



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. 14 - 1:30 p. m., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1990



Printed by the Office of the Queens Printer, Province of Manitoba

ISSN 0542—5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, October 30, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, pursuant to The Regulations Act, a copy of each regulation filed with the Registrar of Regulations since the regulations were tabled in this House in May of last year. I am pleased to table the Annual Report for 1989-90 of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. I am pleased to table the Annual Report for 1989-90 of the Manitoba Police Commission. I am pleased to table the 1989 Annual Report of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us today Keri Sobkowich, a Grade 10 student from Fisher Branch, whose art work has been selected to appear in a calendar that has been delivered to your individual caucus rooms.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Apprenticeship Training Government Initiatives

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Government, in its Speech from the Throne, talked about the needs to develop skills to meet the new technology and changing technology in the Province of Manitoba. The Government has recently received a report, Partners for Skills Development, that was prepared by 12 business representatives and one labour representative outlining the problem in the apprenticeship area in the Province of Manitoba, outlining the fact that the average age of persons in trades is between 45 and 55 years old, and that there will be a need in our province to recruit a large number of apprentices

during the next decade. The report goes on to state that in the short term, there will be a need for extra and additional resources to meet the challenges of Manitoba in apprenticeship training and skill development in the future.

My question is: Why did the Government choose to freeze the budget of the apprenticeship department for the last two years? I would ask the Premier, what is he going to do to meet the recommendations as articulated in the report that the Government received in August of this year?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased with the report that was handed down to my department from the committee that was struck to examine the kinds of skill shortages that there are in this province and the needs for training and to be specific about the kinds of training needs that we have in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to indicate that report clearly identified some of the new direction that needs to be taken with regard to skill development in this province. I would have to say that as a Government, in the throne speech we clearly enunciated that the Workforce 2000 was a direction that we were going to go in, a new direction which would create the many needed skilled types of occupations or skills that are required in much of this province. We look forward to that.

Funding

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Well, the new direction is tax breaks for corporations and frozen funding for people and cutbacks in the continuing education programs, Mr. Speaker. That is the new direction of this Government.

The president of the Federation of Labour has met with a number of representatives of the Government and outlined that as a result of the last several budgets we see apprenticeship faced with severe fiscal constraints and fear for the continued existence of policies that this Government and the federal Government have developed that have put the situation in an acute problem.

My question to the Premier is: Will he now redirect

some funds, perhaps \$1 million from the Oak Hammock Marsh, perhaps some other money that is going to be given away in tax breaks, to the essential apprenticeship training programs so Manitobans will develop the skills necessary for a changing technological world?

* (1335)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Once again, to the Leader of the Opposition, if he examined the Budget Address he would have known very clearly that there is a significant amount of money which is going to go toward creating a skilled work force in this province, Mr. Speaker. This is something that cannot happen overnight. Indeed, the STAC Committee Report pointed out that over the last number of years we have not addressed as a province the skill shortages in this province adequately. That is why, Mr. Speaker, 49 percent of our work force does not have a high school education, because indeed under the former administration those kinds of skill levels were not addressed.

We moved to identify the needs in this province where skills are needed to be upgraded and where people are needed to be trained. Mr. Speaker, Workforce 2000 is our way of showing that there is a partnership approach here harnessing the resources of industry, business and the Government to make sure that in the future we do have a properly skilled work force.

Affirmative Action

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is cold comfort—two million dollar cutbacks in continuing education, frozen budgets in the apprenticeship branch, yet money given to corporations in tax breaks for training. That is the philosophy of this Government, money to the corporations.

We have been informed by the president of the Federation of Labour that the apprenticeship branch has been told to abandon any affirmative action programs which will impact on recruits that would be Native and women.

My last question to the Premier is: Would the Premier please investigate this concern from labour as well as change the policy on funding the apprenticeship branch, which has been starved by his Government, and redirect that the branch recruit

affirmative action candidates as they have in the past?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Multicultural Policy Contradictions

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson): Friday in the House the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) made statements which encouraged divisiveness in Manitoba society. Yesterday in the House he refused to retract his comments and escalated them. Today, the Minister saw fit to appear on an open-line radio show and make comments about ethnocultural minorities such as, give to the needy—

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

Ms. Cerilli: I want to ask the Premier whether or not he considers these actions by his Minister appropriate for a Member of the Government? Does he continue to condone the fact that his Cabinet Member places his personal opinions ahead of his responsibility to bring the people of the province together and foster tolerance rather than inducing conflict?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Again we see the priorities of the New Democratic Party, who said in preparing for the budget, and I recall the comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), who said when he did not bring in a non-confidence motion after the throne speech it was because the really important issue in this Session was going to be the budget.

They were really going to analyze and review and attack the budget. They have done absolutely none of that. They have not quarreled with our economic policy. They have not quarreled with our deficit level. They have not quarreled with our freezing of taxes. They found nothing about it. We are still only halfway through the Budget Debate, they have run out of steam, they have run out of gas. They want to talk about all sorts of other things, Mr. Speaker. Well, we know what the priorities are of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, and the priorities are not the priorities—

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne's is very clear and the traditions of this House are clear

that answers should be to the questions that were raised by Honourable Members. The First Minister, in an attempt to deflect from the question, his answer was entering into a debate. If the Premier wishes to debate the comments of the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), he has the opportunity to in Budget Debate, but should not do so in Question Period. He should deal with the matters raised by the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli).

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. Beauchesne's is also very clear as to questions being repetitive. That very same question was asked yesterday of the First Minister. A full response was provided by the First Minister yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Thompson, answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate. I should also remind the Honourable Members that a supplementary question should not require a preamble.

* (1340)

Multicultural Policy Contradictions

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): My supplementary question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Given the fact that he said, and if you can't be a Canadian first, damn it, don't come to this country—

Mr. Speaker: The question. The question, please.

Ms. Cerilli: —of the ethnocultural minorities, what is the Minister of Energy and Mines prepared to do to restore the morale of his department and to ensure that all employees in that department will be treated fairly?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to restore morale in my department. Morale is high and it will continue to be high.

Multicultural Policy Contradictions

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

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): My final supplementary question is for the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation. What action is

this Minister going to take to restore in ethnocultural minorities that she does not agree with the position of her colleague and it will not affect multicultural policy in Manitoba?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I made it quite evident yesterday in my answers to questions and last night in my debate on the budget what our Government's policy is on multiculturalism. I stand by that as does our Government stand by that.

Orders-in-Council Salary Publication

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In the past the First Minister has shown a certain degree of disdain for the people of the province when he has given salary increases of from 8 percent to 24 percent to members of his own staff while at the same time asking all other Manitobans to hold the line.

Would the First Minister tell us today why the Orders-in-Council are no longer indicating the salaries of the individuals appointed to positions like executive assistant and special assistant, which has been past practice?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in the past the Leader of the Liberal Party has misrepresented the issues with respect to Orders-in-Council. Orders-in-Council in which people were given promotions were simply portrayed by her as being raises.

When a person was moved from being the head of the policy management group to becoming the secretary of the Treasury Board, she misrepresented that as being simply given a raise rather than being a promotion to an entirely new deputy minister level position. At the same time, when a person was given another promotion from one level to another position with exceedingly expanded responsibilities, she deliberately misrepresented that to just simply a raise being given. That is the kind of thing that I think is not becoming of the Leader of the Liberal Party, and I think that she ought not to tread into those kinds of situations where she gets the facts wrong and deliberately misrepresents the facts.

Mrs. Carstairs: We have seen people whose Order-in-Council has been withdrawn, who on the original Order-in-Council clearly stated what they

were being paid. Now, the same Order-in-Council for this individual, in a new position, we have no indication of what this individual is being paid. Why has this Government changed its policy with regard to the publication of salaries in Order-in-Council?

* (1345)

Mr. Filmon: In order to have more flexibility -(interjection)- well, Mr. Speaker, in many cases we are paying executive assistants and special assistants less than had been paid by the previous administration. -(interjection)- If instead of joking and laughing the Members of the Opposition want to listen to the full answer, I will give it to them.

In order to give us more flexibility to ensure that we do not lock into the public payroll people on a long-term basis who cost us a lot of money when they have to be removed from political appointments, as the NDP spent \$400,000 of taxpayers' money in severance to people who have been locked in to those kinds of agreements, instead of doing that, we have more flexible contractual agreements that specify what they are entitled to by way of benefits, what they are entitled to by way of severance, what they are entitled to by way of fees and income. We believe that it is in the better interest of the taxpayer to provide that kind of contractual agreement.

We will be happy to give that information to the Leader of the Liberal Party or anybody who—

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

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, in order to make the people of Manitoba realize that this Government is an open Government, will the Premier now commit to attaching to the Order-in-Council the contracts which he is giving to these particular individuals so there can be no question as to what they are being paid?

Mr. Filmon: The Leader of the Opposition does not realize that we need to have Cabinet authority to enter into and negotiate the agreement. Cabinet authority gives us that authority and then we proceed to negotiate the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to answer chapter and verse to the Leader of the Liberal Party and anybody else about what is the remuneration level of anybody who we have in our Government, on our Government payroll. That is open information, open Government, and I will provide it with all enthusiasm.

Women's Crisis Shelters Funding

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech and in numerous interviews, the Premier and the Minister of Family Services have stated their Government's commitment to services for women and children at risk. In the budget the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has increased funding for shelters, crisis lines, resource centres, second-stage housing by almost 2 percent less than the entire budget average and a full percent less than the rate of inflation.

Will the Minister of Family Services confirm that despite the high flown rhetoric, this budget proves that safety for women and children in Manitoba is not a priority for this Government?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure and opportunity to visit one of the shelters in Winnipeg and came away with a good feeling that they are providing a service to the women and children of this city and comments that the funding plan that was in existence before—there was really no plan at all. I could tell you there is some appreciation for the fact that we have stabilized funding and that we have increased the funding to shelters by some 47 percent over the last two years.

Funding - Rural

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear about the shelter in Winnipeg. The Lundar, Erickson and Ashern wife abuse committee has had its funding frozen since '87 and '88, which means that they have eliminated their preventative, outreach and education programs.

Will the Minister of Family Services guarantee funds to ensure that the entire program for the Lundar, Eriksdale and Ashern wife abuse committee will not be forced to close January 1, 1991, as stated this morning by the co-ordinator of the local committee?

* (1350)

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the local committee of course is responsible for the decisions that are made.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Family Services has the floor.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly one of the areas where the Lundar, Eriksdale, Ashern committee gets their funding. We are committed to maintaining that funding. We are also prepared to work with that committee to see that we have a good look at their operation. I would state that at the end of the last fiscal year they had a surplus. I think questions have to be asked why they are in a deficit position at this time.

Family Violence Sentence Lengths

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, my final question is to the Minister of Justice.

Yesterday Jack Shapira was given a 16-month sentence for simply asking someone to beat another man. Will the Minister of Justice instruct his Crown attorneys to bring some fairness into our judicial system by demanding stiffer penalties and sentences for men who actually beat, abuse and in some cases murder their female partners?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I think the Honourable Member and his colleagues are very aware of the position taken by this Justice Department on matters related to violence against women. I think the Honourable Member will also be made more and more aware of the position my department takes. Positions that we can take have to do with justice issues and have to do with appealing sentences and have to do with an announcement made recently by our Director of Winnipeg Prosecutions about allegations of repeat offenders and how our Crown office is going to be dealing with those and the submissions we make to the judiciary on release provisions for repeaters like that.

I appreciate the Honourable Member's concern, but I am already ahead of her on this issue.

Palliser Furniture Ltd. Environmental Testing

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Yesterday, I had the opportunity to ask a question of the Minister of Environment concerning the Palliser Furniture manufacturing plant in Transcona. Considering that daily I receive phone calls and/or letters from some of the residents of Transcona who are concerned about this issue, my question is for the Minister of Environment.

Considering that the toxic fume problem was

brought to the attention of the Government many months ago by the affected residents and that the health of these families may be at risk, what is this Minister of Environment doing to allocate staff from his department to conduct plant site and neighbourhood testing to resolve this matter?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, essentially I answered that question yesterday when I indicated that we would have access to the information being put together by a consultant who has been employed by Palliser to look at specific issues involved within these complaints.

There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to clarify the record on. Looking at Hansard today, it was pointed out that my words might be construed to indicate that Palliser was not in compliance with their licence. They in fact are in compliance with their licence, and we are looking to further control emissions and discharges from that plant.

Mr. Reid: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister can determine whether or not this plant is in compliance with its licence unless it has had the adequate testing done to determine that.

My question is: When will the Minister's department conduct tests and release the test results to the residents of Transcona and the Members of this House and steps taken to rectify this problem, since the colder weather has caused the fumes to drop into the surrounding neighbourhood and subsequently be drawn into the furnace fresh air intakes, and increase the urgency to resolve this problem now?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, that information will be available for public consumption in the very near future.

Mr. Reid: Considering that the Palliser Furniture manufacturing plant has hired this private consultant and is under no obligation to release all of its findings, why is the Minister and this Government relying on a private company's service contract with a consulting company for environmental testing of their own emissions to determine whether or not the Palliser plant is meeting its licensing requirements?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I think this line of questioning implies something that concerns me greatly about the attitude to whether or not independent professionals can provide correct information to Government or to industry.

The fact is that we will be serving the public of this province much better to make sure that we have people who have expertise and the ability to deal with specific items rather than the province consistently gearing up every time we have a question that we need an answer to.

* (1355)

CSIS Agreement Medical Record Confidentiality

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Regrettably, I must again raise with the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) his ineptitude in hastily signing an -(interjection)- Every time they publish a review of CSIS, I have to raise this question, Mr. Speaker, to raise with the Minister his ineptitude in hastily signing an agreement with CSIS in June of 1988, just weeks after first becoming a Minister.

Manitoba's agreement with CSIS is one of the worst, if not the worst, of the nine that have been signed in this country. Now, yet again the Security Intelligence Review Committee has expressed serious reservations about CSIS's gathering and use of information on Canadians.

My question for the Minister is: Will the Minister now finally come to his senses, admit that he was taken advantage of as a new Minister and renegotiate our agreement with CSIS which puts health records on the fast track in order to protect the right to privacy of Manitobans?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it has been two and a half years since the agreement was signed to protect the privacy of Manitobans, the agreement referred to by the Honourable Member. Much water has passed under the bridge since then, including a general election here in the Province of Manitoba. The same old question arises today, and the same old answer prevails.

Mr. Edwards: The same reports keep getting published—the tarring CSIS's use of information on Canadians. Mr. Speaker, again for the same Minister, why do we have an agreement that puts access to health records for CSIS on a fast track when the review committee recommended, and I quote, we recommend that CSIS be required to obtain a federal court warrant before it is given access to medical records, far from requiring a court warrant where our agreement does not even require

ministerial approval for the release of medical records of Manitobans to CSIS.

Mr. McCrae: The agreement entered into was partly because of the interest shown by the Honourable Member and partly because of the interest shown by the former Leader of the Opposition, but my own interest as well is the subject of periodic monitoring by myself personally. I make enquiries about the use that the agreement is being put to and satisfy myself on a periodic basis that the agreement is in no way being abused and in no way are the privacy rights of Manitobans being unreasonably violated.

Minister's Position

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): It is nice of the Minister to say, Mr. Speaker, but black and white speaks louder. The agreement is a very, very bad agreement. Finally, for this Minister, why does the Minister persist in defending this agreement when other Attorneys General across Canada got agreements that do not even include health records? CSIS's domestic operations have been criticized every year since its inception. The latest review states about information on Canadians—we saw some cases which we cannot discuss for security reasons that gave us concern. We have not yet seen enough files to judge whether exchanges with other countries about Canadians generally take place in an appropriate fashion.

Why does this Minister continue to defend this agreement in the light of all of those factors?

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

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I wish the Honourable Member would get it straight in his own mind just who it is we are trying to stop here and who it is we are trying to protect. My job, and I take my job seriously and it is a serious responsibility, is to protect innocent Manitobans from the likes of terrorists who would blow up airplanes and who would place bombs in mailboxes and do other damage to society as a whole and threaten the national security. So my job is to be responsible and to draw a responsible balance between the rights of terrorists and the rights of innocent Manitobans. I stand on the side of innocent Manitobans.

* (1400)

Residential Tenancies Act Delays

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Housing. Will the Minister admit that under pressure from the Real Estate Board and the property managers, his Government stalled The Residential Tenancies Act, which was scheduled to go to committee January 23 and, similarly under their pressure, withdrew it in March 1990?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. That Bill will be coming forward to the House. It was not stalled by anyone. If the Member would have been here at the last Session, he would have seen the type of amendments that his particular Party put forward. There is no way we could have made that Bill work with the types of amendments that they put forward. Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martindale: I was here and this caucus had agreed to send it to committee without amendments.

Introduction

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): I have a supplementary to the Minister of Housing. Will the Minister assure the House that The Residential Tenancies Act will be reintroduced as soon as possible as promised by the Premier (Mr. Filmon), in its original form without being gutted due to the lobbyists?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): If the individual across the way will look at the Order Paper, he will also maybe go out and talk to his -(interjection)- Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) wants to answer the question, maybe he should get up and answer it.

The Member across the way, his tenant groups met with this Minister and my staff throughout the summer sorting out differences between themselves and the landlords, and we are coming forward with a Bill, and I tell you the Member will like it.

Amendments

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): I have a supplementary question. Since the Minister of Housing has said that Bill 13 would have a minimum of changes, which changes of the two dozen changes demanded by the Real Estate Board has he agreed to? If the changes are minor, when will

he bring in Bill 13, since his department has had since March to make changes?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Not since March—I just told the individual that I have met over the summer with the different groups. Maybe they would not have done that.

Their Government brought forward a draft. They said there was a Bill. They had two Ministers, Mr. Speaker, who failed to bring forward a Bill. I will bring that forward very, very shortly.

Manitoba Telephone System Community Calling Program

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Last week residents of Selkirk, Lockport, Winnipeg Beach and Oakbank discovered that they were being hit with major increases of 35 percent to 60 percent in phone rates as part of this Minister's plan to boost profits so that the firm can be privatized. Why will the Minister not agree to order a review of the Community Calling program, which is gouging rural Manitobans?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Telephone System Act): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the Member up to date on the sequence of events that has occurred over time. In no way are the rural residents being gouged in any fashion with the program that is in place.

The Public Utilities Board held hearings a little over a year ago and ruled on March 31 of 1989 that the ILS program was good for rural Manitoba, in other words putting individual lines into 47,000 homes that have party lines.

In addition to that they ruled that there should be an adjacent exchange calling program, because that is what the public was asking for. So they asked MTS to go back and develop an adjacent exchange calling program. They brought it to the Public Utilities Board who held hearings all throughout Manitoba, and they approved that program as it is being implemented and put in place for rural Manitobans.

All of those members that he has represented, here they say they are being gouged, have access to four to five times as many people that they could call for no long distance toll charge, Mr. Speaker. That has been the request of citizens across the Province of Manitoba.

Jessie Avenue Property

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): To the same Minister, will he order MTS to maintain the five houses on Jessie Avenue in Winnipeg that MTS is allowing to deteriorate so they can then have them demolished for health reasons?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Telephone System Act): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the Member's question. I would like him to repeat it, please.

Mr. Dewar: Will he order MTS to maintain the five houses on Jessie Avenue in Winnipeg that MTS is allowing to deteriorate so it can then have them demolished for health reasons?

Mr. Findlay: I do not know what the Member is talking about. If he would like to have his question rephrased so that the citizens of this House could understand it, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Dewar: The question is: Will the Minister investigate the situation?

Mr. Findlay: I will investigate whatever situation he is talking about if he—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Home Care Program North End Winnipeg Services

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Yesterday, I informed the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) in the Budget Debate of a constituent of mine who contacted social workers at a hospital outside of the north end for home care for her father and was told by those workers that if her father had lived in their catchment area some help could have been attained. This, Mr. Speaker, follows case after case that we on this side of the House have brought forward to the Minister showing cutbacks to senior citizens in the north end.

