



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. 13A - 1:30 p. m., MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 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, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNESSE, 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

Monday, October 29, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the 1989-90 Annual Report of Manitoba Health Research Council, the '88-89 Annual Report of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, and the '89-90 Annual Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL 4—THE PAY EQUITY AMENDMENT ACT

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that leave be given to introduce Bill 4, The Pay Equity Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'égalité des salaires, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion presented.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: I would like to make a few brief remarks on this Bill. Mr. Speaker, it was our sincere hope that the introduction of this legislation would not have been necessary. However, it is necessary.

It is necessary given the Minister of Energy's (Mr. Neufeld) remarks on Friday where he questioned the very essence of pay equity. It is necessary given the decision by this Government, to date, not to use existing legislation to extend—

Point of Order

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

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the privilege of being allowed as a Member to bring forward a Bill and provide a few opening remarks on the record on first reading, in this case, given that the Member had provided notice long before any

other remarks may have been made in this Legislature last Friday, is certainly far out of order. I ask you to bring the Member to order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, our rules are quite clear. It is the right of every Member of the Legislature to make a brief introductory comment on a Bill, which is exactly what the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) is doing.

The fact that the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) made disparaging comments about pay equity on Friday I am sure is something that the Government House Leader could expect in this House on Monday, since it has been relevant exactly to the Bill.

She pointed out that she is bringing in this Bill on behalf of our caucus because of the lack of commitment to pay equity on the part of this Government. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader, Rule 85, and I quote: "Where a Bill is introduced by a member upon motion for leave, the mover of the motion may give such explanation as will enable the House to understand the purport of the Bill, but the question 'that this Bill be now read a first time' shall be decided without amendment or debate."

Subsequently, Beauchesne's 6th Edition, 645, at the First Reading stage: "At this stage it is not permissible to argue the bill. Discussion of the bill's merits may take place on the motion for the second reading. The Member is only permitted to explain the provisions of the bill in order that the House will understand its purport."

On the point of order, the Honourable Government House Leader does have a point, and I would ask the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) to keep her remarks strictly to the Bill.

* * *

* (1335)

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will attempt to outline the main purpose of this legislation.

It is brought forward by the New Democratic Party Caucus because of a gap in policy. It is our view and our stated intention, and our record speaks for this very clearly, that pay equity must be extended in all sectors of the economy.

We are very concerned about the fact that this Government has not made a decision, will make no stated commitment to extend pay equity to all sectors of the economy, particularly all health care institutions beyond the 23 facilities that reached an interim negotiated pay equity settlement.

Mr. Speaker, it is our belief that women have waited long enough for something as fundamental and basic as equal pay for work of equal value. We believe that this Government has not made its commitments and its plans and its intentions to reach that goal. We want to do everything in our power to see that women wait no longer.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Are we still on the first reading?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. The question, therefore, before the House was that leave be given to introduce the Bill 4. Agreed? Agreed.

BILL 9—MANITOBA INTERCULTURAL COUNCIL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I move, seconded by the Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), that leave be given to introduce Bill 9, Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil interculturel du Manitoba, and that it be read a first time.

Motion presented.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, this Government is taking the department of multiculturalism on in terms of politicization. We have seen the MIC lose its funding capabilities over to the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker, this is in order. It is explaining what the Bill does. It says that the Government should get off its political agenda on multiculturalism, and it should be putting it back into MIC where it belongs, where it is not as politicized. That is directly what the Bill is pertaining to.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind the Honourable Member that the practice of this House

is to briefly explain what is in the Bill. The question before the House was that leave be given to introduce Bill 9. Agreed? Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Cross Lake Indian Band Timber Cutting Rights

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Premier received a copy of a correspondence late last week from the Cross Lake Band indicating that they felt the licence and the present cutting in the Cross Lake area was contrary to Article 15 of the Northern Flood Agreement and that they were in a direct confrontation with the Repap Corporation in terms of cutting in the area that they felt was designated as their wildlife resource and their trap line and river and lake area.

My question to the Premier is: Will he commit himself to action consistent with his promise at the aboriginal debate during the election for treaty land entitlement, and will he ask Repap to stop cutting in the area that has been given to the Cross Lake Band under Article 15 of the Northern Flood Agreement?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that the land that is in question was land on which cutting was taking place by the former Manfor for decades under the former NDP Government, and they took no action whatsoever on it. They took no action whatsoever, I am sure, because they were under the same legal advice that we are. That is that that land is not in fact set aside under any constraint that would prevent logging, that would prevent timber cutting that we are aware of.

* (1340)

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether or not this is all a political issue. Why on earth would the band be cutting for decades under the NDP, under public ownership of Manfor, where they could have had direct control over it and not a word be said now that it is an issue because it is under private ownership under the same transference of the same timber cutting rights that were there formerly under Manfor on which timber was cut under that agreement? I do not understand what the difference is or how it has changed or how the Leader of the NDP could say that all of a sudden this is an issue when for all of those decades under his administration Manfor, under public ownership, was allowed to do that cutting.

Repap Manitoba Inc. Share Value

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): In case the Premier has not noticed, the Repap deal is becoming a disaster for this province, whether it is environmental, cutting areas, aboriginal land entitlement, chlorine bleach, on and on and on. Well, let us ask a political question, Mr. Speaker. The Auditor's Report clearly states that the shares of Repap cannot be used as an asset for purposes of program expenditure to assist in stabilizing the financial position of the Government. Yet, this Minister of Finance puts in the budget some \$78 million of Repap paper funds as part of the fiscal stabilization question.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: Who are we to believe, the Provincial Auditor, who says that you cannot put those funds in that account, or the Minister of Finance, who has portrayed that fund at \$303 million this year?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Auditor did not tell us that we could not put the funds there. Indeed, the Provincial Auditor then would have to tell us where we should put the funds. You notice that the Provincial Auditor has not said where else they should go.

Mr. Speaker, it is the perfect place to put the proceeds of that devaluation. What may be in dispute is the value of those shares. That is what may be in dispute. What we have said as a Government is, the best place to put them, to hold them until they materialize in value, indeed is in the Fiscal Stabilization Fund as long as you do not draw on them as if they are cash. We fully expect that the value of those shares will be much greater than the \$77 million unless the Leader of the Opposition is trying to drive Repap out of the province, in which case the full value of the \$77 million will be realized.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance should read the Auditor's Report. It says you cannot use this as an asset as the Minister of Finance has done in his Fiscal Stabilization Fund. That means when the Minister of Finance puts that little slide up for all the public relations, he is wrong against the Auditor's Report. These assets are not worth \$78 million according to the Auditor.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: Has he greatly misrepresented the Fiscal Stabilization Fund

by \$78 million because there is no asset in that fund for Repap?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, if the Member would realize, if he had taken time to read the purchase sale agreement, the share purchase agreement with respect to Repap and the Government, he had taken the time and the effort to read it, he would recognize that if indeed he is successful, as he wishes, to drive Repap out of the Province of Manitoba, that \$77 million will be provided by them in cash in providing under the covenants of the agreement.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, where is it that the Provincial Auditor is saying that the asset value that we have provided within the share purchase agreement is to be lodged?

Multicultural Policy Contradictions

* (1345)

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign we heard this Government boasting of its record on multicultural policy and spending, saying that it increased grants to multicultural organizations. On Friday, we heard the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) in a public speech disagree with this policy in spending by saying, and I quote, I am against multicultural funding. Multicultural funding ends up with the WASPs, if you like, funding everybody else. Given that there is a well known—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there a question here? Kindly put your question now, please.

Ms. Cerlill: My question is for the Premier. Given that there is a well-known constitutional policy that a provincial Government Cabinet cannot contradict Government policy, what is he going to do to assure the public that there will not be contradictions between Government policy and the views expressed by his Cabinet?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat interesting that the New Democrats—of course, the Member is new to the Legislature, and she may not be aware of comments that have been made by her caucus Members throughout time. Time and time and time again I have heard New Democrats decry the fact that because of Government solidarity that, for instance, on issues like the GST, federal people should be

able to speak out against it and vote against their own Party.

I have heard during the '70s when the New Democrats were in Government Members of their Cabinet speak out and say that they ought to have anti-scab legislation, that they disagreed with their Party's position, which was not to bring in anti-scab legislation.

The fact of the matter is that Members on this side may have different views about particular issues, but they are in fact Members of this Government. They support the Government position and will vote for the Government position even though they disagree with it, just like the Member for Radisson will lose battles in caucus and Cabinet—no, she will never be in Cabinet. She will lose battles in caucus and she will still go out and vote with her caucus or else she will not be with her caucus, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, that is the way the democratic process works.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to wonder who really is in control on that side of the House but, more importantly, we are wondering if the Premier can tell us, do these statements reflect a change in Government multicultural policy?

Mr. Filmon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question then is also to the Premier. How can this House and the people of Manitoba be assured that potentially racist attitudes reflected by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) do not influence Government policy?

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, that kind of statement cannot be tolerated in this House. I ask the Member to fully withdraw it and apologize to the Member.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, and it is recorded in Hansard, the Minister made the comment that multicultural funding was WASPs funding everyone else. It was the Minister that introduced this subject matter, and I believe the question from the Member for Radisson is not only in order, it is an apology that should be made without having a question asked by a Member of the Opposition. The Minister should be withdrawing his comments made last Friday.

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

Ms. Cerilli: No, I would like to proceed with my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to thank both House Leaders. I will take this opportunity to reserve my judgment on this one until I have an opportunity to better peruse Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Radisson, kindly put her question now, please.

* (1350)

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, how can this House and the people of Manitoba be assured that potentially racist attitudes reflected by the Minister of Energy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order please. I have taken this matter under advisement. I am asking the Honourable Member for Radisson to kindly rephrase her question.

Ms. Cerilli: How can the House and the people of Manitoba be assured that the derogatory attitudes reflected by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) do not influence Government policy in spending in the area of multiculturalism?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, because as I indicated in response to the last question, our policy remains as it is stated and printed in the folder that we put out as a Government, the first multicultural policy, I might say, that any Government had the courage and the conviction to put out. Despite all the fine sounding phrases of the New Democrats, they never had the courage to put out a multiculturalism policy. That policy is here in writing, and just like the New Democrats talked about anti-scab legislation but did not implement it, we have implemented a policy that is in print for everyone to see that represents the policy position of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to share a copy with her to ensure that she knows and understands what the policy of the Government of Manitoba is.

Minister Energy and Mines Apology Request

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): My question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). It is completely appalling to see a Minister of the Crown make a statement of that nature, and I will quote the

statement. Multicultural funding ends up as the WASP, if you like, or funding everyone else.

My question to the Minister of Energy and Mines is: Will he stand up in his place today and apologize to all those Manitobans that he has offended by making those comments, or at the very least, stand up—

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

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to prevent the Member from standing and commenting. I only ask you this, that the Member is responsible for the Department of Energy and Mines, and the purpose of Question Period is to direct questions to Members with responsibilities within their own spheres. I ask that indeed all Members opposite direct questions in that manner.

Mr. Lamoureux: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Minister to apologize for statements that he had made in the House last Friday. There is nothing unparliamentary or against the rules that allows me to ask that question. I would ask the Minister to stand up and defend himself.

Mr. Manness: There are rules under our House of what are matters of privilege. If the Member feels that his rights as a Member have been offended, there are rules within this House to bring the matter before the floor that can cause a Member to be taken to a committee to be sanctioned, if indeed the House feels that a statement has been made improperly and reflects upon all of us. Those are the rules in the House. This is not an inquisition period where indeed Members in making comments in debate, in this case Budget Debate, are called to explain.

The Premier (Mr. Filmon) has made full enunciation as to the principles and the policies of this Government within that area. The Premier speaks for the Government of the people of the province in this province. Those views are fully stated on the record, and I say, Mr. Speaker, Question Period is not to be used as a moment of inquisition for Members opposite indeed when they make comments in debate.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader raises a spurious point. This is not suggested to be a matter of privilege in

the sense that it did not affect the privileges of Members of this House. It was a very serious statement that impacted on many people who I am sure are going to be very offended to have read those comments, people of all ethnic groups who are seeking multiculturalism as merely a way of maintaining their culture.

The comments by the Minister were not only absolutely uncalled for, they are some of the most severe comments that I have heard in the nine years I have been in this Legislature. —(interjection)— I have never heard someone have such a direct attack—

* (1355)

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

Mr. Ashton: —on multiculturalism in Manitoba in the nine years I have been in this House. I would suggest that we may have a way out of this. I realize that the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) raised one point, which is that Members, Ministers, are asked questions in regard directly to their portfolio, but I do believe that the Minister himself could solve a lot of these difficulties if he gets up and repudiates those statements. If he will not, if the Premier, who sat here in Question Period and had several opportunities—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. On the point of order raised, it appears to be somewhat of a replay of the previous point of order that I have taken under advisement.

It is extremely complex what the Government House Leader has brought forward, and the remarks made by the Opposition House Leader and the Honourable Member for Inkster. So I will take this matter under advisement to give me a better opportunity, in all fairness to the House, to come back after I have perused Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Inkster, kindly rephrase his question, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Crown is responsible for words that he puts on the record in the Chamber.

My question is: Will the Minister simply retract or apologize for making those statements? That is all we are asking, for a simple "I am sorry."

Point of Order

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

Mr. Manness: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, in listening to that question, I could not distinguish it one iota from the question that was put previously.

You have asked this House to give you time to rule, indeed, on this complex issue, using your words.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader does have a point of order. Will the Honourable Member for Inkster rephrase his question, please?

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, then I will ask the Premier, will he now stand up and repudiate the comments made in the House by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) last Friday?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, each person in this House may have his or her own personal views on any particular issue or policy of Government, but there is only one policy of Government. What we have done is go further than any other Government has and put in writing our policy on multiculturalism. The previous administration, the NDP, have never had the courage to do that. Our policy is in writing.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard foolish comments put on the record by the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), put on the record by the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) and many, many people in this Chamber. I have heard them say things that were totally incorrect, things that I totally disagreed with.

I have heard Members of the Liberal Party say things about, for instance, the diversion of the Pembina River into Pelican Lake, on the record, their critic. Then their Leader went to Turtle Mountain during the election campaign and said that was not the policy of the Government.

This is the policy of the Government, and we stand behind this policy, Mr. Speaker.

* (1400)

MGAC Funding

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): My question is for the Minister responsible for Culture and Heritage. I

am afraid that this particular Minister has agreed with the comments in regard to the Minister or at least the approach. Why, I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that if we take a look at the budget, at the line-by-line Estimates, you will find that MGAC's—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Is there a question here? Kindly put your question now, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the Minister of Culture and Heritage agree with her colleague's remarks? If not, why did she freeze the funding to MGAC—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's question seeks an opinion and is therefore out of order. Kindly rephrase your question, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the Minister of Culture and Heritage agree with her colleague's remarks? If not, why did she freeze the funding to MGAC?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's question seeks an opinion and is therefore out of order. Kindly rephrase your question, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: My question is to the Minister: Why did she freeze the funding to MGAC?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Inkster will take the time to go through the Estimates process, he will realize and will recognize that as a result of the needs assessment, we have signed five-year agreements with all of the umbrella groups throughout Government that receive Lotteries funding. There is a formula that has been put in place where they get a certain percentage one year and another percentage the next year. All of those umbrella organizations have agreed to the five-year agreement that we have signed. I will go into great detail through the Estimates process and explain what is happening.

Multicultural Grants Cutbacks

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, in MIC's '88-89 Annual Report, \$1.3 million was spent on multicultural grants. We have seen a decrease in multicultural grants in the last two years, from \$1.3 million to \$1 million.

My question is to the Premier. Does the Government support multicultural grants? If the

Premier does, then why has he been cutting and freezing this portion of the Estimates?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, there has been absolutely no cut in the funding to multicultural organizations. If the Member would take the time to sit in on the Estimates process, we will be able to go through line by line and make that analysis. He will then understand.

Manitoba Hydro Affirmative Action

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

Given his public statements of his views on multiculturalism, does it also mean that the Affirmative Action Program cannot be fully implemented in Manitoba Hydro as far as multicultural constituents are concerned?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): In the first instance, it should be remembered that I prefaced my remarks by saying I supported the Government's budget. I have prefaced my remarks by saying that I stand for Cabinet solidarity, but I also said that I did not necessarily agree with everything that the Cabinet decided. I think that goes without saying. We cannot always agree. There are 18 people in Cabinet. We are not always going to agree on every issue, but I also said, Mr. Speaker, that I stood with what the Cabinet decided in the end. That does not mean to say I do not have an opinion of my own.

I also prefaced my remarks by saying I too am an ethnic. I come from a background of family that immigrated to Canada in 1926. My parents immigrated to Canada. We went through all the discrimination. I was a German raised in Canada during the war. Do not talk to me about discrimination. I have been through all that. I have been through the job hunting process when the only reason I was not hired was because I was a German. So do not let anybody there try to tell me about culture or language or—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Minister Energy and Mines Multicultural Position

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): To the Honourable First Minister, given that under the doctrine of parliamentary government there are individual ministerial responsibilities distinct and separate from collective Cabinet responsibility for which the Premier provides the leadership, what does this Premier intend to do with this Minister who violates that collective Cabinet responsibility on multiculturalism?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): You know, there are none so blind as those who will not see. Those who will not listen or will not hear, Mr. Speaker, cannot be responded to adequately by anybody. The fact of the matter is that the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) has said that he supports Cabinet decisions whether or not he agrees with them. That is exactly the case of everybody who is in Cabinet.

The Minister has indicated that he, as a Member of Cabinet, will carry out Government policy without question, because it is Government policy, and that is the case with respect to this and anything else that -(interjection)- affirmative action, Manitoba Hydro or anything else is Government policy and the Minister responsible will carry it out.

Manitoba Hydro Pay Equity

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): If the First Minister is not doing anything about a divergent policy of multiculturalism expressed by his colleague in Cabinet, how does the Premier propose to implement other related policies like pay equity and other related policies in Manitoba Hydro?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The Government is on the record in writing on every single policy that he speaks of. Our position is different from the position of the New Democrats with respect to pay equity, but it is on the record. We support fully the implementation of the pay equity legislation that has been passed.

We disagree with the New Democrats' desire to impose it on an unwilling private sector. We have a difference of view on that, but the policy of the Government is on the record and will be implemented by this Government.

Manitoba Hydro Pay Equity

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): My question is to the Premier. On Friday the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro (Mr. Neufeld) stated that the inequality in jobs generally dominated by women or men could not be eliminated through legislation. This current Government voted for the legislation which established pay equity within the public sector, which includes the Crown corporation Manitoba Hydro.

