

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 1, 1990.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Chairman of Committees):

Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources presents the following as their Second Report:

Your committee met on Tuesday, February 27, 1990, at 8 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred. On February 27, 1990, your committee elected Mr. Gilleshammer as Chairman.

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 19—The Ground Water and Water Well Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les eaux souterraines et les puits;

Bill No. 35—The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune;

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery, where we have from the Ken Seaford Junior High School thirty Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of Robert Garton and Verland Hicks. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Gas Utilities Annual Rate Increase

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Minister responsible for Energy

and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). Nobody likes tax increases and nobody likes the utility rates, telephone and hydro and gas company bills to be escalating on a regular basis, particularly the gas bill, where each year citizens of Manitoba recently have been faced with multiple increases. The people who are on fixed incomes or people that depend on gas in the cold Winnipeg winters, Manitoba winters, find it very difficult to budget or to plan ahead as to what the expenditures might be. Will this Minister tell this House what action he has taken or his department has taken to have a single annual increase put forward by the gas utilities?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):

Mr. Speaker, I, no more than the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) or anybody else, like increases. This happens to be a way of life at this time. We are in an inflationary period. We have wage increases. Nobody talks against wage increases. I have not heard the Member for St. Norbert talk against wage increases.

Mr. Speaker, we have the Public Utilities Board in place to rule on any rate increases for any of the public utilities, any utilities we have. They are doing the job for us to make certain that the increases are kept at a level that they feel is appropriate at the time.

* (1335)

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is right. We do have the PUB, but I am concerned about forward planning and the ability for utilities to forward plan. The hydro company does it; they take one annual rate increase. The MPIC takes one rate increase to the PUB. Other provinces have one annual rate increase based on projected revenues and expenses into the future. All of the other provinces do it for the gas companies. Why can the Province of Manitoba not initiate some action and ensure that Manitobans are only faced with one annual increase or decrease on their gas bills?

Mr. Neufeld: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the gas company has come to the Public Utilities Board in this last year with more than one increase. I too would like to see that restricted to only one. However, the Act as we have it today permits the application for interim increases. Until we change that Act, which we may very well do, but until we change it, they are in a position to do so.

The Public Utilities Board, as I have said earlier, in the end will adjudicate whether or not those rate increases or applications are appropriate.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I will take that as encouragement that the Minister is going to encourage his department to lobby or change the legislation, et cetera.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Goods and Services Tax Impact Hydro Rates

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): I have a different question, Mr. Speaker, on the GST to the same Minister. Has the Minister had an opportunity to measure the negative impact on the GST on hydro rate consumers?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, there will be, the way the legislation is written today, a GST on hydro bills. There will be a reduction of cost to Hydro insofar as the manufacturers sales tax is concerned. The net result for Hydro will be a decrease because they do not pay the GST.

What he is expecting us to do, I suppose, is to see what the effect will be on the users of Manitoba Hydro. That, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Hydro is reviewing as we speak. They will be in the position to determine the effect of the GST in due course.

Manitoba Public Insurance Corp. General Insurance Privatization

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): To the Minister responsible for MPIC (Mr. Cummings), Mr. Speaker, I was concerned and would like an update. Perhaps he would be kind enough to advise the House what the circumstances are on the potential sale of the insurance division. There has been no mention of it in the annual report. There has been little said about it. We have employees on tenterhooks wondering about their future. Perhaps the Minister could guide us on that.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): Mr. Speaker, thank you, I am pleased to respond to that question. It is obviously not something that is able to be put in the annual report, nor should the Member have expected to have seen a dissertation on it at that point.

We do have companies that are expressing interest in the personal and commercial lines of MPIC. We have endeavoured to make sure that when possible, and as soon as possible, we bring information forward to the employees and the public.

Mr. Angus: A non-answer.

Goods and Services Tax Impact Autopac Rates

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, may I ask this Minister if he has had an opportunity to analyze the impact of the GST on his department at MPIC and what the net effect will be to the consumers of Autopac?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member has decided that is the only way you can get a question on the Order Paper today, to try and conjure up concerns about the future.

If we continue to have the kind of profit margins that MPIC has demonstrated the last two years I am

confident that it will not have as major an impact as some people are beginning to feel.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister suggesting, or proposing, that he is going to use the profits to subsidize the GST and underwrite the cost of the GST in some way?

Mr. Cummings: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to imply that. What I meant to imply was that the reserves billed for the corporation will be in a much more sound fiscal position, in order to be able to provide as reasonable as possible cost for insurance to people of Manitoba.

* (1340)

Bill No. 16 Education Minister's Support

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach).

First of all, today there are some students in the gallery who participated in a ceremony which was designed to promote the non-smoking in our schools and amongst young people across the province. I am wondering, given that the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson) spoke to that group, and given our hopefully collective commitment to stopping smoking in the province, particularly amongst young people, whether this Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) is prepared to join with his colleagues and support the Bill that was introduced by my colleague, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), an Act to protect and promote health of non-smokers.

Is the Minister prepared to support that, stop the smoking in our schools and give a clear signal to the young people of the province that smoking is not good?

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I hope that the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) will join with all of his colleagues in the House today, as we hope to ask for leave to debate Bill 16 today in the House.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues I want to thank the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) for those comments.

Winnipeg School Division Funding

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): My supplementary question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) as well. Yesterday, the taxpayers of the Winnipeg School Division learned that they are going to be facing tax increases from between \$60 and \$80 this year because the Government has refused to provide support to the school division, Winnipeg School Division in particular. I am wondering if the Minister can tell me whether he has met with the Winnipeg School Board to see if he can help them address their situation and whether he offered any additional support to Winnipeg School

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Division, who received only about 60 percent of their total requirements from the Province of Manitoba.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer this question, because I think our Government has indeed supported education in this province at a very substantial level over the past number of years, the past two years. Our commitment is still to support education, at least at the level of inflation and above.

I might indicate that although the announcement was made with regard to funding, we indicated very clearly that now school divisions have the responsibility of going through their budgets to ensure that they maintain those very essential programs of education that are needed, and that they set their priorities.

I have indicated to the Winnipeg School Board that indeed we will be pleased to meet with them, and officials from my department have already met with them to discuss their budgets. It is very important that they go through their budgets and set their priorities and see what it is they can do and then certainly we would be prepared to enter into some discussions with them as to their situation.

Private Schools Funding Formula

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): The Minister will know that the Winnipeg School Division finds it difficult to understand why this Minister can find the money to double private school funding to St. John's Ravenscourt and yet can only provide minimal and frankly insufficient increases to the public schools.

My further question to the Minister is, can the Minister indicate whether, or in what manner private schools in this province have been informed that their increases again this year will be double that which was received by the public schools in the province? Can he indicate how that message was transmitted or whether it has been transmitted at this point?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) knows, the funding formula has not changed substantially with regard to funding schools in this province. As in the past, when we announced funding to public schools, that also triggered the funding for independent schools because there is a formula which was in place when the NDP Government was present in this province that we are still adhering to, in terms of how funds are shifted to the independent schools.

However, I have to indicate to you that we have moved substantially at ensuring that indeed there is not going to be double funding, as was present in the former administration, and that indeed we clean up the accountability question with regard to financial accountability and program accountability.

* (1345)

Funding Analysis

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): The Conservatives and Liberals are prepared to spend an additional \$30 million a year to support private schools in the Province of Manitoba at a time when school division after school division is saying this is wrong-headed. If the Minister wants to see letters I have received from school divisions saying this, trustees from across the province saying that it is time for this nonsense to stop, I will certainly share those with the Minister.

Can the Minister indicate whether he has undertaken any studies on behalf of the 13,000 teachers in this province, the 200,000 students? Has he undertaken any studies to indicate the implications of this massive change in education policy, the support of private schools? Can he indicate whether anything has been done to ascertain what damage will be done to the public schools as a result of this shift in policy?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate very clearly to the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) that there has been a very clear commitment from this Government with regard to support of education in this province. There has been not one penny of funds taken from public school funding and channeled into independent schools. We made a commitment that we would at least support education, at least, at the level of inflation and above, and we have done that. The level of support to schools in this province has been far greater in the last year and a half than it was ever under the NDP administration.

I am proud of the record of this Government with regard to support to education, not only public school support, but indeed support to all forms of education in this province.

Funding Moratorium

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): My final question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) as well. The Minister is attempting to mislead the people of Manitoba by pretending there has been no change in policy. Funding to private schools has doubled in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the Minister is, before he proceeds any further, will he place a moratorium on the funding to private schools so that the trustees who represent hundreds of thousands of students across the province, and teachers will have an opportunity to sit down with the Minister and come to some understanding about the ramifications of this massive change in policy and this decision to subsidize a few elite in this province?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, the only thing that this Government has put a moratorium on is the squandering of money that was done by the former administration.

I have to indicate that we have made a commitment as a Government to support education in this province.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Education is a priority and we will continue to support it to the best of our abilities. We also believe in choices and that was made very clear in our election commitment. I am proud to say that public school education in this province is being supported far better than it was supported under the former Government.

Forks Development Corp. Boat Basin Construction

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker,—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Last Friday excavation began at The Forks site toward the building of a boat basin at the cost of some \$2.5 million. Yet on Tuesday of this week when we asked the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst) questions about it, he did not know that construction had begun. If he did know, he was not prepared to comment on it.

Since \$2.5 million all comes from the taxpayer, will the Minister of Urban Affairs tell us why that decision was taken without public knowledge? Will he tell us today what is going on over there?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, the question was raised by my honourable friend two or three days ago. I was quite correct in the response that I gave. I can tell my honourable friend that today we have an application from The Forks Development Corporation for funding under the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement for payment of the cost of building the boat basin and walkway along the river.

At the time that work was commenced, no application had been received. Discussions, preliminary at best, had taken place. Because of the timing of the rapidly advancing spring season, certain work had to be undertaken immediately if it was to be concluded prior to the breakup of the Assiniboine River. I gather from The Forks Development Corporation that they are proceeding in the hopes that their application will be approved, and I suspect it will be.

* (1350)

Boat Basin Funding

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, but when we asked the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst) these questions on Tuesday, he took them as notice on behalf of the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Today we ask the Minister of Urban Affairs and the Minister of Tourism answers the question.

Now the Minister of Tourism has just told us that excavation has begun on the project before an application has been filed for the funding. Why in heaven's name did the excavation begin before there was a commitment to fund the project?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): I think I answered that question in my first answer, but for the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge's (Mr. Carr) benefit, I will do it again.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated that because of the time constraints related to the rapidly advancing spring season certain work has to be undertaken prior to the breakup of the river.

Mr. Speaker, The Forks Development Corporation in anticipation of approval and, as I indicated to him, some discussions had taken place, and I suspect that they will get approval of this project—that they commence work in order to beat the breakup of the Assiniboine River. That seems to me—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ernst: —to be a reasonable and prudent course of action in order to (a) complete the project, and (b) to keep the costs to as low an amount as possible.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, there is incredible confusion over there about what is going on at The Forks. They do not know what Minister should answer the questions. First it was the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Now it is the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst). They do not know how the money is being used—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

POINT OF ORDER

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

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member and his colleagues have had ample time during the Estimates process of this House to ask all kinds of questions and make speeches. This is not the time for speeches, and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) ought to know that and ought to put his questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), he is quite correct. Time is extremely scarce. Brevity both in answers and in questions is of extreme importance. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Mr. Carr: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the operation of Question Period, I think it would be advisable if the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) did not continuously cry from his seat comments like fool—

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) will take his seat. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. I would remind all Honourable Members, the Honourable Member did not have a point of order but he raises a valid point. For our viewing public, I have to advise Honourable Members again, decorum is of extreme importance. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Forks Development Corp. Boat Basin Construction

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, with a final supplementary question to, I do not know, I will try the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). The site that has been chosen for excavation for the boat basin is a very sensitive one, because there could be contained within that site some very important archeological artifacts of interest to all of the people of Manitoba and, indeed, the people of North America. Can the Minister of Urban Affairs give us assurances that those precious artifacts are not in the least being threatened by this excavation, which apparently has no purpose and apparently has no permit?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is doing it first, if the Member from across the way is getting his information from his Liberal colleagues in City Hall or getting it from the paper. If you read the paper you will see that we have a person on site by the name of Mr. Kroker, who is on there from seven in the morning until seven at night surveying the situation, along with his assistant, and he is watching that site very explicitly. I am sure the Member will enjoy the walkway along the Assiniboine; when all gets completed he maybe will not be so negative on every project that goes towards The Forks.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. James. Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. James.

* (1355)

POWA Agreement Qualification Period

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, the Program for Older Worker Adjustment agreement signed by the Labour Minister (Mrs. Hammond), by excluding all of those who have not lived in Canada and worked in Canada for 15 years, also means that women who may not have entered the work force until late in life, for whatever reason, are also discriminated against. If they do not have 15 years of employment they do not qualify. That is a ridiculously long waiting period which also amounts to

discrimination against women. Why did not the Minister object to this unreasonably long qualification period?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The Honourable Member, I believe, dealt with this matter yesterday and I will bring his question of today to the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond).

Women Exclusion

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, again for the Acting Minister of Labour, can the Minister indicate, can the Acting Minister indicate, what percentage of women in Manitoba have not worked 15 years in the work force before age 55, so that the Minister can tell the House how many Manitoba women are excluded from this agreement? Presumably she would have had that information before her before she would have signed this agreement with this exclusion in it.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I did not bring that information with me to the House today. I will ask the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) to—I will bring the question to her attention.

POWA Agreement Qualification Period

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, finally, for the Premier (Mr. Filmon). This agreement was signed and ratified by Cabinet. I would like the Premier to tell the House if it is the policy in fact of this Government to build in systemic discrimination into agreements like this which it has done. It is with respect to women; it is also with respect to new immigrants. My question to the Premier, specifically is, the qualification for UIC is 16 to 20 weeks—why is the qualification period for this program 37 times that qualification period?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the Program for Older Worker Adjustment is a program that—

An Honourable Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: —is over and above all of the safety net programs that have been put in place—

An Honourable Member: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Filmon: —unemployment insurance, retraining opportunities, other forms of assistance. This is a new program that goes over and beyond what any other former programs had been able to provide where special circumstances such as major layoffs, as took place under the former NDP administration with the closure of the Canada Packers plant in Manitoba—that closure -(interjection)-

Thursday, March 1, 1990

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

Mr. Filmon: That closure, of course, affected many long-term employees, many of whom, because of age and circumstance, could not benefit from the existing programs for retraining and re-entry into the work force, so it provided yet another opportunity to give some Government assistance and we, as a Government, were happy to be able to enter into agreement with the federal Government, to provide this assistance that had not heretofore been available so that many older workers who were faced with circumstances that they would not have been able to find any support for previously, now are able to get that support. That is some - (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) asks questions and then—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I remind the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon) that answers to questions should be as short as possible. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

Native Communication Network Funding

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Heritage and Culture (Mrs. Mitchelson). The Minister of Finance in Ottawa tabled cutbacks to the Native communication programs. Here in Manitoba we have the Native Media Network and also the Native communication programs. They have been doing a great job in promoting programs for Native people and also advising the general public.

I am asking the Minister whether there would be continued funding for these two Native programs and also will she lobby with the federal Government to ensure that these programs will continue and also to put pressure on the federal Government on how important these programs are in the aboriginal community.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I do agree that the Native communication programs have some very beneficial impacts on the Native community and on the Manitoba community in general. We are in the process of, once we get out of this House, establishing our budget process for next year. All programs will be looked at. We certainly will be looking at what the implications of the federal cutbacks will be on those programs.

