out for cutbacks by this Government. My colleagues have spoken eloquently on that this morning. Health care is no exception. In fact, the Air Ambulance Program and the Northern Patient Transportation Program received a direct cut of almost 20 percent and represents the largest single cut in the health care budget.

My question to the Premier is: Would he, in the interest of fairness and community preservation for our North, reinstate adequate funding for the Air Ambulance and Northern Transportation Patient Program to ensure that health care services in the North are not jeopardized?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): I guess the caution that I give to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) to try a little honesty, I ought to have applied to others in his caucus.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member, I am sure, is not suggesting that there is some dishonesty in this Chamber. I would ask the Honourable Minister to withdraw that comment.

Mr. Orchard: Far be it for me to ever suggest that

anybody on any side of the House would not deal with an issue honestly.

My honourable friend, the Leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Doer) attempted yesterday—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the Honourable Minister just to withdraw that comment.

Mr. Orchard: Certainly, I will withdraw that comment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Health.

* * *

Mr. Orchard: My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) yesterday attempted to say that there was a reduction and a cutback in the air ambulance service. There was no such cutback last year, nor will there be this year. There were more trips last year based on medical need and volume, and we funded every single one of them. That will continue this year.

Furthermore, when my honourable friend wants to talk about health care services to northern Manitoba, let us talk about the dialysis program that we put into Thompson that the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) could not deliver while he was a backbencher in the NDP Government. Let us talk about the health office—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Time for oral questions has expired. -(interjection)- Order, please.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the adjourned debate 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), in the amendment thereto as follows, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) who has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, this -(interjection)- apparently someone would like to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry. -(interjection)- Order, please; order, please.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Would the House grant leave to revert back so that the Honourable Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) would have an opportunity to make a non-political statement, and then we could revert back to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon? Agreed? Agreed.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Members of the House, because I think every Member of this House who knew the late Gordon Hall would want to extend to his family today their deepest sympathies.

The former Manitoba Court of Appeal justice died yesterday after a long and protracted battle with cancer. He had retired from the judiciary some 18 months before.

Justice Gordon Hall was well-known to people throughout this province, both in the agricultural community for work that he did in preparing reports in agriculture and also, of course, for his service as a judge and as a lawyer.

He leaves a family. He leaves many, many friends, and he will I think be a loss to all of Manitoba because he enriched us by his presence by living among us.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave for a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have leave? Leave.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add our words from our caucus to the family of Gordon Hall on his passing yesterday.

The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) has so eloquently reflected upon the esteemed career of Justice Hall. We would just like to pass on our condolences and sympathies to the family and friends of Justice Hall.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask permission to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? Leave.

Mr. McCrae: I thank Honourable Members and join with the Honourable Opposition Leaders in paying respect to the memory of former Justice Gordon Hall and extending sympathy to the family.

I do so as one who has had the privilege in the past of working directly with Justice Hall in his courtroom. I feel that a word should be said about the contribution Mr. Justice Hall has made to justice and other issues, other areas of concern in our province. I join, on behalf of all of the Members on our side of the House, in the sentiments expressed by the other Leaders today.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I too would like leave to make a non-political statement on the same—

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? Leave.

Mr. Downey: I rise because I had the opportunity to learn this summer from Justice Hall that in a visit to the Oak Lake Fair that was his home of origin. I had an excellent time visiting with him there. I want that to be put on the record, that he did come from rural Manitoba initially, and his roots are in rural Manitoba, and he did go back to them with his family. I do want to, on behalf of the constituents which I represent, as well as myself, extend sincere sympathy to them.

Also, as the Minister of Agriculture, I had the opportunity, on some of the reports that were done by Justice Hall, to work very closely with him. I certainly enjoyed the direction and the leadership which was given to me, the Government and to the people of this country. So I want to make sure those thoughts are on the record for the family.

* (1100)

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

Mr. Speaker: Reverting back to Orders of the Day, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, who has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I took some time in Question Period yesterday, as did some of my colleagues, to talk about the budget and particularly the cuts that impacted Northern Affairs.

Of course, today's questions and the comments of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) make those cuts more significant, particularly as they may reflect on the attitude of this Government and the attitude of this Minister towards northern Manitoba and people who may have a different view of the province and the obligations of the people who lead the province.

Mr. Speaker: I do take the Minister of Northern

Affairs' comments yesterday as a threat, not a thinly-veiled threat but an open threat, to the people of northern Manitoba that they better vote according to the dictates of the Minister of Northern Affairs, rather than their own conscience. The Minister of Northern Affairs continues to suggest that he did—

Point of Order

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

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I know the Member is debating the budget, and I know he has liberty to cover a wide cross section of issues, but the Member is reflecting on a decision, not a decision that you have made, but an issue that has caused a lot of heat and a lot of discussion in Question Period. The Minister has fully explained his actions and has offered a full apology.

I am wondering why the Member opposite continues to draw into his remarks veiled threats. That is a serious, serious allegation, and I think the Member, and the fact that he is using budget speech at this time, is imputing motives on a Member and he cannot in any way get away with that type of action.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair did not hear the remarks that the Honourable Government House Leader has brought forward. I will take this opportunity to take this matter under advisement. I will peruse Hansard and I will return back to the House with a clarification.

* * *

Mr. Storle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Minister's interjection will not be deducted from my time.

I will only add one further remark, and this is a serious remark. The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) and I have known each other for a long time, and the Minister has never said, other than he was a partisan politician, and indeed he is, we are all partisan in this Chamber, but there is a difference between partisan and jokingly saying to someone in northern Manitoba: Well, we will just have to see how the vote goes. Informal comments that are -(interjection)- constantly, Mr. Speaker—and I know the people that the Minister of Northern Affairs is dealing with. I have known them for 15 and 20 years, and they know that they are subtly being intimidated.

It may be in a joking fashion and it may not even be the Minister's intention, but the fact is that is going on.

I raised questions today, and I asked for the Minister of Northern Affairs' resignation from that portfolio because the people in my constituency have no confidence that their issues and their concerns will be dealt with fairly and honestly and on their merits, and not on the politics of the region.

I am going to leave it at that. It is a serious comment, and I want the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) to take those comments seriously. I will leave it there and we will see whether the First Minister, in this instance, has the intestinal fortitude to act the way I believe, and many on this side and in my constituency believe, he should.

Mr. Speaker, the budget—I have said on other occasions that this budget is very much like the throne speech. It is very much like the elections campaign itself; it is very much like the Filmon team; it is very much like the Premier himself. This budget has no direction, no direction whatsoever and no substance. It is a budget that is going nowhere. It does not deal with the genuine concerns of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). It does not deal with the concerns that we have for the fact that working people are losing their jobs day by day by day. It does not deal with the fact that our economic base is being eroded by the Free Trade Agreement, by the federal Government and by the inaction of this Government. It does not deal with the real concerns that families have for the education of their children, certainly in regions of our province that are less fortunate than the City of Winnipeg. It does not deal with a whole host of real problems that people are facing across this province, and every region of the province, and every town and city.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has shown not only no imagination, they have shown no willingness to create within the province and across this country, a determination to do something about the problems that we face.