How can the Premier continue to have confidence in the Minister responsible for implementing this policy at Manitoba Hydro when he is on record as saying he does not support it?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The fact of the matter is that the pay equity legislation that was passed by the former New Democratic administration with the total support of the Members of the Progressive Conservative Caucus has been in the process of implementation. We have found that there are difficulties for instance that are created by that legislation, difficulties that have caused problems with the implementation of pay equity for the nurses, who have been unhappy with the limitations that were put on that prevented them from getting pay equity in their agreements. They had to go and appeal it to the Labour Board. They lost their appeal to the Labour Board, because despite the fact that the New Democrats said it was excellent legislation, in practice it did not work out very well.

Here you have legislation that has problems, despite the fact that people support it in principle. The fact of the matter is we will continue the work for the implementation of the pay equity legislation as it was passed by this Legislature.

Ms. Barrett: I have a supplementary to the First Minister. Since the Minister responsible for over 4,000 employees at Manitoba Hydro said in the House on Friday that positions of men employed as linemen at Manitoba Hydro cannot be compared to positions traditionally held by women when determining salary levels, how can the Premier continue to let this man remain responsible for the implementation of this policy at Manitoba Hydro?

* (1410)

Mr. Filmon: Manitoba Hydro is a Crown corporation, has a mandate to operate at arm's length from Government within the policy framework

that is set for it by legislation of Government. They will obey all of the legislation that is set forth for them, including the policy that is contained within not only The Manitoba Hydro Act, but The Pay Equity Act as it affects them and any other legislation that we would pass in this province. Whether it be human rights legislation, whether it be any other legislation, Manitoba Hydro will carry out its responsibilities to implement all legislative requirements, and they will, I am sure, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Barrett: Again, to the Premier, since the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro stated Friday in the House that he does not support the implementation of Government responsibility within his own area of Cabinet responsibility, will the Premier guarantee that this Minister or another Minister does carry out those obligations?

Mr. Filmon: I will just—you know, I find it very interesting that the official Opposition, three days after the budget was introduced in this Legislature, have absolutely no questions about the budget, have no issues to raise about the budget, is totally devoid of any responsibility to the public of Manitoba to debate the budget, Mr. Speaker.

I will assure the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) and every other Member on that side that every Minister in this Government will carry out the responsibilities of implementing the policies of this Government as they are stated, as they are put in writing for anybody to see.

Ontario Hydro Agreement PUB Recommendations

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, it is now almost a year since Manitoba Hydro entered into a major agreement with Ontario Hydro for the export of Manitoba hydroelectric power.

My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Order-in-Council that the Minister signed asked that the Public Utilities Board report to the Government by November 1. Could the Minister please tell us when we should expect the recommendation from the PUB?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Yes, when it is ready, Mr. Speaker, it will be presented to the Legislature.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says, when it is ready. The -(interjection)- No. The Premier as usual

is chirping from his seat about a perfunctory analysis—quite the contrary.

We want to know how much time the Government is going to have before the December 31 deadline kicks in, which is the last moment that this Government can withdraw from the agreement without penalty.

Ontario Hydro Agreement PUB Deadline

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): My question to the Minister in charge of Manitoba Hydro is: When does he expect the recommendation? How much time will the Government have to look at it before the withdrawal of December 31 can be achieved?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be right of Government to rush the decision from the Public Utilities Board. They are taking their time and are analyzing the facts and the figures that are put before them and the interveners that come to them. They will in due course bring their recommendation forward to Government, at which time we will act upon it.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says, in due course the Government will have time. The Government will not have time because the deadline of December 31 is moving and moving towards us quickly.

PUB Recommendations

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): My question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. Will he call the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee of this Legislature before the deadline of December 31 so Members of this House could have a look at the PUB's recommendations and do the responsible thing with \$5.5 billion of Manitoba money?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): When the report comes forward, the recommendation comes forward from the Public Utilities Board, it will be aired. It will be aired publicly and the decision will be taken by Cabinet as to whether or not to proceed.

Home CHEC Loan Program Cancellation

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): My question is for the Minister of Energy. We have heard the Minister of Energy and his colleague praise the oil companies for their success at making even higher profits while gouging consumers.

How does this Minister justify cutting Home CHEC energy conservation loan programs that assist those trying to consume less energy at a time when those same oil giants and natural gas monopolies stand to make record profits from the current Middle East crisis when only a tiny fraction of Canadian consumers use oil from the Middle East?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Well, Mr. Speaker, it has to be said first of all, I have never praised the oil companies for profit sharing from the position we are in now in the Middle East. I personally would detest any gouging by the oil companies. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) and I have met with a number of the oil companies. We are satisfied that gouging is at this time not taking place, but the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and his department are monitoring that.

As far as the cancellation of the Home CHEC loan program is concerned, there must come a time, Mr. Speaker, when we must review any program that Government delivers. We reviewed the program of Home CHEC loan and we decided that there were better ways to spend the Government dollars. We cancelled that program and went ahead with other programs that more properly aid us in the conservation of energy.

Mr. Hickes: To the same Minister, why did this Minister kill the program when over 3,500 home owners used this program in 1988 to improve energy efficiency in their homes?

Mr. Neufeld: Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the home owners that used the program used it for door and window retrofitting. Door and window retrofitting does not in itself conserve a great deal of energy. That is the least area of conservation of any retrofitting in the house. We felt that there was too much of window and doors going on and we could better spend the energy conservation money by expanding the Home CHEC program, which we have done by expanding the fossil fuel consumption program and things like that. So we think that we have diverted the funds into better areas.

Energy Information Centre Closure

Mr. George Hlckes (Point Douglas): Why did this Minister close the Energy Information Centre? Did Jake Epp tell him that closing such a centre and closing regional federal energy and minister-renewable centres was necessary to keep energy consumption up and the profits up for oil companies?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): I would ask the Member where the energy conservation office was that we closed up.

Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corp. Funding

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the recent budget brought down by the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) provided only smoke and mirrors for Agriculture for the farmers of Manitoba despite the fact that they tout this a major increase—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Plohman: Obviously a very sensitive vein, Mr. Speaker, over there on this, because in fact what this budget did was simply deal with federal offloading in a number of areas, in crop insurance and certainly in the interest rate relief. In view of the fact that one-third of the farmers, mostly younger farmers, as reported by the federal Farm Credit Corp. recently, are bearing the greater portion of the debt, some \$175,000 on average per farmer, why has this Minister of Agriculture not seen fit to increase the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation budget to provide greater financing for this target group during this difficult time?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Member that over the past two years of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, young farmer rebate has been doubled from a \$2,000 a year credit up to \$4,000 a year. The net worth limit has been raised so more young farmers can qualify. The guaranteed operating loan has been expanded so the farmers can now qualify for up to \$200,000 of a guaranteed operating loan instead of a \$125,000 guaranteed operating loan. MACC supplies the lowest interest rates in the marketplace for young farmers or any farmer that qualifies for those loans. We have done more than any other Government in western

Canada for young farmers in those categories, and that speaks for itself at MACC in terms of our commitment to the young farmers of Manitoba, along with the interest rate relief program for all farmers may have reduced their interest rates by 7 percent. There have been substantial benefits put in the hands of young farmers, in fact all farmers of Manitoba who borrow money.

* (1420)

Farming Industry Economic Conditions

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Things are so good out there, Mr. Speaker, that is why we are having all the farm auctions, and that is why all the bankruptcies. His own annual report says that continuing poor economic conditions resulted in smaller loan portfolio, was unspent in the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

I ask this Minister why he is allowing the banks and why he has not made representation to allow them to take the interest free cash advance that farmers are now getting and forcing them to pay off those loans that the Minister brags about, the 7 percent reduction loans. The banks are taking the cash advances. Why has he not made representation to the banks to stop that practice so the farmers can determine where they have to pay that cash advance?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, farmers borrow money from banks, caisses populaires and credit unions. If they sign a security agreement that they are going to guarantee that the proceeds of that crop will be used to pay the loan off, that is a legal commitment by the farmers. The banks took two test cases to the courts in Alberta on that exact issue because farmers were taking the cash advance and not assigning to loans that they used that crop for security on.

He is advocating that they break the law, that is what he is advocating. One of the reasons a lot of farmers are in difficulty in front of the Manitoba Mediation Board is because they used exactly that practice. They had committed the proceeds from their crop to specific loans, and they took it out and used it for something else. The farmers have to abide by the law and yes, the federal Government has changed the regulations with cash advances. Any farmer that does not assign his crop has no commitment to have to take that money and take it

to the banks. I think in fairness in terms of following the law the right procedures have been used.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, this priority agreement put in by the federal Conservative Government, which has not been disputed by this Minister, states clearly that the lender may apply this amount of the cash advance to reduce the—

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

Mr. Plohman: I ask this Minister whether he is going to continue to allow, or will he make representation on behalf of farmers so they do not have to suffer the humiliation of having the banks cosign their cash advances before they can receive it and so they cannot even make the determination of what their priority debts are that they want to pay?

Mr. Findlay: A committee of producers, industry people and farmers have met and have talked about this issue and are making a collective representation to the federal Government to make the procedure less restrictive, particularly on farmers who have not assigned the proceeds of their crop.

Film/Video Classification Government Policy

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): My question is for the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation. Pornography is an issue which is causing increasing revulsion in our society, and I think we are all aware of the opinions of our constituents in this matter. There have been many demonstrations in neighbourhoods and petitions to all levels of Government.

Mr. Speaker, public concern is justified. Research shows a clear relationship between the use of pornography and violence towards women. An important study by La Federation des Femmes du Quebec shows that three out of four men who sexually abuse women were regular consumers of pornography. The Minister indicated on September 11, 1989, March 2, 1990, that a policy on the classification of videos was imminent. It was announced again during the election—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley, kindly put her question now, please.

Ms. Friesen: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. When will the Minister be announcing her policy on the classification of pornographic videos?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): We have already announced the policy in that we are going to implement a video classification system. Mr. Speaker, there is a process to go through, unlike what happened under the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) when she was the Minister responsible for video classification. They received a report and they shelved it. It collected dust for several years, because they could not—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation has the floor.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Madam Minister, to finish her response.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, we will have a process in place whereby video stores are licensed. They will have to have a classification system in their stores by January 1, 1991.

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, we are glad to hear that commitment to a definite date for the introduction of this policy.

Human Rights Code Pornography

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): My supplemental is to the Attorney General. What consideration has he given to the suggestion made by my colleague the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) in December 1989 to review the Human Rights Code of Manitoba to see if it might include prohibition of material that depicts degrading material?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the review has been done. I will be glad to share the results with the Honourable Member.

Ms. Friesen: I look forward to that as well.

Women's Crisis Shelters Funding

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): My final supplemental is to the Minister of Family Services. What action is being taken to ensure that adequate and secure funding is made available to the provincial shelters for women and families?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, our commitment to the shelters has been very clear. We have increased the funding for the shelters by some 47 percent over the last two years. We have worked with the Eastman shelter as recently as last week and presented them with a cheque for \$58,000.00. We look forward to the board making the decision to reopen the shelter in the next few days.

Palliser Furniture Ltd. Environmental Permit Conditions

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to raise a question in this House on the matter concerning the toxic fume emissions from the Palliser Furniture manufacturing plant in Transcona. The Minister of Environment at that time took the question as notice.

My question is for the Minister of Environment. What steps has he or his department taken to perform the necessary environmental testing, internal and external, of the Palliser plant to determine if the plant is meeting its licence or permit conditions?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the department is working with Palliser to make sure that they bring their plant into compliance with the licence. The construction of the containment facility for the product that is apparently blowing across the neighbourhood will be expected to be closed in as soon as possible. We are actively working with them to make sure that that is followed up. We are also going to be given access to their consultant's report so that we can make sure that complete use of that report is made.

Mr. Speaker: Time for oral questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Eric Stefanson (Kirkfield Park): Mr. Speaker, I would seek leave to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would call Members' attention to the fact that the week of October 28 to November 4, 1990, has been declared White Ribbon Against Pornography Week. At this time I would like to recognize GAP, Group Against Pornography, for

their efforts to encourage citizens to become involved in action groups to fight pornography. GAP is located in the Kirkfield Park constituency, and its stated purpose is to move our citizens and communities, to combat and eliminate the destructive influences of obscenity, pornography and indecency.

I would like, at this time, to commend GAP for their active participation in raising public awareness on the pornography issue. Thank you.

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): May I have leave for a non-political statement, please?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)

Mr. Gaudry: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak on the proclamation this week, October 28 to November 4, as the "Week of White Ribbon Against Pornography."

La pornographie est un sujet compliqué quand on pense aux garanties accordées à chaque individu par la Charte des droits et libertés. Par contre, il y a le niveau d'obligation morale qui nous oriente vers une position réfléchie de conscience personnelle.

Cette obligation morale nous dirige sur le chemin du respect des garanties individuelles de la Charte des droits et libertés.

Par contre, nous devons également protéger la dignité humaine et la maturité croissante de nos enfants et de nos adolescents afin d'assurer une moralité saine pour notre société.

(Translation)

Pornography is a complicated issue when we think of the rights granted to each individual under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. However, there is a moral obligation that leads us each to take a well-thought-out stand based on personal conscience.

This moral obligation guides us along the path of respect for the individual rights contained in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

On the other hand, we have to protect human dignity and the maturing process of our children and young people in order to secure a wholesome morality for our society.

(English)

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons why I am wearing this white ribbon as a symbol of duty towards our society's morality in order to benefit

the dignity of the women and children of this province.

* (1430)

I invite all the Members of this House to join me by sharing the significance of this week's proclamation "White Ribbon Against Pornography Week" by the Premier and the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Ms. Jean Frlesen (Wolseley): I wish leave to make a non-political statement, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. Frlesen: I want to add congratulations and commendations of our Party, Mr. Speaker, to the organizers of the International White Ribbon Week Against Pornography and to emphasize, I think as all Members of the House would agree, that this is an important week. It is going to bring attention of many people throughout the province to an issue which has caused enormous grief to many families and individuals within Manitoba, and that we look forward to the new policies of the Government. We would also, I think, look forward to new policies from the federal Government as well on this, but this is the first step, that is, the expansion of public awareness of this issue. It is a first step in a program of protection of women and children to which we are all committed.

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 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), who has 38 minutes remaining.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to continue my remarks on this very critical debate.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, it is clear to all of us in the New Democratic Party that Manitobans want a vision which builds for tomorrow. They want a Government which prepares for the future, and, regrettably, the Manitoba Conservative budget of this past week fails Manitobans on those counts.

Rather than produce a program 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 a downturn in our economy. It is a budget which leaves Manitobans defenseless in the face of harsh economic realities.

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

Madam Deputy Speaker, this budget is a program of higher unemployment, of cuts to programs which assist people, and cutbacks on programs which can build a better future for Manitobans. A budget which builds for tomorrow would have done many things. It would have included a plan to develop and nurture our hard-pressed communities in the North, in rural Manitoba, in remote regions, and in Winnipeg's inner city. It would not have included a plan to cut back in those areas, and there would not have included any suggestion that for services to be provided in those areas, was dependent upon how citizens in those communities voted in the last election.

A budget that has a vision for the future, that addresses the needs of the 1990s, would have included a strong commitment to the environment. It would not have reduced efforts in those areas that we have seen clearly enunciated in the budget presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) this past week. A budget for the future would have included real moves towards social fairness. It would have a program to enhance community-based training and support for education, and employment flexibility.

It would not have cut back in those vital areas. A budget for the future would have invested in Manitoba's people, and it would have done so through preventative, community-based health care, through family support programs, through ACCESS measures to guarantee our human resources are developed to their fullest potential. Instead, we have a budget which undercuts the foundations of our future.

It undercuts the foundation of our future by cutting in spending in the areas of health care and education. It undercuts our future by reducing services in northern communities. It undercuts our future by withdrawing ACCESS programs for training. It undercuts our future by ensuring

absolutely no protection for laid-off workers. It undercuts our future by refusing to even mention the serious problems in our society today of child poverty, of youth in trouble, of battered women, of families in crisis.

You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is a budget filled with a lot of rhetoric about the great potential of this province, but in reality, it is a budget which will over time destroy the human and natural resource potential of this province. It will mean the loss of thousands of more jobs. It will mean irreparable damage for many communities, and it will create wider disparities between the rich and the poor.

This budget tells us in no uncertain terms what Manitoba Conservatives believes to be the best role for Government. They believe clearly that the best role for Government in the economy is no role at all. The theme of this budget is that decisions made in the private sector should not only dictate what prices and commodities should be, but should also have the predominant influence in what the priorities of society as a whole should be.

It is, in fact, the abandonment of the role of Government to the complete supremacy of the market. The public good is equated with the corporate good. As one example, the Minister of Finance, in his Budget Address, states over and over and over again that we must be creatively looking to find efficiencies in our system; that we must find efforts together to maintain services within our limits; and he, in fact, states that efforts to maintain services are shortsighted and will destroy Manitoba's opportunity for development, will choke off investment and the job opportunities that investment brings.

The approach, Madam Deputy Speaker, is tax breaks for corporations, because in the minds of Conservatives they are the only way we will get out of these economic troubles. For Conservatives that means tighten the belts for everyone else, because you know Conservatives think that our needs for services have caused this mess in the first place. That opinion, that feeling, I believe, is certainly felt by many in our society today.

It is put most succinctly in an article in a very recent issue of *Options*, the June 1990 issue of *Options*, in an article by David Patterson entitled "Corporations and the Debt," as he says so well: What rankles however is the general implication that

we, as citizens, through our Government, with our greedy little fingers scooping up the social program pie, have brought the country to this alarming impasse. Now our friends, big business, like an older, wiser brother taking his gadabout, irresponsible sibling to hand, are prepared, through the sheer generosity of their patriotic corporate hearts, to lead us out of the morass in which we have managed to mire ourselves. It merely requires that we make no protest as the social programs we have worked so long and hard for in this country are whittled away, eventually to harmonize with their U.S. counterparts which are among the poorest in the civilized world.

He goes on to say, and puts so well: It is most irritating to be subjected to this pious, patronizing flimflam day after day, especially when it is such an obvious blend of mush, misdirection and outright self-serving falsehood.

* (1440)

Madam Deputy Speaker, as the debt burden seems to be the overriding motivating factor in this restraint ridden budget, this budget of the Manitoba Conservatives, it is desperately important to search out and to talk about the true cause of that debt situation.

When one does an objective analysis of that situation the only conclusion that one can come to is that the corporate sector of this country has for decades, under Liberal Governments primarily, managed to avoid paying its fair share of income taxes.

Had they been paying, as experts in this field have told us over and over again, for instance, the same effective rate as the average Canadian citizen over the last 20 or 30 years, we would presently be operating in all likelihood under a surplus budgetary position.