* (1400)

Native Organizations Funding

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): My supplementary is to the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey). The

Native organizations are very concerned about the cutbacks, and they want to be assured by this provincial Government their funding to their organizations, particularly MKO, Southeast Tribal Council, also First Nation's Confederacy—their programs have been 100 percent cut by the federal Government.

Will this Government assure that these Native organizations will get their funding from the provincial Government, and also will the Minister lobby with the feds to ensure that there might be possible funding for these Native organizations?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has just responded to the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), my answer is the same, that funding for a future year will be assessed as we go through the Estimates process.

I say it is not our intention to pick up federal responsibility where in fact they have cut back. It is our intention to carry out with priorities that have been identified for community support, such as northeast hydro, which was announced for his community, and those are the areas in which we anticipate strong support from our Government.

Northern Development Agreement Replacement Funding

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): My final question is to the same Minister. This is in respect to the Northern Development Agreement in which I believe we have lost \$270 million. Some of those programs had human development education programs such as northern nursing, social work, teachers. I think we have had over 400 Native teachers under Brandon University programs. The northern people are concerned where this funding might be coming from as a result of loss of NDA. Does this mean that the provincial Government will be providing 100 percent funding to these programs now?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): As has been indicated many times, we are committed to the North and to the education of the northern communities.

The agreement that the Member refers to in fact did run out under the former New Democratic Party. There was not a long-term agreement in place. In fact, there was just an extension of a previous long-term agreement. There are active discussions going on with my colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), who is doing an extremely good job of administering and handling the educational programs in the North.

As we prioritize the activities we are discussing with the federal Government, and as I had answered before, we expect to have a program in place that will in fact take the priority items of this Government, the federal Government and the northern communities, and advance with them.

Cross-Cultural Education Government Initiatives

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). Last night were the closing ceremonies of Black History Month in Manitoba. It was a momentous month to celebrate the role of blacks in our community. During February we saw the release of Nelson Mandela from 27 years of imprisonment caused because he dared ask for freedom.

It was also a month when Manitobans proved that racism is alive and just too healthy in our province. Will the Minister outline what action plans she has in place to educate Manitobans to the value and worth of every citizen in Manitoba, regardless of background and origin?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I did not hear the end of the question. There was a little bit of noise surrounding me. I wonder if I might ask the Member to repeat that.

Mrs. Charles: My question to the Minister was, does she have any plan in place for cross-cultural education in the Province of Manitoba to wipe out racism within our time?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I thank the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) for that question. We do in fact have certain programs in place right now that are ongoing. That does not mean to say there will not be new programs or new initiatives, Mr. Speaker.

I do know that the one initiative that we have taken most recently, just at the beginning of this year, was to second a person over to the Manitoba Federation of Labour from my department with full salary paid by the Government of Manitoba in the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

They are going to be looking over the next short period of time in developing programs that are going to combat racism. That information will come back to Government through that employee, information that will be shared, Mr. Speaker, with all of the Manitoba community.

It certainly is an education process that is going to have to be used to combat racism. As I have indicated in the past, there is no way that Government can legislate people to love one another, to accept one another. It is through the educational process, and it is by sharing one culture with another culture and understanding each other that we can combat that form of activity.

Racist Material Charges

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I believe the majority of Manitobans were disgusted when we saw various racist and discriminating products brought into the province. Has the Minister of Culture, Heritage

and Recreation met with the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) in order to demand that charges will be laid against all those people and companies that promote racism within our province?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, not only have I met with the Attorney General, but just some short time ago, when all of this came to light, the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and myself had a meeting with the executive of the MIC.

We had a very fruitful and productive meeting discussing all of these different issues and, as a matter of fact, I have sent, by way of letter, a request back to the MIC that they work with their communities, in consultation with their communities and bring forward to Government recommendations on what the communities are saying about what activities we should be pursuing in this province.

Racist Material Charges

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): My question to the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae): will the Attorney General remove his ban on laying charges against those companies and people that promoted racism in the province by allowing the racist pins to exist in the stores and in the hands of the public in the province?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): There is no ban on prosecutions against hatred in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. James, on a point of order.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I feel compelled to point out that the Minister perhaps misunderstood the question—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, there is an outright ban on anyone else bringing a prosecution in this province, and he knows full well—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. What is your point?

Mr. Edwards —that was his decision.

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

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Goods and Services Tax Tax Form Information

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Brandon East has the floor.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). The federal Government is determined to bring in the GST in spite of it being an attack on low- and middle-income Canadians. Now the federal Government has included material relating to the GST in the 1989 income tax forms. This is an affront to Parliament, it is an affront to the democratic process, since the legislation has not yet been passed and Manitobans, including my constituents, are upset about this.

Can the Minister tell us whether he was previously advised by the federal Government that this material was to be included in the '89 forms? Has the Minister protested to the federal Government on the inclusion of the material in the 1989 tax forms?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I can remember a time when I opened my guide that came from Ottawa and I came across these nice orange pages that were inserted by the NDP Government of the time. It had a fair amount of propaganda associated with—

An Honourable Member: Did they have Len's picture on it?

Mr. Manness: The picture of the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) was not there, but I still could see his writing throughout it all.

Mr. Speaker, the short answer to the question is, I was surprised when I became apprised of this fact, and I have registered some of that concern—that I share by the way with the Member opposite—with the Minister of Finance federally.

Goods and Services Tax Joint Collection System

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Wilson has said that he is looking forward to co-operation between the provinces and his department to collect the GST. We know there have been discussions between Ottawa and the Minister's department on this matter.

Can the Minister give us an update on such discussions and negotiations on establishing a joint federal-provincial collection mechanism in Manitoba? Has there been any progress in establishing a joint federal-provincial collection mechanism?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I think I reported on this issue last about three weeks ago. At that time I indicated that there was not an awful lot

of progress. Today I can report there still is not an awful lot of progress, harmonization of bases, of course, being the starting point from the federal perspective and we, as a province, saying that there is no way we are interested in harmonizing bases. Once you cannot even get to the starting point, the starting line, obviously you have some difficulty.

There are other areas where there are discussions going on, not the least of which is the impact on municipalities with respect to the goods and services tax. Of course there are various options being put forward, certainly by one of the major provinces to the east, associated with the impact on municipalities.

* (1410)

Mr. Leonard Evans: Will the Minister tell the House that he will absolutely not co-operate with the federal Government on establishing a joint collection mechanism at this time? Will Manitoba do its part to oppose the GST by saying that we will absolutely not co-operate with the federal Government in this matter?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, this is where I guess we differ a little bit with the NDP who could care less as to the impact on small businesses in this province. This Government has said from Day One, in spite of our very strong opposition to the goods and services tax, that if we can find any method by which our small businesses can somehow reduce the cost of collecting our tax, which was increased last, by the way, by the NDP, and the federal new goods and services tax, if we can find any way to try and reduce and mitigate the additional costs associated with the imposition of two taxes, then we will try to work toward that end.

Hog Industry Production Figures

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). In the Manitoba Market Reports, dated February 23, is this statement, and I quote: Manitoba's slaughter hog marketings have been below packer requirements for most of this year.

Can the Minister give some explanation as to why Manitoba hog producers are not meeting the demand of the packers in Manitoba this current year?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hog production cycle traditionally goes through high and low periods. Generally when the price of hogs goes down, the production backs off because it becomes less economical to produce hogs. That is a traditional cycle, and Manitoba Pork Producers Marketing Board, now called Manitoba Pork Est., does acquire hogs from western Canada, Saskatchewan and Alberta, to fill in the void where the packers and processors need additional hogs for kill in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Laurie Evans: Mr. Speaker, it is a very interesting answer, but the other thing that is interesting is 250,000 weaning hogs have left this province in the past year.

Can one infer from that that we are moving the same way as the cattle industry, that we are going to be providing the animals for someone else to use the value-added concept and whereby we lose the market and the value-added component?

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, in 1980, Manitoba produced 800,000 hogs a year. This year we will produce about 1.8 million to 1.9 million hogs in the Province of Manitoba. I say the hog industry has been in a tremendous growth cycle and will continue to grow in this province with strong producers producing hogs to a strong market.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On February 13, 1990, I and four other Canadian parliamentarians were invited to visit Ukraine by a group of Ukrainian parliamentarians. I was scheduled to arrive in Ukraine this past Tuesday and remain until March 10. This Tuesday afternoon I was informed that the Parliaments of Ukraine and USSR had denied us visas. This denial, Mr. Speaker, is a sad indictment of Mr. Gorbachev's fine words about glasnost and perestroika.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would remind the Honourable Member that the Members have granted you leave to make a non-political statement. The Honourable Member is coming extremely close to making this a political issue. I would caution the Honourable Member. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, to carry on his remarks.

Mr. Minenko: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of politics within this Chamber.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Minenko: I seek the direction from the Speaker to advise me whether I can continue in this matter or not.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is a former Deputy Speaker of this House. I suggest that if he wants to argue with the Speaker or get on with something that is not a non-political statement, that Honourable

Members might wish to withdraw leave for the Honourable Member. If he wants, on the other hand, to get on with a non-political statement, we would be happy to hear from him.

Mr. Speaker: On the same point of order, the Honourable Member for Osborne.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member has indicated that he will take direction on this issue. He is not meaning to make this a political issue in the least. It is a personal issue that he has been involved with and has a great deal of feeling about, and wanted to express that feeling to the House. He believed he was making a non-political statement in the sense in this Chamber. He has gotten a little carried away. He has asked direction from the House, and I trust he will honour the direction he has been given.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McCrae: On the same point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On that same point of order?

Mr. McCrae: On the same point, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader.

Mr. McCrae: —the Honourable Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock) is suggesting that non-political means non-political in the sense of this Chamber, but the Honourable Member understands that there are political issues that go far beyond this Chamber, and that needs to be borne in mind by Honourable Members also.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) and the advice also given by the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), both Honourable Members are quite correct. I have cautioned the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), and he has said that he would adhere to the responsibilities or the leave that has been given to him by the House. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, do you want to carry on with your remarks in a non-political fashion?

Mr. Minenko: Mr. Speaker, from listening to what the Government has to say and suggest, my subsequent comments would fall within what he suggests is not within the realm of a discussion in this particular section of our Orders in the House, and I indeed feel greatly concerned that it is crucial that the election that is going to be held this Sunday in Ukraine be conducted openly and democratically, and I hope that the Canadian Government expresses their protest of these actions to the highest levels of the Russian Embassy. Thank you.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Mr. Speaker: There is also another vehicle open to the Honourable Member. He has a grievance process if he has not used his time yet.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Gimli, with a committee change.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Derkach for Mitchelson, and Enns for Pankratz.

Also, I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for this evening's sitting be amended as follows: Downey for Findlay.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call the Orders of the Day as listed in today's Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS AMENDED BILLS

BILL NO. 83—THE OZONE DEPLETING SUBSTANCES ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 83, The Ozone Depleting Substances Act; Loi sur les substances appauvrissant la couche d'ozone, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): It seems to be the week for environmental legislation. We were in delegation this morning hearing representations about the WRAP Act and the reduction of industrial waste. We, yesterday, dealt with two other pieces of legislation which saw the raising of fines within existing pieces of legislation, which was The Environment Act and The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act.

We have here, an Act of a little bit more substance than those two that were dealt with yesterday. We are dealing here with Bill 83, The Ozone Depleting Substances Act. This is a first for Manitoba. We do not have legislation of this nature on the books in this province. I think for that reason it was incumbent upon this Government and this Environment Minister (Mr. Cummings) to bring forward legislation of this nature.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

There has been legislation put forward in a few jurisdictions in Canada on how to protect the ozone

layer from various types of industrial chemicals which we or our suppliers use daily. The significance of the ozone depletion should be mentioned, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate that. Yesterday I had to contend with the heckling simultaneously by four Government Ministers and one not three feet away from me, but today there was a different tactic, it was just general hubbub.

An Honourable Member: We usually get hubbubs around here once in a while.

* (1420)

Mr. Taylor: Oh, now I am going to have another Government Minister off my right shoulder about three away. Come and sit in my chair and keep it warm, Mr. Justice Minister. I see, heckling at close order.

The Act before us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, though in all seriousness, is one that does deserve its time for serious and deliberate debate. The ozone layer is a microthin layer in the upper atmosphere which protects animal and plant life from the onslaught of the ultraviolet rays of the sun.

That ozone layer is subject, however, to the deleterious effects of the escape of products like chlorofluorocarbons and halogens which are in regular industrial use and I might even say home use on this planet. What has been evidenced has been that this fragile but critical ozone layer has been depleted, and has been depleted rather seriously over our own North Pole. Canada through its satellites and ground monitoring stations has been building up a significant amount of scientific evidence on that hole in the ozone layer above the north polar region.

The scientific evidence is, however, not complete. There is no certainty amongst the scientists as to the full cause for the deterioration, nor is there or does there seem to be an explanation as to why the hole in the ozone layer at the North Pole changes. It changes its shape, it changes its size. It appears to be seasonally based to some extent, but there is no certainty as to what is happening.

One of the more notable and alarming developments, however, has been the development of the hole in the south polar region in which the ozone layer there has completely disappeared and in which the hole is growing at a rather astounding rate. The hole has been increasing over the last few years at an average rate of some 22 percent. Now with an opening like that growing, the alarm bells went off all over the scientific world. We finally have scientists getting the attention of their legislators and saying this cannot go on, we must stop using materials that are deleterious to that ozone layer, and we see here before us an Act that starts to do some of that. I am pleased to see it.

However, when the Liberals brought this up more than a year and a half ago, I believe it was in

Thursday, March 1, 1990

September '88, that something should be done about protecting the ozone layer in this jurisdiction, we provided information of products that were available in our stores, our hardware stores, right here in this city. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) first said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no need for that in Manitoba. We do not have enough products that are creating the disappearance of the ozone layer.

We then presented a position to the Finance Minister in which we said to that Honourable Minister, here are products that are available at the retail level in Manitoba. Until such time as national legislation is more encompassing, until such time as the national Government bans the importation, because these were imported products, and hence their arrival on our store shelves, would you consider putting on a tax, a disincentive sales tax, on products containing free CFCs and halogens?

In September '88 our Minister of Finance said, that would be imprudent of me to tax a product containing CFCs. I would have to say, I think it was imprudent of him not to, but we have before us this Bill No. 83 now, The Ozone Depleting Substances Act. It lists in it, under Section 3(2), Application, a whole series of materials which do have the effect of damaging and destroying the ozone layer.

We have CFCs 11, 12, 113, 114, 115; Halon 1211, 1301, 2402 and then a general catch-all one, which is any packaging or wrapping or container that is made of material that contains ozone depleting substances.

That is all very well and fine to say that sort of thing, but let us remember how some of these materials come into our daily lives. Certainly some of them are in packaging and certainly some of them are in wrapping, but let us take a look at the Halon products that are in our automotive headlights or in floodlights. Let us take a look at the Halons that exist within a myriad of firefighting products. What I am talking about is the common red fire extinguisher you see hanging in the hall or in the workplace. Those contain Halons.

The most common material which will deplete the ozone of course are CFCs contained within refrigeration and freezing equipment. That is the substance that is inside the coils of refrigerating and freezing equipment that gives it the cooling effect. It first is produced as a gas and then as it produces the cooling effect and absorbs the heat, it will reform into a liquid and the process goes on and on.