My question to the Minister is: Would this Minister and his Government stop singling out north end residents with home care cutbacks and fully restore this program so that all seniors, regardless of geography, are able to receive the supports they need to live with dignity in their homes and in their communities?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have been urged to stop something that this Government and this department is not doing.

Might I urge my honourable friend to start being honest.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, that last comment of the Minister of Health is clearly unparliamentary. If the Minister cannot deal with the questions, a very serious question raised by the Member, based on information given to the Member by a resident of the north end of Winnipeg, without stooping to unparliamentary language—stooping, yes, stooping—it is totally uncalled for from the Minister of Health and I would ask that you ask him to withdraw that comment.

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

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, at your request I will withdraw that remark, but will my honourable friend—

Mr. Speaker: Unqualified. Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Health has withdrawn his comments.

* * *

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I have said that every time my honourable friend stands up and talks about cutbacks in home care, I have stood up and I have said that there is more budget being spent than ever before in the history of the Province of Manitoba, that the level of service is higher than ever before in the history of the Province of Manitoba. Yet my honourable friend, the new Health Critic for the official Opposition, insists on saying that that amounts to a cutback. There are many who would question the honesty of that statement.

Government Policy

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how it is not a cutback when a man who has emphysema, difficulties in catching his breath, quadruple heart by-pass five years ago, extreme pain in his left arm and shoulder joints, difficulty—

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

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: My question to the Minister of Health is: Is it the policy of this Government to

squeeze people off home care, which all of these cases prove, to then underspend in home care, which the Minister has admitted in this House last week, and then to come in with a hold-the-line budget—

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

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Every time that my honourable friends in the New Democratic Party have raised the issue of an individual case in home care, that case has been investigated. Mr. Speaker, there are circumstances where the decision for service provision has been maintained with no change and there are instances where an assessment error was made and service was increased.

There are also cases that the NDP brought to our attention as a result of a flyer in which individuals checked off home care as an issue, turned those names in to the department for investigation of no complaint, and the individuals were offended and insulted and questioned how their names got to the Department of Health.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any time my honourable friend has a case that she wishes to bring to my attention, have the decency on behalf of her constituent to bring that case by name to me, and I will investigate it and provide her with a response as I have done for two years.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with her final supplementary question.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Every time we bring a case that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. This is not a time for debate. I have recognized the Honourable Member for St. Johns with her—the Honourable Government House Leader.

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, you admonished Members of this House in their preambles to not put forward an additional statement in a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker, there is one Member of this House who continually abuses your ruling. I ask what it is that needs to be done with respect to that one Member, because she continues to flaunt your rulings and indeed your charges to this House?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):

On a point of order, first of all, the Government House Leader should perhaps talk to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), who continuously uses Question Period as a forum for debate and making spurious statements as he just did.

I would also ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Government House Leader withdraw the comments made about the Member for St. Johns.

In fact the Minister of Health will probably remember a number of years ago when Larry Desjardins—

Mr. Speaker: On that point of order. -(interjection)- Order, please; order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Opposition House Leader on the point of order raised by the Government House Leader. I would ask him to keep his remarks relevant to that point of order, please.

Mr. Ashton: I now raise it as a separate point of order, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. On that point of order, I had already dealt with it by telling the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) to kindly put her question, that a supplementary did not require a preamble. -(interjection)- Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Ashton: On a new point of order, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your assistance.

The Government House Leader just made comments that the Member for St. Johns was an abuser of the Rules. We have precedents in this House.

Some of us remember when Larry Desjardins was kicked out of the House for suggesting that the Minister of Health was a frequent abuser of the Rules. That is the exact quote that was used.

I would ask that the Government House Leader withdraw that comment. It is not appropriate on a point of order to single out a particular Member.

The process of raising a point of order is to deal with the rules and not to make statements against other Members in this House. So I would ask the Government House Leader to withdraw those unacceptable comments. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member did not have a point of order there. -(interjection)-

Order, please. I would remind all Honourable Members that a point of order should only be raised

to bring the attention to the Chair and to the House of breaches of the rules or departures from the normal procedures of the House.

Now, the Honourable Member for St. Johns has the floor.

* * *

* (1410)

Ms. Wasylcia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health if the cutbacks, as we understand them to be, are part of a bigger policy as enunciated by the federal Conservative Prime Minister, who said on October 23, and is quoted in *The Province*, the Vancouver newspaper, that seniors at 71 years of age should be at home in bed having milk and cookies.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, that may well be a policy that someone other than myself, possibly even the Opposition, might hold. It is not a policy of this Government. This Government established for the first time a ministerial portfolio and responsibility for seniors.

This Government, despite the continued—how do I put this parliamentarily?—accusations, which are false, of cutbacks in the Home Care Program by Members of the New Democratic Party, when the facts are, as I have repeated consistently and for the last two years, we have spent more money. That is not a cutback. The amount of money spent is greater than the rate of inflation each year. More services are provided each year. The growth in amount of services provided increases, but yet my honourable friends in the Opposition New Democratic Party insist on calling increases above the inflation rate—

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

Health Care French Language Services

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

The Speech from the Throne indicates that the Government is committed to undertaking no new initiatives to respond to the needs of the multicultural community and to facilitate access by that community to health care services, when that same Government cannot even ensure adequate and professional French language health services at the St. Boniface General Hospital.

Since there is nothing in this budget to indicate that the Government is ready to take action in order

to resolve this situation, especially due to the comments recently made toward the French community and the multicultural community by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), my question to the Premier is: When will the Government make public the content of the report on French language services, health institutions and social services they have had for several months?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): A bientôt, M. le président. (Soon, Mr. Speaker.)

Mr. Gaudry: Vendredi soir, M. le président. (Friday evening, Mr. Speaker.)

French Language Agreement Progress Report

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Will the First Minister explain to this House what happened to this province that he made on November 4, 1989, at the annual meeting of the *Société franco-manitobaine* to undertake negotiations with the federal Government to try to achieve a master agreement on official languages between Canada and Manitoba?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion, many meetings, a great deal of work has gone into that agreement, and I would hope that progress and outcome will be able to be reported before long.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Mr. Speaker: I have two rulings for the House.

On Monday, October 22, 1990, during Oral Questions, I took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) respecting the use by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) of the words: "attempt to mislead this House."

I thank the Government and the Opposition House Leaders as well as the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) for their contributions in the House to this point of order.

It is very plain that any words that indicate that a Member knowingly or deliberately misled the House are unparliamentary. My ruling on March 14 of this year is quite clear on this point.

In my opinion the phrase used by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that is: "attempt to mislead," is a direct charge that the Minister in question had

intentionally or knowingly set out to mislead the House.

Therefore, I must rule that the words used are unparliamentary and must ask the Honourable Member for Flin Flon to withdraw them.

Mr. Jerry Storle (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I recall that there was some discussion over whether I had said "attempt to mislead" rather than just "mislead." If I used the word "attempt" in there, which made it unparliamentary, then I certainly withdraw that.

* (1420)

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

Mr. Speaker: On Thursday, October 18, 1990, I took under advisement a point of order raised by the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) about the content of replies to ministerial statements. In particular, he alleged that the Honourable Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) had injected politics into her reply to a ministerial statement, and that this was unacceptable. I thank the three House Leaders for their advice regarding that point of order.

In my ruling of October 24, 1989, on this very point, I stated that a Minister, or any Member, making a non-political statement must be extremely careful to ensure that such statements are truly non-political. I did not indicate that the non-political restrictions applied to ministerial statements and replies thereto. This has never been the practice in Manitoba. Therefore, in order to make the matter perfectly clear, I am now ruling for the record that the content of ministerial statements and replies thereto may be as political as Members choose.

I am also reiterating two other points from that October 1989 ruling: (1) The subject matter of non-political statements must be completely non-political; and (2) Ministers wishing to make statements on matters which in any way relate to their ministerial responsibilities must do so under the item Ministerial Statements.

I must rule that the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) did not have a point of order regarding the content of the Honourable Member for Wellington's (Ms. Barrett) reply to the ministerial statement of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson).

HANSARD CLARIFICATION

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): A very, very serious error occurs at page 507, left-hand column, bottom line in the Hansard for Monday, October 29, 1990, and certainly our dedicated Hansard staff are not responsible for the error. I understated tenfold the size of the public debt in this province, on the back of every man, woman or child. I referred to that burden to be \$1,100 for every man, woman and child. In fact, the number is \$11,000.00.

I thank the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) for bringing this to my attention.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): May I have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make a non-political statement? Leave.

Mr. Neufeld: Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon you recognized Miss Keri Sobkowich in the Speaker's Gallery, and I am proud to have her as my guest today. The calendar which has been delivered to all the caucus rooms today is an example of how our youth see energy, and how important it is. Please refer to the month of June to see Keri's work. Energy, Mines and Resources Canada prepared the calendar in consultation with the provinces and territories. Keri has just returned from Ottawa, where the young artists were on hand for the unveiling of the calendar. We should all be very proud of her contribution.

Keri's question "How can the world take it, or how much can the world take?" is one we must all be prepared to consider. The way we use and produce energy are important components of sustainable development. Mr. Speaker, Keri has done an outstanding job. She was only in Grade 8 when she created this picture. She is currently in Grade 10 at Fisher Branch Collegiate in Fisher Branch. It is a proud moment to be able to publicly pay tribute to Keri. Her work and that of 11 other young contributors will be on display across Canada. I am confident that it will serve as a message to all of us that we must be more aware of our energy resources and how we use them.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the adjourned debate, fifth day of 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), the amendment—Honourable Minister of Housing.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): I am pleased to rise today in support of the budget. However, since I did not participate in the throne speech, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, my friend, on your re-election as the presiding officer of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, over the last two and a half years, you have performed in that capacity very well. I look forward to working with you during the course of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I also mention the Pages. I am sure you will be in for a very enlightening experience. It goes by fast, enjoy it. Also our Clerk staff, I thank you for your patience with all the Members for the last several years, and I look forward to your continuing patience the next few years.

I would like to congratulate the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) and the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) on their election as assistants to yourself, Mr. Speaker. I know they will perform their functions with dedication and diligence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the residents of Riel for the support and confidence they have once again placed in me as a representative. This was my seventh election municipally and provincially. They have shown their support in sending me as a victor, whether there was one to be elected or whether there were seven to be elected on the ballot.

At these times it is hard to express the deep gratitude I feel from our many friends, new and old, who worked so hard during my campaign in order that I might sit in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I thank the canvassers, the phoners, the sign people, the computer people. I guess all of us must thank our families, who take the time out to spend that much important time in delivering what we want and forget about their time commitment to satisfy our wants.

Mr. Speaker, I would also at this time show

gratitude to our excellent Premier (Mr. Filmon), who was a fine example of how a Premier should conduct himself during an election. A man with ongoing type of energy, always straight aboveboard and, sure and always, on the high road.

I would like to welcome all the new Members of the House from all Parties, Mr. Speaker. I am sure you will find that over the next few years, an experience you will never forget being a Member of the Legislature, although demanding of time and energy, gives you a totally new outlook on Government and process. I wish you all good luck, and I hope you enjoy the experience.

To the new Members, I can just offer one small point of view that I have learned through my municipal and my school board days. It is that every one will have their day in the Chamber; good or bad, you will have your days. You always have to remember that if you do not leave it in this Chamber, you probably will not survive the next election. Most people who are reasonable politicians and ones who I have met through my experience, whether it be at school board or at City Hall, remember that they have to leave it at the table.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members look around these days, they will see that there are probably only 24 Members left of the 86 that were originally in this Chamber in the year '86. There are 24 of us left. My sincere congratulations to my new colleagues in Cabinet, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, the new Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, the new Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik).

All of us around the Cabinet Table welcome you and know you are valuable additions to our Cabinet. I would like also to congratulate all former Members of the House who have won re-election, in particular the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) and the Honourable for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs). I look forward to working together in the House with these two representatives.

To the Member for Concordia, I believe he will serve the position well. I hope it is a long tenure as Leader of the Opposition. To the Member for River Heights, I say that maybe people say things that they only want to, they do not think. To that Member, I know that you will carry that dedication in the House and serve her Liberal Party well.

Mr. Speaker, the next four or five years should prove to be a very challenging time for our province

and country. As the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) stated in his budget speech, our country is experiencing a recession. This impacts on all citizens of Canada, including Manitobans. Manitobans will fair better than most Canadians but only if we pull together. It is a time when one must sit back and think about what we, as citizens, can do to make sure our province and country does not sink into a deeper recession or even the ultimate, a depression. That old saying, ask not what the country can do for you, but what you can do for your country, sure takes on new meaning when you are faced with the economic forecast for the next several years.

* (1430)

Mr. Speaker, I know, and we know in this Chamber, that the citizens of Manitoba are reasonable thinking people, and they know the difficulties we face in the next few years. Although Manitoba has many resources and assets, it is the people of Manitoba who make this province such a great place to live. It is the people who make this province strong. The people of Manitoba want a strong economy which provides jobs and therefore money in their pockets. Yet the Honourable Member of the Opposition stated in his reply to the throne speech that his Party believes a high paying manufacturing job in our economy is a much better proposition than the low paying service job. May I ask the Honourable Member, what happens down the line if the technological service industries take over from manufacturing?

Canada and Manitoba have a wealth of people with superb knowledge in the field of technology and who are more than willing to share their knowledge with other people. This is why Government implement a skills training strategy known as the Workforce 2000 to address broad, technical changes and innovations; that is why the Government, in this budget, has given businesses a payroll tax credit of up to 3 percent for employee training.

Do the Leaders of the Opposition not believe that employees should have a chance to be part of an employee ownership plan? If the employees were part owners in their business, would this not help prevent plant closings and business liquidations? The Leaders of the Opposition Parties may not believe this Government cares about people, but the people of Manitoba know this Government cares.

In 1988, Mr. Speaker, this Government took a new outlook on Government. In 1988, we came to Government after we witnessed the six and a half years of NDP administration, which did not listen to the people and was running on what was best for them and not the people of Manitoba—a cold, non-caring Government with no management abilities to boot. During the NDP administration the people of Manitoba were asked to accept increases in sales tax, an increase in personal income tax. These were to be facts of life. This Government has not increased these taxes. In these tough economic times, we ask only that Manitobans co-operate with the Government and not make ever-increasing demands on the treasury.

I am very proud of the competence of which we have been able to achieve during the course of the last two and a half years. I look forward to the next four years as we continue to make Manitoba strong, Mr. Speaker. Throughout the election campaign this Government provided a platform in order to make Manitoba strong. We, as a political Party, know the value of training our citizens and providing the proper environment in which to create the necessary jobs in order to build a better way of life. All this has to be done with the financial confines which we find ourselves in and done with care.

The people of Manitoba want a strong educational system in order to train our young people here at home so able to provide the necessary economic growth for our province, Mr. Speaker. We, this Government, have done this. This Government has increased the 1988 overall education budget every year. Why in the 1990 budget alone additional funding of \$49 million was invested in education and training. This represents an increase of 5.5 percent.

This Government has recognized the need for all residents of Manitoba to have access to better educational opportunities and has provided \$600,000 toward distant education programming to make education more accessible to northern and rural students by satellite transmissions.

Mr. Speaker, in 1988 the people of Manitoba wanted a Government to help protect and enhance the vital health services which are important to all Manitobans. This Government has responded. Over the last three budgets we have increased spending in health by 9 percent and 7 percent respectively and in 1989 by another \$108 million in this budget, which represents a 6.9 percent increase.

Under the leadership of my colleague the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), we increased funding for home care by \$43.7 million and we injected \$3.8 million into Manitoba ambulance services, the single largest funding increase since its inception in 1975.

This Government allocated \$1.5 million toward the first bone marrow transplant program in Manitoba. We have provided \$1.2 million in funding to secure the designation by the World Health Organization of the St. Boniface Hospital as an international cancer research centre. We provided the largest ever health capital construction budget of \$246 million this year.

In my own ministries, Mr. Speaker, we have also made headway. While the provincial Government is working at controlling its own expenditures during these difficult times, we have made an effort to maintain provincial support to the City of Winnipeg with the progressive billing re the core and capital grants.

There is an overall 3.5 increase in financial assistance to the City of Winnipeg. These fundings include \$20,500,000 for unconditional current programs; \$17 million for the urban transit operating grant; \$425,000 for the final phase of the expanding Handi-Transit Brokerage System; \$7,580,000 for a general support grant; \$28 million in provincial-municipal tax sharing payment; and \$16 million in urban capital projects allocated toward 12 capital projects on an equal cost-sharing basis with the City of Winnipeg. All was outlined in the letter to the city on March 13 at the time outlining all these grants. We have continued during our process with the City of Winnipeg to increase ongoing funding to the City of Winnipeg.

We must mention, however, during our mandate we have continued on with The Forks, a very, very successful program, Mr. Speaker. Anyone who wants to participate and join in with The Forks should maybe take a moment to go down and visit The Forks Market, a very beautiful type of building that people are just crowding to get into, to look through that particular project. The Forks Market plaza, which was completed last fall, including the skating rink and the pavilion, the digs going on through the area, the National Historic Park that is there for people to enjoy, the proposed wall of time that is there for people, the walkway—someone might like to walk along the way—the Assiniboine walkway that was just officially opened. They will

have a chance to participate in the docks along the way, to participate in the boat basin when it is opened next year. They want to join in and go across to the St. Boniface site behind the St. Boniface Hospital and participate in that particular walkway.

We will continue to work with the Forks on their different programs. We have letters of intent from the Children's Museum that we are hoping to look forward to participating in; we have the hotel built in the Johnson Terminal, the railway museum which they hope that will be involved in the steam plant.

Mr. Speaker, the people who are concerned in regard to The Forks program, when they go down to that area will see that there is no overbuilding of that particular site. The original mandate at The Forks, when the public hearings were held, when they talked about The Forks was to have a meeting place for people to meet, a meeting place that would pay for itself. That will be difficult in time, but because of the overwhelming response and the success of the area, there should be some types of hearings that maybe there has to be some small change in what the original intent of The Forks was.

Mr. Speaker, I signed on behalf of the Government of Manitoba an agreement with the City of Winnipeg and the Shoal Lake Indian Band 40 in order to protect the quality of the city's drinking water for the next 60 years. Included in this agreement was \$3 million, which constituted the provincial share of the total package. I want to thank those people who participated in the negotiations, both on the Indian band, Chief Redsky and his people, along with the federal Government and their negotiators and our negotiators who came forward to protect the Winnipeg water supply for, as I said, the next 60 years.

* (1440)

This was done through a process of participation by this Minister and by his administration, something that was unable to be supplied by the previous administration who sat around and met with the City of Winnipeg. I sat there many times as a councillor and heard over and over and over again the rhetoric from the other side. The rhetoric that went on from year to year saying, oh, yeah, we are making some arrangement. They were doing absolutely nothing in regard to the Shoal Lake agreement. Again, talk, talk, talk did not produce.

Mr. Speaker, it was the Filmon Government who have been working with different areas in regard to

the Core Area Program. We have continued to work with the core area in the City of Winnipeg. We hear remarks from the other side of the House that we are not providing housing funding, that we are not providing support to the core area. Well, I would vouch my time and my experience, in the 10 years, that the core has been going on with any Member on the other side of the House through my level at the municipal level or at my level of Minister. We have continued with many, many of the programs and will continue through the term of the Core Agreement.

We have been involved in the Exchange District redevelopment, the east yard development, which is known as The Forks, which I talked about; the riverbank enhancement program which has been very, very successful; the neighbourhood and community development programs; the neighbourhood services; the community facilities and services and housing. I could go on and on with the employment and training program. All someone has to do is just attend one of the school's classes that graduate. I have had the honour of participating in the last three classes in regard to the core area training program, Mr. Speaker.