As this budget is really a page out of Mulroney's "How to Govern" book, I think it is certainly very important to see where this hands-off reliance on this corporations approach gets us.

Let us look at the past six or so years under Mulroney, as Prime Minister of this country. After six or so years of so-called economic recovery under Brian Mulroney, we have in this country, in this province, a record number of children going to school without breakfast. We have aboriginal people in a deepening housing crisis. We have more food banks than ever before. The numbers of

homeless young people are increasing. More seniors than ever before are struggling for basic dignity. Schools are in decline. Hospitals are turning away those who need quality health care.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has not been listening to all of my remarks because he would have heard that I was attempting to help this Government come to its senses before it is too late by looking at the record of its counterpart in Ottawa, their colleagues in Ottawa, their cronies in Ottawa who have driven this country into economic despair because of their hands-off, support-the-corporations policies.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am hoping that this Government will realize that the approach does not work based on the statistics that I have presented, based on the information that is put to them on a day-to-day basis, and that they will come to their senses before irreparable damage is done.

In fact, I would ask the Minister of Finance, has this Government not learned the hard way? Is the legacy of Mulroney not enough to convince Conservatives here that political power must be used not only to strive for economic prosperity, but equally to ensure that the values that I believe they respect, the values of liberty, equality and community, to ensure that those values are alive and well despite the market economy.

Instead of emulating Brian Mulroney and bowing to the pressure of their friends in the business community, just for once Manitoba Conservatives and this Government should stop blaming working people and their families. Just for once Members across the way should say no to cutbacks in social programs. It is clear, though, Madam Deputy Speaker, from this budget they have chosen not to take a lesson from the pages of history and instead have chosen to present the corporate agenda in its budget.

It is in my view, Madam Deputy Speaker, that this budget is in fact a budget that is hostile to building a society committed to greater equality. It is a budget of a Government that is opposed and does not understand the deeper feelings of community. It is a budget of a Government that does not recognize the need to expand on the value of liberty for the majority. It is a budget of many outright cuts in spending in the human service area. It is budget of hundreds of more reductions through less than inflationary increases. It is a budget of no initiatives,

no innovation, no creativity in high-need areas. It is a program of erosion through a policy of inaction. It is a budget of ominous forewarnings of things to come, of what is yet to come.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that picture, that scenario that this budget has presented has been backed up day after day since the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) budget presentation of last week, day after day by comments and speeches from Members of this Government's Cabinet. If the public has not understood fully the negative ramifications of this budget from the presentation of the Minister of Finance and from the numbers that have presented to the public, then they surely understand it now after the comments of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), after the comments of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld), and after today the comments of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in refusing to deal with the situations, with the impressions left by his colleagues sitting around the Cabinet Table.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I quoted a minute ago from an article in Options of the June 1990 issue, an article by David Peterson, who talks about the highest patronizing flimflam that we are hearing day after day from Governments and corporations combined.

Speaking of pious, patronizing flimflam, I want to take a moment, Madam Deputy Speaker, and look at this Government's response to the changing and growing needs in our community. Instead of evolving its policies and adjusting its spending patterns to reflect reality, to reflect the changing, growing needs of today, Members across the way have hid their heads in the sand, have become immobilized, intransigent and inflexible about those problems, and have hidden from responsibility by trying to blame the pioneering efforts and the forward-looking strategies of the previous administration.

They have rewritten history and taken on an incredible defensive posture. That position, that posturing is getting tedious. It is getting sickening and it is time that this Government got on with revealing its own programs and policies and commitments, and not hiding behind the well-intentioned efforts of previous administrations.

You know, it is interesting, this Government, day after day, since the House has resumed sitting this past month, day after day on every critical issue of

the day has refused to show its commitment and its intentions for addressing the problems in those areas and has attacked the New Democratic Party for its record of achievement in those areas. Interestingly, it has attacked us in those areas for which we have the most credibility, issues and areas where the public clearly believes the New Democratic Party is best able to govern, best able to address the needs of citizens experiencing those problems.

So, whether we are talking about child care, whether we are talking about pay equity, whether we are talking about Child and Family Services or whether we are talking about family violence, the public understands, the public appreciates the record of achievement of the New Democratic Party in those areas and now wants to hear what the policies and programs and priorities of this Government is in those areas.

* (1450)

Now I realize I cannot use terminology that suggests a misrepresentation of the facts, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I can refer to the fact that this Government has chosen to attempt to rewrite history, to attempt to be revisionists, to attempt to misrepresent the developments of the past, because it has done just that. It has tried to suggest in case after case that funding and commitment were less than adequate by the previous NDP administration, deliberately ignoring the incredible innovation and amount of spending that happened in those areas under the former NDP Government.

Let me give you a few examples, Madam Deputy Speaker, for the benefit of some of the new Members who may not have been told this by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province or, in fact, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) who certainly would be aware of the history and the facts in these areas. Let us look, for example, at their remarks about our initiatives in day care.

The Deputy Premier has not chosen to enlighten his colleagues to the fact that between the years of 1982 and '88, the number of day care spaces increased 134 percent. He does not mention the fact that back in the Lyon years, provincial funding of day care was about \$600,000 and went up over \$33 million in the next eight years under the New Democratic Party. He and his colleagues do not enlighten and consider their colleagues and share the information about the innovative approaches of

the previous administration when it came to child and family services and mention the new ground that was broken by the implementation of a community-based delivery system.

In the area of family violence, Madam Deputy Speaker, this Conservative Government has done the best job of rewriting history. It has boasted on a daily basis about its 47 percent increase to programs dealing with family violence when, in fact, just about all of that increase was provided in the budget, in the Eugene Kostyra budget, that Conservatives across the way voted against.

It fails to mention that the money for the province-wide crisis line came from the decision of this Government to obliterate the Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse, fails to mention that the rural shelter system was put in place as recently as 1985, and that by 1988 before the NDP was defeated, plans were underway to change the funding formula that is the source of the concerns of rural shelters today.

In fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, in the briefing book handed to the then Minister of Family Services, Charlotte Oleson, she clearly stated that a review of the funding arrangements for a shelter system in Manitoba was underway and would be completed in four to six months. Two and a half years later, this Government has still not taken one tiny step to changing the funding formula and to putting rural shelters on a solid financial footing.

You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, that posturing, that defensive posturing, that rewriting of history, the antics of Members opposite, do not wash with the public. They believe that we, in the New Democratic Party, when in Government, did our very best in those areas. They hear us when we say we did not solve all the problems in those areas, that we made mistakes, but we at least, together with the community, had a vision and worked to develop programs and policies that were in line with the best interests of the community.

You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, all it would take for Members opposite would be for once to say: We do not have all the answers. We cannot solve all these problems overnight, but we are working with the communities to address the issues and here is our commitment to show you that we are serious.

In this budget, no such commitment is apparent, and in the rhetoric we are hearing nothing but the language of the dinosaur era. We are hearing now

about how it does not make sense to compare secretaries with linesmen, that one cannot possibly imagine how those two different jobs could be contributing something of equal value in our society today.

By that statement alone, this Government has questioned the very essence of pay equity, the very reason for looking at this whole area and moving with respect to legislation to address the inequities and inequalities in our society today.

The public understands and experiences, on a first-hand basis, that the needs in areas like Child and Family Services, battered women, child care, and the list goes on and on, have grown astronomically in those areas over the last several years.

They want to know what are this Government's policies and plans for addressing those growing needs. They want to know where is the commitment of this Government, but with this budget they wonder if there is any commitment at all.

Nowhere is there expressed in this budget an understanding of the needs of community and the fact that needs and demands have changed and are growing and that Government policies need to evolve and keep pace with those changing issues in our community. Nowhere in this budget is there any sense that this Government understands that a long-term planning approach is necessary, understands that short-term political interests cannot always rule the day and that sometimes a little sacrifice is necessary in order to address a problem down the road.

I think that failure, which is so apparent in this budget, is really at the root of much of the cynicism in our society today about politicians. They see too often politicians striving only to address their short-term political needs and prepared to sacrifice the long-term needs of a community for that short-term political gain.

I think this is nowhere more apparent than in the area of health care. We have raised repeatedly in this House the serious concerns that Manitobans have about the future of our health care system. We have put time and time again on the table our vision, our proposals, and our plans. Now Manitobans and we, on this side of the House, are looking for the vision and long-term plans of the Government of the Day. For long-term plans, for plans that are not just oriented to cutbacks, to underspending, to

short-term measures. Day by day our concern is growing and growing and growing. Madam Deputy Speaker, if that was not apparent before this budget, it should be now.

Let me take one example and if time permits, I will certainly address other examples in the health care field. Madam Deputy Speaker, for two years now, Members on this side of the House have been bringing example after example to the Government of the Day about the cutbacks in home care in the north end of Winnipeg. This Government has continued to deny that such cutbacks exist, that there has been a change in policy.

An Honourable Member: Change in policy?

* (1500)

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: No—Madam Deputy Speaker, there has been no change in policy? No, they just simply make it harder and harder and harder for people to get the kind of home care that they need to stay in their homes and communities and then they say the demand for the program is not there. Then they show a reduced line of spending in the budget.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, certainly in my book, and in the minds of Members on this side of the House, that is a cutback, that is a cutback. That is a deliberate attempt to reduce expenditure in the area and it is having a harmful effect on our system, and shows no vision about the future for our health care system. No understanding about the needs of elderly, which are growing, the numbers of which are growing day by day.

Madam Deputy Speaker, even before we saw this budget, which shows in essence a cutback in home care, even before we saw the figures on underspending, which the Minister revealed last week in the House showing some \$4.5 million underspending when it came just to home care, we were dealing with a personal case, with concerns that exemplified, that showed clearly, the real policy of this Government and showed that there has been a policy change.

In fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to read briefly from a presentation that was made last spring to our New Democratic Party Caucus at a meeting in the north end. I hope the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is taking note, because I believe that this example says it all in terms of the real concerns that we have been feeling with respect to cutbacks in home care.

She starts off her presentation by saying, previous experience terrific, major illness in 1973 with 190 days in hospital, home care provided between episodes of surgery, support provided major reason mental health and physical health recovery, gratitude to the extent that she wrote the Minister of Health under the then NDP Government after recovery to express her feelings and then tells the story about first her mother, then her father.

About her mother she says, how different things are today. When my mother was very ill, it took a great deal of pleading to receive half a day for five days a week care. It did not start out this way, but this was the ultimate of assistance that could be attained. This was very puzzling, as I was aware that parents of my friends who lived on Grant Avenue were receiving full days, five days a week of assistance. These people were far less fragile than my mother.

She goes on to talk about the problems she has had with home care with respect to her mother and ends that part by saying, the very sad part about all this is that on mother's last day she had her home care assistant in the morning, but after lunch she became ill and afraid. My father had gone out on an errand not knowing she was ill and she was home alone. She called me at work. I sensed her illness was critical and ran home only to call an ambulance to take her to hospital where she was sent to Intensive Care Medicine within three hours and passed away within 24 hours.

She talks about her father. She says, now it is three months later. My father had all home care immediately withdrawn. There was no assistance to even give him a week of adjustment; just so long, take care of yourself. I telephoned the social workers at St. Boniface Hospital because that is where the original placement on home care took place. They said that they could not help me because of where my father lived, that he would have to be helped by Seven Oaks Hospital. This did not disturb me, but what she said next really bothered me.

She told me that if my father had lived in their catchment area, some help could have been obtained. I paraphrased her and asked her if she was saying it was only a matter of geography in the city and she replied in the affirmative. This was no longer supposition on my part, but now it was confirmed. When I spoke to home care, I was told that they were not responsible on how other

branches interpreted the rules. As she says, I ask you, do you find this right or fair?

Finally, let me use some of her closing remarks from her presentation, because maybe they will make Members opposite take note and attempt to reassess this situation and reconsider their cutback policy. She concludes by saying, through all of the heartache of dealing with home care, their bureaucratic and authoritative manners have left me trembling.

You may well ask, why am I relating this tale to you? It is not only for my father that I tell you this. Someday you may have a parent or spouse just as sick and in as much need of help. I want to make you aware that we need to get together and tell the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that this unfairness must stop. Unless we do something and send a message to Broadway Avenue that we care about the sick and helpless in our part of the city, the problems of home care will not go away. Unless they hear our message, you stand a very good chance that my problems may surely be yours someday.

Madam Deputy Speaker, if the numbers do not say it all, then this human story told with a great deal of emotion and distress because you know it takes a great deal of courage to convey one's personal situation of such a traumatic situation. If the numbers do not say it all, then surely these cases that we have brought forward to the Minister time and time again say it all. Certainly there is no question in the mind of the public that there has been a cutback in home care. Manitobans know it. Northenders know it on a day-to-day basis. They have been cut off time and time again.

An Honourable Member: Who has perpetrated that?

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) asked, who has perpetrated that? It was under this Government that the cutback policy came into effect. All of this begs the question—

An Honourable Member: How can you call it cutback when we spend more?

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: The Minister of Finance says, how do you call it a cutback policy when we spend more. Let me reiterate the point I have just made. It is fine and dandy to show increased spending in a budget year, but to turn around and underspend that by millions of dollars, then say demand is not there and then reduce your budget, why, it is a cutback.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me conclude by saying this is just one example of the kind of shortsighted policies of this provincial Conservative Government in the area of health care. There are many such examples. This budget is filled with reductions. It is filled with an erosion of programs, and most of all, it is biased towards institutional care based on the illness model. It shows no vision about moving to community-based care. It has no vision for developing preventative measures to keep down the cost of health care, and it has no strategy to respond to the incredibly serious, harmful cutbacks of the federal Government, that are already having serious ramifications on our system and will put our health care system in a crisis.

* (1510)

I want to know, as all Manitobans want to know, where is the plan of action to deal with that situation, or are the ominous words of the Minister of Finance in his Budget Address, when he says, wait for things to come, get ready for further restraint measures by this Government—does that mean this Government intends to deal with federal Government restraint on the backs of people of Manitoba, of the sick in Manitoba, by introducing user fees and means tests?

I conclude by saying, by leaving the will of the people on record, which is for a quality, universally accessible health care system, who expect leadership from this Government to deal with the looming crisis in health care, to ensure that kind of care and that kind of tradition and history of this province and this country in health care, continues forever. Thank you.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Madam Deputy Speaker, let me first of all take this opportunity to say several things as it relates to this new Legislature, the new MLAs, and all those individuals who have returned. My first comments are to the Premier of the province, and to congratulate our Premier on his re-election as Premier of the province in forming the next Government of the Province of Manitoba for some four years.

This province needed this Premier and this Government for the 1990s. I can tell you that it was the hard work and the dedication of him and his Cabinet and his family and the people who supported him over the past two and one-half years that, I believe, gave the rewards that were needed

to carry on with the responsible leadership for this province, and the strong leadership that can be given by our Premier. I compliment the Premier on his hard work and his continued dedication and commitment to the people of Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the policies of which many people could not recognize throughout the campaign, particularly the New Democratic Party, and, for sure, the Liberal Party, and I would be remiss if I did not make a comment about the Liberal Leader and the Liberal Party and their campaign.

You know, it was the Liberal Leader's big thing in the campaign, her commitment, to make sure that she went to 57 ridings; it was her big objective during the campaign. It is a good job she did not go to the seven that she got a couple of more times, or she would not have had any. I think it truly pointed out that the Liberal Party was here strictly as a protest vote against the New Democratic Party in 1988. It was not what the Liberal Party had to offer to the Province of Manitoba; it is what the New Democratic Party had done to the Province of Manitoba in its devastation, in its high Autopac rates, in its MTX fiasco, in its ManOil fiasco, and all the mishandling of all the Crown Corporations drove the New Democratic Party out of office.

The people of Manitoba said, we will put our vote with the Liberal Party because we do not expect that they will get very far. They got to 20 seats and, with the help of one of our colleagues who crossed the floor, got to 21, but I think for the next many, many years in the Province of Manitoba the Liberals have seen their all-time high, as it relates to the Manitoba Legislature and their representation.

I want to point out four basic principles that have carried us, Madam Deputy Speaker, four basic principles that all the Members of our Party ran on, that we worked on for two and a half years, and that we are starting this path on for the next four years.

I believe what I heard the people of Manitoba say is that they could no longer handle or tolerate any increased taxation of any magnitude. They had it up to their teeth as far as Government taxation is concerned, particularly personal taxes. They were unable to cope with any higher taxation. That was the message that was out there. That is the message that is still out there.

That of course, Madam Deputy Speaker, is the main place that this Government and any other Government gets their revenues from, the tax base

from the people of the Province of Manitoba. Some people do not realize that, particularly the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) when she continues to demand more money be spent. She does not say, we want you, the taxpayers in Manitoba, to pay more money to deliver this service. She says, we want the Government to deliver it—we want the Government to deliver it. It is the taxation policies that are directly reflected on the people of Manitoba. They talk about eight million. I will talk about bigger numbers.

Something else that was very clear is that the people of this province want the essential services maintained, the health and education. They want their essential services maintained. Not only did we maintain them under our administration of the first two and a half years, we enhanced them, enhanced them tremendously at the same time that we kept the administrative costs of Government at below the rate of inflation. Health care and education basically in the last year's budget doubled. Madam Deputy Speaker, our record is very clear.

Let me put something else very clear on the record. The New Democratic Party never like to hear this because again they live in some airy-fairy land of thinking that money grows on trees, not the taxpayers pay it. The commitment is to reduce the deficit or to work to the reduction of the deficit over the long term.

Why have we got that deficit, Madam Deputy Speaker? It is because we had a short-term fix Government, short-term gain for long-term pain in the New Democratic Party governing this province for far too many years. What did it give us? It gave us an interest charge of \$547 million in our budget expense this year—\$547 million of budget expense that cannot go to any home care, cannot go to any health care, cannot go anywhere. It goes to the banks in Zurich and New York. That is where the money goes.

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

I can assure you, Mr. Acting Speaker, that it is still that same taxpayer who has to pay for that horrendous interest charge and that deficit that was given to us by the New Democratic Party. Ten thousand dollars for every man, woman and child was piled on the backs of the elderly, of the weak, of the poor, of everybody in our society by the New Democratic Party, and they will not even address it.

There is one more component, Mr. Acting Speaker, that we all have to talk about. The New Democratic Party talk about it in a different light than we do and that is to create an economic climate that will generate the wealth and the incomes to create the employment opportunities, to create the kind of income tax and the kind of taxation that this country needs to pay for the social services and the health care and the education demands of the public. There are no secrets. Those are four basic facts and principles that we all have to deal with.

Again, I compliment my colleagues and the Premier, because I believe in the past two and a half years we have taken a very balanced approach to it. We have responded to those needs that are certainly critical and have to be dealt with to make sure that the livelihoods of individuals are in fact protected through those essential services. So the key word, the key comments that have to be made, Mr. Acting Speaker, is a balanced approach.