Now what we have is we have a lot of older equipment. The equipment is well made, whether that be for equipment that is used in the home, whether it is equipment that is used in the store or whether it is industrial storage equipment. It is very well made. It has a long lasting life. The problem is that over time parts start to wear out, tubing starts to get too thin, the gas starts to seep out. As soon as it does, it starts to migrate up into the upper atmosphere and create the damage. The migration takes a mighty long time, 10 to 30 years for some of it to move very, very slowly up into the upper atmosphere. Once there though it combines with other materials into an effect an acid and eats away at the ozone layer. The only way to stop

this whole thing from happening is to stop the escape of these CFCs and Halons, et cetera, stop that escape before it starts its migration up into the atmosphere.

The comment has been made that if all CFC production in the world were stopped, it would take 10 to 30 years for the final damage to be done to the ozone layer before any corrective effect could take place. What that is saying is that we are setting a sentence by our lack of activity in this area on the next generation and potentially the generation after that, because once the CFCs and the Halons are beyond our control they never can be retrieved. They will gradually migrate to that upper atmosphere and they will insidiously destroy that protective ozone layer.

* (1430)

A few years ago in Montreal a convention was signed by the industrialized nations which said by the late '90s they would cut production by half. The Montreal convention I think is a watchword amongst environmentalists. It has however become a dated watchword and that is very unfortunate. The reason is that two years after the Montreal convention was signed, further information, Mr. Deputy Speaker, came forward from the scientists based on more observations from satellites which indicated what I said about the South Pole, that the deterioration of the ozone layer is happening more than we thought. The deterioration is actually accelerating. That is a very serious thing.

What Ontario did in response was it said, we think we should go further than that. We think we should take the same date in the mid-'90s and say, instead of having a 50 percent cut there should be an 80 percent cut. You know what the Environment Minister then of this province said? What is Ontario doing daring to get out of lock step with the rest of us? We are saying we do not need any legislation in Manitoba, because the problem is not serious enough. Ontario dares to show any leadership, dares to show any initiative, and dares to give further protection to the ozone layer. Well I wish to heck we had seen such daring here. I wish we had seen such leadership. I wish we had seen such legislation earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because it was needed.

This legislation also has some serious flaws with it. It talks about certain products that should not be used, and it assumes that all the replacement materials are available. The unfortunate reality is that not all of them are, because the ones that have been developed are yet not fully test proven. The hope is they will be. However the deadline years of when they are to be ready are slipping, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are slipping a few months, a half a year, a year. Products that were intended to be available two years from now are now not going to be available till three years from now. The scientists and the chemists in the chemical firms are not as optimistic as they once were. They know they will be successful in the end. They are just not so certain when that end point will be reached.

We had some interesting presentations on this matter at the committee stage. The one group that I found most enlightening was an industry group that is involved with the maintenance and repair of refrigeration and

Thursday, March 1, 1990

freezing equipment. They are very concerned with the environment too. It was interesting to hear how much study they had actually done of this thorny problem of dealing with CFCs that are contained within that refrigeration and freezing equipment.

Their view was that in most cases, because of the durability of the appliances, they would be dealing with that equipment for some time to come because it was uneconomic for the owners to replace such equipment. They said there are some solutions available, some technical, mechanical solutions, which will facilitate the trapping and retaining of CFC products. I thought that was great. I thought that was really heartening.

They are saying that there are certain techniques that can be used in the repair process. They are saying there are certain criteria that can be established of when a part is reasonably replaceable or when it is not reasonably replaceable and really the whole piece of equipment should then be junked and a new, safer piece of equipment bought. They said there are some threshold lines and some measures which can indicate that.

They also indicated though that because there are some difficult decision calls to be made, because there is a myriad of equipment over quite a range of years, which means different types of technology and quality, et cetera, that it requires different levels of knowledge and skill to be able to properly service this equipment. The suggestion was that there be in Manitoba the establishment of a hierarchy of service knowledge levels for refrigeration and freezing equipment. I believe if my memory serves right they suggested five separate levels, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which would indicate levels of skill and hence levels of complexity that a service person could attempt to work on. They said by establishing this hierarchy of skills amongst service people and hierarchies of levels of knowledge that we would be very well served.

This is something that does not take great scientific endeavor. It is not meaning that we have to establish research labs and develop products that are going to replace these chlorofluorocarbons and Halons that are causing all the problems. This is saying, here is a real-life, practical solution, not the whole solution, but a very, very commendable and practical interim measure which would answer the needs of this jurisdiction and I would say the world.

There were briefings given to the Environment Department officials going back some eight, nine months ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Eight, nine months back in private session these very same points were put forward to the Government officials. There was the opportunity for them to ask the Government official questions and the reverse was true also. There was a good exchange of information. They were aware of the general thrust of the Government legislation but had not reviewed it. It was not yet drafted.

Here it was, the Government officials and the Environment Department had a wonderful opportunity to include a very practical aspect in this Act, in Bill No. 83, and potentially involving the Department of Labour as well because we are talking here about the

establishment of skill levels and the licensing of service people in this industry, so tying in there as well. It could have been something as a bit of a larger approach to the problem.

What happened is when this piece of legislation came forward at the committee stage and the refrigeration and freezing service people and their association representatives came forward in delegation to speak and put a position forward, the truth came out. Although there had been a couple of letters exchanged, the Government was not prepared to buy into this at all.

I am not sure why, what it was that was so onerous about the establishment of educational levels and skill levels for people servicing these sort of appliances, but the issue and the position was virtually ignored by the Government.

What we did have is, after they came back, after this association came back to this Legislature a second time, this time in the formal process of delegation at committee stage of this Bill, the Government in response I believe put forward one or two very minor amendments answering a couple of points that the association put forward. They did not make any profound change to the Act itself.

That to me shows a lack of preparedness on the part of this Government and on the part of this Environment Minister (Mr. Cummings), Mr. Deputy Speaker. It shows that, yes, they have a piece of legislation that is brought forward and may pass today on ozone depleting substances, but where are some of the practical aspects of this? Why was the refrigeration servicing industry association not listened to? Why were their solutions, other than a couple of very minor clause amendments, why were those concerns not embraced?

Why was this piece of legislation first of all developed in this fashion, when some months before it came forward to the House there was the chance to include those, and why was it not again delayed then when there was a second opportunity in committee stage to bring in these other more profound changes? I would suggest profound, yes, but very, very practical, the sort of thing that can be done right now, today, with today's knowledge levels.

* (1440)

It means technical study, possibly the embracing of this initiative by community colleges like Red River and Keewatin and Assiniboine, and so there would be the involvement of the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach).

This Government has said they very much want to tie together technical training and the Education Department. This would have been an initiative to tie that department in so the Labour Department, the Education Department, working together with the Department of Environment for a very positive and practical initiative to help us here in Manitoba, but also to help the global situation and the protection of the ozone layer, but we did not see that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We did not see it because, again, this Government is

soft on the environment. The old buzzword generator is working overtime again.

We have an ozone depletion piece of legislation before us that does some of the right things, but it anticipates products becoming available earlier than in reality they are going to become available, and it totally ignores some of the practical solutions that were being offered to it by the industry association. I must say, as industry representatives, I was very, very pleased to see they had done an enormous amount of homework on their own, had done a fantastic lot of learning about this subject, who provided welcome information to the Members of the committee, and who were asked numerous questions and provided rather substantive detailed answers.

I would have to say that we have another missed opportunity. We had the opportunity missed in the first year of the mandate of this Government in '88 when we had both the then Environment Minister and our present Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) turning down initiatives suggested by the Liberals on ozone protection. Now we have the actual legislation before us which there was an opportunity to construct it with that information and with that thrust in it of how to practically deal with equipment that needs repair, how do you contain those CFCs within that equipment safely, empty it, repair it, refill it? The techniques are available. Why are we not doing specialized training in Manitoba to make sure that our service people have that training, and why are we not monitoring them, and why are we not certifying them? We are not doing it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because this administration is soft as heck on the environment. They say the nice things, they do not do what is necessary to protect us. They, instead, delay legislation, they bring in legislation that is not complete and they fault adjacent jurisdictions for showing leadership on the matter.

I am rather taken aback at that sort of a situation, but that is what we have come to expect from this Government. We have seen it on Bill 81, we have seen it on Bill 82, we see it again today in Bill 83, The Ozone Depleting Substances Act. I think it is unfortunate for us in this province, I think it is unfortunate for anybody on this globe and in the future generations because until we take an issue like ozone depletion deadly seriously we are not going to see anything corrected. How do we know how we are going to be impacted in later age when we start getting, and unfortunately our children and our grandchildren start getting, all sorts of skin afflictions because the skin has been impacted by excess amounts of ultraviolet rays?

I would suggest that it is not a laughing matter, it is very, very serious. There has already been some evidence of an increase of skin cancer, and skin cancer in parts of the world where you would not have expected the increase to be seen. We are not talking about in Florida, in California, where people of caucasian background who have little skin pigmentation to begin with, end up spreading themselves out as professional tanners and they get brown as heck and they also start losing the dexterity of their skin and they start getting skin cancers and other skin problems a lot sooner than they should, and somebody from the other side says:

What a way to go. I guess he is just trying to get me browned off here. Some Members that do have more hair than I, they may not be burning the top of their heads quite as soon, and I envy them for that. In any case, we do not have much choice in this matter. It is all up to the genes, as they say.

An Honourable Member: Yes, but at least you will not go grey.

Mr. Taylor: Somebody on the other side says at least I will not go grey. I hope I will not suffer from skin cancer so that at least I have a chance of going grey.

The matter is serious. We are going to see impacts on people on this globe. The interesting thing is that the deterioration of the ozone layer is happening in the polar regions. That means right within our own territory. I do not think it augurs very well for the long-term effect.

I really wonder, you know, we can be here today debating this sort of thing. We can make a few jokes back and forth, nothing wrong with that, but seriously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is going to happen in the future? What is going to happen to our children and their children when you have an ozone layer that will not only have deteriorated further at the poles but will have thinned everywhere else? Although it still will exist—and that is the prediction, it will start having smaller holes here and there. That thin layer will stop some of the ultraviolet rays but not the numbers of ultraviolet rays that were the case when we were younger.

What is going to happen? We are going to have all sorts of skin afflictions, and who knows what other damage might be done. We do not know that yet. Anything that can be done in this nature has got to be done. That is why I fault the Government for not taking seriously an industry initiative to better train service people so we will stop the escape of these insidious CFCs and Halons.

In addition, I would also like to see leadership out of this Government, vis-a-vis our national Government in the international context, because what will happen is that while production may be reduced very significantly within a few years in the industrialized world the worry is that the multinational corporations will move the production from the industrialized world to the Third World. So what will happen is you will have lip-service environmentalism on a global scale. You will see the production of CFCs almost stopped in our country, in the United States, in Britain and other European countries, but what will happen? Will you see a plant set up in Thailand? Will you see a plant set up in an African country? They are already set up, some of them, and plans are for more of them. Why—to replace the very plants that are coming out of production in the industrialized world.

Those multinational corporations will be able to say to their Governments and to their shareholders: We abided by the 1988 Montreal convention on the ozone. What will happen instead is we will have as much CFC production in a less controlled environment going on

Thursday, March 1, 1990

in the globe. We will have CFCs continuing to escape into the atmosphere with their known deleterious effects.

* (1450)

I am disappointed not only in the legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but in the lack of coming to grips with the issue by this Government from the kiss-offs we got in the early fall of '88 to the fact that there has been brought up to them in the Estimates process in late '88, the Estimates process again in December. Where are your initiatives to the federal Government to say we expect more within Canadian jurisdictions of Canada in general and of Canada as a serious and important component of the world community?

There has been no statement from Manitoba as to where we stand. That is to me not only unfortunate but, given the seriousness of the matter, unconscionable. I fault the Government for that, and I hope with the quietness we are hearing from the other side for once on this matter that we are having Ministers hear this issue, that they are taking it in and that we will see a change of direction by the Tories on this matter, because I do not think, when it comes to the protection of the ozone layer, that this globe can afford the lip-service environmentalism that we have seen to date from this Government, the Government to the west of us in Saskatchewan, the federal Government we have to live under now. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to say a few comments about Bill No. 83, The Ozone Layer Protection Act. During the committee hearings when we were hearing the people who had concerns about this Act, people from the industry came forward and made some recommendations of how we could come up with some regulations to control the people who were handling the chlorofluorocarbon materials. I think that they made some suggestions that made sense.

I think that the Minister should be meeting very quickly with the people who are involved in the industry and see how they can come up with some way of putting some regulations in so there are not too many fly-by-nighters that are doing the work in that field without having the expertise to handle it in a safe way. From their own words, they said that there were some people who were doing the repairs, where the chlorofluorocarbon was just released into the atmosphere, and after they repaired the equipment then it was refilled again.

I think quite often it is the same thing when you are dealing with automobile air conditioners. Their chlorofluorocarbons are down and they just refill them without finding out what is causing it to go down. I guess that is one of the areas we should be looking at very seriously.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think people are becoming more and more convinced that there is a great risk to our health by the depletion of the ozone layer. I think not only are there increased cases of skin cancer, of cataracts and also there is evidence of depressed

human immune system because of the effects on the ozone depletion, I think there is also scientific evidence which shows that there is harm to the aquatic systems as well as effects on agricultural crops that are also contributing to the greenhouse effect that is over all of the atmosphere.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had an opportunity to be in Barbados during the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, and this is one of the subjects that was raised. Those people were extremely upset that there was not more money being put into research, because they felt that the third world countries did not make a contribution to this depletion of the ozone layer; it is the industrial world that has caused it. They were being penalized to a much greater degree than we were, and yet they were not in a position to do anything about it. They felt that there should be more dollars going into research to find out ways how we can stop the elimination of the ozone layer, and I think that they have a point that should be taken into consideration. They are not industrialized so they are not making the contribution, outside of some burning of their forest. Many of them are not even doing that; they do not have the forests to burn that is causing that as well. I think we should be taking that into consideration when you are dealing with that issue, because there are environmental studies that show that the ozone layer is depleting. I think that we should be moving on that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill No. 83 very closely resembles Bill No. 18, which we brought forward dealing with the ozone layer. I think the Minister brought in some additional fines for people who did not deal with—dealing with the offences and penalties, dealing with people who did not follow the Act. I think outside of that it very closely resembles the Bill that I brought forward as a private Member. I want to congratulate the Minister on taking into consideration some of the good works that the NDP Caucus has done and follow the direction that we had brought in place.

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, without saying too much more, we support this Bill. I think the regulations should be brought forward to deal with the industry. I think that we should be moving very quickly with some of the regulations. I hope the Minister would take into consideration some of the submissions made during the committee meetings and come forward very quickly with regulations.

The people who are involved in that industry have offered to become involved and help. They also have some concerns, because the materials are not as readily available as some people seem to think. There are materials available to replace the chlorofluorocarbons, but as Dupont and many of those companies are doing a lot of research in that field they still have not come to a point where they can have a material that is adequate to fulfill the need that will be there, if the chlorofluorocarbons are eliminated completely.