The Minister of Finance, in his former role as critic—Finance Critic—said on many occasions to the then NDP Government, quit whining about federal Government cutbacks, quit attacking the federal Government because they are cutting back on health and education funding, quit attacking the Government because the equalization formula has been reduced, quit attacking the Government for

their policies. They are doing what they were elected to do, govern.

Mr. Speaker, we said then and I say quite honestly to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), this is still a country. We are part of a country. We deserve national policies that are in the best interests of the country, not the corporate elite of this country. That is the problem.

Until we see some determination on the part of the First Minister to not act like some diplomatic door mat, we are going to see policies initiated by the federal Government that impact people in Winnipeg, Brandon, Dauphin, Swan River, Flin Flon, and South Indian Lake. Deregulation of the communications industry is only the latest example, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my community are facing telephone rate increases on basic telephone services of 66 percent. In other communities, it is going to be higher than that. We have gone from the principle of a Crown corporation providing a basic level of service at a basic cost to every member of our society, to a situation where it is user pay. In this case the smaller community, the more remote the community, the higher the price tag. A result of deregulation of our telecommunications industry.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about the impact of deregulation of the transportation industry on communities like Flin Flon, and Thompson, and The Pas, other northern communities, who have seen jet service disappear in those communities, have seen the price of air transportation more than double. Today, to get to Flin Flon or Thompson costs \$500 for a round trip. The citizens of Winnipeg can travel to Toronto for 20 percent of that almost, return.

Deregulation is killing our regions. This Government continues to sit on its hands. It does not seem to believe that it has any role to play in formulating national policy. I implore the front bench to take some initiative. Do not be door mats for federal policies just because they come from the Conservative Government in Ottawa, just because they are cronies of yours, just because you have known them. Their policies are wrong for the Province of Manitoba, and they are wrong for the country. Do something about it.

The First Minister, today, was decrying the fact that we have lost funding for education programs

because of the elimination of the Northern Development Agreement. We have lost money for mining, and forestry, and transportation, cultural industries. It is not good enough to shrug and say we have lost it. We want some initiative. We want some leadership on those important questions.

*(1110)

We know that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) cannot be expected to carry the weight of all those provincial programs on his back and then carry the federal Government programs as well, but what we do expect is that the Minister of Finance and this Government will be forthright enough to deal aggressively with, not only the federal Government, but the other provincial Premiers, the other First Ministers of this country.

We need some leadership on important issues, education not the least of which. We are losing opportunities for hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of northern people, Mr. Speaker—hundreds and hundreds of northern people, people who could be trained to be professionals, to be nurses and social workers and teachers and go back and support their communities and provide leadership and role models for those people in those communities.

If we lose these opportunities, Mr. Speaker, we are giving up on a generation of people in northern Manitoba, aboriginal people, Metis people, people in our smaller communities who for the first time have come to believe that there may be a future for them in those communities, who can aspire finally to something greater than subsistence living.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked about the Free Trade Agreement, probably the greatest single threat to the Province of Manitoba of the last generation, the greatest single threat, and we have seen no response from this Government. Since this Government took office we have not seen one single analysis of the impact of free trade, no comprehensive review, no comprehensive study of the implications, the ramifications of the Free Trade Agreement. Do we believe for a minute that there are no implications? Is it just circumstance, serendipity that our manufacturing industries are leaving the province? Can the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) stand in their place and tell me today that that manufacturing base is going to come back to the Province of Manitoba?

I said when free trade started in 1987, when we first started the discussions, that the food processing industry was gone. We are not going to have one in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the trade results, the trade statistics comparing 1988 when we did not have free trade and 1989 when we do have free trade support that.

We have seen a 30 percent reduction, Mr. Speaker, in primary industry, we have seen a 36 percent reduction in manufacturing trade, we have seen a 47 percent reduction in the retail trade and wholesale trade as a result of the Free Trade Agreement. We have to have our own strategy.

Mr. Speaker, the budget of Industry, Trade and Tourism has declined. In real dollars it has declined much more than on paper. There is no sense from this Government that it is attempting to come to grips with the reality that we face as a province. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has not only failed in terms of coming to grips with the deficit of the province, he has failed on the other side to put money to develop initiatives which are going to create the economic circumstances in the province which will contribute revenue, see our revenues start to grow again beyond what it is, double what it is, and we are not going to get that unless we take those initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is a failure. If this budget were a book—it would be slim pickings if it was a book—but if it was a book, I am not sure, quite honestly, whether it would be a comedy or a tragedy. In either case it is not good enough.

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): I rise to speak in favour of the budget presented earlier by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). This does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with every item that is in the budget, but we are a team, we have to make concessions and we have to give and take.

Before I speak on the budget, Mr. Speaker, I may be permitted to make a few observations. First of all, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on being re-elected to your position in this House, and I can say without fear of contradiction that you are, indeed, the best Speaker that I have ever worked under.

Mr. Speaker, let me also congratulate Madam Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Dacquay) elected to her position. I would also like to congratulate -(interjection)- my MLA, he woke up. I would also like to congratulate two colleagues who have been

appointed Ministers, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer).

I would also like to congratulate those new Members on both sides of the House that have been elected. I would like to point out, however, that I feel a little lost in that the former Member for Burrows and the former Member for Radisson were not re-elected, and I have nothing against those good Members that were elected in their place; but their defeat relieves me of not being the oldest Member of this House. The former Member for Burrows and the former Member for Radisson were older than I am, and now I have the distinction of being the elder statesman of this House, and I wish that the Members across the way would treat me with the respect due the elders in this House. A little more respect.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on, I would like to also mention a few things that happened recently, some of the comments that have been made by the Members of the Opposition. I was at the twentieth Assembly of Northern Communities yesterday together with my colleagues, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings), the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), and I must say that the best reception and the loudest reception was reserved for the Minister of Northern Affairs. I must say also that time and time again, the speakers at the assembly gave praise to the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) for the work that he is doing for them and had done for them and will continue to do for them. So, let them not say that the Minister of Northern Affairs is not doing the job that he was elected to do.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

I have heard Members of the Opposition, Mr. Acting Speaker, talk about the GST, and the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) said that 90 percent of the people of Canada are opposed to the GST. Now I want to ask him: Where are the 10 percent? I do not know of anybody, I have never spoken with anybody that approves of a new tax. I do not like a new tax. I have no difficulty opposing a new tax, but Governments have to have money. I have no problem with the tax, but I do have a difficulty with imposing a new tax before expenditures are under control. That is where we differ, I think, from the federal Government. I do

believe that our expenditures are under control, and the federal Government's expenditures are not under control.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to ask the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) where he gets his tickets to Toronto, because I have not been able to get a ticket in recent years, return to Toronto, for \$100.00. So there is something either wrong with my travel agent or with his arithmetic.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the fact that I do not drive a Government car should have nothing to do with this speech here today. I do not drive a Government car because I do not have room in my garage for it.