* (1520)

I want to just reflect back to the election for a few minutes and touch base on a few things that I think are important to talk about because again it is important to note that our Premier and the people whom he built around him, that every riding, of which this province has some 57 ridings, had a very high-quality caliber individual running on behalf of the Filmon team. I compliment each and every individual who put their name forward to run for our Party, and thank them for their commitment.

Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker, we did not win as big a majority as what appeared to be out there, but we did get 30 seats and the people of Manitoba did give us a mandate. They gave us a mandate provincially when our federal colleagues and our federal counterparts were less than 15 percent in the polls. They said to the legislators of this province, we like what you have presented to us in the last two and a half years and we are prepared to put our trust in you to go forward into the 1990s, and I think Manitoba will be better for it.

Let me say as well that I believe there were something like seven seats that were lost by our Party by less than 500 votes. Again, a clear indication that many Members of this Legislature who are sitting here with that kind of a majority, whether it be on the other side, are here certainly with the mandate of those people, but not as—it could have gone either way. We could have been

sitting here with up to 37 seats, which, at one point, was quite possible.

What happened? Well, I believe, Mr. Acting Speaker, it was the Ontario election. It was the Ontario election to some degree where we saw the collapse of the Liberal Party because of overtaxation and opportunism, and the buoyancy which it gave the NDP, a little bit of momentum at the latter part of a campaign and many NDP voters went back to their traditional roots. So, building that kind of a background, I think it is important to note that the people of Manitoba can expect a balanced, responsible Government to the dealings of public affairs. To further reiterate, we have many people who ran for our Party out in other ridings that at any time would make an excellent representative for those constituencies, and at some point I would hope be able to be here to carry out a responsibility that we all have been privileged to have.

I again want to say to the unsuccessful candidates, from whatever Party that they represent, that they are to be congratulated and commended for putting their names forward in a democratic system, in a democratic society. To give the people a choice as to who they want here, and to take the time and the commitment, to take that, put their name forward, I compliment them for it because it is being part of a process that we all have to cherish, protect and make sure that survives over the long time so that we can all survive in a free society.

To my colleagues who are newly elected, to my colleagues who are re-elected and appointed to Cabinet, and to the Members of the Opposition Parties who were elected for the first time, although I know there is only one Party which I refer to in that context, but to the third Opposition Party that were re-elected, I hope that we can keep one thing in mind as legislators.

Yes, we can play the little political games that come about and the calling for resignations and the kind of posturing that the system requires at certain times, but let us remember one thing, the people of Canada, at this particular time in our history, are very frustrated. They are very upset. They are saying to us, the elected people of this province and to the elected people of this country, it is time to get the people's agenda on the first item of priority.

Quit playing your little political games. Get on with the job of making this country the great country that

it is. Let us make this province the great province that it can be. Yes, we will take our political shots and the political activity, but the one thing we all have to remember very seriously is to get on with the job of looking after the public affairs of the people of Manitoba.

Whether you are in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition or whether we are in Government, we do have that obligation and that responsibility. I think that it has been demonstrated over the past two and a half years how sincere this Government has been and will continue to be in dealing with the public agenda. That is No. 1 in our minds.

I want to as well, Mr. Acting Speaker, acknowledge the staff of the Legislature. I want to acknowledge the new Pages. I want to acknowledge the appointment of the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, and say it is an opportunity that you have to serve and to work in this great Assembly, as it is ours as elected people.

I also want to say to the public servants of this province that the public are watching very carefully as to the performance of each and every one of us, whether we are elected or whether we are employed and on public taxpayers' payroll. We have to make sure we maximize our output so that they are getting their money's worth.

Now, there are certain areas where people say we do not want anymore Government or we do not want anymore activity from Government, but I believe we are public servants. The people who work for us are public servants. It is time that we make sure we gave the taxpayers a maximum output for the money that they are giving us, because I can tell you that I have many constituents who would like to have a Government job. I can tell you that most sincerely. Many people are envious of the wages that Government people get, that civil servants get, and would dearly like to have the security and the income of a Government job.

In fact, I have done a little bit of checking, Mr. Acting Speaker. I would think that you would find that most people in society want to get a Government job, but there are very few that move from the Government to the private sector. I think that speaks volumes as to what a Government job means to an individual in today's society.

I want to make a brief comment, as it relates to the throne speech. I again want to compliment all Members who spoke on the throne speech because

that is truly an opportunity to put forward your ideas, your thoughts and to reflect on what you believe your constituent sent you here to do and to show your ability and your knowledge of your constituency. I compliment every Member of the House who spoke on the throne speech, because it is in fact an experience that not many people in society have the opportunity to do, to stand in this great Chamber and to put forward those thoughts and be heard and be reflected by the media.

While I am speaking about the media, it is extremely important to note as well, because I have seen over the past years, that I have seen in this Assembly the changing of the media year after year, new people coming on board and other ones leaving, that they do have a responsibility to reflect accurately what goes on in this public arena. So I encourage them and challenge them to make sure that they reflect as accurately as possible what has taken place in this great place.

The throne speech I believe laid out a clear direction. Not in the way in which would confuse anyone or try to be overly flowery about certain conditions, as has the budget done, Mr. Acting Speaker. I believe it has dealt forthright, honestly with the situation in which the province finds itself in, and that I compliment my colleagues, the Premier and the Government.

I want to pay particular attention in the few minutes that I have at this time to acknowledge particularly the comments made by the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) and the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin). I consider the two individuals as very good friends, and, in the time that I have had the opportunity to exchange views, to debate with, to work on programs with, as we have done with the Member for The Pas, have to say to them that I believe there is a real challenge before them to lay before this Assembly, as is the Member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickee), where they, as aboriginals, believe this province and this country are going.

They have a clear opportunity and a responsibility, Mr. Acting Speaker, to tell this Assembly and to tell this province where they see us working together to make Manitoba's aboriginal people, give them the full opportunity to excel, to have full employment opportunities, to completely play a role in our society, not just dealing with aboriginal issues, but dealing in the larger context of which we all have a responsibility. It was interesting to note the comments, particularly of the

Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper). I have read and I have studied them. It is my understanding as what he is saying is that there is no longer—in fact, it is an impediment to the Indian people of this province—The Indian Act of the House of Commons. That is what I heard him say.

* (1530)

I believe that the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) alluded to the same kind of difficulties. I have to say, I agree that it being under the bureaucracy of any federal department would be somewhat frustrating and non-productive. Well, if that is the case, and I take it is the case as what they said, then I encourage them to come straight forward and work with us to put ideas to the House of Commons and before the people of Manitoba to help resolve some of the problems that they have pointed out to us.

So I say sincerely to the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), to the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) and to the Member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickee), let us lay before this Assembly some alternatives, whether it be dealing with land claims, whether it be dealing with unemployment, whether it be dealing with the urban Native strategy, whether it be dealing with gaming, because it is important that we all work together to resolve the greater problems of economic woes of this country. We all have to have the resources to share, to maximize the needs of the people; whether they be aboriginal, whether they be any other group in our society, we have to make those resources available.

The Member for Point Douglas, I would invite him to read what the history of this province has given us under the New Democratic Party, as I would the Members for The Pas and Rupertsland: \$547 million we paid in interest that could have gone a long way to help with the educational problems of the aboriginal people. That money would have gone a long way to educate every aboriginal person in this province to the maximum, but that money is not here. That money is gone to the foreign countries and the foreign banks. So, before they get too comfortable within the New Democratic Party, I would suggest that they review where they can go to help the Native people of this province, because the history of the New Democratic Party has been dismal and a failure in helping the daily needs of the aboriginal people.

I will put my record solidly on the record, so that they can assess who has done the most for the

people of this province, particularly the aboriginal people. I am proud of our record, and I would hope they would work with us in debate to help make sure all the concerns are brought forward.

I think it is important as well, Mr. Acting Speaker, when credit should be given. It should be given up front and honestly, and I am going to do that. We have, over the past few weeks and months, been very critical of the federal Government, but I have not heard too many people stand in this House, particularly the Opposition Parties, and say thank you to the federal Government when they moved on the cash advance for the farmers of this country. I never heard one of them say in their speeches, we want to acknowledge the support the federal Government gave on interest-free cash advances to the farmers of Canada.

Well, I am. I am saying thank you to Charlie Mayer, to the federal Agriculture Minister, for seeing what was being put before them from a community that was under severe stress. I say on the record today, thank you to the federal Government for having the knowledge and the foresight to implement the cash advance for the farm community. I make no apologies for doing that.

At the same time, I will be equally critical of the federal Government when they in fact do the opposite and deter the progress of western Canada and Canadians. I think it is time, I think there is a new era in Canada where we have to be very straightforward with one another. I am going to do that as well.

Well, on to the specific items dealing with the budget. I know that I have used a lot of my time up, but I will continue now to get on with the more specific details dealing with the budget.

I want to compliment my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), who has again put forward to the people of Manitoba the truth as to the situation as to which we are in fiscally in this province. He did not spend an hour and a half during the Budget Address to try and dress up, or to try in some way tell the people of Manitoba that the problems are simple and easy, because they are not. They are not that simplistic. They are not going to be easy.

There is one theme that he has carried out throughout his discussions on this budget and what has to be told to all the people of Manitoba and particularly the Opposition Parties.

We are going through difficult economic times. We all have to share in those difficult economic times responsibly. We do not find comfort in an individual in society who is less fortunate. We, the Conservative Party, are not hardhearted when it comes to looking after our neighbours. In fact, coming from the backgrounds of the family of which I have come from, from the backgrounds I know the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), has come from and the former Member for Swan River—goodness sakes, Parker Burrell has a heart as big, my goodness, as the moon.

He never turned anybody away if they needed money, or if they needed a job, even though he may have been born in a fish shack and only had one suit, and did not speak as eloquently as the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) thinks he speaks. He was here with genuine feelings as every one of my colleagues has genuine feeling when it comes to dealing with the families of people who are in less fortunate situations.

Why do they think we increased the Family Services budget to the magnitude of which we have, the foster parent increases, the shelters? We did it because we wanted to, and we will continue to do it because we want to.

The NDP do not have a monopoly on looking after people in less fortunate conditions.

An Honourable Member: It was just rhetoric that we heard from them.

Mr. Downey: That is correct, because we can lay many cases before this Assembly that clearly point it out, but we all have to do it within the economic capabilities of this province. If we do not, then we will kill the generator of wealth that gives everyone the support that they need. It is the income makers of this province. They wail away at the corporations that there was another \$8 million. What about the \$27 million they frittered away in Saudi Arabia? What about the \$16 million in ManOil? That is the kind of waste. That is the kind of waste that we saw come from the New Democratic Party, horrendous.

We sell Manfor to create employment opportunities, to get on with a billion dollars investment, to create jobs for the Natives of that area. Do you know what the Opposition are saying? They are frustrating it to the point where who would want to come to the province to invest. There are the best environmental protection hearings going on. There is a reforestation that will create a

tremendous amount of economic activity and responsibly done, yet they are always raising this concern about Repap.

I would ask the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) to stand and clearly state his position on what he thinks of the Repap operation. I would ask him and the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) to stand and the Member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), as to what they think the relationship is between the Native people and the unions of the North. I have not heard one Native stand and compliment the union activities of northern Manitoba since I have been in this Legislature. I want the New Democratic Party to clearly say, how can they represent those two factions?

Well, I am glad, Mr. Acting Speaker. There is an individual I want to address a couple of comments to, and I will table this document because it is important that everybody have -(interjection)- you know it is important because one would have expected the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) to put something constructive forward on the record as it relates to the budget. But probably summed up, the best of all, by the editorial in the Brandon Sun of yesterday as to what the New Democratic Party—it is called, "Doer's rhetoric." I apologize for using the name. I am just quoting from the Brandon Sun.

(Mr. Eric Stefanson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Let me table this document, Mr. Acting Speaker, because it is important that I do. I happen to have enough copies for all Members by the way, and this will give individuals a little bit of an opportunity from a basis from which to work. Well, it sums up pretty accurately where the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) is coming from.

You know, I think it is extremely important. I should just quote part of it, maybe I will just—here it is, "The opposition leader says the government should be involved on job-creation initiatives—perhaps the most costly programs a government could undertake. Such programs would only add to the deficit.

"On the other hand, he is telling us that the government should be more fiscally responsible.

"Mr. Doer cannot have it both ways—even in opposition."

I am passing that around, Mr. Acting Speaker, so all Members can see the rhetoric of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) because that

is exactly what he is seeing as rhetoric, political opportunism. He passed up his opportunity to be Premier for six weeks; he will never be Premier for six days. He will always be in Opposition.

Mr. Acting Speaker, it was because he was rejected. The Conservative Party took a vote as to whether they would have him or not and he did not pass the grade.

* (1540)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again about the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)—could you tell me, sir, how much time do I have left to make my final comments? My time? -(interjection)- Oh, that is good, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I did not realize I had quite so much time left or I would have further read the editorial. I would conclude as comments just in the final paragraph: "In short, it is up to the opposition to not only provide levelled-headed criticism of the budget but also to provide an alternative to the government's plan.

"Mr. Doer, one suggests, did neither."

Now he got a real whopping in the Brandon Sun editorial. I would hope he would read it and reflect, because I think those are the sentiments of all the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue on because I think it is important in the 10 minutes or so that I have left to deal more specifically with the budget. I want to deal with some of the Northern Affairs comments that were made of the last few days of the Members opposite.

Our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has again been honest and straightforward with the people of Manitoba. -(interjection)- Well, the Members talk about smoke and mirrors. I can tell you this Minister has maintained a course. He has put forward the position of this Government to continue to contain the taxation on the public, to work towards and to maintain the essential services for the people of Manitoba, to continue to work towards, in the long term, the reduction of the deficit, which was given to us by the New Democratic Party, and to create an economic climate that will in fact generate the incomes that pay for our social programs and to increase the tax base.

I want to refer again to the Northern Affairs expenditures and some of the things that are

happening in the North. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that if all those who got their recent Manitoba Lotteries Annual Report—I think there is a clear indication of the co-operation we saw in the past year and a half of working with a lot of our communities—there is a fine picture of my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) and myself as Minister of Northern and Native Affairs, signing the gaming agreement between The Pas Indian band and the Province of Manitoba, a major step forward.

I believe if I can recall the comments correctly of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), he said at that particular time that this was truly an example for the rest of Canada to follow. Well, I believe that. I still believe that it will be able to work with the Honourable Member for The Pas as it relates to many issues dealing with the Native community, his community and the Member for Rupertsland's (Mr. Harper) as well.

I want to talk now more specifically about the Northern Affairs portion of the Estimates. We will get into that in detail, but I have some particular highlights which I want to touch base with.

You know, when we were elected in 1988, the first thing we were hit with were five northern Indian bands who had been frustrated to no end. They could not get out of the New Democratic Party, since 1981, any commitment to deal with the Northern Flood Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we moved aggressively to put senior negotiators in place to deal with the problems that they were faced with. Yes, we may not have succeeded totally, but we have made massive steps, I believe.

One of the things we did do—and I want the Members opposite to add this to their totals when they are adding up what northern Manitoba got under this Government. I want them to put on the bottom line \$10 million that this Government paid for to work towards the settlement of the Northern Flood Agreement. I also want them to add up the money that Manitoba Hydro put into the Northern Flood Agreement.

When they are doing their calculations, when they are doing all their adding and their criticism of this Government and not spending money in northern Manitoba, add \$10 million to the bottom line and see what that does in a percentage increase for northern

Manitobans. It was not given without a full sincerity of wanting to get on with resolving the issues that were left to us by the New Democratic Party.

There is another extremely important item that I want Members to pay attention to. Yes, it did not show up in the Northern Affairs budget, but it came from Northern Affairs and it came from my honourable colleague, the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). That was \$500,000 over two years to deliver a recreation program for the young people of northern Manitoba. My colleagues supported me and supported my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, without hesitation to help the young people of the North.

Today, there are 27 new people working in those programs to help give those young people productive ways of life. I would expect any members of the cloth who sit in this Chamber to stand up and give credit where credit is due when it comes to helping the young people of the North and specifically those areas. I would ask that he take a look at both sides, both sides of the issue, before he passes judgment. I would say that sincerely, because I think it is important that he do so.

Let us deal again with the other initiatives that have been put forward, and I pointed the picture out of the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), my colleague, Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson) and myself in the signing of the gaming agreement with The Pas Indian Band. Let us not forget the millions of dollars that my colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), put forward for that same community to the Bachelor of Nursing degree program in The Pas.

Why do Members not be big enough to stand and give compliments where compliments are due and credit where credit is due? Is it because they cannot have that quick political cheap little shot at us? Is that what it is? Is that why? Well, I told them earlier the people of Manitoba and Canada are fed up with that kind of political politicking games that they are playing. -(interjection)- No, that is exactly what they told us, that is what -(interjection)- No, they are not, the people of Manitoba, like all the people of Canada, want the truth. You are a stranger to it, I can assure you that, from the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer).

Well, again, the Member opposite says about the GST. We are very clear on the record as to where we stand on the GST.

An Honourable Member: We do not like it.

Mr. Downey: That is right, we do not like it. We do not like taxation of any kind, but when you are following a New Democratic Party Government, you have no option but to put taxation in place to clean up the mess or to continue with the taxation.

Let us look at the GST. I interestingly noted the new Leader of the Liberal Party, in his commitment now to get rid of the GST. How many people remember Pierre Elliott Trudeau and wage and price controls, and what they said about that one when Robert Stanfield was Prime Minister, and the gas tax when Crosbie was bringing in a gas tax? It was only a short period afterwards that it was implemented. Well, in this case there is a difference, Mr. Speaker, because Mr. Jean Chretien and the Liberal Party will not have to worry about being in office—will not have to worry about being in office.

An Honourable Member: Neither will Brian Mulroney.

Mr. Downey: I believe Mr. Brian Mulroney will be in office. He may have to be propped up, he may have to be propped up by a Reform Party of western Canada. He may have to be propped up by a block Party from Quebec, but I believe Brian Mulroney will be the Prime Minister.

An Honourable Member: I shudder to think.

* (1550)

Mr. Downey: Well, there is one alternative. There is another alternative and that, of course, is the New Democratic Party. Maybe by that time some of the policies of the Government in Ontario will start to be evident as to the direction in which they are going to take this country. God help them if they are anything like the direction that the Howard Pawley Government, of which the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) sat as a Minister. If they take in that direction, then they are heading into a nose-dive of death that they will never get out of.