I know that when the Montreal Protocol was held they put a date on as when it should be reducing the use of chlorofluorocarbons to 50 percent. I think that date now should be brought forward. I think many people were expecting that when Lucien Bouchard was made the Minister of Environment. They thought that

with his strong words, when he was first appointed, he was going to be following that up with some very strict regulations, but unfortunately he has not followed up with those early words of promise. I think he has fallen down on his responsibilities and not carried through with some of the recommendations that were made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in May of last year, in 1989, there was a conference held in Helsinki which dealt with chlorofluorocarbons. Many of the countries there were demanding that ozone depleting substances be eliminated by the end of the century. I think that some of the highly industrial parts of the world were opposed to it. I know one of the countries that did support it was Canada.

I think it is necessary that we move with that field and I think follow the direction of some of the world leading environmentalists, who have been putting forward some of their concerns. I think that this Bill is a step in the right direction, but I hope that the Minister will very shortly be meeting with the organizations who have offered their assistance to put in some regulations to deal with it.

With those few words, I want to close my comments and just encourage the Minister to get on with putting those regulations in place and getting on with the next step of reducing the number of substances that are being used in our everyday society.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Environment, closing debate.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): It is my pleasure to close debate on the ozone Bill, as it is affectionately known around these Chambers. More than just to talk about the fact that we are going to be moving on discussion with the industry on establishment of regulations and implementation of regulations, I notice that my critics consistently are saying, well, you know you have to get on with these regulations. We are giving you the legislative authority but do not hesitate to get on with the regulations.

These Bills were introduced last fall. They have languished on the Order Paper for quite some time, and it is a little ironic that the critics are now saying, well, now that we have finally made up our mind that we are going to support this legislation, you have to jump through the hoops just as fast as you can get there. I am quite prepared to provide assurance that we will be moving forward with the discussion on regulations leading to implementation on this Bill as well as the waste reduction Bill once it reaches third reading in these Chambers.

* (1500)

One of the comforting aspects of the way this Bill No. 83 has been brought forward to the public and to the industry is that there will be discussion on the regulations. There will be a logical implementation of regulations so that we replace the products as quickly as is reasonable within our society, eliminate and outlaw those products that can be readily treated with such

dispatch, and thereby do our own small part, if you will, in making sure that ozone depleting substances are reduced and eventually eliminated in the Province of Manitoba.

We all have to be aware of the fact that this is a very small part of the overall problem, and we need not think that the hole will close by 1992 as a result of what we have done here. If other jurisdictions move as well, then we will start to see some positive results. Manitoba is 1 percent to 2 percent of the national problem and, nationally, we are I believe 2 percent to 3 percent of the global problem. You can appreciate that we are about one- or two-hundredth, or an even smaller percentage than that, of the global problem.

Therefore, I simply want to say that I think that we and the people of Manitoba are doing their small share and I would commend the Bill to Royal Assent.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 99 THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 99, The Appropriation Act, 1989, (Loi de 1989 portant affectation de crédits), the Honourable Member for Inkster has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Indeed when I was ending off my conversation or my debate the other day regarding Bill No. 99, it was quite obvious that it hit a couple of nerves in this Chamber, both from the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), and maybe a few other Members of the third Party, realizing maybe what they have done themselves during third reading, or I should say regarding the Concurrence Motion on Monday evening. I am sure no doubt that they do have some regrets.

Today in Question Period, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) was quick to come to his feet once again regarding the expenditures of the Department of Education and allocations that go out to our school divisions throughout the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Education said that the school divisions will set their own budgets and their priorities and then submit it to the Department of Education through the Public Schools Finance Board and that the priorities are then looked at and addressed.

We have brought this to the Minister of Education's attention on several occasions, and we have pointed out to the Minister of Education on those occasions that is not necessarily the case. In fact, if we look at the record of this Government, and this Government has only been in for a couple of years already, it seems like it has been longer, but they have only been in for two years. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) would be surprised on the responses that we get from the Minister of Education. It is somewhat frustrating when you make a statement

Thursday, March 1, 1990

and you know that the statement that you are making is correct and the Minister of Education, even when he is looking at a black and white document, can deny it. It is not the first time this has occurred. I have seen other occasions, and I am going to touch on that other occasion a bit later on in my comments.

If we take a look at the priority list that the Department of Education had received regarding schools, in particular in the north end, we had one school that requested as priority No. 1 a Letter of Intent that the Margaret Scott School be replaced. It was the school division that made that policy decision, and the Minister of Education on numerous occasions stands up and says that it is not he or the department that dictate policy to the school divisions, that in fact it is the school divisions that make policy. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not the case. When we take a look at this particular issue of Margaret Scott School, we will find that it was not the School Board that made the policy decision, that in fact it was the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), through the Public Schools Finance Board, who made a decision on behalf of the school board, and that decision was to shut down that school. The way they were able to do that was by not allowing the funds to flow so that the school can in fact be replaced.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister is saying one thing on one hand; we have the Minister saying something else on the other hand, that I would have enjoyed the opportunity to have asked the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). Hopefully the Minister of Education will stand up, if not on Bill No. 99, at least on Bill No. 100, and give his explanation to clarify the obvious conflict that is there, or the obvious contradiction that is there.

I would also suggest to the Minister of Education, I understand that he has an Education Finance Advisory Committee, which reviews the current method of funding to the schools throughout the province. I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister of Education should be looking very hard at where the funds are actually going to and taking into account what Winnipeg No. 1 and some other more disadvantaged, to a certain degree, school divisions have to put up with.

He has to actually, I believe, come out to the north end. I do not believe any Members of this Government have actually been out, have gone out and seen what some of the problems are in the north end of Winnipeg. The residents of the north end in particular, and I speak on behalf of my constituents, are very upset with what this Government is doing regarding education. They have said on numerous occasions that it is a No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 priority. It is within the top three priorities, top three in terms of priorities. This Government is not treating it like that.

* (1510)

This Government, and particularly the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), has his eyes closed. He is not looking and searching for solutions to what we believe would make a more fair and equitable educational system throughout the province and in particular in Winnipeg No. 1. We have to take into account the different programs that are needed in Winnipeg No. 1 or the core area, if you will, of the City of Winnipeg.

You will find many of the students, in fact, students that are in your own riding that require to have additional programs in order for them to learn. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe you know what I am referring to. We are talking about children that go to school with empty stomachs. I know that because you, yourself have pointed it out to me on numerous occasions where you have seen and heard of children that have to go to school on empty stomachs, and the point that you have put so well that I would like to put, and other Members of my caucus would like to put, is that kids cannot learn on empty stomachs.

What is this Government doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to ensure that does not happen, that to ensure that if they are going to be addressing the problem that it is addressed in a fair fashion, that the burden, the tax burden, is not going to be on Winnipeg No. 1 property taxpayers. That is not taken into account as far as I am concerned.

I would have liked the opportunity to ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) and to have heard what the Minister of Education had to answer, but the third Party in this Chamber assisted in denying that opportunity. I find that unfortunate, even though they might not have any questions, they might not be concerned about the north end residents in the City of Winnipeg or, in fact, any of the residents of the Province of Manitoba. We in the official Opposition are concerned, and it is not just education, it is the health care system. The list can go on, issues that I would have liked to have been able to address. Hoping now, because there are other avenues that through debate, the Ministers, in which myself and my colleagues raise points on, will address or at least supply us with answers. If they do not want to speak on the Bill itself, they can supply the answers through memos, through letters, or find other means to give us the answers that we are seeking.

I did want to also comment on housing. I had several concerns about housing and the direction that this Government seems to be taking. Housing and the development of housing, whether it is for the poor, whether it is for the more well off, the middle class, whatever it might be, and I believe it is the wrong direction. I believe we are going more or catering more to the people that can take care of themselves. We have to start putting more concentration and more effort on those people that need our assistance.

I am referring to housing programs such as the Infill Housing program, a good program. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) himself, 18 months ago in the Estimates process, had said that it was, in fact, a good program. Mr. Deputy Speaker, action speaks louder than words. How many infill houses have been constructed? We are now completing two fiscal years for Government expenditures. Unless there has been some that have come up very recently, I do not believe any infill houses have been constructed. I am sure if there has been, the Minister of Housing will be more than happy to let me know about it.

Other concerns regarding housing—we have MHRC which owns, or we have land banks through the Province of Manitoba. I am interested in what the Government is doing with those land banks. We found that in south

St. Boniface, we had a joint deal with Ladco. I think I have debated that quite extensively, and the Minister of Housing and I have come to a mutual agreement that we are never going to be able to agree in terms of if that was a good or bad deal because we are on opposite ends regarding that.

There are other potential developments that can be occurring. I would be interested in knowing if the area in my own riding, Meadows West, if there have been any proposals submitted to the Meadows West Phase 2 development. I would be interested in knowing on other land bankings throughout the province. Has there been any indication? What are the Government's intentions? Do they want to sell off a certain percentage of the land bank? What would they like to do? How would they like to proceed to find out Government policy? Mr. Deputy Speaker, this would have been an excellent opportunity, and I would admit that the best place to have put forward these questions would have been in concurrence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was not because of a lack of interest, I had questions that I did want to put forward. I believe and I know that the third Party in this Chamber had no questions to put forward because they were quite content, they enjoyed what was going on. The following day they felt it was good to snicker and say, oh, we got you, we got you good. They did not get us, they shafted all Manitobans in this province. They denied Manitobans the opportunity to find out what this Government's agenda really is. The Government has brought forward a budget which is referred to as Phase 1. We have seen in a fundraising letter sent out by this Government, Phase 2. We want to know what Phase 2 is.

I think concurrence would have been a good opportunity to find out what Phase 2 is. Obviously the third Party in this Chamber did not care, they did not feel threatened by any Phase 2, but we are quickly getting the feeling that they were working closer and closer in hand. I find it very hard to believe how a Party of that nature can abandon their principles and work with the Government in such a manner to deny Manitobans the answers to many, many questions that I would have liked to put forward. This Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, deals with the expenditures of the Government and I have many concerns regarding it.

We can go on to Government Services. I had a constituent who gave me a call and was concerned about Government cars and why they all would not have stickers or some type of identification on them so that the public can tell if it is a Government vehicle. There are concerns and questions that one can pursue and try and find out the rationale to why in some cases there is not identification on some Government vehicles.

What concerns me most about this particular budget is the status of our health care system. I am concerned that when we see the line-ups that we have at the St. Boniface. All hospitals in the province have some problems, some more than others. One of the problems that concerns me a great deal are the line-ups that we have seen in the hospitals, in the corridors, people with injuries that need to be attended to in a much faster fashion and that are not being dealt with so that

Manitobans can have a good health care system. We have a serious problem in health care. We have a federal Government that has now stopped transfers, or is limiting transfer payments, monies coming to the province. That is going to have an effect, a major impact on the province.

An Honourable Member: That is the Tories, is it not—cousins?

Mr. Lamoureux: That is the Tory cousins, that is right. I know the provincial Tories would like to divorce their federal cousins, but the bottom line, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a Tory is a Tory is a Tory.

It would be interesting to see what this Government's actions is going to be regarding health care, where they are going to be making up the money. This budget that we have before us is going to have to dramatically change in order to make up what the Tories are doing in Ottawa to the provincial Tories here in the Province of Manitoba. We are going to be seeking assurances—

An Honourable Member: You can count on us.

Mr. Lamoureux: The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) says we can count on him. I am not too sure. I have not been impressed because this is the same budget that has created that Tory slush fund, the same Minister that supports that Tory slush fund.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I can trust this Government, especially when I see a fundraising letter sponsored by the Conservative Party saying, we need a majority. You know why we need a majority? It is because we need Phase 2. We want to implement Phase 2.

* (1520)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is Phase 2? The Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) brings out a good point. What was Phase 1? That is a good question—what was Phase 1? I think if we could ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) that, it would be interesting to see what his answer might be. I am wondering if he would comment on the fiscal stabilization fund, on the slush fund?

I am concerned about Phase 2, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that right wing, Tory hidden agenda. That is what Phase 2 is all about. Members can trust that I myself would like to pursue what Phase 2 is all about to ensure that all Manitobans know what Phase 2 is all about, to ensure that all Manitobans know what the third Party in this Chamber has been all about since they have entered as a third Party in this Chamber, to ensure that all Manitobans know that the official Opposition is here and is pursuing wherever and using whatever means is possible to ensure that their interests are taken into account.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I see I have only one minute left. No doubt if the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) and everyone wants to grant me leave, maybe I will not have to speak on Bill 100. Failing leave, I would be more than happy to speak. The Member for Churchill says, take my time. Is there leave to grant me? The

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says, no leave. I find that unfortunate, but typically his style.

No doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be able to continue my speech on Bill 100 which also addresses the budget. This budget is something that does need to be looked at as very serious, and not treated in a light manner, which some—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Mr. Lamoureux: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): I am glad to have an opportunity to stand in the House in light of the fact that the opportunity was denied to ask many questions that I had remaining following the Estimates process. The unfortunate situation where we had limited time to ask questions and even more unfortunate situation where I think if we were to review Hansard during the Estimates process, the lengthy responses that were given from the Minister denied us the opportunity to ask more questions, as well as a very irrelevant portion of presentation in questioning by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) during the process of Education Estimates.

When we are told that no, you did not organize your time properly, that we could certainly look, and the record is there to indicate that in fact despite attempts to organize the time, the responses were lengthy and often rather irrelevant to the method of questioning.

When there is a three-Party system as we are faced with today, although that will not I do not think occur the next time, because I think we will probably be down to very close to the two-Party system after the next provincial election. I think there are many people in Manitoba who would welcome that as well.

When you are faced with a three-Party system, unfortunately you have the jockeying for position concept and it does interfere with the actual process I think in many respects. I think we do deny the people of Manitoba the more effective type of governing that they so much deserve.

My colleague the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) alluded to the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 situation. I too would like to refer to the very unique, very special situation in which the students, parents, teachers and people of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 find themselves.

When you look and see that this particular school division has the largest percentage of Native children in Manitoba attending school—I think there is something like 42 percent of all Manitoba Natives living in fact in the Winnipeg School Division No. 1. The third Party would like to make us think that they are all up north, but they are not.

(Mr. Neil Gaudry, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The case is that they are located for the most part here in the Winnipeg No. 1 area; the largest percentage of ethnic groups are located in the Winnipeg School

Division No. 1. The largest percentage of unemployed people live in the area of Winnipeg School Division No. 1. The largest percentage of single parent families live where? You are right, in Winnipeg School Division No. 1. The largest percentage of low income families live, you guessed it again, in the Winnipeg School Division No. 1. The largest percentage of rental units are found within the boundaries of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1. Therefore, the population is more transient, you have the largest percentage of special-needs students.

There are very unique situations in Winnipeg No. 1. In a recent survey of school teachers in that particular area, of those who responded, 52 percent of all Grades 1 to 6 Winnipeg No. 1 teachers believe that there is inadequate funding in that particular school division allotted to that school division for the teaching of nutrition.

When I look too, if I can find it, the mayor has proclaimed that March 1 to 7, 1990, will be Nutrition Week. I think that is an admirable proclamation. Then I hear that in one of the core area schools, John M. King School, which I often drive by because I drop my son off at the downtown campus in the morning and come down Ellice on my way to the building with the dome, and I see these young children parading across the street and hear that of these children, 130 of them, often attend a breakfast program. They go to school and they are handed milk, and this morning it was peanut butter sandwiches. Other days they have porridge. A variety of breakfasts are given to these children. Some of these teachers have said, you know, these children are hungry. Some of them have not even had supper the night before.