If I had my druthers, and I have said this to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) before, I would cap the interest that the province would pay in any one year at 8 percent of the total revenue.

An Honourable Member: Why does the budget not bring it in?

* (1120)

Mr. Neufeld: I have said already, Mr. Acting Speaker, I do not agree with everything that is in the budget; of course, I do not. If I agreed with everything in the budget, I could be a robot; I could be a computer. No, I do not agree. I think I have the latitude to speak on the budget if I disagree with it. I have said I will disagree with some points, but on balance I do agree. I am a team player. I have input into the budget as a Member of the Treasury Bench. I have input into the budget as a Member of the Cabinet, and the fact that I do not win every one does not take away from the fact that in whole I support that budget.

Mr. Acting Speaker, Governments must be accountable, and I do believe that accountability has to go down to the agencies that Governments appoint. In the end, if the agencies are not accountable, Government cannot be accountable. It is my view that we must make our agencies more accountable—if the Page can come here and give me a cup that does not leak, then I would—

An Honourable Member: My cup runneth over.

Mr. Neufeld: Well, no, it just—this is an NDP cup. There is a hole in this cup, Mr. Acting Speaker, and I cannot carry on with water running down the desk.

Mr. Acting Speaker, Governments are no different from families. Families must control their expenditures so that they do not go broke. Governments must control their expenditures so

that they do not go broke. The only difference is a couple of zeros. Like in families, all children are not equal; in Governments, all departments are not equal; all territories are not equal; all regions are not equal. We must try to help those who are less able to help themselves. There is—

An Honourable Member: Like the North.

Mr. Neufeld: Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker, the North, when it is not able to help themselves, must be helped. Indeed, when Lynn Lake faced the closure of a mine, the Government did step in to help. The Government stepped in to help with the budget for the town. The Government stepped in to help with the communities, the community clubs. The Government stepped in to help with relocation. The Government stepped in to help with legal services provided to the workers who needed the services at that time. Yes, when help is needed, we are there to help.

Let it not be said that the Conservatives do not care. We have proven I think without any doubt that we care. We care more than most. I will not say we care more than the NDP because I do not know their views. I only know the views that they speak of, but we have to think of the people who pay the taxes as well, we cannot only think of the people who require the assistance. I have no difficulty helping those who need the help, help them over a hurdle, help them for education, help them in health, but I have a great deal of difficulty helping those who do not want to help themselves, who are there only to drink at the public trough.

There was a sign on a marquee on Henderson Highway some years ago that said—and I think I have it right—everybody wants to eat at the Government table, but nobody wants to do the dishes. Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, the dishes must be done. It is in that regard I think we have to put controls into place.

I can give you any number of examples where efficiencies have cost us money—or lack of efficiencies have cost us money. Good management includes good efficiencies. If we do not have good management, we have cost overruns that need not be there; we have abuses to the system that need not be there. Let us face it, we all know of horror stories of abuses, and I will mention a few.

A lot has been said by the other side of the House about child care. Now I am in favour of helping those

families that have to have two incomes, and so we will look after the children while the two parents are working, I am not in favour, Mr. Acting Speaker, of helping families with \$100,000 a year income so they can support a lifestyle that working people sometimes cannot with one member working families.

I do not support the caring of children for those people who want exotic holidays, two cars, three TV sets and cottages at the lake. That is not what Government is here for. Government is here to help those people over hurdles that require two-worker families for a period of time that will help them over a hurdle, help them buy a house, help them in times of need, but not for luxury items.

I have had a constituent almost in tears, because she said she has three children; her husband works very, very hard in order to support them. It is their choice that she stay home with her children, because in their case they think it is the preferred route. She says she gets awfully upset when her husband's hard-earned tax dollars go to paying the child care for those who want the exotic holidays, want the cottage at the lake and want the two cars. That happens, even where the parent pays the full amount in a Government day care. It costs Government \$14 each and every day for each and every child. That is not right. I think something must be done in order to alleviate that situation. Something must be done so that monies can be spent in areas where the need is indeed there.

I can talk about home care. A \$4 million experiment a few years ago is now a \$51 million annual budget, and the complaint is that it is not high enough. Spend more.

When I was Minister responsible for Seniors—and I use that word advisedly, because everything that happened in this House I was responsible for, for about one year until I was relieved of that responsibility.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the NDP of the day told of horror stories of people who were being cutoff home care, elderly women being cutoff home care, elderly couples being cut off home care, and I asked for names. Finally, I received five names, five names of people who had complained to the NDP Caucus that their home care had been cut.

I went to see every one of those five people. One was older than I am, one. One said she had not really complained for herself, but there were other

people in the block she lived in, who had complained to her. Another, when I asked whether they had children that might help out, said the children had their own problems. When I asked if the husband was retired—he was younger than I, healthy looking—why he could not help, and she says that is not man's work. I am sure that will sit well with some of the new Members in this House.

A third one I went to, the lady had a very neat apartment. She was 55 years old but said that she had an asthmatic condition. If she vacuumed the floor, she became short of breath and she had to sit down. She had all day to do this, so my sympathies were not entirely with her. At 55, she was able to drive a car, she was able to go shopping, she was able to look after her grandchildren, but she was not able to vacuum the floor. I have no sympathy for people who do not want to do their own housework, expect Government to do it for them.

Only one person had a legitimate complaint, and that complaint was taken up with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), who is in charge of that program.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) brought a lady into this building with TV cameras, with the newspaper reporters, for a full-fledged press conference. This lady had been cut off. She was over 90 years old. She had been cut off home care. Now on the surface, it would seem as though this was a legitimate case. Then some reporter made the mistake and said, well, can you afford to pay your own? The daughter said, yes, of course we can, but why should we?

Why should we, indeed, if we are capable? I have a mother who is 89 years old, and she qualifies both in terms of income and age, for home care, but she says I can pay my own. I do not need it. I think that is the pride that we should instill in all people in this province. We have lost, we have lost pride. We must regain that. We have lost the will to work. We must regain that. It is an educational process. -(interjection)-

* (1130)

I did not hear that. Jobs, let us talk about jobs. Jobs are not created by Government. Government has never created a job in its life. Jobs are created by industry, by business. Government creates a climate. The only thing Government can create is climate, and if you do not create the right climate you will not get the jobs. -(interjection)-

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

I have seen more job creation and I have seen more job losses than most of you have probably collectively in my time. Jobs are created by industry who search out a climate where they wish to locate. If you do not give them the climate, there are many, many areas in this world, in North America, indeed, in Canada, where they can go in preference to Manitoba, if we do not have the same climate that they have. Indeed, that is the position of this Government and that is why we are reducing taxes. That is why we want to create a labour climate that is conducive to the employment of more and more people, conducive to the creation of jobs. Those are permanent jobs.