They will see that this Government, along with the City of Winnipeg and the federal Government, have continued to participate in the core area briefing. Mr. Speaker, if my time allows me, later on I will go back to some of my housing projects that I have participated on in the core, because I have had comments from some of the Members from across the way in regard to housing and core agreement. I know that shortly they will be getting a briefing from the core area management. Mr. August will have given their briefing and maybe that will answer a lot of their concerns. Maybe when they understand, they will not get up and chirp about things not being done in the core area.

Mr. Speaker, it was the Filmon Government who tried to reduce the size of City Council in 1988, and it was the Filmon Government who reorganized City Council and administration. The Liberal Party came out in the last election in favour of reducing the size of council, but it is the Filmon Government who will accomplish this feat and reduce the number of councillors to a maximum of 15.

It is unfortunate we do not have people on the other side, in the Opposition side, who do not understand the process of council. If they did they would probably understand the benefits of the

reduction of City Council at this time. Maybe during that process of the public hearing, they will have the right to go and learn to understand what goes on at the municipal level. Maybe they will come throughout their own and support such a merit on behalf of this Government.

My portfolio in Housing has been very challenging in the last two years and will likely be the same in the future.

The housing market in Canada is suffering a decline and will probably continue to do so for the next while. In Manitoba, even though our starter home costs are the second lowest in the country, our housing market is falling in this recessionary period to the high interest costs and fluctuating dollar.

A recession also means the number of dollars allocated for housing programs goes down. Even though our 1989 allocation was down, housing managed to deliver 859 units cost-shared with the federal Government. Out of those units, at least 50 percent of the units allocated for the Winnipeg area were delivered in the core area. So contrary to the Opposition's belief that we are doing nothing regarding housing in the core area, Housing is doing its share for the inner city.

One of the housing programs in any city is the infill housing, Mr. Speaker. That has been brought up by my honourable critic, or previous critic from Westin, who I must say did an admirable job in putting his people forward and addressing them of what was going on with the infill housing and what was going on in the Westin area. It is unfortunate that Member does not represent that area now, because he was doing it justice.

Infill housing was a program designed to rejuvenate the core area by providing new single-family homes for sale on narrow infill lots. However, the infill program has run into difficulty in recent years due to lack of suitability-zoned and reasonably-priced building lots in the inner city.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Housing has managed, however, to obtain lots in the western area to build infill housing during the last year or so. However with the difficult times we face right now, we cannot predict what will happen to infill housing in the future.

Housing has also looked at the problem of ever increasing senior citizen population. Last spring, along with the federal Government, we here in Manitoba hosted a symposium called Housing

Older Manitobans Effectively. At this conference, most participants felt that seniors should have more say in their housing and housing should reflect the fact that eventually a senior living in an apartment or a home may have to adjust their accommodation for mobility reasons.

Our Government is looking closely at these concerns and will do something about them.

Since assuming office, Mr. Speaker, our Government has provided mortgage money for many senior projects. In fact, most of our projects funded under the non-profit housing program have been senior projects. Housing is also looking into the problem of the vacancy rates in some of older senior projects, which are mainly bachelor units, and will develop a strategy to deal with that situation.

Personally, I think this Government has done an admirable job of senior housing, particularly when the times are tough financially.

Manitoba Housing, like everyone else, is feeling the effects of federal cutbacks as our 1990 housing allocation is down due to the unilateral reduction of 15 percent, plus the revised allocation message. Which, by the way, Manitoba along with several of the other provinces met with Minister several times and did not agree and argued with this particular decision by the federal Government. However, Mr. Speaker, even with this reduction, through revising our delivery strategy to make the most of the federal dollars available, the net impact of the federal reduction in terms of units over the 1990 planned delivery may turn out to be approximately 17 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in an article October 26 by Patrick McKinley, Mr. McKinley states there is an 8 percent reduction in housing programs. The 8 percent reduction is not the provincial program delivery budget, but represents the loss incurred because, and I must say the word land banking. During the early 1970s the federal Government encouraged provinces to prepare for an anticipated housing boom and that then NDP Government decided to bank land. The housing boom came; however, some unfortunate thing happened. The NDP with their lack of business sense missed the boom.

Mr. Speaker, missing that boom, I think that Government is the only one since Christopher Columbus settled on this land to lose money in the realty market over 10 or 15 years. They are the only ones I think since Christopher Columbus settled.

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

Point of Order

Mr. Jerry Storle (Flin Flon): Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister of Housing is putting information on the record which clearly is not factual. He should consult with the Director of the Canadian Commercial Bank, the Honourable Sterling Lyon, about missing the boat in real estate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Fact is not a point of order, the Honourable Member.

* * *

Mr. Ducharme: If the gentleman across the way suggests that \$6 million in land banking losses for this year alone is what you call good business management, no wonder he is on the second row at the back. He probably will never get to the front bench, and he will never be in Government again. I am tired of that particular type of Member, tired of that Member with their loss of type.

* (1450)

I repeat, who else would lose money on speculation on land over 10 or 15 years? That type of Government did it. The losses represent the difference of what MHRC has received for the sale of land and the taxes and the carrying charges on this land over the years. There was no reduction in programs. In fact, there is a 3 percent increase in funding to cover increased costs caused by inflation.

Mr. Acting Speaker, can you realize what \$6 million and you figure if CMHC participates on 75 cents on the dollar, we could have provided this year \$24 million more in housing if they had not blown it. The Opposition Parties talk about our Government's hidden agenda. What about the Opposition scare tactics that they talk about? Scare tactics.

Mr. Acting Speaker, during the election, I will read you what this particular Government sent out in July of 1990, coming from the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). Here is what he sent out. Recently I met with 80 tenants in one apartment complex who had received rent increases of 6.6 percent to over 9 percent on units. He sent this out to all the apartment owners, still trying to scare up the tactics that they scared in 1981.

Mr. Acting Speaker, after they came back into power in 1982, their friends, the landlords, they gave them a 9 percent increase without even asking. In

1983, they gave them an 8 percent increase without even asking. This Government came through with a 4 percent increase when they came back after the rhetoric that this particular Government—9 percent. They hid the facts during the 1981 election, came back and gave them an increase, a landlord and tenant increase, automatically, of 9 percent. Maybe the Member from across the way from Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) was the Housing Minister at that time. That is probably why the landlords got 9 percent.

Mr. Acting Speaker, these types of tactics during the last election did not take down. People do not forget. The Leader of the official Opposition sent out these types of letters implying the official Opposition had a review committee they talked about. They continue to talk about their Landlord and Residential Tenancies Act, how they wanted it so bad, yet they went through two Housing Ministers over a period of many years. Did they produce the Bill, Mr. Acting Speaker? No way did they produce this Bill.

An Honourable Member: There was rumour.

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Acting Speaker, there was rumour, that is right. There was rumour, as the Member from across the way has mentioned.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this Minister, during the course of the summer, has met with all the Parties wanting to make representations regarding this Bill, and we have not diminished the integrity of this Bill and this Act. They will see when we produce the Bill, in the upcoming days, that the amendments that we produced are good amendments and it is a workable legislation.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the people of Manitoba saw through the scare tactics of the official Opposition. I represent 48 percent apartment owners, 48 percent. I think it is the second largest representation of apartment owners, and they still tried these scary tactics. Well, I would like to—maybe I, instead of criticizing, should be thanking the Members for sending out this garbage in the mail. The garbage—because I increased my majority by threefold.

However, they did not forget the type of Government we have had and we had, and they defeated in 1988. When I was going door to door in the last election, all they were saying was NDP, no debt, please, no Doer, please. That is what they were saying at every door. That is what the NDP stood for.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I guess I would say the type

of attitude that I got at the doors from the people—they were saying, Gerry, I would not vote NDP, that is a like chicken voting for Colonel Saunders. I would not vote it in, because that is the type of Government that these people had up to 1988.

Mr. Acting Speaker, people kept telling me, they remembered the former administration. When 48 percent of your people live in apartment blocks, and even though they receive these type of letters from the official Opposition, the tenants remember. They realize that The Landlord and Tenant Act, for all Opposition's egotism, had never been changed during their particular administration while they were in public office.

Mr. Acting Speaker, last night the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) got up, and she spoke about what Manitobans and what this Government has done in the area of family violence. I am proud of the Act and the role that the Department of Housing was involved in obtaining the new residents for the Osborne House, a Winnipeg crisis centre; and the YWCA Westman Women's Shelter, a Brandon crisis centre. It is with great pride that I was also involved in obtaining the province's first shelter for abused Native women, which is operated by a Native board.

Mr. Acting Speaker, Manitoba Housing has continued its mandate, and we will continue.

To the Member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), in regard to Native programs in the core area, we have the first elderly housing project by this Government, containing 30 units, which was developed under the Urban Native program. Also to the Member across the way, the Native Women's transition centre, which was allocated under Manitoba Housing, we are working with.

Finally, there is a 39 unit allocation to the Native Clan Organization to provide temporary hostel living accommodation to Native convicts, who are on parole while they learn to adapt to society—also adapted by this particular Government.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we will continue that mandate. We do not just float words and as by the previous NDP Government, we care and we produce.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I guess I should not single out the official Opposition in my reply to the budget speech, but to this day I still cannot figure out what

the Liberal Party policies were during the last election, and maybe that is why they are at the position they are now.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I am not pointing fingers on the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) because at least he came forward with good constructive criticism when he was critic. -(interjection)- Also he did do some good kicking around last night.

I hope the people of Manitoba will find out though, however, under his guide over the next four years.

I have heard from the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) how he is going to solve the housing problems in his remarks to the throne. I also heard from the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) tell him what he thought of it. Mr. Acting Speaker, we have a Member for Burrows who is now going to put a tax on owner-occupied homes. We have some people in this city, that is their only form of saving. They rely on that as their pension plans when they sell those houses. That Member for Burrows is now going to tax pension plans over and above—on savings that these people have been saving for, for years, Mr. Acting Speaker. The owner-occupied houses, the largest investment they will ever make, and now he wants to take it away from them.

The Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) got up the other day and talked about debt. He did not call it bad debt, he called it a good debt. I guess a good debt is one that you never have to pay back. That is exactly what they did. They felt that a good debt is one you never have to pay back, and that is what the Member for Elmwood had to say in his remarks. Mr. Acting Speaker, they are coming out loud and clear. When there was only 12 of them, they were a little quieter over there. Now there are a few more, that true socialist philosophy is starting to come out.

Let the people of Manitoba not forget the terrible Government we had in this province for all those years and from that particular Government. Mr. Acting Speaker, there are many achievements which I could list. The point I want to make, however, is that the basis for good Government is not to be able to show how much money you can throw at a problem, like the NDP and Liberals would have us do, but how you can work with people in order to solve the problem within realistic goals, and within a responsible, fiscal framework.

This is the basis upon which the budget speech was produced. This Government is telling the people in Manitoba that we will continue to listen to

their concerns, respond in kind, and also be fiscally responsible so that the people living in Manitoba today and in years to come will have the quality of life their ancestors wished for them and which they deserve.

* (1500)

There was a question from the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) the other day in regard to Native housing. Not only in that particular area in Swan River are we producing approximately 30 units to the Baptist people there and to the town, we are also providing in that particular—and if she would only wait for the Estimates process to come out, she will see that Swan River will be producing nine urban Native, and the urban Native allotment for this particular budget year will be up for this particular year, Mr. Acting Speaker.

I will give you some figures. In Portage, we will propose eight; in the DOC in Brandon, four; Brandon FC, four. I can go on and on in regard to the urban Native. Each year we work with the Native groups. We continue to work with the Native groups.

Mr. Acting Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining? Okay, maybe I could give you some information in regard to the housing and put it on record, in the core area. Housing program eight, for the record. We have provided two private, 10 private non-profit, and five co-operative housing development projects, assisted, or in development. Four hundred and ten new units created to date. Total investment contracted or completed in the core area, \$22,257,366 including the Core Area Initiative.

Initiative programming, the first Core Area Initiative Agreement and other Government grants. Twenty-four jobs are expected as well as 243 person years of construction employment.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in closing I would just like to finish and say that I am just so gratified to the people of southeast of Winnipeg. My Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mrs. Rrender), my Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay), my Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) who worked diligently in that southeast section of Winnipeg; I would like to say that the silent majority out there in suburbia, we thank them for their support in the last election.

This includes the low, middle and high income people who reside in the suburbs, who now have said, and they realize that when you are dealing with

a city issue, you cannot deal how it affects personally in different areas. You deal with what is good for the City of Winnipeg. That has been my track record as long as I have been in public life, and those people in suburbia realize that.

But, Mr. Acting Speaker, in closing, boy how sweet it is in the southeast corner of Winnipeg. It is blue, blue, blue and blue. Thank you.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): I listened carefully to the remarks of the Minister of Housing. I listened to his speech and we share some things in common I confess. One is an interest in urban affairs and in the core area, and also in core area initiative. I was one person who presented a brief to an inner city inquiry. I have not had a chance to read their final report in detail yet, but I can tell you that a number of people made very similar recommendations about the third core area.

We would be pleased if this Government would sign a third Core Area Initiative Agreement, but I think there need to be some changes. I think there needs to be a change from the emphasis on bricks and mortar which got very large sums of money and percentages of money in the first and second core area, and instead an emphasis on programs that would be more people oriented, especially to improve literacy for job training, for social services and for housing.

I know that all of those things were included in the first core area and the second core area agreement, but what myself and many others have suggested is that those proportions be changed in the third core area agreement.

I was interested to hear the Minister's remarks on reducing the size of City Council, something that would affect my constituency and the constituency of many other people here. In fact, I will be very interested when the Minister brings in legislation, if he ever does, as to what the position of Members of the Liberal Party would be, especially their city councillors from the inner city, one of whom I have talked to already who is opposed to reducing the number of councillors to 15 councillors.

I think we can predict a number of things that would happen if that were to take place. One is that councillors would become full-time city councillors, and their salary would probably double, so you know, the Liberal and Conservative Party were promoting this policy during the election, and suggesting that it would be a way of saving large

sums of money for the City of Winnipeg taxpayers; however, if you cut the council in half, but double their salaries, there would not be any savings at all.

The other outcome that is easily predictable, is the suggestion made by the Premier, amongst others, that there be pie-shaped wards. Well, we know what the outcome of that would be. It would be less representation, less democracy—I am glad to hear one of the Liberal Members saying that he does not like that idea—less democracy for people in the inner city and constituencies like Burrows and Point Douglas, like Broadway, like Wellington, and more representation and more control for suburban people, such as the constituents of the Minister of Housing who was bragging about the suburban support for his Party. That is what the intent, I would allege, and the effect of a reorganized City Council with only 15 wards would be.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to rebut one of the suggestions that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) made about units built in the inner city. He suggested that the Opposition Parties said that they were not doing anything. In fact, the Government was doing something. He mentioned the number of units that were built. What we are saying is that we want the Government to do more in the inner city, not less.

He also made, I think, a significant comment about seniors and the need for seniors' housing. He was very particular about one suggestion. He said that seniors need more say in the housing that is provided for them. I commend him for that suggestion, but I would like to recommend that he broaden it and make that suggestion applicable to all tenants, especially tenants in public housing, so that all tenants not just seniors, had more control and more say in the housing in which they live.

I would like to thank the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) and the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) and also the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) for a valuable lesson that they have taught me in the last week regarding the importance of words and how even one sentence can cause one a lot of grief. I am also grateful that a number of Members who are here today were listening to my initial speech and heard my remarks about John Turner making a non-taxable capital gain of \$635,000.00.

I would like to offer two caveats to my remarks. The Member for Inkster has heard this before. The

Member for Inkster was on the Liberal task force on housing that toured the country. They invited me to make a presentation on housing which I did. So the Member for Inkster has heard me speak in a little bit more detail on that. He will remember that Paul Martin Jr. who was Chair of that task force asked me questions about my recommendations about taxation on the sale of a principal residence.

He will remember that Paul Martin Jr. said, well, what about people in my constituency in Montreal who have their life savings in their house which we have heard from Members opposite in the last two days, yesterday and today. I said, well, I do not really like concessions, tax concessions, but in this case I would say okay we will exempt the first hundred thousand dollars of capital gains on the sale of a principal residence. That would probably eliminate everyone in Winnipeg who sells a house, but it would still capture millions of dollars of revenue from people who live in Toronto, Montreal, Calgary and Vancouver.

* (1510)

I would also like to say that the context of what I was saying was tax reform and tax fairness. What I wanted to say was that there is an important area of taxation that is frequently overlooked, perhaps not understood, especially by new Members who were elected to the Legislature, and that is tax expenditures. Tax expenditures are monies that the Government could collect, but choose not to. To his credit the Honourable Joe Clark implemented a new report in the federal budget on tax expenditures.

For a number of years the Tax Expenditure Report was published and so you could look at it and you could see how many millions, in fact, billions of dollars were in the tax expenditure accounts that the federal Government chose not to collect. Unfortunately the current Prime Minister has got rid of the tax expenditures account. These tax expenditures amount to billions and billions of dollars which the Government chooses not to collect and they are much greater than tax expenses or budgets of departments.

For example, in housing in 1980 the federal Government spending on housing was as follows: Ownership programs AHOP, RRAP, \$152 million; social housing, \$396 million; rental housing, \$318 million; other including insulation programs, repair programs, community services, administration, \$539 million; for a total of \$1.4 billion. The largest

housing benefits are conferred by tax expenditures especially the non-taxation on the sale of a principal residence. In 1980, this amounted to \$3.5 billion if sales had been fully taxed. This is more than twice the total of all direct spending on housing.

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

The provincial Conservatives are opposed apparently to the goods and services tax. The Liberal Party is apparently opposed to the goods and services tax. If the GST were scrapped, where would the Government get their money? The Government would have a number of choices. They could increase other taxes which they are unlikely to do. They could increase the deficit, which Mr. Wilson is unlikely to do.

The Globe and Mail yesterday I believe, or today, said that the deficit this year federally would be \$30 billion.

They could cut programs in spending. Well, yes, the federal Government is probably likely to do that, or they could offload to the provinces, for example, health and post-secondary education begun by the Liberals, continued by the Conservatives.

They could offload in the area of housing, which the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) alluded to in his speech. That has already begun to happen. They could offload in other areas. Would they do that? Yes. Or, and this is their choice, they could bring in substantive changes in tax reform and tax fairness.

They could bring back a more progressive income tax system. They could increase taxes on corporations or they could tax tax expenditures, instead of losing all that money they could capture some of that revenue.

Why would they want to increase revenue from tax expenditures? According to Linda McQuaig in her excellent book, "Behind Closed Doors," which I would commend to all Members, by the 1980s, tax expenditures were costing Ottawa \$36 billion per year, almost 40 percent of Government spending, and in fact more than the annual deficit. If Wilson chose to capture this revenue, that he is not capturing from tax expenditures, he could have had a balanced budget every year since he became the Minister of Finance, but he chose not to.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to remind Honourable Members of the context of my original illustration example of John Turner's non-taxation

sale of a principal residence a \$635,000 tax free capital gain, and contrast this once again with someone on provincial social assistance, who has a work incentive of \$50 a month. They can earn \$50 without losing anything. They can earn more than that, but it is deducted dollar for dollar from their cheque, in effect, a 100 percent tax rate.

Why am I talking about this? Because I believe in fairness in taxation, because if you examine the priorities of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) in his budget you see that there is a lack of fairness in taxation, and also because I believe in a society that should share and that we as individuals should share. I believe that if there are any poor among us, and there are, that we must not harden our hearts or close our fist to those in need, but we must be open handed and give people enough for their needs.

When we give, we must give with an open heart. In our complex society we can do so by individual charity. We can do so by supporting organized charities or by Government tax transfers, or more importantly by systemic and structural change including tax reform. Why should we do this? People in our constituencies in the inner city are the people who need a society that shares and need us as a Government to make reforms for more equitable taxation and sharing.

Consider, for example, the number of people who are homeless. In the International Year of Homelessness a survey was done by the Canadian Council for Social Development and they identified 14,000 shelter spaces in January 1987 per night. This figure does not reflect people who were turned away by shelters, people who squatted in empty or disused buildings, those who slept outdoors, or individuals or families who stayed in motels at the expense of municipal social services.