I know that you can argue, is it really the place for the education system to be feeding these children breakfast? I say, no. I do not really believe that the budget should be entirely out of the education budget. That does not seem fair. I think there has to be a closer liaison between the Department of Family Services, the Department of Health, the Department of Education, a far closer mechanism so when we believe that it is true, and it certainly is true, that a hungry child can not be well educated because he is so busy thinking about his hunger. How on earth can you have a teacher trying to assist that child to learn, assist that child to gain the skills that are necessary for him or her to manage in the big world out there when they are so terribly hungry? There has to be a closer liaison. The Government has missed the boat I believe in addressing the particular needs.

* (1530)

When I look at Winnipeg Free Press today the cartoon that talks about what happens when a budget cuts back equalization payments and affects funding for education, and the federal Minister of Finance is sitting there with a dunce cap on holding the budget book upside-down and saying, read my lips. That is supposed to be funny, but unfortunately, Mr. Acting Speaker, it does not really tickle my funny bone. I think it is a very sad, sad statement of fact, a pictorial statement of what we may see. Certainly the Minister of Finance may be wearing a dunce cap and so may many, many other very deserving people in Manitoba.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Just this morning I attended an opening of a very fine office just east of my own constituency for a group known as PERC, Parents for Educational Rights Coalition and this group has been working for some time because they are very concerned about the lack of educational opportunity for a lot of children in Manitoba. When I listen to some of the people who were there and they decry the concern that the educational needs of so many of the students in Manitoba are not met, that Manitoba is maybe not at the bottom of the barrel but very close to it, that we really should look at a lot of the problems in education that we are missing the boat on.

I think in special needs children and the fact that we all may have heard of some of the parents who have moved from the province because they feel that their children are not receiving the special needs educations that they should get. One of the individuals who was there, a very fine lady by the name of Constance Waters who, although she is now classified as a senior citizen, is working on her Masters in English. She is an individual who really does portray, from my perspective, the lifelong learning. She personifies lifelong learning, because that lady has never, ever stopped actively pursuing education—a fine person. When she said, you know, it is a real crime, because the Faculty of Education still does not have the mandatory special needs component in their curriculum, I told her that I had spoken with Dean Stapleton, the Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba, and was assured that they were trying very hard to introduce and to be sure that each student received some education in the special needs component, because all teachers must be able, if nothing else, to identify those students that need special needs education.

I can recall from my days as a post-secondary education educator with the licenced practical nurses that one of the things I felt very strongly about was that an LPN must know, must be able to identify that there is a problem. They did not necessarily have to know what to do about the problem, but if they are caring for a patient and they cannot realize, they do not know what the normal is so they cannot recognize the abnormal, that patients in Manitoba would be in big trouble.

I think the same thing is true for a teacher if they know what is normal, so that they can recognize what is abnormal and what will need to be treated. Maybe that teacher will say to himself or herself I am not capable of actually providing the teaching and the remedial work for this child, but I know that they need help, and I as a teacher know where to go to seek the help for this child. Then we have accomplished something. I think we are missing the boat with some of these young people in our province.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

The war on illiteracy—and there have been big, big bucks in this province to help fight this particular war that we all know is out there, but again I think we are missing the boat, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The dollar is not the only thing. The Government, the Tory side of the House thumps the table, talks, yells and screams about how the NDP squandered money. There is no doubt

in my mind that statement is true and that there was an awful lot of squandering. The examples are all over this province of how over the past NDP terms we have been placed more and more into debt, but you know, when we are sitting on the other side of the House in the next few years, I believe we are going to be able to say the same thing. Look at how the Tories have squandered money. Look at how the Tories have placed bucks into fighting illiteracy.

What do we have, Mr. Deputy Speaker? We have high school students—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education, on a point of order.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education): A point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) could possibly clarify her position, because just moments ago she advocated that we spend more money in Winnipeg No. 1, now she is saying we are spending too much money. I would like to know what position she really is taking.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has the floor.

Mrs. Yeo: The Minister of Education, obviously we have really struck a sore point and a nerve because he is becoming terribly defensive. He knows full well that at that point I was referring to the thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars that have been poured into a pot marked "illiteracy" but nobody quite knows what to do with the pot full of the thousands of dollars. They believe they have all kinds of marvellous ideas, but what are they having? They have high school students, potential high school graduates, who are dropping out of school because what they believe is that their part-time jobs are the most important thing for them. What is the point of going on and becoming educated adults? Who gives a darn? -(interjection)-

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mrs. Yeo: We have libraries, as the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is pointing out, libraries in the city that now have For Sale signs up on them because the doors have been shut and the books have been dumped on the floor and taken out of those particular buildings. There are all kinds of things that could be done and I certainly do not say that the bucks should not be used for illiteracy. I think there should be far better management and organization so that the dollars are well utilized and not utilized the way they have been.

There are a lot of problems with people in Manitoba—

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education, on a point of order.

Mr. Derkach: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is obvious that the Member has not looked at the list of programs that are being delivered in the province for illiteracy. I would certainly be more than prepared to mail her a copy of the list so she could be more informed when she stands up in the House to make her address.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank the Honourable Minister for that advice.

Mr. Lamoureux: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Inkster, on a point of order.

Mr. Lamoureux: On two occasions the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) has stood up on points of order knowing full well that they are not points of order. I would appreciate if he would stay in his seat and listen to the enlightening words. He might learn something.

An Honourable Member: That is sure not a point of order.

Mr. Lamoureux: That is a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has the floor.

Mrs. Yeo: I want to assure my honourable colleague across the floor that I have read with interest the list of those places that have received grants. I have also found that some of those places do not even exist yet, that there are some of those places that have no phone numbers and no building, but oh they will have. Yet they are down on that list having received grants. If the Minister wishes me to enlighten him somewhat I can share the list with him and share those places. I would give him some phone numbers and say, try and phone and see if you can find them because in fact there are some of those places that should receive the grants that do not exist.

* (1540)

I would like to go to the Speech from the Throne from May 18 and look at some of the promises that were made. The Government promises a White Paper that would be circulated; that certainly sounds interesting. That will help the education system be more accessible and more flexible. I believe yesterday the Minister made some statement about The Pas and how

we are going to make The Pas—get The Pas students at the level of the other students, which indicates to me that he is saying that the people in The Pas are receiving inferior education if he has to build them up so that they will become, their education system will become, more in tune with what is received in the urban area.

When the Lieutenant-Governor read the Speech from the Throne and there were statements about state-of-the-art distance technologies, et cetera—and it was at that very time that the MCALC was closed down although I believe it is operating now, but the consortium run by the Government was closed—there was an ideal opportunity perhaps to utilize the program that was in place and to enhance some of the program, some of the Canadian content programs that were in place, and we missed the boat there.

The Skills Training Advisory Committee, we are still waiting for the responses from that particular committee, but I am glad it was put into place. There were a lot of things that were mentioned in the throne speech and I think the White Paper on education is probably the one that we will be watching for very soon.

A while ago there was a release on radon action and the testing for radon, and I would hope that when it comes to the school systems that the schools will also have some radon testing. There have been some reports that indicate perhaps some problems with the levels of radon and I think that the air quality in the schools should be of prime importance. There were a lot of questions that I had hoped that I would be able to ask and unfortunately the concurrence debate did not take place.

The other concern that has come across my desk, and I know it has come across the Minister of Education's (Mr. Derkach) desk with great frequency, particularly since the announcement by the federal Government, is the impact of the 3 percent administration fee which will be applied to all student loans starting in August of 1991. If in fact we believe that the student of today will be the future citizen for tomorrow—I mean that is a fact—if we believe that we, as certainly the legislators and the key communicators, et cetera in this province, should be encouraging our young people to continue throughout their school years to become high school graduates and then to go on to community colleges or universities around our province, in fact, around our country. If we believe that, should we not be doing more to assist those young people to attain these enhanced educational opportunities?

Various people are saying they are putting a floor at \$6,000-earning for students, and there are not very many students who make more than \$6,000.00. It is very difficult for a young person to try and go to university and get a summer job that will pay them a substantial amount. My own children are delighted to get somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3,000 or \$4,000 over the summer. If they in fact want to take some courses at intercession when they are going to university, or take a course or two at summer school to assist them in either speeding up their degree or lightening the load somewhat, because some of these

Thursday, March 1, 1990

students have a very, very heavy load. I would hate to have to be in their shoes. That then takes away from their opportunities to find employment that will put them up at a decent level.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

At the same time as the federal Government is saying, we are going to pull back on funding for post-secondary education to the provinces, they can do their own thing and we will just move out of that or cut way back—at the same time, very likely tuition fees will have to go up. So the students are caught in the middle. They are really stuck in a real bind when it comes to the rebates on loans that they are hoping to get.

Students from the Red River Community College Student Association, students from the University of Manitoba Student Association and students from Brandon College have all said, what are we going to do. We need help. What are the proposals? What innovations will this Government put forward to assist us?

It is a real crime. It is a real slap in the face I think to young students who are looking for encouragement in this day and age, who may say, what good does a university or a community college degree do me, because the jobs are not out there anyway so I might as well quit school and to heck with finishing high school. I might as well just leave school and not worry about plugging away and all the problems that are associated with university education.

I also had hoped that I would get a chance to ask the Minister a little more on affirmative action, the affirmative action policies within his own department, on the decentralization. I was curious to know to what extent the department is decentralized. What are the plans for decentralization? What kind of assistance is there going to be? What sort of decision-making will be used to decide which areas decentralize? What would the cost saving or the cost be? What kind of a staff would be needed in the various locations for different spots, what supervisory versus clerical, et cetera, what opportunities for women, for minority groups.

I also wanted to touch base a little more strongly on the cradle-to-grave idea of education, because I do believe that education is a lifelong process, that those people who are actively seeking opportunities in education throughout their lives—various kinds of education, it does not always have to be the more formal types of education—these are usually when we will find the people who are happier.

I believe people who are learning forever and people who are contributing and are doing things for other people all their lives are the ones who do have more satisfying types of lives. I think it is up to us to try and enhance the opportunities so that they are available.

What are we doing? Well, if an adult wishes to return to school and take upgrade to maybe complete their high school that they had not been able to complete as in the normal process going from Grade 10 to 11 to 12—maybe something stopped them, as in the case of my father who had to leave school in the beginning of Grade 9 because he had three younger brothers

that he was responsible for. He left school for four years, but he was able to go back and complete his high school, and then on to university and complete university.

There are people today who have the same problems. If these adults, at the age of 25, 30, 40, 50 want desperately, it has been a void in their lives—and you will talk to people who will say, you know, one of my biggest concerns is that I have never completed high school, so they want to go back to school. If they go back during the day, the school can claim them. They can in fact be included in the enrollment of that particular school. It does not cost the individual, the adult, anything other than time and the opportunity to work during the day, anyway.

If, on the other hand, they have a day job and they want to go back in the evening, No. 1, it is often very difficult for them to find Biology 200 or Chemistry 301, or whatever they want to take as an evening school course, certainly at the local high school, but will also cost them. There is a cost factor there, and I am wondering if that really is fair to the people in our province. I know that we could be accused of, there the Liberals go again—spend, spend, spend, but I would say there is perhaps some method that could be used to make this fairer.

* (1550)

In the Scratching River Post, which I read when it comes across my desk every week, and I enjoy it—one of the best community newspapers, I think, that we find on our desks in the province. The one in which the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness) was stated as saying that he was just waiting for the April-May election to occur. In this same Scratching River Post, this one from July of 1989, the headline is that adult education course enrollment is on the increase. In fact, that is true throughout the province, not just in the area of the circulation of the Scratching River Post. That is true, and I think that is very admirable. I think it is an area that we could be looking at with greater fervor and increasing and enhancing our attention to the various needs for adult learners.

There are a lot of ways in which this could be done. The distance education, although I would have to say I am pleased with some of the aspects of the distance education, there still are training inequalities—urban versus remote areas. I do not mean The Pas necessarily. I mean even more remote areas than The Pas, because The Pas is a good city. The distance education can be enhanced by utilizing the technologies that we have today to a much greater extent. I think there is still some fear, some people who withdraw when they see computers and they see the video machines. They are a little intimidated by the machinery that is around. A lot of people are also intimidated by the Tory machinery, but that is beside the point.

I think we have to realize too, and it was something that is taught in the adult education certificate course, that adult learners learn differently than young people learn. The approaches have to be different. One cannot just take the way that a teacher teaches a child and

Thursday, March 1, 1990

then transfer that to a person who is a little larger, sitting perhaps in a bigger desk, because adults learn at a different rate and different methods can be utilized.

One thing I found as an adult educator was that when you have an adult sitting at a desk, they are usually there because they choose to be there. They are not there because mom or dad says that they have to go to school because they went to Grade 4 last year and hopefully they will go to Grade 5 this year. That is probably a poor example because the Grades 4 and 5 are still fairly enthusiastic. By the time they hit Grades 8 and 9 their enthusiasm is waning and there may have to be a bit of a push and a shove out the door to get some of the students to go, certainly not the case with the fine young people we have as Pages in our building, but with some of the students that I have spoken with. We have to enhance the programs that are available for adult educators so that they may in fact pick up on the different methodology that is so important for teaching adults.

We are hearing more and more, and I think it is really very unfortunate, that industries are saying, we are finding that we have to have classrooms available to teach some of our workers, because there is an increase in illiteracy because the school system in Manitoba has not fulfilled its obligation and in fact its statement of philosophy and belief and objectives. Falconbridge, Dofasco and some of the other areas are saying, we have to do some of our own teaching. I certainly like the idea of having co-operation between the world of education and the world of business. I think that is a good thing.

I do not want the world of business to be the place where all remedial work is done. I do not think there should be such a need for remedial work. I would like to see better work done in our public and independent schools throughout the province so that when our young people go on to post-secondary education or go on to the world of work that the people who are employing them do not find that they have to re-educate them on the basics.

There are some of these areas where they are finding that young people have not been given the appreciation for nutrition, which I mentioned earlier, the appreciation for more active lifestyles, the need for some sort of daily routine more than sitting at a desk or a bench. Getting up from the desk or bench and walking a few feet to a car and then walking a few feet from the car to the chesterfield creates, I believe, earlier deaths for younger people. I think that is something that the education system could be demonstrating.

It is unfortunate that there are people who go to work for Great-West Life who say, you know, I never thought about some sort of daily activity like that. Perhaps it depends on the home situation as well, and it depends on whether they see mom or pop sitting in front of the TV and that is all the exercise they get is in pressing the remote button and changing the channels.

The Winnipeg Education Centre is the other area. I do not know whether it is unparliamentary to talk about your own absence from the Chamber, but I was away for a couple of days. I may have missed the

announcement about the Winnipeg Education Centre, but none of my colleagues have filled me in to say that in fact it is going to receive the \$50,000 that it might have lost if the decision was not made by February 28, 1990, which happens to be yesterday.

So I hope the \$50,000 that the Education Centre was promised has not fallen through the cracks and the very cracks that are found in the floors at the current Winnipeg Education Centre, because there is a new site that has been waiting dormant for two to three years now. The people involved with the Education Centre have been quite expectant and hoping that a decision would be reached. There was a fairly hefty study done to support the need for that particular centre, and there are concerns.

I have just received a report from the University of Manitoba talking about Native students in Manitoba universities, the higher education for Native students at Manitoba universities. The Quest for Equal Access, it is entitled. I have not had the opportunity to read it thoroughly, but I have glanced through it. I do agree with the statement that the minority groups are under-represented in higher education, both at the student and at the staff levels at all our education sites.