Let us talk about the Jobs Fund. My goodness, I just about forgot the Jobs Fund—jobs created. Before I was involved in Government, I used to see those pretty green signs all over, Jobs Fund, the number of jobs that were created. In my constituency, because the seat happened to be held by the Minister of Finance, there were a lot of green signs. I can name several instances where the jobs that were created were by the members of organizations who did the work themselves in their spare time. This is job creation. Let us not forget job creation.

The members of the organization did the work, got paid for it, and the notice went out that so many jobs were created as a result of this program. There was always a condition attached. You must have a meeting of the members—a coffee party—to which you must invite the Minister of Finance and the Premier of the province.

So the Jobs Fund, in my view—and this goes back to before I was involved in Government at all, before I had any intention of running for office—was a way of campaigning with our funds. These are our funds.

Government has no money. Government collects taxes from you and I and spends it on something or somebody else. It is our money that they are giving to those, in many instances, who do not want to work. Let us call a spade a spade. When I walk down Broadway at noon hour on a nice summer's day, I see any number of people and I see the same young people every day on the dole. They do not want to work. I am supposed to support them. I ask you, Mr. Acting Speaker, why should I support them?

An Honourable Member: How do you know they do not want to work?

Mr. Neufeld: Well, if they are capable of working, why do they not work?

I ask you if there is not any case of abuse in the system, in the welfare system; I ask you, are there cases of abuse? If there are not, then I am mistaken but, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have been around long enough to know that there are many, many instances where there is abuse and if we cut out the abuses we would have enough money to deliver all the programs that are wanted by the other side.

Let us talk about housing. We have a proliferation of housing programs. We cannot cut out a program; it is impossible to cut out a program because immediately the Opposition comes up and says: You have cut something and, unfortunately the press takes it from there and accuses the Government of cutting programs. Programs must be reviewed from time to time.

We had in our department a CHEC Loan Program. We reviewed it, found it was not doing the job, we cut it out. I have been taken to task for having cut out our CHEC Loan Program but, Mr. Acting Speaker, if the program is not doing the job that it was intended to do, should it not be reviewed, should it not be cut, should not the money be spent in areas where it may do more good?

In housing I do not know how many programs we have but there are several dozen programs in housing. How many do we need? We need one. If you need help come and see us; that is the only one we need. Why do we need so many programs? Each program has a bureaucracy attached to it, each program has a budget, each program has a critic, each program has to be delivered and cannot be cut because—

An Honourable Member: Government needs help.

Mr. Neufeld: Government needs help, right, Government needs help. Mr. Acting Speaker, we can deliver a housing program to the needy at far less cost than we are now delivering if we were not taken to task every time we want to make a change. The Opposition and the press will pick on any reduction in budget and equate that to a reduction in programs. A reduction in budget, a reduction in expenditures or lapses is not necessarily a reduction in programming. A lapse could be efficient because of good management, through gains in efficiency.

Why can we not save money for the Government, or for the people of Manitoba, by being efficient? Is there something wrong with that? If we lapse any money—and the Minister of Health was taken to task again yesterday for having lapsed money in the Home Care Program—is there something wrong with becoming more efficient? I mean, tell me, am I walking down the wrong street? I do believe that efficiency is not something we should sneer at; efficiency is something we should applaud.

I will talk -(interjection)- Ah, he talks about brains. Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker, let me tell the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) that some years ago, I suffered a cardiac arrest. As you know, when that happens you need a jump-start and, as you know, if it takes too long to give you that jump-start, there is lack of oxygen to the brain. I have expert medical opinion that I do not have brain damage. I want to ask the Member for Thompson whether he will submit to such a test. -(interjection)-

I have to admit that I was correctly quoted, but it was having to sit with the Member for Thompson, with the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), my own MLA. You have to have an excuse other than I want to run. Who is going to believe me that I want to run if I have to sit with Members from across the way? My own MLA who does not see me. My own MLA. I never see him from one election to another, and then he only comes to the door to see if he can get my vote. My goodness, is it not time that the MLAs in this House started to look after their own constituents?

An Honourable Member: He has taken your vote for granted.

* (1140)

Mr. Neufeld: He has taken my vote for granted, as the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) says, and I want him never to do that again.

(Mr. Speaker, in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about multiculturalism, and I can. My parents immigrated to Canada in 1926. There is nothing wrong in preserving your own culture and preserving your own language, but I think there is something wrong for the public purse to pay for that. I think if you are interested in preserving your culture, you should pay for it yourself.

An Honourable Member: Is this Government policy?

Mr. Neufeld: This is my policy, and I will defend that. I think I can because my parents immigrated to Canada in 1926. They did not speak a word of English, they had no job, they had debt. They came here to start a new life, to start over. They came here because of persecution in another country. They came here and they worked.

The one thing they wanted to do is start a new life. They loved their country, they loved their God, they loved their family and they worked. When it came to preserving language and preserving culture, they paid themselves. They were prepared to, and if you want to preserve your culture, if you want it badly enough, you will pay your own. Why should those of us who -(interjection)- I have made the statement, and I will remind the Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) that I have made that statement, and I have made it time and time again. I will tell him also that my constituents by and large believe that. They believe that, they should.

The financing of cultural programs leads to splits in the country. Every group is out after their own funds. Everyone wants funds. Nobody is prepared to go out and pay themselves. They expect Government—and Government is nobody else than the people, the people who pay the taxes—they expect the people that pay the taxes to pay for their cultural needs, for their language needs.

I do not believe that is right and, I think, I am entitled to that opinion. Why should -(interjection)- pardon?

An Honourable Member: Are you against all multicultural funding?

Mr. Neufeld: I am against multicultural funding, yes. Yes, I am against multicultural funding. If you—I am entitled to an opinion. Multicultural funding ends up as—the WASPS, if you like, are funding everybody else. They do not get funded. That is what happens. On average the German community has received 15 cents per person in cultural funding. The French community has received something like \$15 per person. I think if you are going to fund them, fund them equally.

I think that the aboriginal people have a case, but I do think the aboriginal people also have to come to the table and put all their demands on the table, put all their needs on the table, and not hedge, and when they sign an agreement, when they come to an agreement, let it be all, not time and time again

come for more. I think that is maybe not totally in all cases—(interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, do we want to have a province that is united? We have many different cultures in this province. Do we want them united or do we want them apart? I think we must have them united. There is no such thing as a number of states within a state. You cannot have that. As soon as you start your funding, you are going to have series of states; that is a fact whether you agree with it or not. I think that Government—(interjection)—

No, I do not agree with the size of the deficit. I would like to see the size of the deficit reduced, and so would the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). How can you agree that an additional \$283 million of debt can be good for the province? We also know that in times like this, in difficult times, we have to bring in programs and when we do not have enough funds we have to borrow. It was always that way. In the seven good years you put it away; in the seven bad years you bring it back. That is what the good book says and, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with that. We have, unfortunately, had seven good years in which monies were borrowed instead of paid back. Now, we have to borrow in difficult times and that is not the way things should work. We should be in a position to borrow now and not have to borrow on top of the borrowings of the past six years, or the six years prior to our taking office.