The Canadian Council and Social Development also estimated that 250,000 different people passed through shelters in 1986, or we could look at children in poverty. Those are the people who are in need that I am suggesting that we as a society should be more generous with. Nine hundred and thirteen thousand children in Canada live below the poverty line. They are amongst the 560,000 who rely on food banks to provide their basic nutrition. They form Canada's single largest group of poor people—children, the single largest group of food bank users.

If we get to a more local example in that of the inner city of Winnipeg, there are now excellent statistics that are out by the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg on the use of food banks in Winnipeg, who those users are and what their incomes are. The use of emergency food is confined to renter households with income under \$21,000.00.

I took part in one of those surveys, and I can tell you what the results are. If you look at it in terms of a graph, as income goes up—and they graded it from less than \$7,000 to less than \$14,000 to less than \$21,000 of income—the use of food banks drops dramatically. So that after \$21,000 per year income—this survey was about two years ago—there are almost no people using food banks.

Within this group, predominantly single males with incomes under \$7,000 used emergency food outlets. The second most vulnerable group was low-income families with children. The former are more likely to receive meals. The latter prefer food kits. The overall rate of use of emergency food outlets in Winnipeg was calculated to be 1.7 percent. However, amongst at risk households, the rate was 7.3 percent. Of these, 34 percent are families with children under 18. I believe these statistics are appalling.

It is important to note that these data are based on Winnipeg Harvest outlets only. Other emergency food suppliers such as the Salvation Army and churches that supply food on an emergency basis were not surveyed. Therefore, the figures quoted above are probably underestimates.

Madam Deputy Speaker, what is the impact of the Conservative budget on the people in Burrows? Who are the people in Burrows that I serve? Well, they are a higher than average percentage of people who are seniors. There is a large number of people who are on social assistance. There is a large number of people who are working people, union people. There are very few professional people. These are the people—the poor, the elderly, the single-parent families, recipients of social assistance, people working at minimum wage—who are least able to cope with recession and Government cutbacks.

What do we see in the Minister of Finance's budget? We see that in Housing, the general administration budget has been cut from \$5.018 million to \$4.886 million, a cut of 9 percent. Transferred to MHRC, also a small change. The

actual budget, if you compare the actual 1989-90 to the Estimates for '90-91, there is a 9 percent cut in the budget of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme).

If we look at Canada-Manitoba Core Area Agreements, we see cutbacks. Inner city education initiative, cutback in funding; post-secondary adult and continuing ed. and training, cutbacks; post-secondary career development, adult and continuing education, cutbacks; literacy programs, cutbacks; special skills training, cutbacks; Workforce 2000 job training for tomorrow, cutbacks.

These are the programs that the Minister of Housing was talking about just a few minutes ago, saying that he went to their graduation ceremonies and he was proud to be there. These are the programs that are being cut back, the people who are the most vulnerable in our society. Programs that would benefit them are being cut back.

* (1520)

The income supplement programs, 55 Plus and CRISP, cutbacks; youth programs, cutbacks; continuing care, the program delivery got an increase of 1.9 percent. The equipment and supply portion received an actual cut.

What does this mean for people in Burrows? It means that more people in Burrows will not receive home care or people will be cut off. Since the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is here, I would like to tell him a story about a senior citizen I have assisted over the last few years.

When she first became sick she was 85 years old. Her health was deteriorating. She was admitted to the hospital, diagnosed as suffering from malnutrition. She was in the hospital for three months; while she was there she gained 17 pounds. In the subsequent year, year and a half, she was in and out of the hospital approximately three times and then home care was arranged. Now she is getting home care seven days a week.

I do not know of anybody who is getting home care seven days a week, except this friend that I help. However, I think this is a good way for the Government to spend their money, if you consider that when she was in the hospital for three months the Government was spending \$900 a day to keep her in the hospital, admitted for malnutrition.

Now she is getting home care; perhaps they are paying six dollars an hour or seven dollars an hour, I am not sure, for a home care worker two hours a

day, three hours a day, and subsequently her admissions to hospital have gone way down. She goes to the hospital now for two or three days or a couple of weeks at the most.

I think there are millions of dollars to be saved if the Government would rearrange their priorities and put more money into home care and less money into keeping patients like her in the hospital. -(interjection)- Well, I am suggesting a way to the Government benches of saving money. Are you not interested in listening to ways to save money? The result is that my neighbour is much stronger. My neighbour is in much better health, she has not been back to the hospital as frequently, when she goes it is for shorter stays.

The first time she went to the hospital it cost \$81,000 of the taxpayers' money. Home care is much, much cheaper, and why is this Government cutting back? Do they not believe in preventive programs?

55 Plus and CRISP have been cut back 7 percent. Perhaps the Government will say this is because of a lower take-up rate. Well, they could increase it, they could increase it by advertising. That would not be my first choice, but they could advertise the program so that people are aware of it. For example, the rent increases that the Minister loves to talk about, the 3 percent and the 4 percent rent increases. There is no reason why the Government could not have similar advertising on programs like CRISP and 55 Plus, so that those people who are eligible are aware that the programs are there and will apply for them.

I have a better idea. Why does this Government not inform people who qualify through the income tax form? The federal Government informs people about all kinds of programs through the income tax returns and through old age security cheques. Why does the provincial Government not inform people of programs that they qualify for? Give them the name of the program, the eligibility criteria and a phone number, and an address for applying for them.

There are many constituents in Burrows who are not aware of these programs, and I find that out when I canvass. I find people who are saying they are having trouble paying the rent, and they are going to have to move. I say, have you heard about this rent supplement program? No, we have not heard about that rent supplement program. It gives

-(interjection)- I know that is my job as MLA, but the Government also has a responsibility to inform people about programs that are there for everyone who is eligible.

In conclusion, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think this Government suffers from a problem which I would call perimeteritis. That is, they cannot see inside the perimeter -(interjection)- or north of the Assiniboine, as my colleague suggests. I would like to recommend that this Government govern in the interests of all Manitobans, including the residents of Burrows and the entire inner city.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I regret to say that even though this budget has cutbacks in numerous areas, it will affect my constituents. We have fear of what is going to happen in the next budget. We fear the next budget will be even worse, and in spite of the fact that we are into a recession, we see a lack of programs, a lack of policy and a lack of initiative to deal with the recession and the effects on people. We hope that will improve, but we are not hopeful, given the ideological bent of this Government. Thank you.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Madam Deputy Speaker, once again it is a pleasure to participate in the Budget Debate. I have had the opportunity to speak to quite a few of these and participate in a lot of them.

I can recall sitting in Opposition quite a few years ago when the then Government, the NDP Government brought down a budget, when they brought in the payroll tax at that time. We knew they were in financial straits because of their uncontrolled spending and lack of planning at that time. We figured that they would have to raise the sales tax possibly and other measures of taxation, and they did. They thought it was a great coup at the time when they brought in the 2.5 percent payroll tax. We are still suffering with that one.

Those kind of budgets that came down at that time created a lot of interest. There was a lot of fire at that time. The debates were hectic; definite views were taken from both sides of Government. The Liberals were non-existent at that time. We had one Member there for years off and on, but it was basically the NDP and the Conservative. That were basically at it all the time.

The last two and a half years, of course, we had a bit of a twist thrown in when all of a sudden the Liberals surfaced with 20 Members and that, of

course, has taken its natural course the other way again. That was a flash in the pan, but I can recall many of the debates that have taken place.

On the Throne Speech Debate everybody is sort of testing the waters especially with the new Legislature, new Members. Everybody is relatively nice and complimenting the constituents and people who are elected and have new positions.

In the Budget Debate we get more into the meat of the matter and get a little bit more serious about some of these things. That is what I find sort of different in this particular debate, Madam Deputy Speaker, is the fact that there seems to be no fire from the Opposition in terms of what to attack.

If you go out into the public and listen to the public there is very little concern out there about what happened with the budget. Madam Deputy Speaker, we have to then accept the fact that people are relatively pleased with what we have done.

I think -(interjection)- and second shoe, my foot, under the circumstances I find it very interesting—I used to have a lot more fire when I was in Opposition. It was easier to shoot, you know. The targets were big and lovely at that time. I do not get quite that exuberant anymore in my debate about these things. I try to keep on the higher road if possible, but I have to throw in the odd shot here and there just to indicate to Members of the House the lack of enthusiasm that they seem to have for it.

We happened to have a quorum count yesterday. I will not belabour that, but if anybody wants to read the Hansard it will indicate exactly what kind of lively participation there was from the Members opposite. It is not parliamentary to make reference to people that are or were not in the House, but I encourage all Members to read that.

I would like to think that possibly the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) took some of his people into the woodshed and we have more participation in the House today. The only problem that the Leader of the Opposition has is he cannot get fire into his troops in terms of attacking the budget. That is understandable, because the general reaction, as I repeat again, out there from the public is positive. It is a non-issue. I have seen many budgets where there were major issues. Even at a time when supposedly we are on the verge of a recession, that things are tough, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) outlined the reduction in revenues and alluded to the fact there might have to be some belt

tightening going on, everybody seems to have accepted this. In fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have been out talking to people and some of their first comments were, you are not tough enough, you should have tightened up more. You are still spending too much.

I will tell you something. I am very proud of the budget that was brought down by our Minister of Finance. I know that the process we have gone through in each department by looking very carefully at the possibility of being responsible in terms of our expenditures—and I find it interesting the previous speaker indicated that there were reductions here, reductions there. I have found in the last few days of debate that they have been desperately looking where has there been a reduction? They have never asked why there is a reduction, or if there is a change in the programming, and I think it would be irresponsible if we just *carte blanche* used the same programs.

* (1530)

I think there is an evaluation system that has to take place, and we have gone through that. We have gone through that on this side in preparing the Estimates, and I think we have been very responsible. That is why it is very hard for the Members opposite to attack the budget as it has come down. It will be very interesting to see, once we get into the Estimate process, exactly what kind of response we get from them, when we can explain and detail, where we are not constrained by time and Question Period, when we can go into detail and explain exactly what we are doing and why we are doing it.

I think it will be an enlightening experience for many of the newcomers. I am sure it will be enlightening to many newcomers. I just want to indicate one of the things—just listening to the previous speaker who made all kinds of comments about cutbacks, and we should spend more here, we should spend more. That was the impression we got.

I had the privilege of opening a seniors unit in the Town of Steinbach a little while ago. There were approximately 150 seniors there—a lovely complex that we were opening up. I had the opportunity to make some remarks at that time. When going down there, I was thinking about some comments to make. The one thing that came to mind, in order to

know where you are going, you have to know where you come from.

Then I thought back 20, 30 years ago when—and I think I made reference to this to some degree in my throne speech—the fact that let us just consider what our parents, our seniors had, 20, 30 years ago. I can recall 40, 50 years ago, where children at that time had to look after their parents because there was no pension programs, there was no hospitalization, there was no seniors housing, and I think it is proper that we look to perfection to try and improve things all the time, which is being done.

When you really want to take it in proper perspective, you have to look over the longer period of time and see exactly what kind of services we are providing as Government. I think it is phenomenal. I would think my area in a smaller community, and I would hope it would affect the seniors in the city the same way, that they have never had it so good. They have never had it so good, and they admit that. I think that shows positive action on behalf of the provincial Government.

It just happens that our philosophy, in terms of what we are doing, is different than the NDPs. I will not make reference to the Liberals because we are always trying to figure out where they are at exactly, because they had their crack at trying to crowd into the middle ground somewhere along the line, and got devastated by that. It is very unfortunate.

Madam Deputy Speaker, from the time that I got involved in politics in '77, the lines were very definite between the NDP and the Conservatives, and even that has melded to some degree. It has melded a lot more than we maybe care to admit, but the different philosophy is still there, and that comes out in the debate. That is why we have these debates.

As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) indicated, I think that it is scary why people are losing their confidence in politicians of all Parties. They feel we are not accountable, we are not being truthful.

When the Minister of Finance indicated that we were paying interest to the tune of \$551 million a year on debt that the province has accumulated, that makes me sick to my stomach, for the simple reason, I have a capital program, Madam Deputy Speaker, a Capital Construction Program on highways—and I want to get into that after a while—of \$107 million. If I could ever lay my hands on the interest that we are paying on debt for one

year, can you imagine what the roads would look like? Or if the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) could get that money into his hands for one year, or any one of these departments, can you imagine what we could do with that kind of money? That money is lost money.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have been a farmer and a businessman, and I have had debt. The worse thing that always bothered me was paying interest on borrowed money, and I think a lot of people feel that way. I do not mind paying the capital amount, but it is the interest that always hurts so much because that money is gone. In many cases it is like paying rent. Once you have done it, it is gone. You have nothing for it. I think when we talk of different philosophies—and it still comes out especially with some of the new Members speaking on the throne speech and on the budget speech. They talk of spending, spending. You know, spend more, do not cut anywhere, and that is the difference very often.

What we have done in the two and a half years, and I think this is why the people of Manitoba in the last election gave us a majority, not a big one, but they gave us a majority because they felt comfortable in terms of how we handle the fiscal responsibilities of Government. The challenge is there for us definitely, but the one philosophy that always came forward from the NDP was that if things are tough, spend Government money, spend public money. That is why we are in that kind of trouble.

Another reason why I believe, Madam Deputy Speaker, that there is not much fire in the Opposition in terms of the budget, is they have been looking for all kinds of other issues to try and attack because obviously they are not scoring on the budgetary matters. We had the case the other day where—and you know I take this with a grain of salt and enjoy it to some degree—when the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) made an unwarranted comment, and subsequently, you know, apologizing withdrew that comment, but that was the issue of the Day. All of Question Period was tied up pretty well the next day on that issue.

We had the same thing when the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) made a personal comment and we spent Question Period, almost over a Question Period, on that issue. To me, it signals that they have no real issues to attack the Government on. Certainly, they do not have any issues on the budgetary matter that—the Leader of

the Opposition (Mr. Doer) has a few questions from time to time on the budget, but they are very limited, the questions that we have had on the budget since the budget came down, but understandable. I mean, if there is nothing to shoot at you look for other targets.

Now I am want to go back a little bit. I just want to make further reference to the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), the Minister responsible for Seniors, that in the two and a half years that he has been in that position—and I have a close working relationship with him through my northern airports, through the roads, so the Minister of Northern Affairs and myself have been working closely on many projects jointly with the communities up north.

I dare say that there has not been a Minister responsible for Native and Northern Affairs who has done more for the people in the North as the present Minister of Native and Northern Affairs. I dare anybody to challenge that if you look at the record that he has. If you ask the people truthfully up north they admit that. They admit that this Government and this Minister have been very responsible in terms of responding to the needs of the North and he has done a tremendous job. I say if they want to shoot at him, most Members know the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs, he is a pretty hard target to hit as well. He will look after himself. I do not have to necessarily defend him, but I wanted to put it on the record that he has done a commendable job.

I want to go back to the budgetary matters, and I want to talk about my Department of Highways and Transportation to some degree, and maybe touch on Government Services. I am hoping, Madam Deputy Speaker, that when it comes to the Estimates process that we will have a chance to maybe go through Government Services this year. Last year that department plus others had to be passed *carte blanche* because there was no time left. We had spent almost a record time in the Estimates of Highways last year. I certainly enjoyed that. We covered just about every pothole in the country going through the Estimates.

Just a little bit of history of the Highways Department's budget. When we lost Government in 1981, the Capital Construction Program at that time, the carry-over budget—the first budget for the then NDP under Howard Pawley—was \$100 million. Year after year after that, it dropped down to the point where when we took Government in '88, the

capital expenditure on Highways was \$83 million, not increased, but that has gone down to that.

With the freeze that they had on with the civil servants, we could not even lay off people when they did not have work. That was a fallacy of something like that, but it was in keeping with the then thinking of the then Premier, Mr. Pawley, because I have had the opportunity to talk to Ministers that were responsible for the department during those years. They are not in the Legislature now. I am not talking about the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), but others before them, who indicated to me how they had to fight to even have a capital program on highways, because the Premier at that time felt that was not a priority, was prepared to take and have no capital program for construction.

* (1540)

That is why I am pleased that our Government has seen the socioeconomic impact of a good road infrastructure in the province. What we did the first year when we took Government, we brought the capital program from \$83 million to \$95 million. Subsequent to that, we moved it up to \$102 million. In this current year, we have it up to \$106.5 million with \$500,000 of it being moved over to the Parks Department, my colleague from Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), to do roads within the parks system, so we are moving it up in the right direction.

I personally, of course, with a bias would like to have more money to be spent there because when you consider that, as I indicated in my throne speech, we are an exporter of transportation services, it is a very important part of our economic system. In order to have that continue that way we have to have a good road system. We are moving in that direction.

I indicate and I hope you know that nobody gets excited because you give a personal comment as my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) did. I feel that we should be spending more monies there, but that is a challenge that I have together with my colleagues to establish their priorities.

It is surprising when I hear the questions that get shot across the Chamber here to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) about cutbacks. Everybody seems to have a hangup about that. If anybody availed themselves of this 1990 Manitoba Budget Highlights and if you look in there, it says 1990

Program Highlights—\$148 million of additional funding for health programs, \$148 million. That is additional money. My total program in capital construction is \$107 million, \$48 million more for Family Services, \$46 million to assist the farm community, \$37 million extra for Education and Training programs, and the criticisms come.

That is why I hope that the new Members will take their time and go through the Estimate process when the time comes and look where this money is going. It is easy to say something has been reduced. You know you have to know what the shift is and what the total picture is. In that respect, I do not know who drafts some of the questions that the new Members bring forward, but there is room for a little bit better strategy in that and to know where you are coming from in many of these things.

Anyway, Madam Deputy Speaker, I deviated a little bit there from my highway interests. I want to indicate some of the challenges that will be coming forward and why I think we will have to look at possibly spending more money. I certainly am very supportive of the National Highway Program and hope that we can get financial participation from the federal Government which collects a big portion of money off the highway system and puts very little of it back. That is a different debate that we will be entering into with them.

When you consider the fact that rail line abandonment is a thing that is very real to the people in rural Manitoba, and as these lines get abandoned that we have a transference of traffic from rail to municipal and provincial roads, the challenge of building up those roads is definitely there. The cost nowadays of road construction is escalating, and certainly the high fuel prices right now are going to have a dramatic impact on that department especially.

I had actually in mind, Madam Deputy Speaker, to make reference to some of the lean years under the NDP and the road construction industry, how they have prioritized their roads already with the cut budget it seemed. I say this to the Member for Dauphin who was then Minister responsible for Highways, how he prioritized his roads. I think he flew by the seat of his pants and looked after his own constituency, by and large, because there is a system in place that we apply in terms of having the district engineers bring forward the information in terms of highway traffic on there. We have a rating system on it, and we have to try and establish that.

It is also based on, as I indicated, traffic count. We have paved roads built in areas up to 200 kilometres long where we have less than 100 vehicles a day, and that—

An Honourable Member: You are kidding. Who built them?

Mr. Driedger: Well, it was built under the NDP. That is why I think that was irresponsible in terms of how they dealt with that.

We are very cognizant of the fact that especially we have spent a lot of money around the circumference of Winnipeg. Everybody realizes, of course, that Winnipeg is responsible for the roads within their system, except for certain roads that we are working with them on in terms of exchanging regarding the entrance of Highway 75, the twinning of 75 into the city, but we are also looking at the northeast Perimeter. I know this is very dear to people from the North.

It has been sitting there for countless years. If it had been done at that time, we would have a good system in place. It would be easier to maintain. Now we have a problem. We are moving ahead completing the finalization of acquisition of right-of-way and starting to do the design aspect of it, but because there are major overpasses, we have two major railways involved there, we are looking at costs that are going to exceed \$60 million. That is scary when you consider what my total budget is, but we feel that for our trucking industry we need the access into the city to the businesses.