* (1600)

There is a desperate need in our province for effective role models by our aboriginal peoples. There is a desperate need for the general public to change the perception that may well be out there. There are some very fine young Native people, very fine old Native people as well, and they on their own reserves in their own communities, the elders that many of us have met are a tremendous example for the people coming up through the forces.

If in fact 42 percent of the Winnipeg No. 1 School Division are Native individuals or 42 percent of Natives in the province is a better way of wording it, are in the Winnipeg No. 1 area, we have to do something. We have to take an aggressive step to see that students throughout our province have more Native leaders. I do not know whether I agree.

We have not discussed in caucus whether we agree with Judge Murray Sinclair's idea that there should be Native schools. I believe even more emphatically, I am sure as compassionately as he believes what he believes, I think that there should be more Native teachers throughout our community, not just teaching Native students, but we have to show the non-Native individuals that Natives can do jobs such as teaching, be bankers, be secretaries, waitresses. I do not have the list of the top positions, but I know electrical engineers were one of them and chefs was another. I think that we should give these young people the opportunity to be good role models in our province. I think they are crying for it. The Winnipeg Education Centre is one outstanding facility. Granted it does not just teach our Native population, but there is a high number in the student ratio of Native students.

I am running out of time. I have a few papers left, but I know that Bill 100 is coming, and I will look forward to my opportunity to debate Bill 100. Thank you.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

COMMITTEE CHANGE

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Gimli, with his committee changes.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: McCrae for Gilleshammer.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to have this opportunity to speak on the appropriation Bill. I think that I would be remiss if I did not start out by a few comments regarding the federal Budget and its implications to this province. I am not going to dwell on the areas that have been covered in some detail already, in other words the CAP, the equalization payments and the things of that nature, the funding to the established programs, and so on, because I think they have been adequately addressed. I think we know the serious implications that some of those decisions have had on the province as a whole.

Some of the things that are sometimes ignored is the fact that we have here in western Canada a very, very significant industry, and that is agriculture and the rural diversification, the rural programs that go along with that and the implications that the budget has to the continuation of that part of our economy and the importance that it has to western Canada.

We have already, Mr. Speaker, lost a great deal in terms of the federal Government's cutbacks on support to the agriculture sector. We have lost things such as the two-price wheat system some time ago. We are now seeing the loss of the advance payments on stored grains. They used to be interest free. Now they are interest bearing. We have seen the reduction in the rebates on the excise tax for fuel and so on. So there has been a gradual decline in the type of support that is coming from the federal Government to prairie agriculture.

With this federal budget we are seeing some more changes that on the surface may not appear to be that detrimental, but one that certainly concerns me is the reduction of three-quarters of a billion dollars in the Canada Crop Drought Assistance Program. Now this, one can infer, is being removed because there is no need for drought payments, but we have to remember that to date the only drought payments that have been made are those for 1988. I have tried to convince Members opposite, and to what extent I can, my colleagues from our side of the Opposition, the five Members of Parliament from Manitoba, that we do have a serious drought in Manitoba or did have in 1989.

I am satisfied that I have convinced the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), because obviously he is very aware of the situation, not only being a Minister of the Crown, but also being a farmer.

I am sure many Members opposite, including the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey), who lives in that part of the province, knows the situation as well if not better than I do in southern Manitoba at the present time.

We have a very, very dry situation there. We have seen the Premier of Saskatchewan already indicate that he feels he needs something in the range of a billion dollars in order to compensate for the drought in Saskatchewan in 1989.

The figure for Manitoba for last year for 1988 drought payments was something in the order of \$154 million. While I hope that is not the level that is required in 1989, there still is a significant amount of drought compensation required in southern Manitoba.

It concerns me, Mr. Speaker, that the federal Government appears to be prepared to support prairie agriculture through a contingency fund. In that contingency fund that Mr. Wilson has for the so-called emergencies that arise, he in his wisdom reduced it from something in excess of \$3 billion to \$1.2 billion.

There is not a great deal of money in that contingency fund. One can only infer from this that if a decision is made to come up with a drought payment for western agriculture for the crop in 1989 that the federal Government is assuming that the province is going to assume a large proportion of that cost. In other words we are seeing the continual offloading of what I regard as federal responsibilities onto the provincial treasuries. This can only go so far.

It is rather amusing from this side of the House to notice that this House, when we are talking about federal issues, has three Opposition Parties. Every Party in this House gets up and attempts to criticize the federal Government.

This must become a little embarrassing after awhile because the Members opposite I would think in their caucus must be considering the possibility of a change of name. I am not sure how they can stand up here on a daily basis and criticize the federal Government and then still call themselves Progressive Conservatives.

Somewhere along the line they are going to have to consider divorcing themselves from the federal Government or in fact agree, as we do over here, that there is nothing that they can do about it because a Tory is a Tory is a Tory and obviously they are not having much influence on their Tory colleagues.

It would appear to me that this Government, despite their protestations, is having very little impact on their federal cousins. There is not much happening that I can say is reflecting the impact that they have on their cousins in Ottawa. I think as time progresses we will see them gradually approach the popularity that their federal cousins have, which I gather is somewhere around 19 percent at the present time. I would suggest to them that they may well be at the peak of their popularity and I would suggest that they are probably going to ask their Premier (Mr. Filmon) to draw up a writ very soon because things are certainly not going to get any better for them.

The other thing that one looks at when you are looking at the federal impact on the provincial Government of

Thursday, March 1, 1990

course is the GST. Here we have a Government in Ottawa which started off saying, we are going to give you a 9 percent goods and services tax, and they carried on with that 9 percent until that had us convinced that the 9 percent was something that we could not tolerate, and then they said, well we will reduce it down to 7 percent, and everybody felt a tremendous amount of relief.

They still have to convince me that there is a necessity for that 7 percent. They also have to convince me that 7 percent coming from the federal level is not going to be identified as 14.49 percent tax when you start looking at the combination of the provincial and the federal tax with the cascading that goes with it.

The general sales tax of course, the one beauty that it has I suppose for the federal Government is while it starts off at 7 percent, one has no guarantee that it will not be 9 or 12 or something even higher than that as time goes by. Many of these issues which the federal Government has brought about obviously have to be very embarrassing to the provincial Conservative Government.

* (1610)

I want to spend a little time, Mr. Speaker, on the agricultural issues per se because here again we, on the Liberal side, have been accused of spend, spend, spend and the Brink's truck and all the rhetoric that comes from the other side, but I am still very concerned, and I am not telling them to spend more, I am telling them to look at their priorities. I am very concerned, and I will address this directly to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) who is a farmer by profession. I think it is unrealistic for the Conservatives to stand up and tell us that agriculture is the backbone of our economy and then find the generosity to come up with 1.86 percent of their budget to support agriculture, 1.86 percent of the budget to support the backbone economy of this province. It ends up being a relatively weak backbone.

One can argue, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just agriculture. We should look at rural development as well. Well, if we take rural development and combine that with the amount that is made available through agriculture, we end up with a grand total of \$146 million which comes to 3 percent. So you combine the two departments, agriculture and rural development, and you still have roughly 3 percent, a tremendous, generous approach to the rural economy, and these people stand up and say how strong they are in terms of their support for rural Manitoba and they go out and pontificate about the importance of agriculture to the economy and they come up with the generosity of 3 percent to support this part of our economy. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to be convinced that this is the type of support that agriculture needs.

An Honourable Member: Blame it on Bonnie, it is her culture

Mr. Laurie Evans: Well, I am not going to tell you how to establish your priorities, but do not tell us that every time we tell you that there should be something done

that it is spend, spend, spend. It is a case of management and establishing the right priorities, and I am trying to convince the rural Members on that side that agriculture and rural diversification, rural development need some more support.- (applause)- I am pleased to see that the Members opposite agree, and many of those Members who are rural Members know southern Manitoba better than I do, but I know southern Manitoba relatively well from having spent 32 years in the Faculty of Agriculture and I suspect that I may well have been on more farms than most of the farmers opposite through my profession over those years.

We have had farmer co-operators with our experimental programs for many years, including I might add, a very good co-operator in our programs with the current Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) who has plots on his farm that we have visited on many occasions over the years. So I have no problem with the fact that there are many good farmers in Manitoba, many of them that are not in serious financial trouble, but we have a large number who are facing financial trouble and I think that it is a shame every time we see another family farm disappear from Manitoba. Now we cannot expect to save them all, but I think it is imperative that this Government look at ways and means of attempting to be more supportive of the family farm and the retention of the family farm because I am not convinced that there are many so-called poor managers left out there. I think the poor managers in the rural areas have disappeared long past and those that are out there now are suffering consequences which may be even management would not do a great deal about because they are in situations that are beyond their own control.

I want to be as positive as I can be this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, because I think that we are in a situation where agriculture is in a relatively desperate situation, and one can say, well, if the rain starts things will change. I can tell you that I would love to see two, three, four, five or six inches of rain and that would result in a great change in the rural economy and the rural picture in a hurry.

One, I think, would be naive, when you are in a drought cycle, to assume that it is likely to change. As any weatherman will tell you, if you want to gamble on the weather, the safest thing to say is that tomorrow it will probably like today. I think we have to be very positive. We have to be optimistic but at the same time, I think, have to bear in mind that we are in a drought cycle. We may not see the improvement that we are hoping for. I think we have to be ready for that.

This brings me to some of the programs that have been initiated. I want to be positive about some of those programs, because I do think they are steps in the right direction. One that I want to talk about briefly is crop insurance. Here we have a program which is a good program. It is a program which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) has certainly supported, one that he advocates and one that I would support him in that regard, because I think it is imperative that farmers utilize this program to the best of their ability. I am satisfied it has worked reasonably well in terms of the cereals and the various grain crops.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

I am somewhat more critical when it comes to the livestock feed security program, because that, while it was intended to be a good program, was a virtual fiasco last year. There has been some modification of it this year, which has improved it a little bit, but we still see a lot of farmers who are not convinced it has served the purpose they hoped it would. That is situations where either through poor advice they did not take the type of coverage they should have, or they did not understand the situation adequately and did not get the type of support they had anticipated.

I think there is room for some modifications in there. Obviously the thing that is most important with the livestock feed security program is that the modules that are used for the monitoring have to be reduced in size so they are much more representative of all those that fall within a particular module. I think it is clear from what has happened to date that most of those modules, be they municipal or the soil classification polygons, are still too big to really be adequate for the individual circumstances that arise. Obviously the best procedure would be if they could be done on an individual farm basis. The practicality of that may rule it out, but obviously it needs to be reduced down to something that is more appropriate in terms of reflecting the situation on the individual farm units. Likewise, I still think there are some problems in terms of the forage crop coverage. This is one that we have not had enough experience with to really have ironed out all of the wrinkles. I think there needs to be some additional work on that.

(Mr. Neil Gaudry, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

This is a good program, one that needs to be supported. The one criticism I have of it and one disappointment that I have with the crop insurance program is that once again the federal Government has offloaded a portion of their responsibility. It used to be, prior to this year, that the crop insurance was 50 percent covered by the premiums paid by the producer, 50 percent covered by the premiums paid by the federal Government and only the administrative costs covered by the provincial Government.

Now we have a situation where the farmer still pays his 50 percent, but the federal Government only pays a quarter, and the provincial Government pays a quarter, so here we have a direct offloading of what I feel were federal responsibilities onto the province. It may well be that we would have been better off to have gone to a true tripartite system where the farmer paid a third, the province a third and the federal Government a third. At least the farmer would have been relieved of some of the cost in that manner.

I think this is a situation where there should have been an opportunity, Mr. Acting Speaker, for the three prairie provinces to have taken a unified stand and gone to the federal Government and said, this is the way we want it to be, rather than have the divide and conquer approach that appears to have been successful for the federal Government.

I want to touch briefly on some other aspects of the grain industry. I am concerned, Mr. Acting Speaker, with what is happening regarding the method of

payment. The method of payment of course is frequently referred to as the Crow benefit, the Western Grain Transportation Act being the Act that is the legislation that deals with this. Currently the payment of the Crow benefit is paid directly to the railroads. One can argue that this should be evaluated, and of course it is under evaluation at the present time. The federal Government has established a task force which is looking at the grain transportation system, but I get the impression, when I listen to what is going on at the federal level and to a lesser extent in the province, that the decision may well have already been made.

My suspicion is that Don Mazankowski and his colleagues in Ottawa have already made their decision that the method of payment is going to be paid directly to the producer. Now, many producers in Manitoba, I am satisfied, feel that this is appropriate, but I am not convinced that the provincial Government has taken the necessary steps to make sure that Manitoba is not left in a lurch on this one, because for those who do not follow this closely, the method of payment is based entirely on the distance that the farmer is from either the West Coast terminals or the terminals at Thunder Bay.

* (1620)

For those farmers in the eastern Prairies, the additional cost from taking that grain from Thunder Bay to the Atlantic port, is pooled across all of western Canada. If that is not taken into consideration when the decision is made to pay the producer, it could well be that Manitoba producers will find themselves responsible for the total cost of the movement of their grain right from their farm in Manitoba through to the Atlantic port, because the majority of Manitoba grain would move eastward as opposed to going to the terminals in Vancouver or Prince Rupert. If that has not been clarified and has not been taken into consideration, then Manitoba producers well could be the losers on a method of payment change to where the producers are supported.

I think, in addition to that, while to date the transportation has been based strictly on distance, it did not matter whether you were on a branch line or a main line, if you were a specific distance away from the terminals, your cost for moving the grain was exactly the same. With the change in the method of payment, we are going to be looking at a situation where those producers who are on branch lines are going to have to pay a lot more to move their grain than those that are on the main lines. If that has not been taken into consideration, then those on the branch lines in the more remote parts of the province are certainly going to be in a disadvantaged position.

I think in this case, while I may be proven wrong and I hope I am proven wrong, I suspect that Manitoba got into this a little bit too late. The consultation process with producers started in January and was completed on February 1, whereas those consultations in the other two prairie provinces were started and completed much earlier. It is my suspicion that Saskatchewan and, particularly, Alberta and the Peace River region of British Columbia are having more impact on the decision of

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Mazankowski than Manitoba is. I hope that I am wrong, but I suspect by the time Manitoba makes a decision and submits their recommendations to Mazankowski, he will have already made his decision.

I have attended one of those meetings that were held with the reports from the consultant Deloitte Haskins & Sells. I am satisfied, and I want to give the Minister credit and certainly the consultant from that company. I think they did an admirable job in attempting to provide a balanced view of the pros and cons of the different types of alternatives that are available for the method of payment change, but I would have preferred it had that occurred and had we been leading the pack, so that Alberta and Saskatchewan could look at what we had done rather than us having to look at what they have already decided before our consultations were initiated. So this is certainly a concern.

Another area that I want to dwell on is what is happening with the so-called grain industry when it comes to the value added components. Now, when I was a kid on a farm in western Saskatchewan, it was common for virtually every town to have its own little flour mill. What that meant was that you take your grain in, which so-called grist would be taken in, it would be milled and you would come back to the farm with your own flour in probably 100 pound bags, and so on. Well, that has disappeared and probably rightfully so. Then we moved on to the idea that we were going to have value added in our grain industry, and it is particularly galling to me to see that we have a very sophisticated oil crushing facility in western Canada—seven different plants, three of them which are virtually shut down at the present time, and the two in Manitoba, namely the one at Altona and the one at Harrowby, working on essentially a half schedule.