The only thing we can hear from that side of the House is tax; tax the corporations more; tax the rich more. Now, how much can you tax? If you tax the rich 100 percent, you would not gain an awful lot of money in this province. I hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) time and time again saying, the corporations have paid less and the individuals have paid more in tax. Well, that tells me only one thing in the knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that there have been no tax increases in Manitoba, corporate tax increases. There has indeed been an individual tax decrease. That tells me the earnings in corporations are down, and the earnings of individuals are up. That is the only reason we can have increased taxes.

An Honourable Member: The logic escapes him.

Mr. Neufeld: Well, the logic is, Mr. Speaker, that if in Manitoba the corporate taxes are up, or down rather, and the individual taxes are up, that means that the corporate incomes are down and the individual incomes are up. It is the only way

of—there has not been a change in tax rates, so it must be on the income side of the equation.

I think they are going back to job creation. We must bring in a program, Mr. Speaker, that is going to create a climate for the industry to want to come to Manitoba. We cannot buy them to come to Manitoba. We cannot compete with the Albertas, we cannot compete with the Ontarios in money. We cannot compete with the American states in money. We have to have a climate that is going to bring them here. We have the natural resources. We have the power. We have the labour force. We have to have the business climate. At this point in time, I suggest to you, we do not have a sufficient business climate, a good enough business climate to attract enough people. We must change that and are in the process of changing that, and will change it before our term of office is up.

Mr. Speaker, there are many difficulties facing this Government. Very few of those difficulties can be overcome by legislation. Education is what we need. We need education, not in terms of book learning, but education in people's minds. We have to change people's mind-set. We cannot carry on with the division between the aboriginal people and the rest of society. We must bring them together. They must come into the mainstream. They must come in and be part of the community. We have one Manitoba. We have one Canada. We cannot have two.

Mr. Speaker, difficulties have been expressed frequently in this House by the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis). The earnings of women are not that of men. That may well be so, but legislation will not change that. Education will change that. Anything you cannot do by education, you will never do by legislation. You cannot change people's—(interjection)— Karl Marx said that in later years though.

I think it is important. I am the father of two daughters, and I think it is important for them that they have the same opportunities that they would have if they were my sons. I do believe that one of them at least has learned that—and she told me the other day—there are many inequities still but not at her level, not in the professional world. In the professional world, she is getting paid more than most male peers of hers, substantially more.

* (1150)

Statistics are for losers, or as we used to say in the accounting business, figures do not lie, but liars

figure. I am in agreement with the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcyia-Leis). I am in agreement that there are inequities, but I cannot join her in her thinking that we can eliminate those inequities through legislation. That is through education.

I want to speak very briefly on pay equity. Pay equity and equal pay for equal work are two different things. I want to talk about personal care homes, personal care homes that the former Government funded, in some instances 20 percent less for wages in some care homes than for others. What was their sin? What was their sin? Their sin was they were not union shops. So the non-union shops were funded 20 percent less than the union shops in spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, they paid union wages. Now you tell me about pay equity. You tell me about pay equity. That is hypocritical. I cannot believe they will come up and stand in this House and demand pay equity when they did things like that.

An Honourable Member: You signed in Hydro.

Mr. Neufeld: Whatever has been signed in Hydro, has been signed in Hydro.

An Honourable Member: You do not believe in pay equity?

Mr. Neufeld: I do not believe that you can go into a business and say this job is worth as much as this job.

An Honourable Member: Why did you open the legislation?

Mr. Neufeld: I was not here when the legislation was brought in.

An Honourable Member: Would you have voted against it?

Mr. Neufeld: That is something we do not know. That is a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think that I have to answer that.

I will tell you about pay equity. Pay equity, in some instances—Hydro created a 23 percent increase for people who had their contracts negotiated by their union. Is that fairness? I ask you about fairness. There is a case in Hydro where a young woman wanted to upgrade herself to a technician. She spent many years in night school, received her diploma, and found out that the young woman who took her job received within a dollar a week of what she was getting. That is pay equity. That is pay equity.

Fairness is not where clerical positions in Hydro are paid as much as linemen. Clerical positions are

those where there is no experience, no educational requirements. The line men have to have three years of training before they can become a journeyman lineman. Journeyman linemen have to go out in blizzards, they have to go out in storms and fix lines. That is a dangerous position. That is not considered pay equity.

I will tell you how they considered pay equity, and how they brought the clerical position into the same level as linemen. They said, somebody came in and said, how many times do you have to come to the counter? Now each trip to the counter -(interjection)- that is true. Each trip to the counter is a stress situation, and through these stress situations, their position was upgraded to that where it was almost equal to that of a lineman. Now that creates, at best, morale difficulties in any firm.

An Honourable Member: Time is up.

Mr. Neufeld: Mr. Speaker, I will say only one more thing. If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem.

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, on a point of order.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) was, as put colloquially, in full flight. We were finding his remarks very interesting, and we are prepared to grant leave for the Minister to continue his speech if he wishes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. The Honourable Minister has 30 seconds remaining.

* * *

Mr. Neufeld: I would be happy to help the Members out on the other side, but I do have a rather important outside engagement.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it is going to be difficult, indeed, to follow the eloquence of the Member who has just spoken ahead of me. I must apologize to my friends in the Opposition Party. I do not believe I will be quite as scintillating as the prior speaker, but I do hope that they will enjoy my comments. -(interjection)- That is correct. The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) says, I never am. That is true.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak today on the budget put forward by the

Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) just a couple of days ago. I am, along with my colleagues, pleased to support the amendment put forward by our Party, which I believe accurately indicates some of the major, certainly not all, but certainly the major flaws within this Budget Address by the Minister of Finance.

Let me start by, I believe, exploring and hopefully exploding the myth which is perpetrated by this Government and their federal counterparts that they are fiscally responsible, that they are people who somehow have a handle on the deficit situation, really know how to handle money, and they detest incurring future deficits because in their own words—and I want to quote from the eloquence of the Speech from the Throne, I think they put it very well: The Government recognizes—this is on page 4 of the Speech from the Throne—the deficits merely represent delayed taxes. Already we must spend over \$500 million a year just to cover the interest on previous deficits. That is an accurate statement, I believe. Deficits represent future taxes. They are a mortgage on the future, which our children and our children's children will have to pay.

Let not this Government or their federal counterparts or Conservatives, generally, worldwide say that they somehow have reduced deficits, that they are responsible fiscal managers. Mr. Speaker, anything but. By 1992, when Mr. Mulroney comes up for re-election, three-quarters, fully three-quarters, of the federal debt will have been caused under his administration. We hear long and hard comments about the deficit growth under the Trudeau Government, but three-quarters of the national debt will be attributable to Mr. Mulroney's regime when he is finished in 1992.