We negotiate on an ongoing basis with MTA, Manitoba Trucking Association and the city in terms of trying to make it a little easier for our trucking industry. I could get into that in depth, because we are facing major problems in our trucking industry—deregulation, competition. There are many things that create a lot of financial problems for especially the owner-operators. We are working to try and see whether we can resolve that.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) made reference to that in the removal of the payroll tax for some of our trucking organizations. It is a small step. Would that we had the funds to do more. We will certainly be reviewing that, because we have to have a good healthy economy in order to continue providing the services that we do. Sometimes it is a little scary when you consider that three departments spend virtually two-thirds of our total budget, and those three departments are not

revenue-bearing departments. So we have to have a good economy to be able to keep on providing those kinds of services, and it is not that simple—(interjection)— Pardon me?

An Honourable Member: It sounds like the toll roads are back.

Mr. Driedger: We have a lot of—and there is a difference here, especially from the speeches that come across, how they view what should happen to anybody who has, let us say, wealth or money. I think to myself, if I had \$1 million, would I take it and invest it in a company to try and make a little bit more than the normal interest, or would I put it in the bank and I could live off the interest.

You know, if you have that kind of money, you have to have, first of all, the entrepreneurial spirit to take and invest that, but you have to be able to look at the opportunity of making that extra money, otherwise nobody would invest. Nobody would invest, and if you do not have people who do invest in companies you have no jobs. If you have no jobs, you cannot provide the tax base to provide the services that everybody wants. So that to me is a very important part. We have to create a climate of comfort for those people who are investors so that we can have the jobs, that we have this economic strength, so we can keep on providing the services that everybody holds very dearly, and we have good services.

Compare our province, our country to the rest of the world. Why would everybody want to come to Canada? Because we are a rich country. We have a rich base. We have rich services that we provide in terms of health, education. It is a lovely place to be, is it not? If you look at the news and look at what happens throughout the world, how lucky can we be? We have to be careful that we do not abuse it, because if you—I think when it comes to a history lesson I should let the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) give you a history lesson on socialism. He started on it the other day, and he has a lot of things that he could impart in terms of giving you a lot of food for thought in terms of what has happened and where we should go.

I just want to indicate that it is not quite that simple just sitting there. There has to be some responsibility by all of us. I think we have to be forthright in terms of indicating what we are doing, but you cannot just sit as the Opposition and shoot from the hip because that is where we have lost the

credibility with a lot of people. I have made this comment before that the general public, by and large, regards politicians—and this is no reflection—used car salesmen, but as a pun. We are in a low category in terms of the views of people. I do not know whether somebody watched the program on Saturday night. Did somebody watch the program which was on TV on Saturday night, where they did a bit of a poll as to what people thought of politicians? -(interjection)- Sunday night, was it? Okay. I did not see it, but I heard about it. What was it, 80 percent?

An Honourable Member: Seventy-six percent.

* (1550)

Mr. Driedger: Seventy-six percent of the people do not like politicians. -(interjection)- Okay, now why is that? Why is it that people have that perception of us? I am talking of all of us. Why do they have that perception? Because we are not always playing fair in this game. Many of us play it for our own political gain and purposes, and we are not looking after the interests and the public in Manitoba. That is why we have lost the respect. That is why the federal Government has lost respect. Why is voter turnout low on these cases already? Unless you have an issue -(interjection)-

How do we get around? You see, I do not sense the antagonism in this House at this stage of the game that we have had here many times before. It has been very vicious here from time to time. I do not sense that. I think that if there is a desire—and especially with more new Members in this House than we have had at any given time that I recall, 22 new Members, I think we can develop a relationship that would start garnering the respect of the public out there.

For example, I do not know what the NDP are going to do, whether they are going to vote against the budget or for the budget, but if the budget is a reasonable budget why would you not support that budget? Just on principle of being Opposition, you are going to vote against it? I am talking to the NDP specifically here, because the Liberals, from the day that they came into the House and had a little power, they were against everything. They wanted an election every day. I do not think they want one today, though, but they would still vote against the budget. -(interjection)-

Oh, I think we -(interjection)- I appreciate that. Anyway, I would just want to indicate, Madam

Deputy Speaker, that I think our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has to be complimented. I know working with him that he is tough. He makes everyone of us on the Government benches be accountable for how we spend, and I think that is the way it should be.

I think we will have to be accountable to the Members opposite in the Estimates and explain exactly what we are doing and why we are doing those things. There has to be a better understanding by everybody in terms of how we present ourselves to the general public.

Final remarks, I just want to indicate, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I have two departments, Government Services, and Highways and Transportation. In both cases I have good staff to work with.

I will give you an example. I think by and large we sometimes get critical of our bureaucrats, and sometimes I think it is not always warranted, not saying that we should not be watching it very carefully, but we saw yesterday what happened when the media took—and those of you who were watching the six o'clock news, the I-Team Report, saw what happened to some of the people in the construction industry and how it affected possibly the city.

I understand there is going to be another follow-up today at 5:30 or six o'clock, whatever the case may be. When I saw that happening I was a little concerned because I was not sure exactly how—is there any way that possibly the province could have been affected by the same kind of thing happening?

I spent a lot of time since yesterday to go through that to find out exactly where we stood with the matter. I have to say I am very pleased that the department—not because I was there because we have a system in place that has been there for over 20 years to safeguard against something like that. I am very pleased about that.

I just want to indicate sometimes we maybe come down a little hard on the bureaucratic system. I certainly do from time to time. At the same time they have been there for a long time and in many cases work for the best interests of the public, and we as Ministers have to make the decision, show the course that we choose and let them operate from there and see whether we can make things flow well and be efficient.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it will probably be a

while before we get into a debate situation again. Certainly I am looking forward to the Estimate process with Members of the Opposition, to be able to go through—because I found out when I was a critic that was my best opportunity to know what was going on.

Certainly that is a time when I think—in most cases because of the kind of way we do our Estimates it is not acrimonious in most cases; it is a matter of exchanging information.

I very often said that people get the wrong impression watching Question Period here because everybody is an actor at that stage of the game. The media are here. Television cameras are here. They should come some time when we sit in the evenings and go through the Estimate process and find out exactly that this system is a good system; it works. Every once in a while we have a little bit of fun too, but by and large it is a good system. I look forward to that.

Thank you for my opportunity to participate.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to thank all the Members of the House who, during their throne speeches, welcomed us all to this House. It is nice to have such comfortable surroundings, the cut and thrust of debate, the mutual seeking after truth, the desire to inform and enlighten, a co-operative frame of mind that I am so used to from the university.

It is my first time as a new Member to have the opportunity to comment on a budget. I had expected to find at the budget some clear policy directions of this Government.

In the throne speech I think we saw very little in the way of new initiatives. It was certainly a speech which offered very little hope for many of my constituents, those single mothers who lost their parent-child centres, the many people in parts of my riding who are still unemployed and continually those people who are now having to seek out the food banks at the beginning of the month, no longer now in the third and fourth weeks.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I looked with some anticipation to the budget, but I was astounded I think at the magnitude of the absence of policy directives. What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is like a play, and I was interested to hear my colleague just now speak of us as actors. We have a play in several acts and here in this budget I think we have the opening scene, the

introduction of characters, the setting of a scene and the creation of a moral environment.

The scene is familiar. We have seen it before in Devine's Saskatchewan, in Thatcher's England, and in Republican America. It is the morality play of the new right. Its hero is untrammelled and unregulated market systems.

This is the first of perhaps a few Tory budgets in this province, the first of a series of budgets which will put in place the ideology of this new Tory Party, the ideology they share with Mulroney and Wilson, Reagan and Bush. As befits this first act, there is little dramatic action here. Much of this budget reflects the year past and the limitations and constraints of the situation of minority Government.

The strident tones of the new right are beginning to emerge. The proud boast of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is that there has been no increase in taxes. This is, of course, a very unrealistic interpretation, Mr. Speaker. The people of Winnipeg in particular will find this out rather quickly.

The grants to both inner city education and to the City of Winnipeg are inadequate. They do not take into account the increases in the GST and the cost of living that is going to face everyone in all our jurisdictions. It is going to result in some very difficult decisions in the daily life and in the educational opportunities of more than half our population in the Province of Manitoba.

The City of Winnipeg faces enormous burdens in educational social issues. It has very limited ways of raising revenues. They can either increase user fees, as they are already doing in the recreation area, or they can increase the property taxes. In the current economic situation, where we are seeing an increasing loss of full-time jobs, neither of these options is very palatable. The Government is doing this and they are well aware, I think, that what they are doing is transferring more of the burden of taxation in this province to the average homeowner in the City of Winnipeg.

This is not a no tax increase budget, Mr. Speaker. This is a budget which passes the buck to City Council and to other jurisdictions. This Government has chosen to put the burden of paying for the maintenance, and I do mean maintenance, because I do not think any of the jurisdictions are considering any expectation of expanded services, the maintenance of civic and education services onto

the urban homeowner. Although the recent reassessment in the City of Winnipeg did redress some of the imbalance in taxation which had remained from the pre-Unicity days, it is not always the fairest means of distributing the burden of taxation.

* (1600)

As a result of this first true Tory budget it is easy to envision that there will be cuts in services, cuts in jobs at both the city and school boards and perhaps also an increase in taxation. The impact of all of these I think is going to hit home very hard in the City of Winnipeg. As a result of this policy I think we are going to see a decline, a marked decline in the quality of life for many in the inner city.

In the area of Culture, Heritage and Recreation this budget indicates a cut in the hard departmental monies of \$1.4 million. The increase estimated for departmental spending appears to come entirely from Lotteries money. This is at a time of national recession, when it would seem unlikely that lottery monies will maintain even their most recent levels. Since this Government seems inclined to begin its attack on the labour movement of this province with its harsh treatment of the casino workers, it seems unlikely that the more than a million dollars already lost to strike will be recouped. Is that one of the million dollars that was so cynically allocated to the increase in the Culture budget?

This is all the more puzzling, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister's own Policy Review Committee recommended against reliance on the Lotteries money. Is the Minister rejecting the advice of the DeFehr Committee? Or is this increase simply a phantom of an offer to make the cuts in Culture more palatable to the community?

The truth is—and I was pleased to see that both the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) admitted it—that one of the major reasons for Manitoba's current economic difficulties is the policy of the federal Tories which for some time now have been slashing the transfer payments to provincial jurisdictions. They have been doing so in the high cost and significant areas of Health and Education and they have been doing it consistently now for several years.

When the NDP was in power, we chose to fight this with a Health and Education levy to protect the vital services which bind the community together. We accompanied this, Mr. Speaker, with intensive

and very successful job creation programs which helped many Manitobans weather the storm of the post Sterling Lyon regime.

Mr. Speaker, we may be facing a harsher recession in the immediate future, although we all hope it will be brief, and yet there is no word in this budget of any kind of job creation program at all; merely a shifting of Government revenues from fiscal stabilization into line departments. What we see here is ideology at work. These Tories may acknowledge that Manitoba is currently on the short end of the stick from the federal Government, but they are not prepared to wage all out battle on that front. They fundamentally agree with the ideology of Mulroney and Wilson, the ideology of the new right on which it is based.

I would like to quote from today's column by Jeffrey Simpson. I must admit that I never thought after Meech Lake I would ever quote from Jeffrey Simpson. I did not even think I would ever read him again, and today he was right. He says: Many are the reasons for the unpopularity of Prime Minister Mulroney's Government, but the core problem is quite simple. This is the most right-wing Government since that of R. B. Bennett in the early 1930s. They are not Conservatives in the traditional sense of the term, he says, since Conservatives value tradition and order, celebrate community and are skeptical of change. The Conservative Party has very little in common now with traditional conservatism. The Tories are right wing in the ideological sense of a deep skepticism of the state, a reverence for the market, and determination to allow the market to force changes in behaviour that the political culture of Canada has usually resisted.

He concludes—he is talking, of course, about the dismantling of yet another Crown corporation, Petrocan, and he says—I notice the Minister opposite talked about the poll on Sunday night and I think it is directly attributable to the acts and policies of this federal Tory Government—There is across Canada a sense of a country slipping away. Too many Canadians believe that they have lost the capacity to do great things together through their Governments.

The Manitoba Tories, Mr. Speaker, are not prepared to create new jobs because they are fundamentally opposed to Government intervention in the economy in that manner.

So we have a Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)

who acknowledges the source of some of his woes, agrees with its premise and passes it on, passes on the impact to the average homeowner in the City of Winnipeg. We have a Government which understands the impact of the stagnant revenue of the province in the last quarter and who, for ideological reasons, refuses to play any role in stimulating the economy through job creation programs at the very time when this pass-the-buck policy is likely to result in increasing unemployment in the city and the province.

Like their counterparts in Ottawa, London, Washington, Regina, these new Tories are bound by their ideology. "Manitoba is open for business," the Premier (Mr. Filmon) said repeatedly. It is the echo of course of Calvin Coolidge. The business of the new Manitoba is business. It is a business additionally in the context of free trade, where free trade is used as a weapon of the wealth.

The essence of this new Toryism, Mr. Speaker, I believe is twofold. It is, first of all, a faith in market systems, and it is also a belief that the social policy should focus upon the greater value of the individual.

It is in this kind of context I think, that we lose the communal values of our society. The image of the lone man in front of the tanks at Tiananmen Square or of Nelson Mandela walking free, that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) used in the throne speech are potent and very appropriate images for this ideology. One would wish that he had added the image of the peace camp that sat at his own front door this summer, or of the exhibition or the demonstration of communal and spiritual values that the World Conference of Mennonites also exhibited in Manitoba this summer.

The new Toryism implies both in Ottawa and Manitoba, a deregulation of significant industries beginning as we can see today or as it is today, Petro-Canada. It implies a philosophical commitment to free trade in a continental sphere where Canada's social network and her stronger labour unions will increasingly be called into question. It is an ideology which relies on the market to allocate resources to all our people and which has a remarkable faith in the incentives to private initiative that will inevitably, they believe, have a trickle-down effect on the economy in general.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the effect of this kind of Toryism in Saskatchewan where the Tories, the

new Tories, the Devine Tories have wrecked the community built by generations of social democrats. They systematically reduced the role of Government. They expanded the private sector with public monies. They have undermined unions, frozen the minimum wage, cut welfare payments, and ironically and cynically throughout this, portrayed themselves as populists.

The man in the canoe and his Finance Minister are warning us that we must be reasonable in our demands as workers, that we cannot expect any increase in the minimum wage. This Government has based its economic policy on the extension of the tax holiday to small businesses and selective reductions in the health and education levy to those larger corporations still affected by it.

In real terms of course, income support programs, 55 Plus and CRISP will decline, continuing care, community health programs, dental programs, have all been cut or funded at a level below inflation. The new initiatives announced in the throne speech, in wife abuse programs, family violence courts will only bind the wounds. It will not change the situations that many Manitobans find themselves in as the gap between rich and poor widens in our society. Tory policy aims at the very limited amelioration of existing conditions and not at the fundamental and growing poverty of the lives of many of our fellow citizens.

* (1610)

At the federal level, Mr. Speaker, we have seen too the effect of the new right. We have seen the abandonment of equitable regional development in favour of market allocation. We have seen the dismantling or the beginning of the dismantling of the very ties that bind us, the national social programs, the railways, the CBC, and the family allowance, which now accounts for only 3 percent of the average monthly income.

We are travelling down a yellow brick road of North American untrammelled monetary economies, market economies. We are taking a very different road from the social democratic countries of Europe such as Sweden, Denmark, France or Spain. We are taking a very different road from the historic routes that Toryism took us in the past. I will admit this, Mr. Speaker.

From the time of Macdonald until the election of Brian Mulroney the Tory Party has accepted limited intervention in the economy of this country, whether

it was in the provision of grants to the CPR, the creation of Air Canada, the creation of the CBC, the Tories were always committed to the creation of a different kind of North American nation in the northern half of this continent. Yes, those were different days.

We should be, Mr. Speaker, I think, very aware that in Ottawa we are dealing with a Party that is not only at 15 percent or less in the polls. What is it today? Is it 15 percent, 16? -(interjection)- It is a Party that bears very little resemblance to its roots. I notice that the federal Tories revealed their agenda after their election—free trade—after clearly indicating they would not pursue such an initiative. They shifted the taxes to middle-class and working families; they attacked pensions; they returned abortion to the Criminal Code; they exhibited a dogmatic faith in privatization, all taken out of the hands of the community. Those same Tories used the language of the gutter and the gaming table when they rolled the dice with Canada's future, and for some years, as Jeffrey Simpson and I agree, have soured the political atmosphere in this country.

In Manitoba, we have always experienced the more conservative wing of the Tory Party, whether it was Rodmond P. Roblin or Sterling Lyon. The only exception to this wasteland of Tory Government was Duff Roblin. Duff Roblin, like many Governments of his day, used the opportunity of expanding economies to intervene and expand the public sector in education, health, and public works, but this Government is Toryism of a very different stripe from both Rodmond P. Roblin and Duff Roblin. There is no job creation. It is full steam ahead on the free trade agenda. There is a hostility to labour. There are freezes in the minimum wages. It is the agenda of the new right.

There is another pathway, another vision, Mr. Speaker, that we have tried to articulate, to speak about and which we have always tried to follow. We have had a -(interjection)-

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, on a point of order.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order only because it happened to me some many years ago when I was making one of my first speeches in this House. I remind you, of course, Sir, that it is against the rules of this House to read from material

in any of our contributions or speeches in this House. I would suggest that perhaps the Rules Committee might want to reconsider that rule, but from time to time, I take it upon an obligation to remind Honourable Members and you, Sir, of the rules of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Member would have had a point had the Honourable Member been reading from her speech. I would like to quote from Beauchesne, 6th edition:

"No. 473. While it has frequently been ruled that in addressing the House, a Member must not read from a written, previously prepared speech, Members have traditionally been allowed to make use of extensive notes when speaking."

I believe the Honourable Member was using her notes.

Point of Order

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

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I am like my learned colleague from Lakeside (Mr. Enns), who perhaps with his advanced years of experience in the House is perhaps not able to quite clearly see across the room quite as well as he could in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Member—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the Honourable—order, please. Is the Honourable Minister reflecting upon the ruling of the Chair?

An Honourable Member: No, no. He was agreeing with you.

Mr. Speaker: I do not believe so.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, I would not think of challenging the ruling of the Chair at all. I just wanted to inform you, Sir, that I did not think that the Member was reading at all from a speech.

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

* * *

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): I would like to thank the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) for their advice and for their concern. Thank you.

I was suggesting that there was another agenda, that there is another vision for this province in this country than that exhibited by the new right, both in Ottawa, Saskatchewan and in Manitoba. It is a philosophy of democratic socialism which we have always articulated throughout this province and across prairie Canada.

The historic roots of our Party, Mr. Speaker, are in urban social reform movements, in labour unions, in farm movements, right across the Prairies and across Canada. The history, in fact, of the Canadian Prairies can be argued to have been shaped by a very different vision of Canadian and prairie society.

In the Winnipeg General Strike, we fought for a living wage. When we organized in farm communities to mitigate the conditions of the market from the early 1900s onwards, we fought for the fair price. We formed co-operatives, consumer co-ops, producer co-ops, in farming communities right across the country, and again, we fought for the principle of a fair price.

When we led the fight for pensions, for health insurance in Saskatchewan and elsewhere, we fought for the principle of equality of condition. In the Regina Manifesto, the Winnipeg Declaration, the founding documents of our new Party, in Parliaments and in provincial Legislatures across the country, we offered a different vision of society, and one which we are continuing to offer to the people of Manitoba today, one which is not necessarily based upon a faith in those principles of the market economy, one which continues to fight for a fair price and a living wage.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I very much welcome the opportunity to participate in this Budget Debate. I am particularly intrigued by the remarks of the last speaker, of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I stand corrected if my honourable friend's academic strength is in history, I believe. I was very much intrigued with her new vision of the economic order as it should emerge and ought to emerge should her Party, with the diversity of beliefs that exist in that Party as enunciated by some of the new Members, should ever come to power.