What is happening in this case is that, because of our tariff structure and some other anomalies, it is much more economic to move canola out of this province into North Dakota and see it crushed in Velva, North Dakota, to meet the American oil market than it is for us to crush that seed in Altona or Harrowby and move the oil into the American market. So here we have facilities essentially sitting idle, which should be value-added, which are not being used because of peculiarities in our tariff and duty structure.

This, to me, Mr. Acting Speaker, is a move in the opposite direction. At one time we milled flour and exported flour. We crushed canola and exported oil. We are reverting back to the point where everything is going out of this province in its whole state. I am not blaming the provincial Government or anyone else, specifically, on this, but there is something wrong. I am not claiming that I have the answer to that, but if we are going to move to the value-added and the increasing jobs and whatnot that are required in rural Manitoba, that has to be turned around. It is critical.

An Honourable Member: That is why we . . . final offer selection.

Mr. Laurie Evans: Well, these are, I think, unrelated issues, very unrelated issues, unless the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) is attributing our problems

to the cost of labour. This is a possibility, and maybe he would like to elaborate on that some time in the future.

Likewise, Mr. Acting Speaker, we are running into similar problems in the livestock industry, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) was kidding me when I was talking about hog cycles and the question in Question Period today, but I think even the Minister of Finance will be concerned about the status of the meat industry in Manitoba. Here we have an industry, and Manitoba was one time referred to as the Chicago of the North because we were the centre of the meat packing industry in western Canada. That is no longer with us.

We are to the point now where we cannot even keep one cattle or beef production facility going. We have only got one major one left and that is the Burns plant in Brandon, and they are not operating at full capacity because we do not have the fed livestock for slaughter that are available to them in a manner by which they could compete. So we now have a beef industry that is based almost entirely on the cow-calf operation where the farmers produce the calves, many of them are sold at weaning time, and where do they go? They go either east to Ontario, west to Saskatchewan or Alberta, or they go south of the border. The amount of processing of beef that takes place in Manitoba is not even enough on most occasions to satisfy the Manitoba and Northern Ontario requirement.

The reason I asked the questions of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) today is that I fear the same thing is starting to show up in the hog industry. Now I have been criticized by Members opposite for being somewhat critical of what happened at the Springhill Farms plant in Neepawa where we moved from a killing-and-cutting plant to strictly a killing plant. So now all they do up at Neepawa is take the hogs in, butcher them, and the whole carcasses are shipped directly to Montreal. Then they are processed at the Olympia plant in Montreal, and where do they go, Mr. Acting Speaker? Apparently they go right back over the top of us on their way to Japan. The logistics would tell me that it would make a lot more sense if a deal could have been struck where that plant at Neepawa, rather than being reduced from a killing-and-cutting to simply a killing plant, had been increased so that it was killing, cutting and processing, with that product going overseas to Japan, if that is where the best market is.

Now we learn in data from the Minister's own department that we are not even producing enough hogs to satisfy the local packing industry requirement in Manitoba. What is happening there is in this past year, 250,000, and I want to repeat that figure, 250,000 weanling pigs left this province to be fed to finishing either in Saskatchewan or Alberta or south of the border. The weanling producers, the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) says, fine.

An Honourable Member: What were they saying?

Mr. Laurie Evans: They were saying that they are quite happy to have that, but -(interjection)- One year ago they were in a depressed situation over this. They have

found a market, Mr. Acting Speaker. The weanling producers have gone and found themselves a market outside the province, but if the Minister's own figures from his department are correct, they are saying that we lost \$13 million in terms of value added component in this past year on not being able to fully utilize our pork processing capacity in this province. So something is going wrong.

I think that we have to look at that very seriously to find out what it is exactly that is going wrong, because otherwise we are moving into the situation once again where we produce the raw commodity, ship it out, and provide the job-creating capacity in some other jurisdiction. This is detrimental; in fact, it could be devastating to the rural economy unless this is turned around.

Now there are many areas that I would like to dwell on this afternoon, Mr. Acting Speaker, but time obviously is only going to permit me to touch on some of those that I feel are the most critical. I want to talk a little bit about the whole concept of the safety nets. I have talked briefly about the crop insurance, but I think what we need in western Canada is a system of safety nets that guarantee farmers a reasonable return on their investment, a reasonable return on their labour, and one that provides the stability that I feel they deserve in rural Manitoba.

* (1630)

I am hoping that the federal Minister who has established a task force looking at safety nets will come up with a procedure that will do many things. First of all, it will guarantee farmers a reasonable return on investment. It will guarantee them some return on their labour, because I think that even those farmers that are doing what we call "reasonably well" at the present time, when you go out and look at a good farmer today, it is not uncommon to see him with a capital investment in his land, and his property, and his facilities ranging anywhere from a half a million dollars up to probably \$2 million, \$3 million in many cases.

If you were to look at that as a normal investment by anyone else, and we will just use the argument that he has a million dollars invested, in today's market you would expect that he is going to find something in the range of \$120,000 or \$130,000 just as a return on that investment. They are not getting that on their investment, Mr. Acting Speaker. They are not getting that on their investment, and they are virtually providing their labour and managerial skills for nothing.

So they may be doing all right in terms of not having to go and borrow money. They may be able to put the goods on the table and do the things that they would like to do, but they are certainly not getting the return on the investment that they would if they were in any other business. So in many respects, farmers in western Canada have been subsidizing all the rest of us for a long, long time through the concept of the cheap-food policy. I have no concern whatever in justifying the support that is given to the farmers when I am talking to an urban audience. I think the urbanites have been subsidized by the investment and the hard labour of

the farm community far too long, and it is time that this was turned around.

I think there is a major educational process that is required so that the urbanites understand where their food comes from and they do not think that it just originates in Safeway or SuperValu which seems to be fairly common in many parts of urban Manitoba.

My colleague from St. Norbert says settle down, but I think including himself, there are a lot who could learn a lot more about food production, where it comes from. While I am satisfied that he realizes that chocolate milk does not come from a brown cow, there are others that need a little more education than that to have a good understanding what goes on in the rural communities.

I want to dwell briefly on the whole concept of diversification, because this is one of the flagstones that the Government here has utilized as saying that is what we have to do, and that is, lip-service has been given to diversification for a long, long time. I think that it is critical that we look at diversification, because we tend to look for scapegoats all the time.

When we talk about the grain industry the first thing that people say is, oh, this is all due to the trade war between the European economic community and the United States with its export enhancement program. This certainly is part of the problem, but the other problem that we have to start to face up to is that perhaps—and I am underlining perhaps—those markets are no longer there for the traditional commodities that we have produced in this country.

We have to, I think, start to look at what is the market that is out there, and produce for the market rather than produce and assume the market is there. I just want to use a couple of illustrations, and I hope these will be taken to heart. I have spoken to people who have convinced me, and I think that they have a good point that here in western Canada, for example—and I am going to revert back to the livestock industry—we have dropped from being No. 1 supplier of pork to Japan to No. 4. We have been superseded by China, Taiwan and the United States. We used to be No. 1.

I asked him why is this? Why are we not supplying the Japanese market the way we used to and they said, and they said it bluntly, you are too stubborn to change. We do not like the way that you grade your hogs. What you call a No. 1 is not what we want. We want something that is 20 or 30 pounds heavier, has more fat on it, and you are not prepared to supply that to us.

The same thing, the Japanese are now, through their tariff structure, opening up the country for the importation of beef, and beef is becoming a major commodity over there. Here again, Mr. Acting Speaker, they do not want our A1 and our A2 grades. They want something that has more fat on it, a softer fat and things that satisfy their housewife. If we are not prepared to modify what we produce so that it satisfies their market, then we have a very tough educational process ahead of us if we are going to try and convince them that what they like is not good for them and that they should like what we have available to provide them.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

This is a big issue, and I think we have to start to think in terms of supplying the specifics of a market rather than producing something and assuming the market is there. We have to wake up to this fact very quickly or we are going to be left behind.

I think we also have to be concerned that we are seeing major changes in eastern Europe. Those countries have not produced to their capacity in recent years, but with the change in Government in there, it well could be that in a little while they will not be importers of our product, but they will be competitors. We are going to have to look at a lot of these things in order to determine what would be the type of diversification that should be possible in western Canada in order to maximize the returns to the rural economy.

I am going to comment briefly, Mr. Acting Speaker, on the concept of decentralization, because I think that the Liberals have been put in a somewhat bad light in terms of the comments that have been construed by our concern with decentralization. We support decentralization. I think it is something that is critical; real decentralization is essential. We have to get some of these Government departments out of Winnipeg and into the rural communities.

The thing that I feel is critical is that they have to be done in a manner which is realistic. The thing that was wrong with the first statements that were made on decentralization by this Government was that it came out as a blanket statement that 500 jobs out of the 8,000 would be moved into rural Manitoba. There did not seem to be any plan to it. One could assume that every 16th person coming in the door as a civil servant was to be told that you are one that has to go in order to get the 500 out of the 8,000. I think it should have been done in a much more humane fashion. Identify the departments that are going to be decentralized, and the sections within those departments.

The other thing to me that is critical is that when they are decentralized they are decentralized in units that are somewhat autonomous and have some authority unto themselves. You do not want decentralization which means that you put two or three relatively subordinate positions out in a rural community that cannot make any decisions without getting back to their so-called principal in Winnipeg every time. It has to be large enough units so that they have some autonomy.

I am satisfied, Mr. Acting Speaker, that the decentralization of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation to Portage has worked well. I have not seen any major problems with the Water Services Board in Brandon; I think it works relatively well. So far, we have not had enough opportunity to see how well the so-called tripartite office in Portage is going to work. I have no major problems with those. I do have some question with taking three or four people and putting them out into a rural community and saying, well, this is decentralization. I think there has to be a little more rationale in going into the way in which it is done.

An Honourable Member: Will have a better quality of life out there on the farm with us You know that, Laurie.

Mr. Laurie Evans: I understand the quality of life, Mr. Acting Speaker, but the quality of life is only good if you are satisfied that you are doing the type of job that you expected you would do, and you are able to do it with some satisfaction and with some dignity.

An Honourable Member: It is pretty hard to backtrack, Laurie.

Mr. Laurie Evans: I have no intention of backtracking, Mr. Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz).

Finally, Mr. Acting Speaker, how many minutes have I got left? Five minutes. Well, I will try to utilize them to my best advantage then.

I want to talk about a couple of things that have been going on recently. One of them, of course, is the issue of research. I am satisfied that in the passage of Bills 28 and 29 last year we made a step in the right direction. I have had some criticism of it from the concept of opting in versus opting out. This was brought up in the committee meetings when this was discussed. I think that it would have been preferable had it been workable if you had an opt-in as far as these organizations are concerned rather than an opt-out. I think it is also realistic to think that many individuals including farmers are not apt to take the time and put the effort in that is necessary to join something, but if they are adamantly opposed to it they will take the initiative to opt out. I have no problems with the way in which this has been handled.

* (1640)

I am pleased, and I discussed this with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). He tells me that of the approximately 25,000 applications that have gone out for membership in CAP, approximately one-fifth of those have come back as opting out. He indicates to me that many of them are duplicates in the sense that there may be two, three or four individuals on the same farm who have received applications, and one or two of them have been turned back in because it just did not make sense to have three or four members of CAP all in the same household. I am satisfied that this is moving along reasonably well.

I do have some concern though, Mr. Acting Speaker, with the commodity groups that are now seeking membership with a view to having a checkoff. The reason that I have concern with that is that it seems to be going on at the same time as the Western Grain Research Foundation is anticipating looking for a national checkoff or at least a checkoff in western Canada for research purposes. I would hope that can be co-ordinated so that you do not have the duplication that would be there otherwise.

The other area that is always getting a lot of concern is the whole business of the environment. I am disappointed, very disappointed, Mr. Acting Speaker, that we have not had the announcement of the so-called National Centre for Sustainable Development. I think this is something that could have been sort of the flagship for Manitoba. I think it is something that should have been on its way to construction and to

Thursday, March 1, 1990

implementation at the present time. I am hoping that it is not being waved there as something that will come eventually. I am hoping that we will see an announcement on that very shortly, and I would hope that the Conservative Government would put pressure on their Tory colleagues in Ottawa to get this thing moving in a hurry. I am not sure that one cannot already be somewhat critical of it. It was announced a long time ago. It is not as though it was announced last week or last month. It was announced a long time ago. The federal Government has been very quiet on it, and as far as I can see, the provincial Government has certainly not exerted very much pressure.

Finally, Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to discuss an issue which I hope the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), perhaps other Members, will take as being something that I feel is symbolic and something that really does not create the right optics. That is the Manitoba Agriculture in the Classroom Program. I certainly do not disagree with the necessity of having agriculture available in the curriculum in the schools. What bothers me the most is the advertising that has gone out recently where they are requesting that people get involved and pay a membership fee into it, and then at the bottom, a tax-free number.

To me, this implies that we are looking at Agriculture in the Classroom as being something that is done almost on a charitable basis. It would seem to me that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) should get together and make sure that Manitoba Agriculture in the Classroom is treated as something that is a high priority, rather than something that the level of which it has attained in the classroom will be dependent on charitable donations from farmers in order to have it properly reflected.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) does not seem to quite understand it. I would more than happy to show him the type of advertising that is going out and why Manitoba Agriculture in the Classroom should have a tax deductible connotation to it which to me is a non-profit organization or a charitable type of an approach. I think that really creates the wrong optics as far as agriculture is concerned. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I could go on at length, but there will be another opportunity.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): Mr. Acting Speaker, I was pleased to come back and be able to speak on this Bill now. I notice that the Tories are now going to have to dip into their election slush fund perhaps before they intended to do so. That is unfortunate but it comes about because of their own action, their own inaction in fact of forecasting what was going on. They thought there was no tomorrow, that they would still get bundles of money from transfer payments, Inco and whatever. Now they have come to the reality of life. They can dip into the funds that they should have properly accounted for in the last fiscal year.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

My colleague for Fort Garry was talking. He mentioned the farming community. I notice the

Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) said that he might be able to teach some Liberals how to farm. I am sure for the record that the Liberals—

An Honourable Member: I take that back.

Mr. Rose: I am sure, for the record, that the Liberals in his riding, and all over Manitoba, would like to learn that the Tories do not think that they can farm at all.

An Honourable Member: I do not think that is possible. I take it back.

Mr. Rose: I knew you would like to take it back, Harry, because it is going to hurt you in the next election, because I want to tell you, there are lots of Liberal farmers out there and like us we are planting seeds. They will soon germinate and then you will see how we can cultivate and harvest a crop.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just want to establish whether the Honourable Member is threatening me on this side. It sounded like a threat to me, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister did not have a point of order. It was a dispute over the facts.

Mr. Rose: I wish he would have. I could have spoken again on it.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the last thing that I would do is put a threat to that Minister. I have known the Minister for good and bad for many years. It is well known I think that at one time I unfortunately was a Tory for several years, and therefore I know—and this is what they dislike about me, because they know that I know how their Party operates inside. They get disturbed when I tell them the truth, that the reason they never win elections is because they are too arrogant. You see it almost every day.

Mr. Speaker, so I am not misunderstood, most of the time I am not referring to the arrogance of the Members indeed but to the Party in general, how they take things for granted. They go into elections with the polls showing them in great shape. Through their Party organizations they seem to turn the public off. They do it election, after election, after election.