Now we hear this Government saying that they are fiscally responsible, that they have done us a good turn in these last three years by being in Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe—and I do stand to be corrected—I looked, perhaps not as thoroughly as I could have, but I looked and the last balanced budget that I could see was 1975. It certainly has not occurred since the early -(interjection)- The Member for Concordia, the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Doer) says balanced budget in '88-89.

Now truly we could have balanced the budget; in fact, we had a surplus, but because of the concocting of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund we had

a deficit. Why? So the graph would look better, plain and simple, the graph would look better.

We are reducing the deficit and we sure know now why we did not get this budget pre the election we have just gone through. We certainly know well and clear that the strategy which was denied by the Government, but was articulated by both of the Opposition Parties, that this was a budget which would not sit well with the people of Manitoba. We know that those accusations were true today, Mr. Speaker. We see a deficit, in real terms, of \$383 million in this fiscal year. That represents future interest payments for as long as anybody can predict because we do not see any sign of balancing a budget, future interest payments in the neighbourhood of \$38 million to \$40 million. That is indefinitely as far as anyone in this province could reasonably predict. We have no indication that a balanced budget is anywhere in sight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only make those points to illustrate to Members that the Government can lay no claim to fiscal responsibility in this province. They go out and tell people that they know how to handle their money. They go out and tell people these deficits are terrible, and then they come in and they create \$383 million deficits which they reduce fictitiously by a \$100 million payment from the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. It was, plain and simple, sleight of hand back when that fund was created, and it is sleight of hand today.

* (1200)

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on to talk about the budget in some detail in the departments which I represent our Party as the critic. Firstly, let me turn to the Department of the Environment, and this department probably of all departments that I have a direct interest in as a critic does offer some very interesting indications of where this Government is going and how it really feels about the environment and that is illustrated through this department. I do not say that money is everything, I do not say that if you threw money at the environment you would solve the problems, the environmental problems in this province, I do not say that, but what I do say is that the spending priorities of this Government can reasonably and accurately be assessed by what they have done in this department, and in the Estimates process we will look for some explanations in greater detail for these concerns.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

Let me start by indicating that out of the 21 departments of Government, the Department of the Environment finishes third from the bottom, out of 21 they finish 19th, in terms of spending. Total budget is \$13 million; the only two departments which have less of a commitment from this Government, in real terms, are Fitness and Sport, which has a budget of under a million dollars, and Corporate and Consumer Affairs, which has a budget of roughly \$9 million. So that is a starting point about this Government's commitment to the Department of the Environment.

Now, within the budget document itself, we see that the increase for this year is some \$742,000.00. Madam Deputy Speaker, that increase is not only accounted for, but more than that increase is accounted for by an \$800,000 payment to the International Institute for Sustainable Development. That institute is obviously a worthy cause for this province. That institute we were told was going to be paid for by the federal Government. I gather it is not. We do not know, as yet, the full extent of the federal commitment to this program. We hope that it reaches the initial press release figures and the hopes driven up by numerous press conferences, both involving this Government and this Premier, and the Government in Ottawa.

I personally have very little doubt that it is going to fall far short of that at the federal level, and I wonder if the commitment at this stage, while welcome, does not represent an acknowledgment that the federal Government is retrenching its position on the environmental centre in this province, and is pulling back from an international commitment through this centre in Winnipeg to the environment and the environmental process.

In any event, my friend, the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), indicated at least, or was quoted as indicating, that it very much should not be here in this budget document under the Department of Environment. I do not agree with that. I think that it is an appropriate expenditure and it is appropriately listed within this department.

That does not take away from the fact that once you take out that grant to the institute you have a Department of Environment which has suffered a loss of some \$58,000 in revenues in a commitment from this Government. Not only has the 4.5 to 5

percent inflation rate, which is attributable to salaries and other expenditures in this department—not only is that not accounted for, but you have a further incursion into this department of some \$58,000.00. This department in a very real sense has been slashed.

Madam Deputy Speaker, going further under the headings of the Clean Environment Commission and the Manitoba Environmental Council, both of them represent increases, but very marginal increases. I look at the budget for the Clean Environment Commission, and I see that they in all likelihood have received one further staff person, which accounts for the increase of some \$37,000 in that appropriation.

If we know anything in the environmental area in this country, we know that the work of the public arm of the Government, the arm's length bodies, which go out and do the environmental assessments, have a future of enormous growth. Environmental Impact Assessments are being called for on the major projects and they are lengthy indeed, but they are also being called for on even the smaller projects.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we know that even in this province we are seeing increased desire and demands for the involvement of bodies like the Clean Environment Commission and the Manitoba Environmental Council. Whether or not they are listened to is another matter, and a matter in which this Government has given us a clear indication they are not particularly willing to do, with specific respect most recently to the Oak Hammock Marsh decision. These bodies have received marginal, very marginal increases, and I would suggest that in the coming year that is a grave error on the part of this Government.

We very much need to open up the environmental assessment process. This Government has made commitments in numerous, very nice looking brochures, and in numerous press conferences and press releases about opening up the process and being environmentally conscious and doing this, that and the other thing, but when push comes to shove we see an absolute lack of credibility on environmental issues. We see an absolute denial of everything that they have stated, which is that the public should be involved and the public should be welcome. That takes the appropriate bodies sitting there listening to them and in some cases granting intervenor funding. That is not obviously in the works from this Government.

Madam Deputy Speaker, moving on to the Hazardous Waste Corporation, which shows a budget decrease of some \$500,000, I believe 20 percent, I initially saw that and was quite disturbed, because, of course, that corporation as well is slated and of necessity is going to have increased workload in this coming year. They have many projects which are going to require an enormous amount of public consultation and research and analysis. To see a decrease of that extent in the budget is a grave concern.

Now I have since been advised—and I took the time to investigate that decrease—that the representatives of the corporation have indeed come up with some explanations. They say that monies come from some other source. At this point, I would not want to indicate or to publicly admonish the Government for that cut if that cut is being made up in some other way. I do not know if it is. The indication is coming from the corporation that it is.

We will wait until the Estimates process to hear that explanation. I can tell you if that explanation is not satisfactory with respect to the ongoing and the increasing work of that corporation, this Government will be held to account by many of the communities in this province which are facing hazardous waste problems. Of course, those problems are increasing both on a federal level, specifically with respect to nuclear waste, and on a provincial level with respect to other hazardous waste products.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me take a few minutes and reflect on the Rafferty-Alameda project and what we have been through in this province. I will ask for some latitude from Honourable Members to refer to that in this address. While it is certainly not directly tied to an appropriation in the budget, I think it does fit in with my concerns about the environmental commitment of this Government.

Manitobans and Canadians have now witnessed the virtual completion of the Rafferty dam. That is despite two federal court of Canada orders in the last 18 months. That is indeed a depressing spectacle for those in this country who want our laws to be upheld, and more than that, want the environment to be protected. I think Canadians can quite correctly ask what has happened, that despite two federal court orders—the highest court in the land aside from the Supreme Court of Canada—but the federal court of Canada despite that, this dam is going to be completed illegally, not by private

enterprise but by a Government of this country, the Government of Saskatchewan.