Mr. Speaker, our commitment to northern Manitoba, I can go over and over it, continued to support the infrastructure programs of the North with sewer and water, fire protection mechanisms, bridges and roads in the communities which were neglected for some 16 years by the last administration, nursing stations at Easterville,

kidney dialysis in Thompson, sewer and water, one sewage lagoon, which I am sure it was appropriately placed and that was in the back yard of the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). Well, here again, here is this Party of New Democratic people who change the colour of their campaign material to reflect their environmental concerns. He was, in fact, under an environmental order as a Minister of the Crown, and it took the Conservative Party to put the funds together to clean up their mess in the sewage lagoon at Bakers Narrows. So much, Mr. Speaker, for their commitment to the people of Manitoba.

I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying, I am proud to sit as a Member of this Government with this Premier (Mr. Filmon), who showed the people of Manitoba on September 11 that he had the policies, he had the direction, and he had the strength to take Manitoba into the 1990s.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to participate in this debate on the budget. I shall focus on the economy itself, the present situation of the economy, condition and state of our economy in general, some basic concepts like GDP rise, inflation, recession, the role of education and economic development, the twin problems of inflation and unemployment, the plight of our senior citizens in the face of inflation and unemployment, and then offer some suggestions to the Government for the proper development program for senior citizens, and conclude with some guidelines about the happy and confident style of living.

If we look at it from the societal perspective, the economy is the system of human interactions in relation to the creation, conversion, and distribution of material goods and services that constitute the wealth of society. This material wealth is derived from what are known as the primary factors of production: land and all the accessories that go with the land, like timber, minerals, gravel and other resources and deposits; labour—the human effort, the skill and energy of people that go into the production process; capital—the factories, the machinery, the equipment, computers and other capital equipment; technology—knowledge, processes into production, managerial as well as technical knowledge that goes into the production process.

What is the situation of our economy at the national level and at the provincial level? The

present economy of Canada is characterized by a high rate of interest, represented at the highest point by a 14 percent, one-year mortgage rate. The inflation rate in this country is being contained, but it is approximately at 4.3 percent. But, with the introduction of the goods and services tax in the coming New Year, there will be intensification of the inflationary pressure and inflation will tend to increase. The rate of unemployment used to be 7.8 percent, but has now gone a little bit to 7 percent. Investment in housing is down.

The value of all these goods and services in our economy is usually measured in many ways, such as the gross national product or the gross national expenditure, but the most recent measure of this wealth of society is what is known as the gross domestic product. The gross domestic product is a measure of the value of final goods and services in current prices, produced within Canada or Manitoba, as the case may be, both by Canadians and by non-residents. The gross domestic product, however, excludes certain expenses, such as the value of intermediate goods, the value of the transfer payments, which are non-productive in nature, second-hand sales and purchases, and certain kinds of transactions which are merely exchange of paper assets.

If the dollar value of the gross domestic product is corrected by the reduction of the price increase since the base year, we get what is known as the real GDP, or the real value of the gross domestic product. The gross domestic product is obtained by summing up all the payments made for the factors of production under the flow-of-income approach to the economy. It, of course, consists of consumption and spending, spending of people on durables, such as cars, on semi-durables like shirts and dress, and non-durables like milk and food.

It also consists of gross domestic spending both by Government and business firms in the economy, in investment in machinery, in construction and inventory charges. There will also be Government spending on the basic essential services including security, police, goods and services, acquisition of materials for Government, as well as the net export over import.

In order to understand the economy, we have to have an understanding of basic economic concepts like the concept of price. Price is the amount of a unit of good or service, that could be exchanged for it. It can be understood in two basic senses, in the

sense of economic price, which is anything, whether it is money, good or service, for which another could be exchanged for something else.

It can also be understood in a more limited sense of accounting price, which is the dollar price. The number of units of monetary currency which must be exchanged for a unit of goods or service. The measure of changes in prices—we have in economics a concept known as CPI, the Consumer Price Index. The Consumer Price Index is a comprehensive measure of the changes in prices that are derived from a periodic survey of Statistics Canada, of a set of specific items weighted by the share of expenditure of the consumer on each individual item in that basket of food.

The CPI, Consumer Price Index, is simply the ratio of the base year quantity of output at current year prices, to the base year quantity of output at the base year prices, multiplied by 100.

If there is a widespread and ongoing increase in the general price level in the economy, and if this price increase continued for a sustained period of time, we have what is known as the phenomenon of inflation. Inflation therefore, is the widespread, ongoing, general increase in the general price level for a sustained duration of time.

There are two kinds of inflation. What the economists call demand-pull inflation, as distinguished from the cost-push inflation. Demand-pull inflation is characterized by excessive demand, by rising prices, coupled with full employment. In the case of demand-pull inflation, the aggregate demand will shift upward, and this is due to the increasing Government spending, or reduction in taxes, or due to the optimistic, orientation and expectation of consumers, or to the increase in money supply in the economy.

The shifting of aggregate demand upward, leads to the increase in the quantity of real output, creating more jobs and a declined rate of unemployment, but at the same time, the price levels also increase as a result of intensification of economic activity.

To counteract the demand pull type of inflation, the Government should resort to tight monetary policy. The Government should also resort to tight fiscal policy to reduce his spending in the heated economy. The other type of inflation is a more difficult one to deal with. It is known as the cost-push inflation. This is due to the monopoly power of the business firm, the corporate entities, or the

monopoly power of the union, as the case may be. It is characterized by rising prices, but the economy is producing at less than full capacity.

* (1600)

In the case of cost-push inflation, the aggregate supply shifts downward. The downward shift of the aggregate supply is due to the increase in money wages, due to the cost of production increases, due to the increases in taxes, the increase in the cost of materials, the increase in energy costs in the productive process.

The cost-push type of inflation leads to a decline in real output, leads to an increase in the rate of unemployment and a stagnation of employment for people who remain employed. The price also increases and there is no more trade-off between price increase and rate of unemployment.

If the Government resorts to a tight monetary policy, or a tight fiscal policy, this will mean that there will be an increase in the rate of unemployment, but if they attack unemployment and resort to spending, that means that there will be an increase in the rate of inflation. Therefore, there is no remedy in this dilemma, the twin problems of stagnation of employment and inflation at the same time. The economists call it stagflation.

The appropriate remedy, according to some economists, is to go to the supply side and do the corrective measure by means of wage control or price control, which they recommend for the cost-push type of inflation.

Now what are the effects of inflation in the economy? What are some of the ill effects of inflation in our economy and on the people in the economic system? Inflation tends to redistribute income unevenly among all the sectors of the population, for example, from the old to the young or from debtors to creditors. Inflation also distorts the production decisions of business firms. Inflation also distorts the consumption decisions of consumers, thereby reducing in the long run the capital stock of wealth over time in society in general.

What about unemployment? What are some of the ill effects of unemployment in the economy? Unemployment represents certain commodities, goods and services that could have been produced but were not produced because the productive capacity is operating at less than capacity. Unemployment misallocates the resource input of

labour and at the same time wastes a lot of those resource inputs of labour.

If the Government wishes to counteract both these twin problems of inflation and unemployment, what are some of the alternative sources of financing that the Government could go to in order to finance its problem of activities, at the national level for example?

The Government can either go to the current tax revenue collection by increasing the rate of taxes. Alternatively, the Government can do internal borrowing from the public by floating bonds and selling them to the public or investing in those securities, or the federal Government can borrow from the Bank of Canada which is an act of pure monetary creation.

Out of all these three alternative sources of funding, of financing of governmental activities, the weakest impact on income and employment can arise by the choice of increases in tax rates, because the increase in taxes will reduce the consumption component of aggregate demand, which means that it will go down as a partial upset to the increase in governmental spending.

Out of these three types of financing the most significant impact on employment income is by the Government resorting to borrowing from the central bank and resorting to money creation, because the new money that is created will initially boost the interest rate, but the investment will go down due to the crowding out effect of Government spending on private investment. However, the new money will also increase the monetary supply in the economy, will reduce the initial tendency of interest rates to rise, thus offsetting in part the inflationary effect of increased Government spending.

If we have to have economic growth we need to increase the output per unit of input in the economy. There are generally three basic ways of increasing the output per unit of input. One, by economies of a scale, which is the means of increasing the output per unit of input that is derived by greater specialization, and also by longer production run.

An Honourable Member: Work harder, right?

Mr. Santos: Work hard and longer. The second way to increase the output per unit of input is to improve an efficient allocation of resources. This means that we are going to shift the less efficient and low-paying forms of employment in favour of the more efficient and high-paying forms of employment.

The third way to increase the output per unit of input as the definition of economic growth is the advance in knowledge. As the production relevant knowledge increases, the output that can be produced from any given unit of input will also tend to increase, but knowledge advances, technical or managerial, can only happen if we put our emphasis and investment in our educational system.

This leads me to the topic of education. This budget of the Tory Government is deficient in the area of education by providing an increased spending of only 4.1 percent, which is less than the inflation rate of 4.3 percent. It is in effect a cut on spending on education. Notice that whatever this increase, which is less than the inflation rate in education spending, the bulk of it had gone or will go to the private school system because of the increase from 50 percent to 80 percent public funding of private schools patronized by the rich and the well-born to the detriment of the public school system to which the middle-income Canadian and poor families could send their children.

The Greek philosopher Diogenes said that the education of the youth is the enduring foundation of every nation. This Tory Government, by cutting spending, is destroying the advancement of education, including the production of relevant production knowledge essential to the increase in the output per unit of input that could be extracted. Therefore, they are undermining economic growth itself by undermining education.

They are undermining not only the economic growth process, they are also undermining the potentialities for greatness of this province and of these people. They campaign on a great people and in a great province, but they are, by cutting education, undermining the potentialities for greatness.

It is through education that we can create a better person out of ourselves. Aristotle said that within every block of marble, you can create a beautiful statue as you remove the superfluous part of that marble. In our personality, we can create and develop our personality through education by getting rid of our vices, our exorcise, our foolish ways of doing things due to ignorance, due to illiteracy, due to poverty, and this can only happen through the process of education.

Education is a lifelong process of improving human personality, as well as improving society and

advancing economic growth in our materialistic society. Similarly, better ways can be found in improving ourselves, seeking out new and better ways of doing things in the economy as well, if we undertake to support education.

Of all the institutions of society, the educational system is the very place where we produce the future leaders and managers and administrators and workers in our industry, in all areas of human activities. If we cut funding on the public school system, we are cutting the growth of our society in a material and a spiritual sense as well.

Let me go back to the topic of recession. Recession is a general slowdown in economic activity. There is a general decline in total output, general decline in income, general decline in employment that lasts for at least two consecutive calendar quarters, or at least six months and marked by a contraction in many sectors of the economy.

Recession implies that there is a drop in aggregate nominal demand that is caused by contractionary monetary and fiscal policy, that there is a decrease in plan investments by business firms and there is a decrease in consumption expenditures of consumers. This is simply the pattern of decline from the highest point called the peak, down to the lowest point called the trough, in the business cycle, until it picks up again in the expansionary scale of the business cycle.

* (1610)

We know that gaps may exist and a divergence may exist between the actual aggregate spending in the current equilibrium of production and the maximum full employment potential production if all resources in the economy are fully utilized to capacity. If the actual aggregate of spending in the current equilibrium of production is less than the maximum full employment potential production at full capacity there is known a thing called recessionary gap.

What is the remedy when there is a recessionary gap in the economy? The remedy is easy money policy. The interest rates should come down. The investment spending should go up. The Government should buy Government securities in order to increase the amount of supply of money in the economy. There should be lower bank interest rates and there should be lower secondary reserve

ratio. The deposit of Government should be transferred to the charter banks.

In the area of fiscal policy, there should be more Government spending and there should be tax cuts. If the actual aggregate spending in the current equilibrium level of production is greater than the maximum full employment potential production at full capacity, it is known as inflationary gap. What is the remedy in case of inflationary gap? There should be tight monetary policy. The Government should sell the Government securities in order to decrease the supply of money in the economy, they should increase the bank interest rate and they should increase the secondary reserve ratio of the chartered banks. They should take the Government deposit out of the chartered banks. In the area of fiscal policy, there should be a decrease in Government spending and an increase in the tax rates.

All of this should be in conjunction with the built-in economic stabilizer in the economy such as our progressive tax system. Recession along with inflation is particularly difficult for people who are on fixed incomes. Among the most significant group who are on fixed incomes are a number of senior citizens. Inflation and recession are felt by both landlords and tenants, but more so by tenants, especially those senior citizens who are on fixed incomes.

Last Friday, October 26, I responded to a complaint by a senior citizen and his wife, whose annual lease has expired and who wants to move to another apartment. They put a partial deposit of \$40 to move into another apartment, but the existing landlord refused to give them any release because they failed to give notice of their intention to leave. They have occupied the apartment one month in excess of the yearly lease, which they refused to sign again.

The senior citizen is sick. The old apartment was exterminated and he felt it, and the doctor recommended that he move. The wife is emotionally upset and when, as the MLA for Broadway, I made inquiries as to the facts of the case to find a solution that will be fair to both sides, the tenant and the landlord, so that this poor couple with limited resources would not be paying rent twice for the same period of occupancy, one to the old landlord and one to the new landlord, the Government immediately said that they will set a hearing for this. The man is sick and the wife is in an emotional state

of mind, and to top it with a hearing to me is insensitivity to apply to people who are already in a problematic situation. When the wife is emotionally upset, how could the Government set a hearing that will be difficult for these people to handle?

I suggest that the Tory Government, if they want to stay longer in power—and this is good political advice—they can, but they will not. They should show compassion to our senior citizens by developing the optional stay home program for seniors. The optional stay home for seniors means that they can keep their old residence where their family has grown up, the residence so dear to their hearts, if there is a program of gradual reduction of real estate taxes from the residential homes of senior citizens who can afford no more to pay these taxes. There should be gradual reduction as they grow in age so they can stay home and keep their place of residence.

I suggest also that this Government undertake the expansion of the Home Care Program. They should render assistance to those senior citizens who would choose to stay in their homes and possibly give some assistance to members of the family who want to take care of their grandmother or their grandfather in their own homes.

There should be an adequate healthcare delivery system for senior citizens who are now confined in nursing homes with a sufficient number of nurses in attendance, with a sufficient number of supplies, and adequate attention paid to these sick people. Those who choose to stay away, to have some sense of privacy away from their family, and have chosen to live in some public housing capacity should be housed in some decent housing units with some privacy to themselves.

Moreover, if the stay home program is adopted, this should be linked with a social assistance program so that those welfare recipients who are able-minded, able-bodied young people, before they get their social assistance cheque, should be required to render community service like shovelling snow on the pathway of senior citizens homes in wintertime before they take their cheques so that nobody gets something for nothing.

This Government should enrich the pension plan of those senior citizens, particularly widows, who have no private pension plan of any kind who are dependent on the Old Age Assistance Program.

One problem the senior citizens of this country have been suffering—and you can read it through the newspaper almost every day—is the scheme of people, financial abuse more than physical abuse, of senior citizens. This happens too often to the most respected members of our population, done by criminal fraud artists in many different ways, someone for example posing as a bank examiner asking senior citizens to withdraw cash from their deposit account ostensibly to check the honesty of some bank employee and to catch the dishonest employee. After the senior citizen hands on the cash, the phony bank examiner disappears along with the cash.

Another form is by offering instant business opportunities promising fantastic high profits, asking senior citizens to make substantial investments or substantial franchise fees or registration fees and then disappearing with the fees. There are also on-the-spot home improvement offers to improve their homes, getting the money and not doing the work or, even if they do the work, doing such a shoddy and haphazard work that some of our senior citizens are bilked of some of their savings. Some of the more callous ones are so unscrupulous they bilk the senior citizens even of their lifetime savings. How can the Government help?

I formally call upon the Government to establish a financial compensation system for victims of commercial frauds, especially senior citizens, who have been subjected to such financial abuse that they lost their lifetime savings. That is the only way that we can recompense our senior citizens who have been subjected to such unscrupulous manipulators and oppressors and exploiters in our society.

Let me now suggest to everyone who has ears to hear some of the guidelines of a successful and contented life, especially in your mature years when you become a senior citizen. One, lead a simple life, because the best things in life are simple. Spend less than what you earn in order to keep yourself out of debts, out of trouble, and out of problems. Be grateful for all the opportunities, all the blessings, all the privileges that you enjoy and be thankful. Cultivate a pleasant disposition by always seeing the side of the issue from the other person's point of view. Know and control yourself by having an attitude of peace, of good will and tolerance to everyone. Look at the positive side of events instead of dwelling on the negative side. Have a recreational

hobby such as walking, biking, gardening, golfing, photography, carpentry, even poetry,

* (1620)

Keep close to God. Pray for spiritual renewal and nourishment. Pray for divine protection, and pray for the inner direction and guidance. Help others. Give and love generously, because it is in helping that we are helped, it is in giving that we are given, and it is in loving that we are loved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by asking that all of us who are in charge of society for the present and for the future, all of us who in good faith are trying to do the best we can in our collective struggle for social, political and economic equality, fairness and justice for everyone, I suggest that it is the duty of every civilized Government to provide adequate health care to all its citizens, particularly to senior citizens. It is the duty of every civilized Government to provide adequate income and economic security to everyone so that no one will suffer such a style of living as to lower one's dignity. It is the duty of every Government, as much as it can, to stamp out poverty whenever and wherever it raises its ugly head, because poverty is the root cause of many other social problems that we have to contend with.

It is the duty of every civilized Government to open up more social, economic and other kinds of opportunities to all citizens regardless of class, regardless of ethnic origin, sex, gender or any other kinds of artificial discrimination. We must have faith in ourselves as legislators. We must have confidence in the Almighty, because it is faith, good work and good faith that enable us to see the invisible, to hear the inaudible, to feel the intangible, to believe in the incredible, even to do the impossible. Thank you very much.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I am very pleased to be able to rise and enter into the debate on the budget, Mr. Speaker. May I begin with a few preliminary remarks since this is the first occasion that I have had to formally address the Legislature this Session since the election.

May I begin by congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your return to the Chair and wish you the very best as you preside over the proceedings of this House. I also congratulate my colleagues who have returned to the House, especially all the new Members on this side of the House who certainly add a fresh scene to this Legislature. We look

forward to their input and to their positive contribution to the House. May I also congratulate all Members who have been elected to the House, and we look forward to the debates in the months and days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, in having said that, I would like to formally say, thank you to all of my constituents for placing the confidence in me and returning me to the Legislature as their elected official. Over the next term, I plan to ensure that they receive the best possible representation as we work through the legislative Sessions in this House.

Now, turning to the budget, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am very proud to be a Member of this Government, and to be a Member on this side of the House, in the way that the budget has been presented to this House just a few days ago by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). Manitobans for a long time have been asking for the truth. Since we were elected, we indicated that we would give Manitobans the truth about the economics, about the economic picture of this province, and ensure that we would manage in a responsible way. That is what Manitobans expect of us, and that is what we must give them.