* (1620)

I noticed my honourable friend mentioned some interesting things about, you know, making the economic system and decisions which are based on

non-people concerns and that only the new right has that kind of agenda.

I was intrigued, and I will leave it up to my honourable learned friend, the historian, to correct me if I have the wrong name of the British Prime Minister. I believe the British Prime Minister's name was J. Ramsay MacDonald, and he was a member of a philosophical belief very akin to my honourable friend in that he embraced socialism as well in Great Britain.

The time of his Government was about the '20s or the '30s. One of the things that he did, because postwar Great Britain after the devastation on the working people and the aristocracy—if that is the right word—of the First World War had caused Great Britain to really rethink their values and where they were going as a nation. They were having some substantial difficulty maintaining the traditional British role as a world power.

Prime Minister J. Ramsay MacDonald, providing my memory is correct and I have the name right, wanted at all costs, as a socialist prime minister, to maintain the value of the British pound because he saw the decline in the value of the British pound to be devastating to Britain's role in the international world economy.

So he approached the money lenders, much as Howard Pawley did and Ed Schreyer did in Paris and in New York. He wanted to borrow substantial amounts of money to prop up the British sterling value, because he believed it was important to maintain that as a socialist prime minister and adherent to my honourable friend's philosophy.

The pre-conditions that the money lenders in Paris and New York put on the then socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain were two things: That first of all, they must balance their budget; and secondly, they must cut their expenditures.

The combination by which they were required to do that was: (a) to raise taxes, and (b) to reduce expenditures. What the socialist Prime Minister, MacDonald, did in his term of office was to reduce by 10 percent the then welfare payment to individuals who were unemployed post-World War I.

One would think after listening to my honourable friend, the historian, that he was a member of the new right. No, he was a socialist prime minister adhering to the principles just espoused over here.

Mr. Speaker, what happened then is that

the—and I believe it was Cambridge University. There was a very, very narrowed and secretive group called the Apostle group, and they were very much into the study of the Marxist philosophy as we have heard espoused from time to time. As a result they adhered very closely to this socialist prime minister because they believed that he would carry forward the policies that would benefit the working man and not reduce by 10 percent welfare payments and make them participate in the prosperity of the nation, so they all sacrificed some.

They disavowed themselves of the socialist philosophy and very much undertook a very radical militant left adherence of the Marxist philosophy. From that Apostle group at Cambridge University came such notables on the world scene as Kim Philby and others who have contributed greatly to the free world.

Mr. Speaker, all I say to my honourable friends is they talk their classic socialism. Check your history and you will find that socialist prime ministers, when faced with the very real issue of maintaining the integrity of a nation's economy or a province's economy, there are certain inflexibilities that you do not have the luxury to deal with such as going out and borrowing more money, such as raising more taxes. Those options may not be there for you to exercise if you have engaged in extensive spending as has happened in this province from Howard Pawley and the NDP, with the current Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer), part and parcel of that spendthrift time, and the second dean of the House pushing the money cart down the hall, throwing the money left, right and centre and driving this province into a deficit.

Now, I know my honourable friends do not want to talk about the impact of that deficit on our ability to deliver programs. Every Member in this House has talked about how the interest bill of over \$500 million, which has grown by over \$400 million in the decade of the '80s since Howard Pawley got his hands on the financial throttles of the Province of Manitoba, how those dollars in fact deprive the people that my honourable friend who just spoke in her heart wants to help.

The dollars to do that are called first by those same money lenders in Paris and in New York, that the socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain had to adjust his economic policies in the twenties to satisfy before he could borrow money to protect the integrity of Great Britain as a nation. Interesting how

there are some universals that my honourable friend, the historian, fails to put into perspective and I know will because I believe in her full and complete understanding of things.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about three general areas that are encompassed in this budget. There is a thrust in taxation policy. There is thrust in budget policy, and there is a thrust in deficit policy which are essential to be there. Taxation policy has to be clear. We have to be competitive in this province in order that we create the climate for investment and for creation of jobs and wealth and profit.

Profit cannot be a dirty word in Manitoba. It has to be one of the key and essential words if we are to attract those productive industries in this province that can create the long-term stable jobs producing new and additional wealth and revenues to finance the kind of social programs that all of us want to administer, as needed by the people of this province. That requires a taxation policy which is competitive.

It requires a general budget policy which demonstrates a clear understanding of the challenges in front of Government, to offer a consistent approach to the monetary policies of this province, so that those potential investors understand that the province has a level playing field and will have that for a number of years so that their investment does not have any sudden curve balls thrown at it as has happened in the past with the previous Howard Pawley administration and their taxation policy. It must be consistent if you are going to attract investment.

Thirdly, we must clearly understand the very devastating impact of deficit upon provincial Governments, and indeed national Governments, to deliver program in the face of a burgeoning deficit. I would suspect that 40 years ago or 30 years ago in Argentina, a country of abundant resource wealth, there was absolutely no question that they could continue to spend beyond their taxation and their revenue means because they were a country of infinite wealth, pampas with agricultural capacity buoyed by 25 feet of topsoil, genuine climate and resources like few other countries in the world have, but they borrowed themselves into a deficit position where now the ravages of inflation tear the poor people to shreds in Argentina and other countries where they have not taken control of their deficit.

If you think the imposition of the money lenders in

Paris and New York were difficult for Prime Minister MacDonald, the socialist Prime Minister in Great Britain to adhere to, try being a finance minister in Argentina, Brazil, or any of the Central American countries where their deficits are completely out of control, their currencies are devalued and inflation runs rampant. Ask yourself how the poor in those countries survive. In Brazil, instead of having food banks to feed children who may be homeless or whose parents are not adequately able to care for them, they have, according to the newspapers, death squads to hunt them down. Is that not -(interjection)- Oh, yes, I will fully admit the right way death squad -(interjection)- Oh, my honourable friend says that is something completely different.

I would suggest to my honourable friend, the Member from wherever he is from, would say that 30 years ago in Brazil they said, this cannot happen in our country; we have enormous wealth; we have resources upon which we can borrow into the future. So understand that you must have a fiscal policy which does not borrow future generations into desperation. That is the kind of consistency that is in this budget, the kind of honesty and projection that is in this budget to make Manitobans aware and partners in solving the problem of how we continue to have an economy that grows, provide jobs, create new wealth and services to Manitobans.

* (1630)

I want to take just a few minutes, because my honourable friend, the historian, mentioned how the roots of the CCF and the NDP were a coalition of farmers. I want to share just a little bit of basic economics with my honourable friends in the Opposition, because I do not know of too many farmers that are over there that are actively producing. There may well be some; I am just not aware of it.

I want to point out—and these are figures that are personal to me, because they are what I experienced when I started farming on my own in 1973. In 1973, I commenced farming. Today, after 17 years, I produced this year one of the better yielding crops and better quality crops that I produced—wheat averaging about 50 bushels to the acre. Mr. Speaker, that wheat, the best I can get paid for it is \$3.25 a bushel, for the best wheat in the world—the best wheat in the world, the highest protein, the best bread-making wheat in the world—\$3.25. In 1973, when I started farming, I would get paid \$6 for that same bushel of wheat.

Now, all of a sudden, we have a value and you can deal with it in one of two ways. You can talk about today's value in 1973 terms, or you can talk about that \$6 as to what it would be worth today. It is kind of shocking. The \$3.25 we receive today is equivalent to \$1.03 for that \$6 bushel of wheat that I received in 1973. The \$6 I received in 1973, if you factor it up to today's price, would be \$18.80 per bushel. Fancy what the farm community would do with that kind of revenue. Fancy what that would do for the Manitoba economy. I do not need to remind you, Mr. Speaker, because I believe you were part of the industry at that time.

The price of nitrogen was 10 cents a pound of actual product, today it is 22 cents. The price of diesel fuel in 1973 was 30 cents a gallon and today it is approximately 40 cents a litre.

What I shared those basic pieces of information with my honourable friends in the Opposition for, is to demonstrate to you that when you come to this House and you say that individuals need more, that some of your constituents need more, ask yourself if those constituents are receiving one-sixth of what they did in 1973 in the amount of money they take home at the end of the day. Ask yourselves if your constituents pay twice, in not just real terms, but actual terms, more than twice for what they consume today versus 1973, and take home one-sixth of what they did in 1973, and you will see why there is a cynicism out there, Mr. Speaker, in the agricultural community in rural Manitoba.

They see, for instance, casino workers wanting a six percent, or whatever it is they want, increase in their salaries, which are, I believe, and correct me if I am wrong, approximately \$19,000 to \$20,000 per year.

An Honourable Member: \$20,500.00.

Mr. Orchard: Twenty point five thousand dollars a year, and all they want is a 6 percent increase because they deserve it. Members of the farm community say, when is my turn? After all if we talk about the basic fundamental needs of society, surely we have to admit in a non-partisan fashion that food is one of the most important commodities we can have, and in this province we not only have an abundance of food, but it is the best quality food in the world.

There is no one produces better wheat, canola, beef, pork, buckwheat, on and on and on. We have the best in the world, the cheapest in the world, and

ask yourself—and I want my honourable friends in the Opposition to ask themselves—does it make sense for an agricultural producer, a farmer, to look at the economics of production and to find out that he would be better off with the farm sold and the money invested, and he would make a far greater return than investing in production of an essential commodity like food.

That is going to be a very, very serious challenge, Mr. Speaker, that all of us have to come to grips with because if anybody inside the City of Winnipeg believes for one minute this province can survive without the strong and vibrant rural Manitoba fueled and driven by a vibrant agriculture, they are absolutely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to share that with my honourable friends, because the habit to date in Opposition is to simply say we need more money for every single step of the way; every Question Period they have asked for more. The question that they have to answer is where does the more come from, because the deficit spending does not work. Manitoba is already taxed to the limit; Manitobans said that in unequivocal terms in two elections now, so demands for more have to be balanced from within.

That is going to be a very difficult job. Let me share with my honourable friends, and I look forward to the debate on the Estimates of Health, because that is exactly the tenor we are trying to set in terms of the health care system. It is not a unique position that we face in Manitoba with our health care system. I have now been to three Health Ministers Conferences since I have been appointed Minister of Health. Each province and each territory faces the identical challenges in health care delivery that we face in Manitoba.

It does not matter whether it is a Liberal Government with absolutely no opposition in New Brunswick, a newly elected Liberal Government in Newfoundland which went through some very, very difficult decisions in their health care budget, wherein they are taking monies out of the budget of health in the Province of Newfoundland, or whether it is a Progressive Conservative Government in Alberta, or a New Democratic Government in Ontario or the Northwest Territories, or a Social Credit Government in British Columbia, every Health Minister in Canada is faced with demand from the system for more, and faces the restriction

of having, at best, finite and narrowly growing resources to meet those increasing demands.

Every province is dealing with that issue in almost a similar fashion, in terms of involvement of the public in two areas: first of all, education of the challenge so that the public understands and knows the challenge facing Government, and secondly, in attempting to work co-operatively with the public at large in developing action plans which will give us health care into the future which meets needs in a very economic fashion. No province is unique in that.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in many ways, after being at the Health Ministers' Conference for three different meetings, now I have to tell you that in Manitoba we enjoy probably as good a level of co-operation from professional groups, from administrations of various health care institutions and from various program deliverers in the Province of Manitoba, because I have not attempted to tell them that there is a magic bullet in our quiver of policy in the Progressive Conservative Party. I have not attempted to tell them that I have all the answers and my colleagues have all the answers, but I have attempted to be at all times very honest and open with the challenges that face us in the health care system, something that I have asked from time to time, my honourable friends in the Opposition to do, and from time to time they have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to share with you the most recent failure. October 26, 1990, Manitoba New Democrats' news release—I do not know whether this one came out in southern Manitoba, because it just went into, at least as far as I know, northern Manitoba locations.

* (1640)

There is an obligation on all Members to at least communicate the truth. Earlier today you might recall that you asked me to retract a statement to the Health Critic of the official Opposition (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) where I urged her to try a little honesty. Well, I am asking them to do that right now, Mr. Speaker, because this press release is totally and absolutely false in what it says to northern Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, it says in here, and this is a press release from the New Democrats and it says: For further information contact Oscar Lathlin, NDP Northern Affairs Critic. Mr. Speaker, what does he say? He says that we have cut \$250,000 from the

Northern Air Ambulance Program. Do you recall a question in the House on the Northern Air Ambulance Program? No, there was none, was there?

You know where the figure comes from. -(interjection)- Mr. Speaker, if they had the common decency to ask me I would have explained why there is \$250,000 fewer in this year's air ambulance Estimate.

It is not a cutback, because if we followed my honourable friend's rhetoric that we always spend—and you spend the entire budget. What we would do is we would completely overhaul the engines on the air ambulance when they do not need it, because we did not want to cut the budget back, because that is the difference year over year. There is no major overhaul of the air ambulance engines this year, which we had to fund last year, and that is why the budget is down.

There will be monies available for an increased level of services on air ambulance in northern Manitoba this year, as there was last year, no cutback, nothing but, Mr. Speaker -(interjection)- oh, my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), now is on another topic.

When you confront him with when they have misled the public of Manitoba directly, without asking the question, in a deliberate attempt to play politics with the people of northern Manitoba in a dishonest fashion, then they want to change topics. They do not want to talk about it.

I expect Mr. Lathlin, the MLA for The Pas, to put out a press release to northern Manitoba saying: Oops, sorry, I was wrong, if only I would have asked. That would demonstrate that there is a shred of honesty in the official Opposition, that they intend not to try to put out false information to their constituents, and that they are not going to, as the poll suggested, fit the mold that Canadians have of politicians, that we do not tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker, they did not tell the truth in this press release. It would be nice for a little honest confession saying, I erred, and in fact we are going to receive ambulance service as before, as needed. I would hope that they had the honesty, the integrity, the decency, to correct the misrepresented press release that they have put out to northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges we face in the health care system are not easy ones. Everyone has said now for about a decade, all political Parties, across

the nation, that we need to reform the health care system to move away from the institutional setting where we cure illness and disease and put more emphasis, more money, on community programs which promote wellness, health, education, better lifestyle.

Now, I -(interjection)- my honourable friend, the second dean of the House, says that is nothing new, and he is absolutely right, because the previous Government that he was part of talked about it, but the delivery was a little slim, sort of like in the funding for women's crisis shelters. They talked a heck of a good story. They were the best baseball players in the wintertime and the best hockey players in the summertime, but they did not deliver. It took this Government to deliver.

I want to share with my honourable friend some of the initiatives that we have undertaken in just two years. -(interjection)- Pardon me? Well, my honourable friend, the intellectual capacity of the back bench is rearing its empty head. -(interjection)- No, no, your back bench, your collection, Mr. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) has already got your disease. He has already got your disease. He has already got the Leader of the Opposition's disease where he is not able to communicate accurately and factually. There is parliamentary language that I could not use, Mr. Speaker, because I know you would rule me out of order. There are people who are outside observers who would say that they do not tell the truth. Now I could not do that, but outside observers could.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about initiatives in health promotion, not the talk, not the rhetoric, not all the good intentions as displayed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) in this Budget Debate where he said we have to reform the health care system, but never made one single suggestion. I suggest that is reasonable because I do not think he has any suggestions on how to reform the health care system, but I will simply share with him how we believe it can be done.

Let us talk about the Health Services Development Fund. Let us talk about the Health Services Development Fund wherein the president of the Manitoba Nurses' Union is one of five Manitobans deciding projects which are going to be used for the reform of the health care system, hardly an insignificant position for the president of the MNU. That is one you never hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about. He says we do not use nurses

and we do not seek their advice, but he fails to mention that one. Maybe he did not know, but now that he does know, maybe he will not be quite so inaccurate in some of his statements in the House.

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

Mr. Acting Speaker, we took the Health Services Development Fund, with criteria we have reviewed 122 applications and we rejected 109 of them because they did not meet the criteria, and we approved 13 of them. Of the 13, there are six that are very much projects designed for wellness promotion, education and injury prevention. I just want my honourable friend in the Opposition, the Leader particularly, to understand what they are.

We are funding an elders health education program on chemical dependency at St. Boniface. You know why? Because it has been proven by a survey that seniors often are victims of over prescription of pharmaceutical products and end up with a chemical dependency. We are funding a program to educate seniors in this province so that kind of inappropriate use of medication does not cause their health to decline. That is health promotion in action and it fits with our initiative of bringing in the triplicate prescription program for narcotic pharmaceuticals. It was suggested to be brought into the previous administration but they would not do it.

An Honourable Member: Why not?

Mr. Orchard: Why, I do not know. What we did in bringing in the triplicate prescription program was to put a computer registry in place to track the prescribers as physicians and the recipients of narcotic prescriptions as consumers, and to find out if any physicians were over prescribing, hence abusing the health of the patient or whether any individual patient was abusing the system by buying narcotic pharmaceuticals possibly for resale on the street.

*(1650)

We put that program in place this year to curb that kind of abuse of narcotic pharmaceuticals. Why? Two purposes, Mr. Acting Speaker. First of all, to improve the health status of Manitobans, so that they are not using narcotic drugs that they do not need, and secondly, to save money. Do you know that we anticipate that our \$100,000 investment is going to save us three-quarters of a million dollars in the Pharmacare program? That is genuine reform of the health care system, something I hope my

honourable friends in the Opposition would approve of.

Surely they do not want Manitobans to be wantonly and needlessly using narcotic prescriptions—an initiative of reform that is going to work for the betterment of health in Manitoba. A second fund, Health Services Development Fund is a Head Injury Prevention and Education Program to try and prevent head injury which causes permanent disability of young Manitobans. That fits with our program, Mr. Acting Speaker, at Deer Lodge and then to be at Municipal Hospitals of a head-injured unit for the treatment of those individuals. This is a first for the Province of Manitoba, a first for this Government, but to listen to my honourable friends in the Opposition, we do not do anything in terms of new programs.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the third one is a Back Injury Prevention Program in Manitoba health care facilities. Why? To protect the workers in those health care institutions, and secondly, as an attempt to prevent unnecessary claims for the Workers Compensation Board and to save all employers in Manitoba premiums to the Workers Compensation Board, a common-sense approach on prevention of back injury. We are taking a diabetes awareness program for \$175,000, targeted at awareness and education on type two diabetes in the Province of Manitoba, because type two can be controlled with nutrition, with lifestyle changes, to the great improvement of the health status of those Manitobans suffering from type two diabetes and at a great deal of saving to the health care system.

That is reform in action, that is health promotion in action and we have two cardiovascular education programs under there, one at Brandon, one at Carman, to bring the risks of lifestyle related disease as it applies to heart and cardiac disease in Manitobans. Those two initiatives at Brandon and Carman, Manitoba build upon our heart health survey that we announced in October of last year, wherein the province committed funds to a \$2 million survey of heart health over a five-year project. Why? Because cardiovascular disease is still one of the major killers, the leading killers of Manitobans and those who suffer from stroke as a result of cardiovascular disease are often frequent, frequent patients of the health care system. So if we can provide education, lifestyle changes by awareness and promotion, we can maybe prevent some of those disabling heart disease problems that affect

and afflict Manitobans. That is again health promotion in action, not in words, but in action. I hope my honourable friends in the Opposition would support that initiative.

They might want to read the report that has just come out. There was a newspaper article on Friday in the Free Press, which indicated that many Manitobans are subject to at least one lifestyle related risk of poor heart health from smoking to bad nutrition to lack of exercise to suffering from stress, all of which are lifestyle related. If the individual takes ownership of nutrition, exercise, breaks the smoking habit, they can lessen their chance of cardiovascular disease and lessen their chance of personal tragedy, family tragedy and cost to the health care system. That is health promotion in action. I want to carry on. Let us talk about smoking as a specific lifestyle related risk which can cause cancer, cardiovascular disease and many other related health problems, not to mention the effects of second-hand smoke, et cetera, et cetera.