*(1210)

The explanation for that in view of the fact that two out of the three Governments involved have on various occasions expressed a large desire to see this overall project completed and the third Government, that is the Manitoba Government, has gone back and forth and back and forth on whether or not they support this project. They started July 27, 1988. The then Minister of the Environment, now Minister of Workplace, Health and Safety and the Workers Compensation Board (Mr. Connery), indicated discussions were going on between the Government of the United States and the federal authorities. He was correct.

The Government of Saskatchewan was also involved in those discussions. Madam Deputy Speaker, the question is, where was the Government of Manitoba in those discussions? We have the United States negotiating on behalf of North Dakota. We have the Saskatchewan Water Corporation and a Minister of the Crown in Saskatchewan negotiating on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan. The absence of the Province of Manitoba in those discussions is glaring and calls out for an explanation, because those decisions back then are directly related to the dilemma that we face now in Manitoba, that dilemma being that a dam which can affect and will affect our water quality and quantity is two or three days from completion.

It will be operational by the spring, according to Premier Devine, and, frankly, I believe him. He would know. He says he is going to be able to finish that dam, and he will. Where has Manitoba been? The agreement back in August of '89 between Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada made virtually no mention of the Province of Manitoba, despite the fact that we are the ones downstream. North Dakota is downstream, and they were included.

Manitoba is the ultimate recipient. We are downstream, and we were not included ever. That was by design of this Government, Madam Deputy Speaker. That was benign neglect. That was a decision to stay out of this because the decision had been made that it was good for Manitoba, and for whatever reason in 1988, this Government chose to play ball with their federal counterparts and cozy up

to the Government of Saskatchewan and be a part implicitly, if not explicitly, of the deals that were cut.

Two months later, in October of 1989, the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada signed a deal. That deal is an international document which the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Saskatchewan could not have been a party to because international documents are not within their jurisdiction. However, that document very clearly articulates the protections for the Province of Saskatchewan and the responsibilities of the Government of Saskatchewan to produce studies and information on the effects of the project on the wildlife, on the water quality, on the rare plants in that area. Yet Manitoba is mentioned, I believe, once in that entire agreement, and it is obviously not a party to the discussions which led up to that agreement.

The State of North Dakota had very good representation. They had representation from their federal Government. It is clear that they are being protected time and time again as you read through that agreement, all 14 pages of it. The Province of Saskatchewan was also being protected, and it was also well served. Why? Because first and foremost, the commitment in that agreement is to complete the dam. That is October of 1989. That is right between those two federal court orders that said the dam should not go ahead for environmental reasons. Our federal Government, with the explicit participation of the Government of Saskatchewan and the implicit neglect of the Province of Manitoba, signed the deal committing to build the Rafferty and the Alameda dams and the boundary diversion.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that is how we get to today. That is how we get to the Rafferty dam being just days from completion and this Government saying, as recently as two weeks ago, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province standing up and saying, this is not our problem. This is a federal problem. It is their jurisdiction. They should take care of it. That was two weeks ago. Now we are two days away from the Rafferty dam being completed and they cannot tell us that this has not been their wish.

As early as July of 1988 we had indications from the then Minister of the Environment on record in response to questions from our Environment Critic of the day saying, we think this is good. We have made the decision. This is good for Manitoba. Let us go ahead full steam. Do not worry about those environmental assessments. They just take up time,

take up money, get in the way. If we have to do it, we will do it real quick. We will do it while we are building the dams, and we will not worry about the result. No wonder the panel members quit. They quit because their integrity and their credibility were on the line. How can you be studying the environmental impact of a project which is going ahead, not eight hours a day, not 16 hours a day, 24 hours a day? They are building the dam while you decide whether or not it is good for the natural and the human environment.

Now we see even as late as yesterday, Madam Deputy Speaker, another example—not local but in Quebec—of the federal Government being unwilling to take a real stand and defend the Environment Act. The federal Environment Act is the only instrument which has been effective in bringing home the desire of Canadians to protect their environment, bringing that home to the Governments of the Day.

The federal Environment Act has stood up beyond our wildest expectations. It has been the instrument that has shut down the Oldman River, that has attempted to shut down the Rafferty-Alameda project. It has been the instrument of defending the public right to participate, comment and have their voices heard on major environmental projects.

Now we see, yesterday, the Province of Quebec wants to enter into a similar mega project to divert rivers in that province, and we see the provincial Minister of the Environment in Quebec standing up and saying, let us have a comprehensive environmental assessment. You know, to his credit, he made those comments before he had Cabinet approval. When he went into the Cabinet in Quebec—and we saw this on TV last night—he came out with his tail between his legs, very humiliated, because that Government shot him down and said, “No, we won’t; no, we won’t. We are going to divide this in two,” just like the Government of Saskatchewan did with Repap, “we are going to divide this in two.”

The Government of Quebec said: We are going to go ahead and we are going to build the roads. We are going to build the airport strips, we are going to build everything, all of the accoutrements, everything except the dam. We will do the dam later. -(interjection)- The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) says, those are Liberals. He is correct, those are Liberals.

I am going to get to some comments made by Mr. Blaikie about the New Democrats in this province -(interjection)- Oh, he says he is retired. Maybe the Member for Concordia will illustrate to me, when I get to that, what portions he is retracting. I would be interested to hear that.

An Honourable Member: He had the date wrong.

Mr. Edwards: He had one date wrong. Okay, we will find that date. In the half a page, we will find that date that was wrong.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in any event, we see this Conservative Government, both federally and provincially, retracting abominably from the environmental issues which face them and which Manitobans are very, very concerned about.

Manitobans, I believe, are reasonable people who will not say, no, it definitely should not go ahead. They will not say that at the outset. What they say is, let us have a process which respects our rights to participate, give us the opportunity to find out what the effect of this is going to be and learn enough so that we can make an educated cost-benefit analysis. That is the idea behind Environmental Impact Assessments. What is so threatening about that idea to the Governments of this country? What is so threatening to the three Conservative Governments about studying the impacts of the Rafferty-Alameda project before going ahead?

Madam Deputy Speaker, we know that deals were cut. The tradeoffs were made both with Saskatchewan and, I suspect, this province in order to gain their complicity to whitewash the environmental process set out by the federal Environment Act. I want to commend again the federal Member for Transcona sitting in the House of Commons, Mr. Blaikie, for his forthrightness in coming to grips with the incredible neglect of the New Democratic Government when they were in power, with respect to this Rafferty-Alameda project. It is truly encouraging to see a Member, in this case of the House of Commons, go beyond the partisan politics and come to grips with the failings of his own counterparts here in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to take this opportunity just so that the Members of this House can appreciate the forthrightness of the Member for Transcona. I want to give them an opportunity to hear his words. This comes from the House of Commons Debates of October 16 of this year, and

this was in response to statements by the Member for Ottawa West, the Liberal Member, Deputy Environment Critic, talking about the history of the Rafferty-Alameda dam project. Mr. Blaikie indicates, and this is talking about his colleagues here in Manitoba under the Pawley administration: . . . but the fact remains that I have no desire to defend the passivity with which this issue was dealt with by the NDP Government of that time.