Our economic climate has not been the best over the last few years. We were left with an enormous debt by the former administration, a debt that our children are going to have to share some responsibility in paying for. To some this may not mean very much, Mr. Speaker, but indeed to a father who has three young children growing up, I know that the money they will be earning in the future years, some of it will have to go to pay for the mistakes that we, as people who had responsibility to lead this province, have made.

Therefore, I am proud of the type of budget that has been introduced, because indeed it is saying that we must live within our means. We can no longer continue to keep spending beyond our means, and keep spending money that we do not have. The budget addresses the fact that we as a Government have to reduce our expectations and our spending. It addresses the fact that we as a society in this province cannot continue to expect more and more from Government, and yet it balances that with our ability to be able to contribute to the economy. We cannot continue to expect taxpayers to reach into their pockets and pay more and more and more.

It is not there, Mr. Speaker. Families in this province cannot continue to be taxed any more. Yet, I think Manitobans understand that it is important to preserve those kinds of institutions and those kinds of services that we have come to appreciate, and we know that are needed in this province, services such as health care, social services and education.

I think if we take a look at the track record of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) in the last year or two, and we take a look at the track record of this Government as it relates to health, we should indeed be proud, because there has been a considerable investment in facilities in this province to take care of our senior citizens, and to take care of the people who are sick and in need of care. When you think that \$250 million has gone into facilities, indeed that is a commitment that we have to health care in this province.

As a Member representing the western side of the province, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to participate in the opening sod-turning ceremonies of a facility in my constituency which will allow elderly people to live in their community because there is an expansion of a personal care home in the area, which indeed will allow those senior citizens to stay with their families and close to their families for an extended period of time.

Those are the kinds of services that we need in our small towns in rural Manitoba, so that indeed, those families who are retiring and are in their golden years can be close to their families in that way. In the past, as a personal experience, Mr. Speaker, I remember my grandmother having to move away to a community in Brandon where she knew no one. Those are the kinds of things that these kinds of facilities will prevent.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to mention the agriculture portfolio, because the area I represent is largely agricultural. In the last five years, we have seen dropping prices. We have seen drought. We have seen all of those devastating things that drive people off the farm land. I have to say that this last year we were blessed with fantastic crops. I think anyone in my constituency will tell you that the yields they received this year were beyond their expectation, but unfortunately not only are the quotas not there to sell the grain, but neither are the prices at this time.

* (1630)

So when we take a look at what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) here has been striving for, what he has worked towards, the amount of money that has gone into agriculture, I think we can say that this Government has indeed done its share in making sure that agriculture can be supported in the best way possible. When you talk to farm families in rural Manitoba, and you explain to them about the programs that we have initiated in two short years, programs such as the Interest Relief Program, programs such as the Young Farmer Rebate Program, the expansion of the MACC program. Also the relief of education tax on farm land. All of these things, indeed, have allowed farm families to stay on their farms longer.

I think it is unquestionable that the Minister of Agriculture here is indeed interested in supporting the farm families of rural Manitoba in the best way possible, and indeed, that this Government has as its focus farm families within our province.

Mr. Speaker, my portfolio of education, is a challenging one. We see and hear from people right around this province and right around this country, the importance of education, the importance of education in later years, in adult life and perhaps education has not been playing the role that it should be in our society. We are living in changing times, especially in the area of education, and in education we have enacted some changes that are going to take us into the next century and the 1990s will be a period of renewed, if you like, emphasis on education, renewed emphasis on where we are going, and challenges set up in the system.

We need to ensure as a province, that all Manitobans have an opportunity to receive a high quality of education so that they can function in a society in a fruitful way, so that our labour market can be filled with people who have graduated from our education system, who possess the skills to be able to function effectively. We have to understand that all of this means that we have to make a considerable investment and commitment to education, and we have done that. There are new pressures to make sure that we train people for the new global markets.

Our society is changing very quickly and we have to ensure that our system can change as the changes occur. I would have to say that the high school review, for example, which has been in the works now for some three and a half years, took almost too long to complete, but the

recommendations that have come in the form of strategies for success are, I think, visionary and will take our high school education system to be one that is competitive in the world, to be one that really addresses the needs that need addressing, and will change the face of our high school education system to an extent where students who are graduating from the system will possess the foundation to allow them to go into university or post-secondary education, with ease.

I have heard for far too long, since I have been in the portfolio I have heard from business people, from parents, from people who hire high school graduates, that our high school graduates do not have the necessary skills. Some of them do, Mr. Speaker, but many do not. Skills at literacy, skills in writing, skills in being able to compute, and even some of the basic skills of being able to live in independence.

So, Mr. Speaker, there was no question that there was a need to change our high school system, and we have done that. Over the period of the next three to four years, we will be implementing the strategies that have been put forth in this document called, *Answering the Challenge, Strategies for Success in Manitoba High Schools*. We have begun that process as of September 1990.

Some of them we will have to be flexible on, so that as the changes are needed, we are able to change the plan somewhat; however, the objective and the goal will not change, Mr. Speaker. There has been some resistance to change, and that I guess is normal as we go through changes of any kind. There are some of those in our society who would like to see things just the way they were. Do not rock the boat. If we take that attitude, we will fall behind drastically, to compare that to the rest of the world.

Our students who are graduating from our high school systems have to be competitive, not only in our province, not only in our country, but around the world. They will be competing against people from the Japans and the Germanys, and I have said this before, that they have to have the skills that will allow them to compete on an even playing field.

So, Mr. Speaker, *Strategies for Success* does lay that foundation to allow them to do this, and I look forward to making sure that all of these strategies are implemented.

There is something else. We would look at curriculum. It is just not enough to change the structure of something and hope that everything else will fall into place. There is a commitment in this document to rewrite curriculum so that it is made more challenging, so that it is made more relevant, so that it is made more appropriate to the needs of society and to the needs of the variety of students that we have within our system.

Whether a student is a special needs student or whether a student is a gifted child, that student needs to have the assurance that there is an education process in place that will challenge his situation. Indeed, this is a beginning. It is certainly not the end, and changes will have to be made as we go along, but indeed it is a beginning in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, in the budget, one of the issues that was raised very emphatically was our intent to put into place a training program and a retraining program for our society where business, industry, education and Government can come together and work towards an effective training program for our society, because it has been noted by the Skills Training Advisory Committee who put a report together for me not that long ago that there is a shortage in our society, in Manitoba right now, of a well-skilled labour force. About 45 percent of our labour force are not made up of graduates, Mr. Speaker. Between 25 percent and 30 percent of our population is deemed illiterate, and that is not acceptable in this day and age.

For those reasons, we have to ensure that we provide training programs where we can take the resources not only of Government but of business. We can come together in a partnership and, together, we can then create some effective training programs, some effective job skills programs.

We have talked about partnerships now for two and a half years, Mr. Speaker. I guess I talked about partnerships in public school education. I talked about partnerships in post-secondary education and even in training programs, because education is truly a partnership approach in every respect. It involves not only the educators and Government, it involves parents of students who are in the education system, and it involves the business and the community at large, because all of us have a stake in education.

We have to ensure that the scarce dollars that we spend on education are used effectively and efficiently, and that the students who are in the system benefit as best as possible from the system.

In the last couple of days, we have heard some criticism from across the way about the northern programs that we have in place, and what we have done with regard to training in the North. I would like to point out for the record what we have done in the last two and a half years in the whole area of northern education. I can tell you that when we first came into Government—

An Honourable Member: They are not as interested today as they were last week.

Mr. Derkach: No, they are not, Mr. Speaker; however, I have to tell you that when we came into Government two and a half years ago, there were about 32 Native people employed in my public school branch, in the Native Ed branch, or right through the Department of Education. Today that number has increased from the 32 individuals to some 78 individuals. We have doubled that.

When we take a look at the criticism that was levelled at cutting the budget for KCC, Keewatin Community College in The Pas—let me give you a bit of statistic on that one in terms of numbers. When we came into Government in 1988, there was one person out of 11 people who are involved in the administration of Native or aboriginal origin. Today we have six who are of aboriginal origin. Two of them are Native women. Out of the 11, when there was only one female before, we now have six women in administration and, Mr. Speaker, in two and a half short years. I think that certainly speaks for our commitment in terms of employing aboriginal people in northern Manitoba.

I can also say that when we came into Government we had what was called the Limestone Training Agency, an agency that was designed to train people of northern Manitoba for Limestone. They entered into an apprenticeship program. This was under the former administration, and I have to point that out.

* (1640)

There was an agreement struck with the federal Government that some \$30 million would be spent on Limestone training, \$12 million or \$18 million was supposed to come from the federal Government and the rest was supposed to come from our provincial Government, well, Mr. Speaker, \$12 million

specifically. As it ended up, some \$41 million was spent instead of \$30 million, and only \$12 million was recouped from the federal Government.

Eighteen hundred people entered the apprenticeship program, and do you know how many graduates we got out of the program, six. After \$41 million of expenditure we have six qualified journeymen from that program. That is the success of that program. The exercise was fine the results devastating.

One wonders why, when we moved into Government, we said this has to be changed. Not only is there a phase down of Limestone training, but indeed we had to change the focus. We renamed the program. We called it the Northern Training Employment Agency, and we moved, yes, we moved the offices out of Winnipeg, because the offices for Limestone Training were not in the North, no, they were in Winnipeg, the corner of Portage and Main.

Do you know that in one year the travel to northern Manitoba from Winnipeg amounted to some \$170,000.00? I ask you, is that a real commitment to northern Manitobans? I say to you, no it is not, not at all.

I can continue on for hours and tell you the kind of devastating performance that we had up there by the former administration. I had an opportunity to travel up in that area last summer. As I was making my tour through there they told me you had better come out to the old Manfor site because we have a building out there. I said we do, do we. We went out there and there was a building out there sure enough, but I could see all this old equipment lying in the trees, construction equipment of all kinds, house trailers, trucks. I said, who owns all of this? They said, Mr. Minister, your department owns all of this. I said, what is it doing in the bush? They said, it was kind of used for Limestone and some of it was just left here broken down, and we do not have the budget to repair it so we just kind of leave it here.

We went about -(interjection)- well, we do not know, there were trees growing around some of it. We went ahead and we brought all of this equipment together, Mr. Speaker. I would say if anybody is familiar with Keewatin Community College, if you go to the back of the college you will see a huge yard, and we filled that yard with equipment that we dragged out of the bush and dragged out of everywhere.

An Honourable Member: And how much did you not find?

Mr. Derkach: There are still serial numbers that we cannot find the equipment for, but nevertheless we were able to sell that. We generated not that great amount of money but some \$500,000 I think. If you value that equipment at its value when it was bought I am sure that there was over \$3 million worth of equipment sitting there. That is the kind of management that we had by the former administration. It goes on and on and on.

Instead of talking about those negative tones let me talk about some of the programs that have happened in the last two and a half years up in northern Manitoba. The reason I focus on this is that we have seen some criticism about what is happening in northern Manitoba.

Let me tell you some of the things that are happening. Keewatin Community College was at the verge of closing when we took Government, because there was indeed a desire to close it and move it to a different institution. We rejuvenated that college, Mr. Speaker, and the enrollment has been going up consistently. About 58 percent of the people who are now at the Keewatin Community College are of aboriginal descent. I have to tell you that the enrollment has gone up. In 1989, it went up by 13 percent. This year, in 1990-91, the enrollment is up 85 percent, and I can tell you it is operating at full capacity.

In terms of management I have laid that out, Mr. Speaker. We have six people in management now who are women. Pardon me, I think I gave you the wrong statistic before. It is five out of the 11 are aboriginal. In addition, we have entered into new programs right through the North. We have 65 evening programs representing a broad range of activities. Now where are these programs running? Well, they are running in Flin Flon, they are running in Thompson, The Pas, Snow Lake, Gillam, Leaf Rapids.

We have a program called Enterprise in Action which was started in October 1989. This program which incorporates business management techniques and entrepreneurship is running in The Pas, Thompson, Nelson House, Norway House, Oxford House, Red Sucker Lake, Duck Bay, Camperville, Fort Alexander, in northern Manitoba, and the list goes on. There are other programs under market driven training which indeed we have

initiated in the last two and a half years. So, Mr. Speaker, our commitment to northern Manitoba is solid, and it is strong.

The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) who spoke just before me indicated that we had initiated a program of northern Bachelor of Nursing training. Well, the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) who was then the Chief of the Swampy Creek Tribal Council was a key individual in these negotiations. Since 1985, he tried to ensure that program would get off the ground.

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs, on a point of order.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Yes, I wonder if you would do a quorum count, Mr. Speaker, if you would, please, at this time?

Mr. Speaker: A quorum count?

Mr. Downey: Please.

Mr. Speaker: Madam Deputy Clerk. Order, please. I would ask all Members present to rise in their place and ask that the Deputy Clerk at the table call and record the names of those present. Order, please.

The Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs, on a point of order.

Mr. Downey: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the quorum count should have been taken prior to the Members of the Opposition coming in at this particular time. The call was made prior to the entry of many Members of the Opposition Party. That is when it should be recorded as of.

Mr. Speaker: Madam Deputy Clerk would you want to take a count, please, names. Would all Members please rise.

The Honourable Member for Inkster, to that point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, to that point of order the Minister has quite correctly pointed out the fact there has been a couple of Members, and maybe we can ask, will those Members who might have come in prior to the Minister making the comments, to leave the Chamber so in fact it would be accurate according to our records.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There were two Members who came in after I requested a quorum count. Order, please.

Honourable Members present now, would you please rise. Madam Deputy Clerk, take a count, please, those who were present.

Madam Deputy Clerk (Bev Boslak): The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), the Honourable Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), the Honourable Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), the Honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), the Honourable Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), the Honourable Minister of Co-op, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery), the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose), the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson), the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), the Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh), the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine).

Mr. Speaker: A quorum is present.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach), to continue his remarks.

* (1650)

Mr. Derkach: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. I was just indicating that the northern Bachelor of Nursing Program was one that was asked for back in 1985 and as I said the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), who was then the Chief of the Swampy Creek Tribal Council, has been working very hard to ensure that program would become a reality.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was not done within the mandate of the former administration, but I am proud to say that just recently we were able to forward the first two quarterly payments to ensure that the northern Bachelor of Nursing Program would in fact take place. We have students enrolled in the

program now, and I am proud to say that once again we will be training nurses for the North who perhaps will live in the North and give the services to the people who so badly need them in northern Manitoba.

I might add that many of these students—there is a quota of which I believe 40 percent must be of aboriginal descent so that, indeed, we are committing our resources to training people for northern Manitoba.

In addition there have been a couple of new programs that have been launched in Keewatin Community College, one on Law Enforcement and Career Preparations; another one, a three-year Natural Resources Management Program; and a Business Administration Program. In addition, there is an availability to transfer credits from this Business Administration Program to the Business Admin Program at Brandon University and also for the Natural Resources one to the Natural Resources Management Technology Program at the University of Manitoba.

So, indeed, Mr. Speaker, I could continue to read lists of programs that have been initiated in the last two and a half years in northern Manitoba and that would simply reiterate our commitment to Northerners and to ensure that programs are in place for them.

There have been some advisory councils as well, Mr. Speaker, that have come together made up of northern people, aboriginal people, to give advice to the President of Keewatin Community College, to give advice to the Government on the types of programs, the content of programs, that need to be implemented for programs for northern Manitoba. It is because we have to understand that there are special needs in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I also mention briefly the Skills Training Advisory Committee Report that came down, and in this Skills Training Advisory Committee Report one of the recommendations that was made was that there was a crying need to harness the efforts of people in industry, Northerners, people in the community at large, to ensure that in fact the jobs that we are training for are real jobs rather than superficial jobs or no jobs at all, Mr. Speaker. Workforce 2000 is going to work towards that. This is our response to the STAC report. It is one of the major initiatives of this Session, and my department will be working very

hard and very closely with agencies and business to ensure that the program is implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) in the last few days telling us that we are giving breaks to the big businesses in terms of reducing their payroll tax. Well, our commitment was to reduce the payroll tax completely, because this is a tremendous disincentive for industry to hire people. Indeed, we feel that instead of just allowing that money to go, we will allow them to use it as write-offs for people that they train. Indeed, it makes a commitment on behalf of business to ensure that they are training people for real jobs, for real work in the work force that we so desperately need. I think it is an initiative that will work.

We have made a further commitment. We have committed to ensure that 75 percent of the training costs of these individuals will be looked after by Government. In addition, if industry will hire aboriginal people, we have indicated that we will give 40 percent of their wages in assistance. If they are non-aboriginal, we said that we would allow for 30 percent assistance to them for hiring these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to Workforce 2000 because I think it is an innovative program. It is one that brings together the people from business, the people from industry. It brings together people from Government to ensure that we move co-operatively together toward supplying Manitoba with a skilled work force in the 1990s and as we work towards the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention for just a moment to university education in this province, and I have to indicate that there has never been as big a commitment to university education as there has been by this Government. I think it was made very clear in the budgets that we have proposed before this Legislature. We indicated that we would support university education at least at the level of inflation. We have done that, and we have even surpassed that. Besides that, we have channelled some specific funds to some very important and needy projects, projects like the School of Dentistry, which was in fear of losing its accreditation, projects like the physical therapy program at the University of Manitoba, where we were able to supply \$100,000 to allow for improved conditions, improved facilities and greater service to the people who are in those programs.

Mr. Speaker, the steam tunnel at the University of Manitoba has been collapsing for years. I have heard about it for the last five years at least, but nothing was done. We had to move very quickly because of the dire circumstances. We put in \$11 million to ensure that the steam tunnel would be rebuilt. In addition, the Faculty of Management at the University of Manitoba received a considerable shot in the arm to ensure that it would become a world class faculty, to ensure that it would attract the kinds of students to it who would be able to enhance our way of life in our society, because indeed our businesses do hire many people out of the Faculty of Management. It was only appropriate that we support the Faculty of Management.

A two-year child care program, not only at Keewatin Community College, Assiniboine and at Red River, but a four-year degree program at the University of Manitoba was supported by this Government. I could go on and on. There has not been any question about our commitment to education, Mr. Speaker, despite what is being said by some individuals from across the way. We have to understand that we have to live within our means, that the pot is not bottomless. That is, we do not have an infinite amount of money that we can continue to throw at various things.

All we hear from the other side of the House from time to time is, spend more, spend more. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), current Opposition, used to accuse the third Party when they were in Opposition of having a Brink's truck mentality. Well, Mr. Speaker, that Brink's truck has sort of shifted into the Opposition now. Now they are saying "spend more, spend more."