We brought up a program which I thought was really innovative. I wish it was my idea, but it was not. It came out of the department. It came out of my Health Promotion Directorate. It is an excellent idea, Mr. Acting Speaker. Unfortunately, I was not here when my colleague the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson) presented the certificates to a Grade 2 class in the Legislature. What we did is we offered Grade 2 students across Manitoba the opportunity to become smoke-free grads in the year 2000. To start at the Grade 2 level and make it exciting not to smoke, because clearly, overwhelming information tells us that if you never start smoking by the time you are 17 or 18, you never will start. The time to get the children is at a very young age, and Grade 2 is the age. The Health Promotion Department enrolled Grade 2s across the length and breadth of this province to pledge that they would remain smoke free until they graduated in the year 2000. An excellent health promotion exercise, not an expensive one, but a good initiative.

You want to know what I ran into? The incredible thing is the New Democratic Party talks about being believers in health promotion in the education program. I was on Peter Warren during the election campaign with Avis Gray, who was filling in as the Health Critic, and with the candidate for the New Democratic Party in Springfield, who is a registered nurse—I believe that is who it was—and that

individual took issue with our Smoke Free Grads: 2000 Program. She said we should not be doing it.

I did not think that that was the policy of the New Democratic Party, to help prevent young children from starting smoking, but that is the position she took on Peter Warren. I absolutely was amazed, astounded and flabbergasted. Now I do not know whether that was Party policy she was enunciating, but I have to assume it was because she was there as the Party representative of the New Democratic Party.

Now do we assume that the New Democrats who sponsored a Bill which was to stop smoking, to encourage Manitobans to stop smoking, made an exception? They want all Grade 2 students to smoke. Is that what the policy of the New Democratic Party is? I doubt that. I doubt that, but explain how your candidate would be against that program? Please, try.

As my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), has difficulty—I had a nice little chat with him in the hall, and I said he is going to have an interesting time keeping his caucus consistent in their approach. Already that is showing up in spades, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Let us talk about some other initiatives. Now my honourable friends constantly want to talk about reform of the health care system. I have already dealt with triplicate prescriptions and the reform initiative that we have undertaken, and I hope they will ask questions about it in Estimates.

My honourable friends talked about lapsed funding in health care. One of the lines that we lapsed funding in was in the payments to the physicians, the medical line. Part of the lapsed funding there, Mr. Acting Speaker, was because we brought in a changed system whereby physicians ordered lab tests for their patients and instead of going through a menu and tick, tick, tick, ordering up anything and everything they had a desire to, we made the form more definitive so that they had to choose very clearly what tests they wanted their patient to have.

That one single change in the way physicians ordered lab tests in the Province of Manitoba had the impact on the budget of having one which normally increased by \$2 million a year decrease by a full million dollars in its first year of implementation, genuine reform of the health-care system and it saved money. It saved money.

I notice my light is flashing. I will close, because I look forward to future opportunities of debating health care and the reform of the health care system.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the health care system will not be reformed by the half truths that are laid on the record daily by Members in Her Majesty's official Opposition when they talk about cutbacks, because every program in the ministry of health has received increased funding, major increases in funding in many, many areas. I will deal with them.

For instance, closing the gap of union versus non-union wages within our health care facilities, a policy of open discrimination by the NDP when they were Government to hold down the wages of non-union workers in the health care field, some commitment to equality and fairness in the health care system by New Democrats. We resolved that.

We resolved the ambulance funding problem where we were dead last in per capita funding in the Dominion of Canada, below Newfoundland, and we raised it, Mr. Acting Speaker, to now the national average.

* (1700)

I hope that my honourable friends in the Opposition have the ability to be honest with the people of Manitoba and not the quick tricks and half truths that we saw go out in an October 26, 1990, news release which was absolutely false to the people of northern Manitoba.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to join in the debate on the budget at this time to deal with a few of the issues that have been put forward by some of the speakers across the way and certainly to continue on into some of the areas that I was not able to deal with during the throne speech because of the lack of time that was available there. Forty minutes being certainly inadequate when there are so many issues to deal with.

The problems associated with this Government even in the very short time it has been in office and the two years previous as a minority Government have certainly brought to light a lot of issues that have to be addressed from the Opposition side and certainly that are being ignored by the Government. So it does take a great deal of time to deal with those issues when discussing them in the throne speech and the budget.

I would like to start by dealing with the lack of initiative in this budget for addressing the problems

associated with the slow economic progress in rural areas and in the total province. Many of the economic indicators are showing, at this present time, that Manitoba is facing a very difficult time as we enter a recession, a made-in-Canada Conservative recession, Mr. Acting Speaker, as has been generally acknowledged, even by the federal Finance Minister now saying that—indeed he is using the "r" word—there is a recession in Canada.

Manitoba of course is already in the midst of it with the present Government perhaps leading the way in a similar way to the way that Sterling Lyon did in 1979-80. Luckily of course, Mr. Acting Speaker, the province did see a new Government in 1981 that was able to deal in a very progressive and sensitive way with the recession. Certainly as a result we were able to alleviate many of the difficulties that would have been associated with a recession had the Conservatives been in office at that time. That was very clear.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Of course the Conservatives used that opportunity to say that the New Democrats were not spending wisely and that they ran up large deficits. I pointed during my speech on the throne speech to other jurisdictions that had in fact during that period of time run up deficits much greater in proportion than Manitoba had. They were Conservative Governments, and of course Liberal later on in Ontario, but the fact is that they did run up huge deficits.

I pointed out to the Members opposite that it was the New Democrats who had in fact left the Conservatives with a surplus in 1988 when they took office. That made the rainy day fund possible. That has never really been acknowledged by the Finance Minister or any of the Ministers or the Treasury Board to say publicly, yes, it was the New Democratic Government that left us with a very good financial situation in this province insofar as the balance of the budget was concerned. Of course as a result we were in a position where we could in fact cut some taxes in a marginal way and make ourselves look pretty good out of that. That is really what happened. Those are the facts and they deserve to be restated in this House as often and on as many occasions as possible in hopes that the Members opposite will in fact admit that at least to themselves if they will not say it publicly. Certainly the backbenchers and the new Members would do

well to recognize that truth in this House, because it is in fact the truth.

Now when we move out from that situation, Mr. Speaker, I also address the issue of the deficits and how revenue basically has everything to do with the bottom line. If the revenues are cut or reduced there is going to be a larger deficit, and that has happened in many areas. It is not a matter of cutting fat in Government to offset those massive cuts in revenue. No Government has been able to do that. Even Sterling Lyon, with the hacking and slashing approach, the acute protracted restraint was not able to in fact do that. He was running up a deficit even as he was leaving office, despite the acute protracted restraint that went on. In fact largely because of his preoccupation with the private sector delivering the province and moving the province ahead insofar as progress is concerned, it did not work.

Now we see another Conservative Government doing the same thing. This budget was clear evidence. We certainly predicted it during the Throne Speech Debate, Mr. Speaker, and as we have seen by the budget that was delivered last week, the Government is acting more like true Conservatives, like the right wing is once again taking charge in that caucus and Cabinet. In fact the budget demonstrates that they are unwilling to become an interventionist Government, a Government that is ready to take hold of the reins, as my Leader has referred to, and ensure that we steer Manitoba through the worst effects of this recession and alleviate the harshest impacts of that recession. They are unwilling to do that. They say basically we are going to cut taxes to corporations, and they are going to deliver us. That is the old line. That is so old certainly that you would think that the Conservatives at this time in their new marginal mandate would in fact cast aside that old doctrine that has generated their basic support over the years.

It had certainly been rejected by voters in recent years, in the last couple of decades, and they should discard it and realize that it is not going to deal with the real issues facing Manitoba today. They did not do that in this budget. We can look, Mr. Speaker, at a number of instances where that is the case.

Before I get to Agriculture and deal with some of those issues, I want to look at a couple of the other major areas—Industry, Trade and Technology, which is extremely important during a period of

recession, an area that could have been fattened up a great deal insofar as expenditures to provide some incentive, a partnership if you will, as the previous Government did with the Jobs Fund.

It was designed to work in partnership with the private sector, with non-profit organizations, with labour, with municipalities, with the federal Government, partnership, to generate economic activity and jobs. It did that in fact, and of course it was much to the chagrin of the Conservative Opposition at that time that the Government was very successful with the Jobs Fund.

Insofar as generating economic activity and good positive indicators that showed the population was rising in the province rather than dwindling as it is under the Conservatives, people were not fleeing the province as they had done during the Conservative regime of Sterling Lyon. In fact they came back to Manitoba because they saw there were opportunities for their children and for their families. There were certainly people coming to this province. It was demonstrated in the unemployment statistics that showed relative to the rest of Canada that Manitoba was doing very well. It was demonstrated in the investment, public and private investment, during that time, leading the country in many if not all of the major economic indicators—housing starts, for example.

All of these things have slowed down of course during a period of recession, but we see no action to deal with them by this Conservative Government, which is very alarming indeed and is bad news for many of those who are disadvantaged in society and are going to suffer most as a result of the recession that we are now entering.

That is the sad part insofar as the beginning of this new Conservative legacy. It is only a couple of months old, but we already see a pattern that will certainly serve to haunt the Government over the next three or four years, and in fact when the election occurs will be their undoing. I believe that they will look back, if many of those who are no longer elected after the next election look back and read Hansard at this particular time and realize that it was predicted this early, only two months into their marginal mandate.

* (1710)

I wanted to mention Industry, Trade and Technology. What we had was a drop, Mr. Speaker, in this budget, of about a million dollars in the

Industry, Trade and Technology budget. It demonstrates that the Government is not willing to act. We see that in their failure to renegotiate any of the ERDA Agreements for this province, the Economic Regional Development Agreements that were so important for economic development.

When I talked earlier about a partnership between industry and Government, federal Government and municipal Government, non-profit organizations and labour, the ERDA agreements were part of that strategy. It was funded appropriately from the Jobs Fund, \$280 million federal dollars during that five-year period from 1984 to '89 and extended some of those to 1990. They dealt with such areas as mineral development and exploration, transportation, the development of Churchill, the communications and culture area, Agri-Foods, forest renewal, tourism; all of those areas were dealt with under that ERDA umbrella, and those served Manitoba well.

I see the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), he is feeling very sheepish about his record on Churchill over the last three years, because indeed it has been dismal. As a matter of fact, he actually chose to brag about the fact that Churchill almost broke even under his third year in the portfolio.

The fact is that when we were in Government, the Port of Churchill was in fact averaging perhaps two to three times as much as throughput each year, than this has averaged over the last three years under this Minister, and I am probably giving him the benefit of the doubt there. It is at least three times than the average that this Minister has had over the last three years. It has truly been a dismal record. It was partially because we made it a priority, as a result of the ERDA agreements, that Churchill did indeed move forward during the time that we were in Government.

So we see a number of major agreements that have not been renegotiated by this Government, and that indicates to me that, first of all, they have been a complete failure in their dealings with the federal Government, with their federal Conservative cousins in Ottawa. They have been failures despite the fact that they bragged in the last two elections, especially in 1988, that they could in fact deal with the federal Government, and could achieve where the New Democrats could not.

The New Democrats stood tough and strong

when the CF-18 contract was awarded to Quebec and provided leadership in this province. At that time what we heard from the Conservative Opposition was that all we were doing was fed bashing. In fact they have taken to doing that themselves, and distancing themselves from the federal Conservative Government. They realize that there is certainly an unfairness in this country, an insensitivity to Manitoba's needs, and it has manifested itself in the lack of progress in any of these agreements over the last number of years—any new major federal expenditures in the province.

That has hurt our province a great deal. It has hurt the creation of jobs, it has hurt the opportunities for people, and slowed our economy down and made life more difficult for all Manitobans, because we have not had that initiative, that spending during this period of time in our province.

So I say that the provincial Government, the provincial Conservatives, under Gary Filmon, has been a dismal failure when it comes to economic development throughout this province.

You know, we have a Minister responsible for Rural Development (Mr. Penner) with no plan. He has had three years now to put in place a plan for rural development. There has been no plan revealed during that time. They have a Rural Development Committee of Cabinet, which should identify it as a priority, and yet there is no action there. There is nothing comes out of it. It was smoke and mirrors as much as the budget was.

It was simply a public relations exercise, and the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) is smiling at that. He probably knows that is true. It was a public relations exercise to in fact leave the impression with the public of Manitoba that this Government was going to make rural development a high priority, and yet it never happened.

It never happened, and it is a testament to the failure of this Government over that period of time, and I think it is extremely unfortunate for all of our citizens.

Now, that is only one area, industry, trade and technology, during a recession that this Government is cutting, and where it has failed in its negotiations and discussions with the federal Government, but it has many other examples. There

are many other examples, Mr. Speaker, of failure of a similar nature.

I have to look at their support for the Free Trade Agreement. Over the last two or three years, they have been strong supporters, this provincial Government, of their federal Conservative cousins' Free Trade Agreement with the U.S. Government. They have in fact touted it as a boon for the Province of Manitoba and for this whole country. They said it was going to mean economic prosperity, it was going to create jobs, and it was going to mean a renewed future, new hope for Manitoba, for our country.

In fact, what has happened in this province over the last year, two years of the Free Trade Agreement, is the opposite, completely the opposite. What has happened, contrary to what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Mr. Ernst) said in the Legislature, in his statement—

An Honourable Member: Tourism.

Mr. Plozman: Tourism—Industry, Trade and Tourism, said in the Legislature. He said, Mr. Speaker, that we have ample evidence of the fact that we have increased trade since the Free Trade Agreement. He said that on October 18: We have a billion dollars more of increased trade under the Free Trade Agreement, and those are the facts, on the record, as part of the statistics that are produced in this country. That is the statement by the Minister of Industry—now he says Industry, Trade and Tourism.

Now, this Minister said that those were the facts according to the record that is produced in Canada. I think it was produced in his head as he stood up. That Minister, along with some of his colleagues, is not afraid to use the figures and statistics very loosely in this House. His statements have shown that in the last number of days.

The fact is that in the food industries area, in free trade, there has been an increase in the deficit of our balance of trade by some 244 percent in '89 over 1988—increase in the deficit of balance of payments. Overall, in total manufacturing, 36.5 percent increase in the deficit in the balance of payments in the trade. That is the fact, and it is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) who says that things have gotten better by a billion dollars.

If he is so loose with the facts in that particular case, what can we believe from that Minister insofar

as the responses that he gives us on major economic issues facing our province and activities in his department? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the representatives of the food-grocery product manufacturers of Canada said in 1987, December 19, to the parliamentary committee looking at the free trade issue, that there are going to be serious problems in the food manufacturing industry in this country if the free trade deal goes through. They said that they will be, and I quote: There will be many that will face serious decisions regarding employment and capital investment in the food processing industry in Canada.

They said that to the federal Conservative Government. They said that in public so that the Conservatives in Manitoba could read it. They chose to ignore it, to close their eyes. They were blind to the facts, and they said this was going to be good for Canada. In fact, just as the manufacturers said in 1987, there has been a tremendous increase in our deficit in terms of balance of payments in the food processing industry over that first year of free trade. I think the facts speak for themselves, yet these Ministers stand up one after another and continue to say that Free Trade Agreement was good for Manitoba and Canada.

* (1720)

How can they deny the facts that are presented? How can they deny the fact that there are some 12,000 manufacturing jobs lost, full-time the majority of them, full-time permanent jobs lost in Manitoba over that term in the Free Trade Agreement? They brag about the jobs that were created during that time but most of those are part-time work. We all know that is a serious problem now. That is one way that employers are getting around a lot of the—

An Honourable Member: The full-time are down.

Mr. Plozman: I said the full-time jobs. My colleague says they are down. The full-time jobs are down, but it is one way that employers are getting around the issue of benefits and the contracts associated with unions. They are breaking that by going to part-time workers to ensure that they will not have to pay the benefits and abusing those workers in doing so and particularly targeting women because many of those are part-time workers. Many of the women are part-time workers and are suffering as a result of that transition from full-time work to part-time work. That is taking place at an alarming rate in our province. I think that the Members of the back bench and the

Members of this Government should be seriously concerned, Mr. Speaker, about that trend. They should also raise the fact that free trade is a major culprit in that whole transition away from full-time permanent jobs here in our province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the failures of free trade in many areas, and I could point out a whole series of statistics that demonstrate that in manufacturing we have lost jobs and our deficit in the balance of trade has increased, and I mentioned the food processing industry and that affects agriculture. I want to deal with some of those issues in agriculture. You know, the farmers of Manitoba and western Canada are facing some of the gloomiest times that they have probably faced in many decades. As a matter of fact, recent information has shown that in fact the net farm income in real dollars, the per acre value of production in real dollars, is probably the lowest since 1960-61, the lowest—the per acre value of production. That tells it all, and that was put out by the Minister of Agriculture. There is a tremendous drop in net farm income. They had 20 percent the previous year, 18 percent last year. It continues to go down and farmers were making very little, very marginal during that period of time.

An Honourable Member: Are you beating up on the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay)?

Mr. Plozman: I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) would do well to listen to other points of view than the ones that he has been indoctrinated with up to this point in time let me tell you. In fact he is only hearing and only listening to one side of the arguments in most cases. He is closing his eyes to the many serious problems that are being faced by farmers out there on the land and off the land as they are being kicked off the land through many methods, not just bankruptcies, through being forced into, embarrassed into quitclaims and abandoning their farming operations. It is really a sad state of affairs out there. It is really a sorry situation.

I have just met with some of those farmers in that kind of trouble here today in the caucus room of my colleague, the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), and discussed with them the kinds of actions that we might take to assist them, but it is not even just the banks that are doing it, Mr. Speaker, it is the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and the federal Farm Credit Corporation that are in fact engaged in this kind of activity at the present time.

If we look at the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Findlay) annual report last year, we can see that in fact there is a dismal failure insofar as the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. Mr. Speaker, he brags about the fact that the Young Farmers' Rebate has been increased in the last year, but in fact the budget was underspent in the annual report '88-89, it was underspent. The excuse that they gave was that continuing poor economic conditions resulted in a smaller loan portfolio than expected. Insofar as the loan guarantees, there was \$1 million, \$1.5 million unspent, and they said that was due to economic conditions, fewer loans and guarantees were issued than anticipated.

I do not think that they should be bragging about that, because the poor economic conditions are not taking up their programs. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that during a time of economic hardships that they are facing now, that the program should be tailored. There should be additional uptake during that difficult time or else the programs are not tailored to meet the needs of the farmers, and they have to take a serious look at what they are offering, because it is obviously not meeting the needs out there. It is not enough to sit back and say, well, they are not using it, we did not spend it. There is something seriously wrong when it is not being used during these economic times.

Surely the Members on the opposite side recognize that, not just the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), but all of his colleagues. Many of them like to talk about the fact they are from rural Manitoba, not as much since the eminent Senator, Nate Nurgitz, talked about the "yellow dog syndrome." Many of them do not talk about that as much, but the fact is they like to reflect on this idea that they represent rural Manitoba. How are they really representing rural Manitoba when their programs are not even being used by the farmers, and they gladly put in the annual reports that it is because of the poor economic conditions?

I fail to understand how they can in fact use that excuse and think that will wash with anyone during this period in time, when farmers are facing such difficult economic conditions. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the difficulties come from many factors, there are many factors involved.

I am going to be the last one to say that it is all the fault of the Conservative Government here in the Province of Manitoba. Now they know that it is not, and I know that it is not, so I will not say that. There

are -(interjection)- Well, I think that we have to acknowledge the facts when they are clear.

On the other hand, the federal Conservative Government, the federal Government, has a greater responsibility than the province on that issue but each has a responsibility to deal with the crisis in agriculture at the present time.

We cannot look to the European economic community and the U.S. to bail us out on this. I know that the Conservatives in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and even at the federal level are putting all their eggs in one basket, in the GATT basket. They are saying that the only way there is going to be any future for agriculture is if the GATT talks result in the complete elimination of agricultural support in this country.