* (1220)

He goes on to say: It was far too passive on a variety of environmental issues, and I believe it is one of the reasons it met the fate it did in 1988. I could spend a lot more time than the Honourable Member has documenting the way in which the Government of the Province of Manitoba at that time, in my judgment, did not pay enough attention and did not have the political will, I was just talking about, that is necessary to deal with the top environmental questions that have to be dealt with.

He goes on to say in the next paragraph, referring specifically to the decisions which have been made under various Governments, that—referring specifically to the New Democratic Government of Ontario—this is the kind of thing the Manitoba NDP Government should have done and did not do.

The forthrightness of that statement, I believe, deserves the respect of all Members in this House. It is truly encouraging when one Member can go beyond partisan interests and roundly criticize his colleagues, albeit his friends, I am sure, in this House.

A lesson to us all, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I look forward in some future address—it was not referenced in either of the responses given by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) in the last couple of weeks—I look forward to his attempting to clarify something here. He has indicated it was false, it has been retracted. Let us find out exactly what was wrong about that.

We see the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), now he wants to play ball with the Opposition—surprise, surprise. He has had a rough day, but lo and behold a couple of hours later he has come around. The marriage of convenience continues in spades, Madam Deputy Speaker, and we see that obviously in this House. We saw it in the last campaign.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me move on to the Department of Justice which I am also privileged to

be the critic of for my Party. I do not have many comments with respect to that department. I look forward to going through the Estimates process in some detail. Let me just -(interjection)- the Member for Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) says more taxation. Let him hear me out. He is going to be perhaps enlightened by this comment.

I see that there was an \$8 million roughly increase in the Department of Justice. What disturbs me, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that virtually all of that came from the Public Prosecutions Branch. We have some very fine prosecutors in this province, but since I have come back into this Legislature I have seen numerous, and I have not actually counted the number, but I have seen probably a dozen of our Crown Attorneys receive quite substantial pay increases.

I am certainly, and I am not afraid to make enemies amongst my brethren in the legal profession as Members know, I have certainly done that before, but -(interjection)- the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) says I have supported judges. He should know it was me who stood up on many occasions talking about the Court of Appeal and that it should be a court of public record. It was me who criticized the appointments which were made in the wake of the "ticketgate affair" to those who had been reprimanded, but let me get back to the public prosecutors who have received quite substantial pay increases, a number of them.

I am going to be looking for an explanation from the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) for those increases because they are making a lot of money. Pretty well everyone that I saw was going to \$73,000.00. These people are professionals, that is true. They deserve a decent living wage, but to have so many come so quickly after this last election taking them up to that top rate of that level which is roughly \$73,000 does suggest to me that there may be a problem in this department, in this branch. Public prosecutions, as I say, is responsible for all of the increase in the Department of Justice.

I am going to be looking for answers. I do not at this point want to say that I outrightly oppose all of those pay increases, but for so many to come so quickly with so much extra money does appear out of line to me, Madam Deputy Speaker. Of course, that is in addition to all of the other benefits which flow to public prosecutors who are attached to their collective agreement that certainly do not flow to those in the private Bar. I might add, to come up with

\$73,000 in the private Bar is not an easy task. That is the criterion on which I base my judgment on and I see that as a lot of money. Certainly some are worth it, but for a dozen or so to experience that increase in a matter of weeks seems somewhat dubious to me.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Department of Natural Resources, of course, is a department which has seen quite a large decrease in budget. That is completely understandable given the forest fire expenditures which had to be made last year. I acknowledge that. I look forward to going through those detailed Estimates with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) when the time presents itself.

Similarly, with respect to Native Affairs, I look forward to going through those Estimates with the Minister. I must say that given the comments today and yesterday by the Minister and by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) with respect to Native issues, I join with my colleagues in the official Opposition in having grave doubts about this Minister's capacity to lead his Party in Native issues. However, Madam Deputy Speaker, we will leave the detailed discussions to the Estimates process.

Let me simply conclude by going back to the original statements made in this address to the effect that one thing we know for sure is that what Conservatives talk about they do not do. We know they think that they would like to be fiscally responsible, but we see sleight of hand, we see continued deficits, we see continually telling people that they can live at this rate, when in fact they cannot. They are going deeper and deeper and deeper into the hole.

The rhetoric about deficits sounds great, but look at the conservative Governments in this world. Look at Ronald Reagan and at Brian Mulroney, who is going to be responsible for three-quarters of the national debt by the time he is finished, and look at this Government and analyze closely the words they say, because they never ring true when it comes to the fiscal matters before this House.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): I am delighted to participate in the debate on the budget of this Government for 1990-91.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it is clear to all of us on this side of the House that Manitobans want a vision which builds for the future. They want a Government which prepares for tomorrow.

Manitobans have said they need and they want positive pro-active Government. They want and need a frontal attack on the recession facing this province. Manitobans have said they want a Government that builds and sustains all of our communities in all regions of our province. Manitobans want a strong commitment to the environment. Manitobans want social programs to meet our needs now and to prevent serious problems down the road.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, if it was not clear from the budget presented this week and the speech from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), it certainly is clear now from the speeches and comments across the way, from the comments of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) and the comments and speeches today from the

Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Neufeld) in this province that this Government has failed and this budget has failed the people of Manitoba.

Rather than produce a program through this budget to meet the needs of the 1990s, to lead Manitoba through the recession, this Government has produced a budget which passively accepts the recession and intervenes only on behalf of those best able to endure any downturn in our economy—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) will have 38 minutes remaining.

The hour being 12:30 p.m., according to the rules, Rule 35, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Friday, October 26, 1990

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
		Goods and Services Tax Doer; Manness	440
Tabling of Reports		Urban Native Strategy Hickes; Filmon	440
Annual Reports: Manitoba Lotteries Foundation; Advisory Council Status of Women Mitchelson	432	Goods and Services Tax Alcock; Manness	441
Oral Question Period		Child and Family Services Alcock; Gilleshammer	442
Minister of Northern Affairs Storie; Filmon	433	Rock Ridge, Manitoba Plohman; Downey	442
Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Storie; Filmon	435	Air Ambulance Program Wasysyca-Leis; Orchard	443
Minister of Northern Affairs Storie; Filmon	435		
Community Economic Development Fund Ashton; Filmon	436		
Minister of Northern Affairs Ashton; Filmon	436		
Immigration Policy Carstairs; Filmon	437		
ACCESS Program Doer; Filmon	438		

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Budget Debate

Storie; Neufeld; Edwards Wasylcyia-Leis	443-460
--	---------

Non-Political Statements

Death of Gordon Hall, Former Manitoba Court of Appeal Justice Carstairs; Doer; McCrae; Downey	444
---	-----