When we were on the steps of the Legislature, I heard the Honourable Member who is the critic for Education, the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), stand up and indicate that we needed to spend more, continue to spend more. He would lobby to ensure that we continue to spend more.

Mr. Speaker, the pot is not bottomless. There is a need to live within our means, and that is what we are proposing. Whether it is at the school division level or at the university level or whether it is at the community college level, we have to ensure that we live within our means.

I think the Honourable Member who spoke just before me, from the Opposition, alluded to the fact that we have to change our thinking, we have to

change our attitude and we have to live within our means. Yes, we have to invest in those important services, services like health, social services and education. I do not think there is any question about the fact that we have made those priorities in our society because Manitobans have wanted us to make them our priorities.

Mr. Speaker, we have to set our priorities carefully. We have to ensure that we are just not churning out things for the good of Government, but indeed that we are putting our money where it is best used by the people who need it most desperately and that the results are there.

* (1700)

There has been an identification, Mr. Speaker, that literacy in this province—there was a need for good literacy programming. We went into literacy programming, a task force first of all to determine where we needed to put our emphasis. I am proud to say today that we have some literacy programs operating in this province where there never were literacy programs before, some of them right here in the inner city, others in rural and northern Manitoba. They are working effectively. People are happy with them and they are producing results.

I was very pleased when I learned that the Governor General was giving a medal for literacy workers. Indeed, that is a recognition that this is an emphasis that we have to take and we have to run with.

I think society recognizes that illiteracy costs all of us. It is not just a detriment to the people who suffer from it, but indeed it costs society, and that is why there has been such a need to address this very crying need.

Mr. Speaker, the budget, in an overall sense, speaks to the current situation that we have in Manitoba. We have a horrendous debt over our heads, a debt of some \$10 billion, I believe—\$500 million a year in interest costs before we can start on programs. Five hundred million dollars, that is more than half of the budget of the Department of Education and Training. That is the kind of debt we have been left in Manitoba.

Before we can begin to expand programs, we have to ensure that we do it in a balanced way. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) I think has done that very nicely.

We were accused of the rainy day fund, Mr. Speaker, as being one that is a slush fund. Well, I

think Manitobans today are very thankful that indeed there was that investment and that there were those savings so that today Manitobans are not being gouged again with high taxes. As a matter of fact, last year there was some reduction to Manitoba families in personal income tax. So I do not know how anybody can criticize that when Manitobans around this province are saying: that was the right course to take.

I think it is just about time that some of the third Party and the Opposition listen to what Manitobans are saying, because indeed that is what they have not been doing is listening to what Manitobans are saying and the advice that Manitobans are giving us.

We have to be responsible. As responsible leaders in our province, we have to make the right decisions. I can tell you that the Fiscal Stabilization Plan was a reasonable and prudent approach to take, especially given the times that we are facing today.

Manitoba is not the only province that is facing somewhat of a slowdown in economy, but we have to be thankful that in Manitoba the forecast is bright as compared to the rest of the country, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has laid that out for the people of this Legislature and for this province, that indeed the climate is becoming healthier in Manitoba. Why is it becoming healthier in Manitoba? Because of the type of administration, the type of Government that we have been able to put together and the type of Government Manitobans have elected. This is what Manitobans want. They do not want rhetoric. They do not want spending without being accountable for it. We have to be accountable for what we do and for what we spend.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to say that I am proud to be part of a Government that has indeed put an emphasis on spending within our means, spending logically, but making sure that the essential services are protected for the good of our province and for the good of our citizens. Certainly I am confident that as Manitobans look at the budget that has been proposed by the Minister of Finance they will understand that indeed this is the most prudent course to take.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, before I talk about the Budget Address and the budget that was presented to us I would like to make

comments on several things that have been clearly enunciated by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in his Speech from the Throne, in Question Period both on and off the record. No. 1 is, he has alluded several times or talked several times about Members of the Opposition being ideologues. I looked that up in the dictionary and an ideologue is someone who believes in a systematic body of concepts about human life or culture. So I would like to go on record stating that, yes, the Opposition Party is made up of ideologues as are the Government benches as well. We are all ideologues because we all do believe in a systematic body of concepts about human life.

We are also, on this side, social democrats. We are part of a proud movement and tradition that has been an economic, social and political force throughout the world. Governments in Sweden, France, Germany, Holland, Japan and yes, even England at times, have been social democratic Governments and have done very well in providing for the economic and social needs of their citizens. New Democrats in Canada have been or currently are Governments or official Opposition, and in the federal level we have held the balance of power, thereby making possible much of the social legislation that we are currently enjoying and which is currently under threat from the last two federal Governments.

Secondly, in her response to the Speech from the Throne, the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) caused the Premier (Mr. Filmon) a great deal of discomfort with her statement about a particular quote. The First Minister was unable to make this statement, which I would like to put on the record. "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs." I find it very interesting that the Premier had difficulty with this concept which underlies two of the basic tenets that all western democracies hold dear. That is the progressive income tax and the social services such as universal health care, social assistance and unemployment insurance. All democracies in the Western Hemisphere more or less apply these rules and these tenets. However, I will say that the current Governments, both federally and provincially, are doing their best to make changes, particularly from each according to his abilities.

The third comment that I would like to make is that there have been references by Members opposite as to the inexperience of the new caucus Members.

Well, we may be inexperienced in the ways of the House, but we certainly have a vast range and depth of experience outside the House. -(interjection)- On that one item, yes.

We have shown in our inaugural speeches, in our questions in the House, in our discussions with the media, in our work with our constituencies, and in our critic areas, that we are a caucus to be reckoned with, and the Premier and the rest of the Government would be well advised to ignore us at their peril.

Having put those comments on record, I would like to comment about the budget, Mr. Speaker. I will be the first to admit that I am not an expert on finances. Actually, I have already told the Leader that when we are elected Government, I will not be Finance Minister, but I have had on occasion the opportunity to read budgets, evaluate budgets, and even prepare budgets.

Budgets are plans. They reflect the priorities and the way of looking at the world of those who make the budgets. Money is very important in our world. Those who control where we get money, and those who control how that money is spent, have enormous influence over all of our lives. Budgets are also responses to the external realities and, hopefully, help enunciate ways of dealing with these external realities.

On this side of the House, we do agree with the Government on some of those external realities that are facing us in Manitoba and Canada today. We agree that we are in the midst of a global economic upheaval. All throughout the country, both east and west, north and south, forces are at work that I do not think anybody knows what will come or how they will end up, but major changes are being undertaken throughout the world.

We are also in the midst of a North American recession due, in large part, to the supply-side economics and the Reaganomics and the trickle-down effect so callously undertaken over the last six years by the federal Government, and, to be perfectly honest, repeated in our estimation, in this budget. The federal monetary and fiscal policies definitely have had an impact on Manitoba.

We do not agree on the role of the Free Trade Agreement in this North American and certainly Canadian recession. New Democrats and I believe Canadians at large believe that the Free Trade Agreement was one of the worst things that could

have happened to our country, and the effects will be long-lasting and overwhelming. There will be more unemployment, less full-time jobs, less jobs in the manufacturing sector. Jobs that are created are going to be more likely in the service sector. We will have more reliance on resource extraction and less reliance on the manufacturing of goods.

* (1710)

Mr. Speaker, the budget states that we all have to share in the problems facing Manitoba. If I could directly quote the first sentence of the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) conclusion: ". . . we all must do our part to refrain from unreasonable demands, whether they be with respect to prices, wages, services or taxes." In reality, this budget does not ask us all to share and share alike, or share equitably, neither on the revenue side nor on the expenditure side.

A few days ago, in his speech, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) spoke with the voters that he talked to during the election campaign as being tired of taxes. Well, the people of Wellington, Concordia, Radisson, Transcona, Burrows, Swan River, Interlake, St. Johns, Kildonan, Dauphin and 10 other constituencies across the province told us that they were tired of taxes as well. They were not tired of paying taxes, or paying their fair share of taxes; what they were tired of is others' not paying their fair share.

I would like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, a statement that the Member of Parliament for Winnipeg-Transcona, Bill Blaikie, recently said, which I think effectively summarizes this point. He says taxes are important. They pay among other things for health care, for education, for transportation infrastructure, and increasingly for the environmental measures to help save the planet. Taxes are the nuts and bolts of our commitment to be a community, to do and pay for things together. We believe that Canadians realize this, but we also believe that Canadians have a right to know that we are not being played for suckers by the rich and the powerful who are getting away with murder at tax time while people with families to feed and mortgages to pay are wondering how to make ends meet.

The budget, Mr. Speaker, does not ask wealthy Manitobans or large profit-making corporations to help cushion the blows of the recession we all know are coming, to help cushion those blows on those

least able to withstand these effects. The only cushion in the budget is to large corporations with an \$8 million tax break. The effects of the recession and the Tory policies and plans as outlined in this budget are devastating on people on the margins, the youth, elderly, low income, renters, single parent families and children.

Specifics will, I am sure, be available in the Estimates as we have been told time and time again by Members opposite. I would like however, to talk about a few specifics in my area of Family Services. Actually, after statements by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) to the effect that there would be a great deal of support for women and children living in fear in this budget, I believe it is not too strong a term to say that it is shameful, that the support in this budget for family dispute services is 3.6 percent increase. The overall increase in the budget as a whole is over 5 percent and the inflation rate as stated in the budget is 4.2 percent. The reality of this 3.6 percent increase is that there will be a decrease in service for women and children who are needing of the services provided by family dispute services.

As well, day care basic maintenance grants will be increased by less than 1 percent; overall funding to day care, the youth and employment support increased by 2.4 percent.

In talking with Child and Family Service agencies, directors and workers in shelters throughout the province, other support services such as second stage housing, Evolve, other services under this family dispute department, they all state that this budget means that they will be required to cut staff. There is no way they can provide even the services that they are currently providing with a 3.6 percent increase.

It means telling people that they are actually facing, they are coming to these services with unreasonable demands, that women and children who live in fear are making unreasonable demands when they go to shelters, that children and single parent families are making unreasonable demands when they go to parent-child centres and there are no more parent-child centres, when Child and Family Services have to cut back all prevention programs and deal only with the basic bare minimum and not even that of child protection. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the Estimates process will speak more directly and we will certainly be speaking out more directly in Estimates.

I would like to read into the record several waiting list items for battered women, children and batterers in Winnipeg, programs that we know of even last year, that were well behind. Evolve in 1989, they had 573 individuals who were turned away because they could not provide services, 273 women, 274 batterers and 26 children. Since 1986 there has been an 86 percent increase in the turnaways to this very important program. In 1989, in the first three months of that year there were almost 200 turnaways. Now this is a program that has proven itself to be effective, that comes under the Family Dispute Services part of the budget, and it is not going to be able to most likely provide the service it currently is providing, never mind any increase.

Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre in 1988, 465 women were turned away, and you can bet your bottom dollar that number has increased. Women's Post Treatment Centre, they now have a year-long waiting list, and because they have that year-long waiting list, they have closed their waiting list, so we do not even know how many people might have been turned away. Family Services of Winnipeg has a waiting list of two to six months for both victims and batterers. These are just a portion of the statistics that could be talked about in terms of just a small portion of this budget.

This budget with its priorities is a clear example, to use a very good social work term, my background, of blaming the victim: of telling women and children in danger that there is no place for them to go to be safe; of telling single parents and their children there is no place for them to go to have fun, to learn and relax; of telling children there is no room in Manitoba for them to have enough to eat, a safe, clean place to live; of telling seniors that there is no room for them to be able to live within their own homes with dignity. Those are unreasonable demands according to the Family Dispute Services section in this budget.

There is no recognition of the dignity of the individual in this budget. This budget gives us a glimpse of Tory times. They are not only tough times; they are shortsighted, mean-spirited and narrow-minded times.

In conclusion, let me speak for all of my colleagues of the official Opposition. As New Democrats, and social democrats, we will continue to speak out with and for all members of our society, to work for fairness and equitability in our taxation system, and to urge the Government to institute

programs that will support working people, women, children, the elderly and the youth. Thank you.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, four and a half years ago you and I entered this House for the first time as Members of this Assembly joined by a number of other Members, certainly on this side of the House and a few others, and we were the class of 1986.

Since that time I have had a very positive experience working with you, not only as a colleague on the backbenches of the Opposition, but also as a Government House Leader, with you as the presiding officer of this Chamber. Therefore, that having been such a positive few years, I was pleased upon the recommendation made with respect to your more recent reappointment and pleased to be very supportive of that. I offer to you my continued support in whatever capacity I can offer that and wish you well in your responsibilities. They are tremendously onerous responsibilities, and the performance of the last two and a half years by yourself demonstrates to me that there could be few others who could rise to those responsibilities in the way that you could.

* (1720)

This is my first opportunity, publicly and formally, to offer my congratulations to our new Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) and our new Deputy Chair of Committees, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau). I have known both of those Honourable Members from some time before, having met them on opening day in this Legislature. I know that they, too, are good choices on the part of this House for the duties that they will be undertaking.

I was a new Member in 1986, and that is not that long ago, so I do not consider my experience to be particularly long. I find I am able to put myself into the shoes of the newly-elected Members to this Legislature and understand some of the things that they are going through, empathize with them in their difficulties, and I am pleased for them in their successes. I wish them all well on all sides of this House, and look forward to a productive term of office for this Government and a productive term for this Legislature. Those comments are directed to Honourable Members from all Parties in this House.

Something I have not had the misfortune of experiencing to this point at least, Mr. Speaker, is defeat at the hands of the electors, but I know that there were some Members of this House who were defeated in the last election. There were a number of people who let their names stand and put their best feet forward and the platforms of their Parties forward in a very democratic process. To them I say thank you for the service you provided to the people of our province and to the various constituencies. I say thank you for that, and I say remain involved in public life at whatever level, because all of that involvement ultimately results in better communities and a better society for all of us.

Just think what it would be like if all of those who were not successful in the recent election campaign had never let their names stand. Democracy would not have come through in the way democracy must in order to provide the best kind of Government for the people of our jurisdiction.

I maybe could use this opportunity to say a word of thanks to those people in Brandon West who worked so hard and so diligently on behalf of myself, and to remind them that I always have a little trouble finding the words to describe my own feelings about a successful election campaign backed by so many, many, wonderful, wonderful people.

Every Member in this room can say the same thing. I am sure they join with me in offering thanks, and thanks to their own volunteers, but you know, we should extend it to all volunteers for taking part in the political process. Those who work for the candidates of their choice do so for their various reasons. We may not always agree with all of those reasons, but they are their reasons, and they are entitled to have them. It is all part of the process.

My opponents are another case in point. Those opponents put forward their platforms, offered constructive criticism of what I have been doing for the last number of years, and what the Party I represent has been doing. It makes for good, healthy, positive debate in the public forum, which is what people need to hear in order to make informed decisions.

In terms of thank yous, I suppose it would certainly be appropriate to say a word directly through you, Mr. Speaker, to the constituents of Brandon West, of all three persuasions in the last campaign. There were three Parties represented on the ballot and constituents voting the various ways, but all

constituents in Brandon West should be reassured of my commitment to them as constituents of mine, no matter how they happened to vote.

For those who did not vote for me, there is always hope for next time, is there not? I hope by my performance I can persuade even more Brandon West constituents to see their way clear to put their "X" beside my name in the next campaign, should I happen to be honoured by being nominated by my Party.

A word to my colleague, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), our new Minister of Family Services, I congratulate him on his appointment to the Executive Council of Government. I commend him for his courage past and present, and that courageous attribute my honourable friend has will come into play many, many times in the course of the future as he attempts to discharge in the best way he knows, his responsibilities as Minister of Family Services.

The one thing I like about the Honourable Member for Minnedosa is that I have always noticed that he is one who is able to remain in control of his emotions and of his thoughts, and his thought patterns no matter what the pressures might be. In this particular portfolio that attribute he will find will be his greatest strength as he faces the difficult challenges ahead. There is no question about his commitment to the task at hand so I do not need to dwell on that.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) is our new Minister of Labour in the Province of Manitoba, and I congratulate him on his achievement of attaining that portfolio. In my time having known him, I have known him actually since 1986 as well, and I found him to be an articulate person and a competent person and I think that is what we need on the Treasury Benches. That is what we need in the sensitive portfolio of the Department of Labour and I think we will be well-served in that respect.

I have been able to deal with a few things that many Members dealt with during the throne speech debate. I more or less sneak it in in a Budget Debate, but I understand the latitude is there at this particular juncture of a Session, that there is considerable latitude in dealing with the Budget Debate.

Unlike some notable Honourable Members opposite, I do not propose to avoid discussion of the budget brought down last week by the Minister of

Finance (Mr. Manness), because I believe it is the kind of budget that deserves to be commented on, deserves to be commented on positively. It seems that there are some opposite who think that if they cannot say anything negative there is no point speaking. I do not see it that way.

I remember being on the opposite side and I had lots of criticisms of Government budgets, but I always made a point, I believe fairly, to point out some of the positive aspects of budgets brought down by Mr. Kostyra, Mr. Schroeder and even though there might have been precious few positive things to say about those budgets, there were some things and I did make a point of saying them.

It would be nice to hear from Honourable Members opposite about what they see as positive about the budget as well as what is negative. The point is we are not hearing anything, positive or negative, from Honourable Members opposite, because they seem to want to avoid discussion of the budget, because they know the budget is right on for the times that we face right now. There will be a few of them who will shake their heads and maybe say a thing or two from their seats and find some way to disagree with me, but not all the news is always good. There is no point being critical because the news is not good. Is the news realistic? Is the budget news realistic and is the budget news the right news for the situation we face at this particularly difficult time in our economic history?

Budget notwithstanding there are some important things that have been happening in the constituency of Brandon West and in Brandon East. Brandon as a whole has benefitted in the last couple of years by the existence of a Progressive Conservative Government in Manitoba.

Very quickly, I am going to run through some of those things about which I am particularly proud, and the budget brought forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) goes a long way toward providing the things that Brandon deserves, Brandon needs, as it faces continued economic difficulties, but also opportunities to develop our economy in Brandon, to develop our quality of life in Brandon. Brandon is indeed Manitoba's second city. I know that kind of a comment might fall on a lot of deaf ears in the City of Winnipeg and among some of the Honourable Members opposite who represent constituencies outside Brandon and outside, what a good friend of mine refers to as, greater Manitoba.

* (1730)

In the Brandon area I remind Honourable Members that the Keystone Centre serves a very large geographical area surrounding Brandon. In fact with the three major fairs that are held at the Keystone Centre during the course of the year I find that I have the pleasure of welcoming many, many people not only from within a hundred mile radius of Brandon but far beyond including the City of Winnipeg.