What alarms me, Mr. Speaker, is that the bargaining tactics of the federal Government, with regard to the GATT talks, are not much better or probably worse than they were in the free trade deal, because what we did in the free trade deal—what the Conservative Government did is in fact give away a lot of its bargaining leverage before it went to the table. For example, deregulating the transportation industry before completing the free trade negotiations.

Now you do not give away all your bargaining chips before you get to the table, but they did that, a major one in the free trade negotiations, now they are doing it again in the GATT talks. If you look at the situation, they have dropped many of their programs from the peak of 1988, Special Grains Program which was to deal with the low price of grain and the Drought Program, of course, the two-price wheat policy that was in place, fuel tax rebates, interest-free cash advances. Now the interest-free cash advances have been restored on an ad hoc basis for one year only, due to the intense pressure by so many groups across this country.

The fact is that most of those programs—all of those programs that I mentioned, were dropped before they got to the table for the GATT talks, yet when I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) whether this had weakened Canada's position, he said no. He did not think it had. Now, I say that he is as much a negotiator as his federal counterparts are in that regard, because he said it did not weaken their position. Well, I cannot understand how you can give all those things away

and then hope to have some leverage left to negotiate at the table.

You know what they are putting forward because all of those programs are gone? They are putting forward the Crow benefit and our supply manage programs. That is what they are putting forward. Now, you tell me how we can in fact compete in this country without some transportation subsidy. Other countries have it. The Army Corps of Engineers runs the maintenance and operation of the Mississippi waterway, the subsidy for all materials, all cargo moving down the Mississippi.

We have a vast geographic region. Distance to markets is very large, and that is why we have had the historic Crow benefit to assist our farmers in moving grain to export. It is a fact of history in this country. I ask the Members opposite how they believe farmers can compete without a transportation subsidy for the export of their grain? Yet, those are the kinds of things that Don Mazankowski et al. are putting on the table at these negotiations.

* (1730)

Yet even though before they got to the table they eliminated a number of subsidies, a number of programs unilaterally, unlike what the U.S. is doing—U.S. knows how to negotiate. They are upping the pressure. They are increasing their export enhancement program even while the talks are going on. Why are we the nice guy? Why are we going to Geneva on bended knee with cup in hand saying, please, you guys, we cannot keep up with this? See, we have given our burnt offerings. We have given away these programs already. Our farmers are starving. They are going off the land. Well, they are not starving. They have lots of grain, but they do not have any money for it. They cannot make a living, so we are giving these things up. We are putting these offerings on the table before we get there in a completely weak-kneed position insofar as negotiating. Meanwhile, the U.S. is playing hardball. The U.S. is increasing its export enhancement programs and its subsidies during that period of time and so is the European Economic Community. So how on earth can we compete at the negotiating table, never mind competing insofar as the dollars are concerned for our farmers in a subsidy war that we have been facing.

Here we have the Minister of Agriculture, federally, saying that Canada wants major

reductions in agriculture subsidies, but will not drop its protectionist policies until other countries begin doing the same—Agriculture Minister, Don Mazankowski, said yesterday. That is on the same page of the same paper where it has outlined numerous programs, as we all know, that have been dropped by this federal Conservative Government before they even got to the table. It is utter garbage, and they have placed Canada in such a weak position.

I would hope that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and his rural colleagues would stand up in this House and admit, yes, there is but another area where they disagree with their federal counterparts, but no, the Minister of Agriculture stands up and falls into the same trap as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) fell into. That is to defend the trade agreement with the U.S. in the same way this Minister of Agriculture defends the position that the federal Government has taken at the GATT talks. That means that we cannot look to this Government for any wisdom on those negotiations.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to lose if we end up in that kind of weak position. We are going to lose, not only the Crow Benefit for the transportation of grain to market, we are also going to lose all of our other support programs in this country. There are no guarantees that the price of grain will even go up at all as a result of that.

I think we have to face facts that as long as we are going to rely on the traditional grains as our major production, major source of income for our farmers, we have to have a stabilization program in place that would be, in fact, cheaper than putting in place all these ad hoc support programs that the Government keeps throwing out for political purposes, a solid stabilization program that reflects the cost of production and the profit for farmers on the base amount of production.

Then I believe that what we have to do is concentrate on moving away from the traditional high-protein wheat production for export. The markets are just not going to be sustained in the future, I believe, to other crops and other markets. That has to be a major initiative, not only of the federal Government, but also the provincial Government. That is an area this Government could play a major role in the leadership role, but what do we find, the same pattern, Mr. Speaker.

We see it drop in the marketing branch of the

Department of Agriculture. The Agriculture Development and Marketing Division has a marketing branch, and there has been a drop. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) represents the constituency of Ste. Rose with many farmers. How can he, when he understands that there has to be a switch in emphasis in terms of what we are producing in this country to tailor it to new markets? How can he stand idly by and, the Minister for Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) as well, see a reduction in the marketing branch of that department when it is so critical at this time? Now, how can he do that? Do they not recognize the serious issue as far as the future is concerned?

I have to wonder at the kind of thinking and planning and research that goes into this Government's preparation for the budget, because they have made so many errors. I have to ask also, Mr. Speaker, why they have not pushed aggressively to have the federal Government—not only the province, but the federal Government—move in the area of Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation the interest rate, lower interest rates, but the federal Government with the federal Farm Credit Corporation? Why have they not said to the Farm Credit Corporation, now there is an excellent vehicle?

If it was in the hands of anyone else but the Conservative Government, we would see a major policy switch at this difficult time to provide low interest loans, something like the Young Farmer Rebate. Here I am asking the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) to broaden that program, because we are seeing the increase in bankruptcies. We have seen the increase in quitclaims and foreclosures that are taking place.

The Minister of Agriculture brags about how they have expanded the programs for young farmers, what a tremendous job they are doing. Well, yes, there has been a little bit done, but it is not near enough. He should be going after the federal Government with the Farm Credit Corporation to put in place a similar program, because they have a much larger loan portfolio. Why is he not saying we are doing this, and the federal Government should be doing this?

He should be at the table when the Agriculture Ministers meet and demand, with his colleagues from western Canada, that the Farm Credit Corporation must put in place a similar program for young farmers with a higher cap than is presently in

place with a longer number of years than five years and a greater interest subsidy on those programs in order to save those farmers.

The Farm Credit Corporation has already done a survey. It shows that one-third of the farmers, mostly newer and younger farmers, bear the burden of the majority of the debt, an average of \$175,000 per farmer. So this program is barely scratching the surface of this Young Farmers' Rebate that the Minister of Agriculture talks about, but he is not interested in expanding it. He cuts the budget of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, and he does not say anything to the feds on this issue, a major area where they can do something, and they can also do of course, in the federal jurisdiction as well as provincial, many more things. The major program that I talked about, Mr. Speaker, is the issue of a farm stabilization program for all commodities that has to be put in place so farmers can start to concentrate on living a fuller life in this great country that we live in, instead of having to worry, and that is putting it mildly. To be tortured in fact, emotionally and mentally, the way they are at the present time because they are unable to have any certainty about their economic future. They just do not have any hope. They are losing hope, their will, and I think it is grossly unfair.

I think we as a Government provincially, and we as an Opposition Party have a responsibility to address these serious issues, and this Government has failed to do that, Mr. Speaker, so that is why I believe this budget is a failure for Manitobans.

Mr Reg Alcock (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is interesting as I rise to speak on the budget, something occurred in the Chamber today that I want to comment on. I want to do it because there is a thought that nags at me as I reflect on what the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) had to say in his speech today, and I deliberately chose this time to begin speaking because I know that I will have an opportunity to speak again tomorrow after I have reviewed the Hansard.

I want to share with Members an experience I had about 10 days ago as I sat one evening with Lloyd Axworthy who is, as everybody knows, the federal Member for Winnipeg South Centre, and also the new Critic for External Affairs for the Liberal Party nationally. Lloyd has travelled extensively in South America, and I think he has made 15 or 16 trips there now. He has had an opportunity to meet with people

from all of the political factions down there, and to see firsthand the effects of policy in that region.

He told me a story that was related to him by a Canadian peace worker, a church worker actually who is down there, and her job is to serve as a living shield for members of some of the agricultural movements down there, or members of some of the political movements down there, who have an unfortunate habit of disappearing.

* (1740)

One night this particular worker was awakened to hear the sounds of the army hammering on the door of their building, and she and another—there were four people in the house, herself and three El Salvadorians at this time—and she and one of her friends in the house ran to the roof of the house and hid in a shelter at the top of the house. They lay there and listened while their friends on the main floor were machine-gunned by the police. They went downstairs to find the bodies of their two friends on the main floor of the house.

He also told me a story of women coming to him, and coming to the delegation that they led down there, asking for the delegation to intercede with the Government because these women were going around, as they stated it, digging in soft spots in the ground. They were digging up unmarked graves of their children, their husbands, their friends who had been killed and just buried indiscriminately in the countryside. Their joy, as he related it to me, they spoke of the joy that they found when they actually uncovered the body of someone they knew because at least they knew that that person was no longer being tortured or abused.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) today, if I understand what he said correctly, and I am going to get the Hansard to check it out, invoked those images in talking about the ravages visited upon South American economies by quote, socialist policies. What he failed to refer to, Mr. Speaker, is that those are actions being taken by right-wing death squads who choose to enforce their policies by killing those who object to them.

What has struck me as I have sat here and reflected on what occurs in this House all the time is that we have one side of the House who chooses to depict the other side of the House in very extreme terms, and this side of the House chooses to do exactly the same thing. That there is no balance, that there is no discussion, that there is no coming

together to do away or to reduce that kind of conflict in the House. In fact, if anything, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) today chose to inflame it. He chose to continue to depict the Members of the official Opposition as socialists and as destructive and as somehow anti the best interest of this province and if I am to be fair, what he is speaking of is exactly the other side of the coin to what the Members of this side of the House do, as they stand up and speak of Members on the other side of the House who are indeed—or who they depict as being somehow anti-human, anti-women, anti-people, anti-children, anti-family.

I guess I am struck by a need at this time to say, we have to stop that. We, somehow in this Chamber in the way in which we govern, have to find a way of putting that extreme rhetoric aside and find a way in which to make decisions that are on behalf of all of the people that we serve. We have to stop depicting the people who live north of the Assiniboine River as somehow socialist and we have to stop depicting the people who live in southwest Manitoba as somehow redneck and anti-

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak on the budget today and in starting to do that I wanted to reflect on something that I said some two years ago, two and a quarter years ago actually, in the very first speech I made in this House where I said the economic future in Manitoba in the short term is not promising, despite what the Finance Minister claims. -(interjection)- I said that two and a quarter years ago and the Finance Minister derided me and said that, oh, no, growth was going to be two and a half points, growth was going to be strong in Manitoba. Growth that year was four-tenths of 1 percent.

We have a recession that is upon us now and it has not taken a great deal of wisdom to discover that or to point that out, Mr. Speaker. Every credible economist in the country who has looked at it has said that we have some very serious problems coming. Problems because of the underlying strength of the economy in Canada, problems because of adjustments internationally. The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohma) spoke about the problems that have been visited upon the farm community. The problem with that is that the most negative effects of the recession are going to be visited most heavily on those that have the least capacity to deal with it.

I think I want to take issue on the macroeconomics side with some of the decisions that the Finance

Minister (Mr. Manness) has made. The first thing, and it is one of things that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) when she moved her amendment to the budget motion, she said that the Minister of Finance had failed to portray accurately and clearly the financial affairs of the province. You know, we saw that two years ago in his first budget, when he said, no, no, things were fine. We saw it again last year, and we see it again this year, when while he cannot help but reference the fact that there are problems, he nonetheless chooses to cast them in a very rosy way, if you like. He casts them as though it is not really a problem, they are a correction, they are an issue, they are something that we are going to have to deal with, but he has a plan.

The problem is, in two and a half years, now three budgets, we have not seen any concrete evidence of any plan. What he has done instead is obscure the financial picture on this province. What he has done instead, Mr. Speaker, is play with the books and to make a mockery of the fiscal picture of this province. What he has done is take a \$383 million deficit and portray it as a \$283 million deficit.

He had an opportunity two years ago when he became the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) of this province, when he could look down the road and see that there were some serious problems coming in this province, when he could take off the blinkers and he could see that the Free Trade Agreement was going to have a serious impact on people in this province. He was sitting with money in the bank. He was sitting with a real surplus, actual cash, that he could act on. Instead of using that cash to start the engine, to fuel the engine, to create wealth then in the hopes that we would begin to see some benefit from that now, he chose to hold back.

He chose to borrow more at that period of time in order to create the illusion that he was managing somehow more efficiently or more effectively. All he did was create a fiction that he maintains budget after budget. It is a fiction that the Auditor has said repeatedly is absolutely false and the Auditor will not support. It is a fiction that he has compounded by falsely valuing, over the advice of the Auditor, the putative sale of Repap or the benefits of the sale of Repap.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, he continues to obscure the fiscal reality, the economic reality in this province. In the budget speech he says, retail sales are growing by 4.5 percent. Yet, in the first quarter

income from the retail sales tax, he shows 1.8 one-hundredths of a percent increase in revenues. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot have the difficult side of the equation and the rosy picture.

The reality is that we are in a very serious state in this province and we need to find some creative solutions to the dilemmas that confront us. The unfortunate part of it is that we had an opportunity to do something two years ago. We had an opportunity to act. We could have done something, and we missed that opportunity. Now, we are trying to play catchup. Unfortunately, we are not going to be able to get things moving quickly enough to feel any positive effects for some time.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)—and I recall debating with the Minister of Finance during the election. One of the things that we said then as we say now is that we need an adjustment strategy for labour. We need it for two reasons. We need it because we believe there is going to be significant dislocation in the workplace in the next year or two, in part because of free trade and in part because of the underlying weakness of the economy in this province. We also need it because, if we are going to see changes, if we are going to move in this province to aggressively meet the challenges that are in front of us, given the changes internationally, we need to make retraining opportunities available to people. We need to allow people the opportunity to learn new skills so that they can exercise those skills here in this province rather than being forced to move out.

* (1750)

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) all during the last Sessions of the House, when people would call for such a strategy, would laugh and would make light of it. During the election the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) did much the same thing.

One of the things I thought was positive in the throne speech was that there was a mention of a need to begin to allow some retraining. I was disappointed though to see that it took the form of an \$8 million hand-back to the largest corporations in the province. That by allowing the large corporations to write off existing training expenses, all we have done is lower their tax burden by \$8 million. We have done nothing to allow the small

entrepreneur, who is not paying the employment tax, the ability to build a skilled labour force in order to compete internationally. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) talked about the creation of niche markets and the exploitation of niche markets by small manufacturers but has done nothing to give them any of the strength that allows them to play in that particular area.

Free trade, Mr. Speaker, is also a concern because for some reason that I cannot yet fathom because we do not have a single shred of evidence that the Free Trade Agreement has been positive to this province—the only evidence that we have is that it has been exceptionally negative for this province—this Government continues to fail to recognize that, not only fail to recognize it, but continues to pretend that the situation is exactly the opposite. That in fact somehow we are benefitting enormously from this and therefore there is no need to do anything to assist local businesses in taking advantage of what limited opportunities are presented to us, and no need to shelter existing businesses from the negative impact of that particular deal.

They also spoke at great length last year in this House about the need to strengthen education, about the need to provide training opportunities for Manitobans to prevent the need for people to go elsewhere looking for work. They spoke about the need to strengthen our universities and to make it possible for more people to avail themselves of a university education, but again in this budget we see no particular—I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, were you calling time on me? We see no action, no innovation, no energy put to back up that particular pledge.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the impacts of this particular time in our history in this province. The Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) spoke a bit about the poor, but it is not just the poor. Those people who have the most limited possibilities among us will be hurt very badly by what is coming. Their already limited opportunities because of limited education or skills will be further reduced as the labour force shrinks, but it is not just the poor who are feeling the effects and who will increasingly feel the effects of what is coming, it is the shrinking middle class. It is that portion of our community that has up to now been able to be relatively self-sufficient that is going to feel increasingly the impact of this down turn. It is the people who thought for some time through the '70s

and into the early '80s that they were well off who are increasingly recognizing that they do not have the resources to get by, that they do not have the ability to make ends meet in today's world.

It is not just the problem of some under class, it is a problem of all of us and it is a problem which the Government has it within its ability to address and which this Government is failing to address but rather is continuing the same kind of polarized action against certain groups in the community. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) spoke at length about honesty in this House. He spoke at length about how the home care budget has in fact been expanded and how they are spending more now than they always have been. Well, I think like every Member on this side of the House, can and do regularly bring forward to the Minister of Health examples of how that is simply not the case, that people are being denied home care regularly and repeatedly.

The only reason for that seems to be a change in policy on the part of the Government. People who have had home care, people who have always been able to avail themselves of it, are no longer able to avail themselves of it. The truth, Mr. Speaker, is in the numbers of people who are coming forward with these particular concerns.

I will take issue with one thing that was said by the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale). This particular side of the House is fond of citing the examples of, in this case, the person who spent three months in hospital at a cost of some \$900 a day where she could be serviced at home at a much less cost. He said \$5 or \$6 an hour. It might have been \$10 an hour.

The problem always has been that while the mathematics in that appear compelling, in fact, the reality is if one person moves out into home care we do not see the decrease in expenditure on the hospital side. Unless we are willing to change the use of those beds to recover that money, we are

going to pay for the hospitals, and we are going to pay for the home care.

However, that analysis included it is not then wrong to put more money into home care, because we do have an expanding elderly population. What the increased home care expenditures may do is prevent the need for building more acute hospital beds and to allow us to use those acute care beds more appropriately than they are currently being used.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about Family Services, because there are some examples. The Government says to us at times, and I think rightly so, if you do not like what we are doing, tell us what you would do that is different. I have referenced some things relative to the deceitful practices relative to the fiscal stabilization issue and relative to the lack of action economically, back when they had an opportunity to do so.

I want to speak more concretely within the Department of Family Services. I want to use a couple of cases to reference that, because I think that some of things that the Government is currently doing in Family Services are correct. I think that some of the decisions that they are making and some of the approaches that the Minister has taken are essentially the right ones. I think he has captured one part of the problem that needs to be confronted if we are going to have effective management of the family service system.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Sergeant-at-Arms has approached the Mace. I assume that my time is coming to an end, and I will let the Minister wait till tomorrow to hear what that might be.

Mr. Speaker: When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have 20 minutes remaining.

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

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Tuesday, October 30, 1990

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Tabling of Reports

Regulations filed pursuant to The
Regulations Act; Annual Reports:
Criminal Injuries Compensation Board;
Manitoba Police Commission;
Manitoba Human Rights Commission
McCrea 531

Oral Question Period

Apprenticeship Training
Doer; Derkach; Filmon 531

Multicultural Policy
Cerilli; Filmon; Neufeld; Mitchelson 532

Orders-in-Council
Carstairs; Filmon 533

Women's Crisis Shelters
Barrett; Gilleshammer 534

Family Violence
Barrett; McCrae 535

Palliser Furniture Ltd.
Reid; Cummings 535

CSIS Agreement
Edwards; McCrae 536

Residential Tenancies Act
Martindale; Ducharme 537

Manitoba Telephone System
Dewar; Findlay 537

Home Care Program
Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard 538

Health Care
Gaudry; Filmon 540

French Language Agreement
Gaudry; Filmon 540

Speaker's Rulings

Point of Order Oct. 22, 1990
Manness; Storie; Alcock
Point of Order Oct. 18, 1990
Manness; Barrett
Rocan 540

Hansard Clarification

Re: Page 507, Oct. 29, 1990
McCrae 541

Non-Political Statement

Tribute to Keri Sobkowich
Neufeld 541

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Budget Debate

Ducharme; Martindale; Driedger;
Friesen; Orchard; Plohman; Alcock 542-580