For those Honourable Members who are newly elected and do not know I will tell you now so you can mark your calendars accordingly. Around the end of March—and I do not have the exact date so you will have to get back to me for the exact date, but your colleagues will tell you anyway—the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair is held in Brandon, and all the MLAs from across the province are invited to be there.

For Honourable Members who never had a chance to have a ride in a horse-drawn wagon or had a chance to visit a world class agricultural fair that is an opportunity you should grasp—(interjection)—the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) has been there with his family. I am sure he will tell his colleagues that he is welcomed warmly when he comes to the Keystone Centre for the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair, and any other time he comes to Brandon he is welcomed warmly because that is the way Brandon people are.

Who ever it was that decided to put the words "Friendly Manitoba" on the licence plate had Brandon in mind when that inspiration came.

I say this seriously to Honourable Members. You should seize that opportunity because you will be given, those of you who perhaps are not particularly agricultural—and I do not hold myself up as being particularly agricultural either, but I have a very firm belief that cities like mine and other communities in Manitoba would not be there today nor would they be the communities they are if it were not for the agricultural activity that surrounds them.

It is an opportunity for Honourable Members to be reminded about the importance of agriculture in our society in Manitoba and to be extended warm greetings from people from far and wide. Certainly those volunteers and others who are directly involved in the operation of the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair will do everything in their power to make you feel comfortable and make you feel very

welcome, because that is indeed what you are when you show up at the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair.

To get to the point of the Keystone Centre, which is where I started out, Mr. Speaker. I think the careful management and budgeting of this particular Government has made it possible for the Keystone Centre to be undergoing in the near future a \$9 million expansion.

The fair that I referred to, and other events during the course of the year in the City of Brandon, have become so successful that the Keystone Centre is bursting at the seams, and the Manitoba Government some time ago made a commitment to its one-third share of the funding for this major expansion. That is good news for Brandon. It is good news for agriculture.

Perhaps not this coming Winter Fair but the one following Honourable Members will be treated to the sight of a very much expanded and better facility to serve the agricultural producers and all of those who use the Keystone Centre.

Recently we were able to attend a formal announcement of the Southern Development Initiative, which will allow Brandon, my community, to benefit because of the sewage treatment upgrading which is so badly needed in our city. So a good amount of that money will be coming from the Province of Manitoba, and I am very pleased about that.

The Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) and others have been working closely with the downtown Brandon development people. Like so many communities like Brandon there is a need to enhance the traditional downtown business area of our downtowns.

Many, many communities in Manitoba benefitted under the Main Street Manitoba Program of the previous Government, but for some reason my community and a couple of others in Manitoba were left out. Somehow Brandonites did not take too kindly to that kind of treatment. There was also an awful lot of money spent in the core area of the City of Winnipeg.

I appreciate the fact that a number of Honourable Members opposite are actually listening to what I have to say about this because, you see, I think they agree with me that no matter where you live in the Province of Manitoba, you are entitled to be viewed as important as anyone else in the province. We in

the City of Brandon for a long time have felt that maybe we were getting a little bit of the short shrift in terms of this kind of financing for projects in our city.

With the election of a new Government in Manitoba in 1988, things started to look a lot better to the people of Brandon. I am very pleased to be part of that particular Government that came to office under which the City of Brandon has benefited to a very large extent, so that over a five-year program, Brandon's downtown will experience some improvements that are going to make our downtown a more attractive place to come to visit, to shop, to take part in the life of our downtown.

Our downtown very often finds itself competing with suburban malls that have been developed in the suburbs. No one wants to take anything away from commerce in general, but we do want to preserve something that we think is an important part of our city, and that is our downtown.

I know Members in the Liberal Party will disagree outright, and the New Democrats are very careful about how they handle the issue of decentralization of Government services, but I am not particularly careful about how I choose my words when I talk about decentralization. I am for it. I am pleased to know that southwestern Manitoba is going to benefit by the presence of 237 Government positions being located in my corner of the province. -(interjection)- I hear Honourable Members on this side applauding these statements, because they know that in their regions of greater Manitoba, their regions will benefit as well and to a very large extent. My community of Brandon will be the recipient location of something over 100 Government positions.

In times when the migration seems to be from greater Manitoba into Winnipeg, this kind of thing the Government can do is very much appreciated. There are some Honourable Members in the New Democratic Party who reside in greater Manitoba and represent constituencies in greater Manitoba. I hope they can reduce whatever rhetoric might be coming from some other colleagues which would sound a little bit to be in opposition to the decentralization program.

I would like very much to have some New Democrats make some clear statements about where they stand on decentralization. The Liberals have made themselves very clear. They are against it, and they have been judged accordingly. We know

how things went for them in greater Manitoba in the recent -(interjection)-

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McCrae: What began as inconsistency on the part of the Liberals became outright opposition from some, and others I guess did not want to say anything about it. Certainly I give the New Democrats credit for being a little clearer, but I wish they would clear it up entirely so that the people in my community can know that they have support from at least two of the three political Parties in Manitoba. If we could get some spokesmen out there, that would be great.

I know during the campaign all there was, was ridicule. My opponent and people like the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) were saying things like, well, we are supposed to get all these jobs, where are they? It does not really sound like a lot of support. It sounds like a little bit in the way of ridicule. If we could get everybody pulling in the same direction to develop greater Manitoba, I think we could get more good done rather than fighting over everything that comes along.

In a little while I am going to talk in relative terms about the Westman regional Cabinet office, which has been the subject of some harassment, shall I say, by Honourable Members opposite, and I am going to talk about that Cabinet office in the context of the budget.

* (1740)

We have seen unprecedented highway construction in my area of the province. Other Members will no doubt want to talk about the unprecedented highway construction in their areas, not the least of whom will be the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), but we are very grateful to that Honourable Minister for the attention that he and his department have paid to the development of a transportation system for greater Manitoba.

We all must understand the importance of good transportation in the '90s, and we have a Minister of Highways and Transportation who understands that very well. We have a Government that is prepared to put priorities where they belong, and highway construction is one of those priorities; a Government, by the way, led by a Premier (Mr. Filmon) who, I think in his two and a half years occupying his position, has shown no small levels

of leadership and statesmanship. He has also shown an abundance of determination in getting the job done, all the while with the kind of compassion that Manitobans have grown to expect from their politicians.

Incidentally, our Premier has taken a very prominent place on the national stage, and I think all of those things I have mentioned had a lot to do with the Premier's results in his particular constituency and indeed right across the province.

The budget brought down last week by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is what you might describe as a no-nonsense budget. I think that is a good way of putting it. There are those who will see it other ways, but they cannot describe it as a nonsense budget, that is for sure. They cannot describe it as a budget that is all rhetoric and no action. They cannot describe it as a budget that is not realistic in terms of the realities we face in our province.

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

The thing I like best about all three budgets of the present administration and our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is that each budget has had an eye to the future. Each budget has indeed been realistic, but each budget has a strong element of planning for the future and looking out for those who come after us. That is why, right from the beginning of the concept of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund, I have been a big supporter of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund, because Honourable Members who were not here then may not know it, but then again maybe they might, the fact is we were experiencing a couple of good years in terms of revenues in our province.

We had a Minister of Finance who, unlike his predecessors, did not grasp a moment like that to find excuses to spend substantial amounts of money, because the present Minister of Finance, as I said, does have the future in mind and does have future taxpayers and future citizens of our province in mind when he makes his decisions. He very wisely, as many, many Manitobans would do in handling their own household budgets, said, things are not always going to be so good, let us face that and accept that and admit that and resist the temptation to spend all of these revenues in one particular year. Let us set some money aside for that so-called rainy day.

Then we heard the next day that it was raining right here in the Province of Manitoba, but the same people who were saying it was raining were saying that we should have cut taxes more, and we should have had a smaller deficit than we did and so on—a little problem with consistency from some people in this place, but Governments cannot afford to be inconsistent. Governments cannot afford not to keep an eye to the future, Madam Deputy Speaker, and that is not the way this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) conducts his responsibilities.

So this year, when we know the rain is beginning, we have the benefit of a Fiscal Stabilization Fund which cushions Manitobans against immediate tax increases, cushions Manitoba against a budget deficit which would be \$100 million higher than it is except for the Fiscal Stabilization Fund.

To their credit—here again the New Democrats could not find all that much good to say about it, at least they could see their way clear to support it. To be fair -(interjection)- The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) is saying something over there and I suspect I know what it is. That he did say one or two good things about that. Here I will give credit to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon for seeing an idea as a good one when that is exactly what it is.

Here we are entering upon that period that heretofore was referred to as an "R" word. We have a Government in Manitoba that has taken some steps to cushion Manitobans from some of the worst effects of recession. It has been said that Manitoba is one of the last ones to get into a recession and one of the first ones to get out. Well, part of that is due to the diversified nature of our economy, the fact that people in Manitoba are well endowed with the work ethic, and some of the same things that our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is endowed with and that is the ability to plan and the ability to look ahead.

So people of Manitoba being like that, it should come as no surprise to Honourable Members opposite that the people of Manitoba support this Minister's budget. We do not know what the Honourable Members are going to say about it when it comes time to be heard, but I suspect the Liberals will have their minds made up and probably did before the budget came down. That would be true to form for Liberals, because we have heard their finance spokesman say in the past, he does not care what is in the budget, he is going to vote against it.

At least the New Democrats, maybe it is their experience in politics, I am not sure, but at least they prefer to look at the budget before they make up their minds whether they are going to support it or not. We will give them credit for at least looking at it. Now we will see how it comes out on the day on which those decisions have to be made.

I am a big supporter of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. I am a big supporter of keeping a firm hand on taxes in Manitoba. Manitobans want to see more creative solutions than just the old hand-in-the-pocket trick that we saw so much, prior to our coming along.

I talked about the Cabinet office in Brandon a minute ago. I just want to mention that the office that is located there has given southwestern Manitobans a better feel for presence of Government in their neighbourhoods, in their constituencies. That office has provided them with quicker access to Government information and services. It has been referred to as all kinds of things by those who wish they had done it before we did, but the Cabinet office is doing a good job of bringing Government closer to the people in Manitoba.

Do you realize that, with the amount of money we have to spend in this province to service debt imposed on us by the previous Government, that amount of money could finance 5,000 Cabinet offices in this province, if that was the way we chose to spend money? Did you know that we could have 166 Keystone Centre improvements and expansions just in one year based on the amount of money—(Interjection)—each year—we have to spend servicing debt incurred by others in this province?

When I think of Manitoba's share of the Southern Development Initiative, well we could have 71 shares of those per year with the amount of money we spend servicing our debt. Downtown redevelopment for the City of Brandon, we could have 1,428 of those per year. Just with the amount of money we spend to service debt incurred by the previous Government, supported by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer).

Now the Honourable Member refers to Mr. Justice Sterling Lyon. In 1981-82, the total debt of the Province of Manitoba was \$5 billion. Well this is only eight years later, and the total debt in Manitoba is now \$11 billion. We have about a million people in our province. That comes out to me to be about \$1,100 for every man, woman and child in this

province. That is the total amount of the debt and on a yearly basis, \$500 million—\$537 million this year to service that kind of debt. More than half of that total debt is the responsibility of the previous Government in this province.

* (1750)

Now I know there are Members opposite who sit on the same benches as those who made those decisions and who will never in a million years spend five or 10 minutes of any speech talking about the public debt in this province or even the deficit in this province, because that is just not their area of concern. Their area of concern is how to spend money, not how to save it, nor how to get rid of debt.

Honourable Members opposite who are being truly honest with themselves know that this is totally unacceptable and ought to be curbed as soon as possible and be done in the most orderly way possible and, of course, as painlessly as we can, because we have to preserve health care. We have to preserve education, and we have to preserve social services or there will not be a society in the years ahead that we can be proud of or that we can say that we are proud to have had any part in creating for the future.

So, Honourable Members, they say a lot of things, but I know they are Manitobans just like I am. They have to be concerned about these things. They just do not admit it all the time. In fact, they rarely do, because you have some Members that are so far over on the left wing of the political sphere that any talk of being critical about deficits is just totally out of line, probably not allowed in the caucus room.

I know these people are Manitobans, and I know they care about the future just as much as I do. So that in their own way somehow they are trying to rationalize how best to deal with these things, but getting out of the problems does not seem to be first on their list of priorities. Somehow, maybe it is because they are in Opposition now and their interests are more in well how can we criticize the Government for not spending a little more here and not spending a little more there.

Honourable Members know what I am talking about, so there is no secret about the issue of debt and spending other people's money and spending money that we are not entitled to spend, and robbing democracy from future generations. You know at 10 percent of our budget, we only have 90 percent democracy in this province. What the people voted

for in the last election was—what they thought they were voting for was a Government to spend 100 percent of the budget, but we only get to have a say on about 90 percent of it, because 10 percent of it goes to finance debt because of decisions made by legislators in the past.

Now that is not good democracy and even the Leader of the Opposition would admit that and knows that. Now he is changing his tune a little bit because now he talks about deficits and surpluses and things. This is really refreshing because we do not always get that from Honourable Members opposite, and I am just wondering if his caucus colleagues let him talk about it very much in the caucus room. We know the agenda of some Honourable Members opposite, some of the older ones and some of the newer ones, too. So we know that from comments made in this Chamber and outside the Chamber and on the campaign trail as well.

Just in the few moments remaining, I would like just to touch very briefly on what I think has been a success story of the last two and a half years, not a total success to this point, because it has to be qualified by certain events going on now. The impaired and suspended driving provisions of Bill 3 are showing results. -(interjection)- Now it is Act 3. My honourable colleague, the Leader of the Opposition reminds me it is not a Bill anymore, it is an Act. It is indeed an Act, and it is an Act that is saving lives in this province. We have had a setback in the court process none of which should come as any surprise to anybody with any background in legal circles.

I do not really see anybody in here who has that, but my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) is not here. I do apologize for that comment, Madam Speaker. He is not here. I know he is here in spirit so that should cover that off.

The point is, new legislation, new in-ground breaking legislation does experience the odd bump along the way, and we are confident that ultimately we will survive intact, and I do not mean that as a pun. Our legislation will survive intact and more people will survive in Manitoba. Lives will be saved, property damage will be decreased and the grief of long-term injury will also be decreased. That is a success story, something that enjoyed the support of all Honourable Members in the House. Sometimes we wondered about the quality of the support we got from the Liberal Party, but it was

there kicking and screaming or whatever. We finally did end up getting support from the Liberals on that point, and we are saving lives as a result.

In Manitoba, I think, the issue of violence in the family is going to occupy centre stage in justice issues and in family service issues for some time to come. When we know that there are 1,700 or more people being charged annually with offences relating to the violence in the family, we know we have a problem. I do not care if that statistic is better than the statistic in some other province or jurisdiction, that is too high. That is far too many lives being very, very adversely affected by violence. I think Honourable Members in this Chamber hate the thought of violence in family situations or in any situation, but certainly in a vulnerable family-kind of scenario. Violence has no place in our, what we call, civilized society.

So, I am going to be asking Honourable Members to join with me in giving this issue the kind of priority it deserves and needs. I know there is substantial support for that kind of direction on this side of the House, and I know there are many people on the opposite side of the House who share with us that vision of a more civilized and less violent society. So as time goes on we will be hearing more about that.

We are also proud of some of the things that have been achieved by this Government over the last two and a half years, and I refer very quickly to the family violence court, our domestic assault tracking project, funding for abuse shelters throughout the province, funding for a province-wide crisis line, the fact that the judiciary is putting more emphasis on education respecting family violence and issues relating to violence against women. -(interjection)- I hear Honourable Members talking about Party names and so on. I was talking about family violence, so I do not really know how that figures into that discussion. -(interjection)-

Well, in the Department of Justice I can say that we are adequately funded. Is there ever such a thing as adequately funded? You can look at a department like the Department of Justice and its history and you can say that it is greatly improved from pre-1988, but there are still plenty of challenges in our prosecutions area, in our courts with the police corrections, family justice issues and of course we are keeping a close eye on what is going on at the Land Titles Office. Can you imagine if we got our share, about 5.6 percent, of that \$500 million that we are spending on debt charges, as a Justice

Department? Can you imagine the kind of progress we could make? I am not sure if I have this right but I think we are talking about something like \$28 million annually, if we could be spending that debt reduction money on justice or if we could be spending it in family services or in health or in education which are those important priorities of Government.

I do not like to keep harking back to the issue of our debt, but it is a very serious problem and we cannot bury our heads in the sand any longer on the issue of debt. The people of Manitoba will support all Honourable Members if they take a concerted look at removing this debt problem from the backs and the shoulders of future generations, including our own.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in the short time remaining, I remain proud and I remain honoured to be an MLA, a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. I commit myself to working together with Honourable Members on this side of the House and on the other side of the House to ensure that Manitoba remains a strong and wonderful place to live, and that Manitoba becomes even stronger and a more promising place for those who come after us.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Deputy Speaker, I wonder if it might be possible to call it six o'clock -(interjection)- five seconds.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It is six o'clock. The hour being 6 p.m., I am leaving the Chair with the understanding that the House will reconvene at 8 p.m.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, October 29, 1990

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Tabling of Reports

Annual Reports: Manitoba Health
Research Council; Alcoholism
Foundation of Manitoba; Manitoba
Health Services Commission
Orchard 461

Introduction of Bills

Bill 4 - The Pay Equity Act
Wasylycia-Leis 461

Bill 9 - Manitoba Intercultural
Council Amendment Act
Lamoureux 462

Oral Question Period

Cross Lake Indian Band
Doer; Filmon 462

Repap Manitoba Inc.
Doer; Manness 463

Multicultural Policy
Cerilli; Filmon 463

Minister Energy and Mines
Lamoureux; Filmon 464

MGAC
Lamoureux; Mitchelson 466

Multicultural Grants
Lamoureux; Mitchelson 466

Manitoba Hydro
Santos; Neufeld 467

Minister Energy and Mines
Santos; Filmon 467

Manitoba Hydro
Santos; Barrett; Filmon 467

Ontario Hydro Agreement
Carr; Connerly; Neufeld 468

Home CHEC Loan Program
Hickes; Neufeld 469

Energy Information Centre
Hickes; Neufeld 469

Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corp.
Plohman; Findlay 469

Farming Industry
Plohman; Findlay 470

Film/Video Classification
Friesen; Mitchelson 471

Human Rights Code
Friesen; McCrae 471

Women's Crisis Shelters
Friesen; Gilleshammer 471

Palliser Furniture Ltd.
Reid; Cummings 472

Non-Political Statements

White Ribbon Against
Pornography Week
Stefanson; Gaudry; Friesen 472

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Budget Debate

Wasylycia-Leis; Downey; Santos;
Derkach; Barrett; McCrae 473-509