I perceived this several years ago, and I came to the conclusion that this Party, the PC Party, could not form Government for any length of time. As a matter of fact at the convention where the Tories, Sterling Lyon, torpedoed Sidney Spivak—one of the finest Manitobans ever to be in politics in my estimation—when they torpedoed him I said at that convention they will be four years at the most and then out, because their arrogance will be uncontrollable. Certainly for the first time in history that happened, and I was proven to be right. That is what turned me off.

Earlier than that what happened? We had Walter Weir in 1968 and '69 before the election, had some by-

Thursday, March 1, 1990

elections. He read the polls completely wrong, arrogantly went into election and then we had the most catastrophic thing happen to us in Manitoba that in my lifetime I never have seen happen.

At the time, I recall quite clearly, I was in Edmonton and I told people that I was talking, they said, how is the election in Manitoba going to go? I said, I think the NDP is going to win quite a few seats from us and this will be a good lesson for the Tories because they have been too smug—I do not want to use that word “arrogant” any more in this speech because it will become a cliché. I was so confident that the Tories would win a couple or three seats extra.

Let me say that Walter Weir is a decent fellow, but the Tories made a mistake in making him the Leader because he did not have the gut feeling to have power. Anyway, for one reason or another, I did not even follow the news that night, went to bed, rushed for the airport the next morning and as I passed the newsstand I see the results of the election in 1969, that the Party that I belonged to at that time was defeated, straight blunder and smugness, not reading what the people wanted. I said, what am I going to do? Am I going to go back to Manitoba, or am I going to stay in Edmonton and find a home here, because I knew that the inaction of the Tories, bringing a socialist Government into Manitoba was going to wreak havoc on us all. That prediction was also right.

* (1650)

So it was planning again. Now the Tories, they are saying things, for instance, that Liberals cannot farm. Well do the Tories have a monopoly on farming? That is an insult to the Liberal farmers. It was mostly in this country. My father was in the business of settling immigrants of all types, Ukrainians, Germans, not so much Hutterites, but Anglo-Saxons and people from Europe, all over the place, but it was basically, in the days of the Selkirk Settlers, that those people came and there was a great preponderance, as the Minister knows, of Liberals at that time who really broke the sod in this province and took down the forests and planted the Prairies here and became the first people in the breadbasket, but they overlooked the ability of these people.

Now I grant that in Manitoba, from an agricultural standpoint, and I have been in agriculture, was in most of my life and still take an interest in it, we have, in my knowledge of travelling from one end of this country to the other in agriculture and going to conventions, we have the finest, most dedicated, hard working farmers that exist, probably on this continent, but the Tories have always let them down, particularly when they are in Government. One of the ways they let them down was by letting their guard down, by being smug, thinking they could get by on their good looks or their laurels, and letting the socialists come in. What the socialists did is they copied the Tory ideas but made them worse even, and I will take an example.

If my memory serves me right, at one time—Mr. Speaker, there are cash crops and where a farmer can get cash very quickly in poor times is by raising

livestock. In livestock I mean all types of feeding, particularly broiler chicken, eggs, turkeys, hogs, cattle, but what did the Tories do when they were in power back in those days when I was in business? The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) knows full well what I talk about, that we said that here we have an element of all types, and I will give special consideration, if I could, to the Mennonites and the Hutterites so dedicated in this province to the production of livestock amongst other people. They were the principal producers of broiler chickens, turkeys and eggs at the time that I was in the business. What did the Tories do? They said, no, we will listen to the demands of Quebec, we will listen to the demands of Ontario because in Manitoba we can produce a better product cheaper and provide a cash crop for our farmers for their feed grains better than anybody else in this country, and nobody can dispute that. I dare them to dispute it. What did the Tories do? They said, no, we better make a deal with Quebec, over the objections of all the people like myself and other so-called professionals or people who were on the firing line and said, no, you cannot do it.

We have a viable industry here, but, no, when that Minister was the Minister of Agriculture, if I recall properly, it was he who allowed the introduction of marketing boards. He supported marketing boards. He did it, so now when he says there are jobs and his Party says there are jobs lacking in Manitoba, the reason is because of their actions back in the '50s and the '60s that put a cap on what we could do and let the rest of Canada take advantages, so today we do not have those cash crops. We are barely back to the point where we feed our own population here in Manitoba.

Look at the price of broiler chickens today? Look at how profitable the industry is?—the jobs that could be had through hatcheries, through the feed mills, not to mention the cash crop to the farmers. We do not have that any more, thanks to the Conservative Government who said they knew better than everybody else. They said we will collapse to the demands of Quebec, British Columbia and eastern Ontario, and we will put in marketing boards.

What happened? We eventually saw the closure of the Canada Packers processing plant, one of the most up-to-date poultry processing plants in Canada. The reason that we did it, because of the Tories' action and their policies during the 1950s and 1960s. That is why the jobs are not there and that is why Canada Packers—I will not even blame that one on the NDP, that was the Tories' fault because they limited the supply available for turkeys and chickens for those plants by instigating a plan when they knew very well that this was the most cost effective province and territory in Canada to be able to produce those cash crops, livestock.

The fact in those days, I have not heard the expression for a long time, we used to call turkeys and eggs—this is a new expression for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)—we used to refer to them, and I know the Minister of Agriculture, federal, at that time, Eugene Whelan, used to say all that these products are its feathers around grain.

They converted—I am sure that they are aware that a broiler chicken is the best feed converter of any animal by far. You can get some one pound of meat, and I apologize, I do not have the latest figures, but I would say that they are probably down to a point now of one pound of meat for every two pounds of feed put into the animal. That is a conversion rate of two to one. If I am out a little bit, I apologize, but it would not be very much. You can compare this with a conversion of hogs or cattle, it is an outstanding thing. You can see how valuable a crop this is, the turkeys and chickens, to the farmers of Manitoba and to get cash crops especially in those years where they have a lot of feed grains or they have a hard time internationally selling their grains.

It was the Tories, as I said before, who fought for marketing boards for Manitoba, encouraged marketing boards for Manitoba and that is why we are stuck with it. Some people may say I am hypocritical. Their rebuttal would be that I would be hypocritical because I ended up making a living from the Manitoba Egg Producers Marketing Board and as marketing director of the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency, but that is because they approached me. Of course, in the business I was at, they limited my ability to trade when those national schemes came into effect.

I could see that the production in this province of all items, including, by the way, the way that the Tory Governments collapsed to the national agencies of butter and milk and what have you, amongst other things. I could see the writing on the wall, and I did indeed work for them. I think that I am proud of the record that we did have in Manitoba in keeping the industry alive as long as we could and helping in the marketing of the product, the surplus eggs of all Canada, around the world from countries like Mexico, Venezuela, the United States and Germany. So that is the reason that I was there, but what happened then?

Here is where we can take a swipe at the NDP. They brought people in who knew more than the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who knew more than the Minister of Agriculture, guys like Red Bill—what is his name? Harry, Red Bill Jenkins, yes. Boy, did he do something to the agriculture industry in Manitoba! They gave him a free hand and he could bring in all the people—what do you call them, hippies in those days—and put them up and nobody next door knew who they were, but they ran agriculture in this country, in this province. What the Tories did on the sly—it just went down in a direct dive from there. At least I will say this much for the Tories, at least Red Bill—(interjection)—right and then they brought in Cass-Beggs and Cass Booy and all the bugs and boos you could get your hands on.

An Honourable Member: If it quacks like a duck, what is it? It is a duck.

Mr. Rose: It is a Tory. At least I will give the credit, Mr. Speaker, to these Tories. At least to some reasonable degree they let—and I think the previous Minister of Agriculture would be interested in this. At least he let the marketing boards and the commissions do their own thing, and indeed with some political help because it was their baby, never mind.

When these fellows to my left came into power, that was the end of it, because the marketing boards had no more say any more. It was they who travelled to Ottawa. It was they who travelled from coast to coast ahead of the marketing board people and ahead of the marketers. They spread their wisdom far and wide across Canada. They further scuttled the marketing system and consequently the growing system in Manitoba.

An Honourable Member: Bob, what is the number of the Bill you are on?

An Honourable Member: What difference does it make.

Mr. Rose: Whatever Bill we would speak on—the Minister of Finance asked, what Bill are we on? I want to say to you, in this House, in my observation for some 20 something months, it would not matter what Bill that we talked about, we would still find within that Bill and within the Government that “A word” again. It is typical of the Tories. They sit back there the same smug way. Again they are looking at the polls, and they are getting real smug and real cocky and saying, well, if only we could find an excuse to pull the plug on these babies, we would end up with 35 or 40 seats.

* (1700)

You know if they wait long enough and believe me there is no desire that I see in this Party, there is no desire in this Party, we are enjoying what you are doing. We are enjoying seeing what you are coming up against. We do not like it for Manitoba, but we will pick up the pieces when they fall. Maybe they will wait too long, and maybe even \$150 million to \$200 million will not be enough, because the people of Manitoba, like they always have, have realized, particularly during an election campaign, what the real ilk of the Tory Party is.

So when we go out in a smug manner and say, like the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) did, that Liberals in this country know nothing about farming—he did not say that exactly—but he said he could teach them farming with the implication that they knew little or nothing about farming. That is the smugness. They are trying to tell us something. What are they trying to tell us by that? Are they trying to tell us that the only people who can farm or know anything about farming in this province are Tories, card-carrying Tories, or people who support the Tory Party?

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely wrong. There are good, clever, hardworking farmers of all stripes, all nationalities, all ethnic backgrounds and certainly all political Parties in here. I would never hope that anybody in our Party would stand and say for instance like they had that any particular group—just take one group out of the whole bunch and isolate them and say, that group, we should someday sit down and teach them how to do this, that and the other, particularly farming.

It just shows you how far off base they are, and the people of Manitoba are never fooled, particularly at election time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thursday, March 1, 1990

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have 21 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' hour. Oh—the Honourable Government House Leader.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask Honourable Members if today we might agree to deal with four Bills, those Bills being Bill No. 16, Bill No. 91, Bill No. 95 and Bill No. 96, and if we should conclude consideration of those Bills, that then we might at that time call it six o'clock.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Inkster, with a committee change.

Mr. Lamoureux: I move, seconded by the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose), that Law Amendments be amended as follows: St. James (Edwards) for Radisson (Patterson); Springfield (Roch) for Inkster (Lamoureux); Seven Oaks (Minenko) for Fort Garry (Laurie Evans).

I move, seconded by the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Kildonan (Cheema) for Radisson (Patterson); St. Vital (Rose) for St. James (Yeo).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: As was proposed by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), I would remind the Honourable Government House Leader that he does not call the Bills during Private Members' hour. It would have to be the will of this House, if they so decided, to call those Bills in that order. Would that be agreed upon? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, that would be agreed upon. The only thing that I would request is that I would want to see 96 in particular be dealt with. If we are going to be dealing with all four Bills, I have no problem. If not, if we will only be dealing with two of them, I would like 96 to be a part of it too.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point raised, I believe Bill No. 16 was going to be called, 91, 95 and 96—in that order? The Honourable Government House Leader.

Mr. McCrae: I have reason to believe, unless some Honourable Members are going to prove me wrong, that all four of those Bills would be dealt with today.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Thompson, with committee changes.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): If I could make some committee changes, I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Member for Elmwood (Maloway) for the Member for The Pas (Harapiak); and the Member for Flin Flon (Storie) for the Member for Rupertsland (Harper).

I also move, seconded also by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows, the Member for Dauphin (Plohman) substituting for the Member for Churchill (Cowan).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Also, is it agreed upon that we will be doing Bill No. 16, 91, 95, 96, and when we are done with 96, we will be calling it six o'clock? Is that the will of the House? Agreed.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 16—AN ACT TO PROTECT THE HEALTH OF NON-SMOKERS

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), Bill No. 16, An Act to Protect The Health of Non-Smokers; Loi sur la protection de la santé des non-fumeurs, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Justice who has six minutes remaining, the Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me last time I discussed this Bill I was discussing general principles. Indeed those principles were so general that some Honourable Members wondered if I was speaking to the Bill. I can tell Honourable Members today that I intend to confine myself to the principles underlying Bill No. 16, standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, the Honourable Member for Concordia.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that despite the efforts of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) to distract me from the duty that I have before me, I will concentrate my comments on Bill No. 16.

Speaking on behalf of the Members on this side of the House, we would like to see this Bill passed at second reading and referred to a committee so that we might have a discussion, however lengthy or short; hopefully it would not have to be an extremely lengthy

Thursday, March 1, 1990

discussion because most of the things I see in this Bill are things that I, speaking for my colleagues, can agree with. Certainly the underlying intentions of the Honourable Member for Concordia are laudable intentions, and I think many Manitobans would thank him and all Members of this House for being supportive of this kind of measure.

I remember from my days in the City Council of the City of Brandon in dealing with a by-law to restrict the practice of smoking in public places in the City of Brandon, being part of that exercise and remembering that day and those days and the few short years since, I think of agencies like the Interagency Council on Smoking and Health and all of the good work that they and the lung and the heart and cancer people have all done to encourage Canadians to protect their health.

I have to say that not all Canadians have yet heeded all of the warnings. Not all Canadians have yet curbed their addiction to tobacco. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I think the approach that has been taken in latter years, more of an understanding approach, I think is going to be an approach that will work. On the other hand you also have to make it clear to those who maybe sometimes are not as mindful of the rights and comforts of other people, and maybe there needs to be something to remind them of their responsibilities as citizens. So I think I have used about as much time as I need.

At this moment, though, I would just indicate to the Honourable Member for Concordia that I have asked people in my department to review his Bill, and I would say that while there may be some inconsequential amendment that might come forward, I would seek the Honourable Members' support and the support of others to make this Bill better.

I am not saying that there is anything terribly wrong with the Bill. I am not saying that, but I am saying that for purposes of enforcement and whatever proceedings might be taken under this Bill, let us get it just right. The indications I have that any amendment I might be bringing forward would be extremely inconsequential in terms of the principle underlying the Bill, but it might even help in terms of the enforcement of the Bill.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

I would be happy, when I have my amendments ready, to share them with the Honourable Member and whoever wants to look at it from the Liberal Party, and approach this Bill with that kind of spirit, because this is the kind of Bill I think the people of the province will appreciate us all getting together and working on together.

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may take a few very short moments to put some of my own thoughts and comments on the record with respect to this Bill and to exercise my privilege as a Member of this House.

Firstly, let me say that in principle I am a great supporter of this particular piece of legislation, and I want to congratulate the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) for introducing it. I believe there are a few technical matters that perhaps can be improved upon

a little when it gets to committee. I am looking forward to those discussions.

The principle of this legislation is one that is long overdue. I am glad that we are having the opportunity to deal with this in this Legislature. I think for those of us of a little bit younger generation we all recognize very fully that society has changed a great deal in the last 10 or 20 years.

* (1710)

What was once very socially acceptable, a decade, even indeed five years ago, has now become to be very socially unacceptable. For us, as a Legislature, this particular piece of legislation has given us an opportunity to come together, I hope come together unanimously—three Parties in this House to do I think very much the right thing, to protect the health of Manitobans from indeed a problem that takes 32,000 lives in this country a year.

If we can contribute to the solution of this smoking problem in a small way by prohibiting smoking in so many public spaces, Mr. Deputy Speaker, then we, in this Legislature, have accomplished some good for the people of this province. So I am very pleased to lend my personal support to the Member for Concordia on this piece of legislation and congratulate him on this initiative.

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I too would like to just show my support for the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), who has brought forward this Bill.

Already, like the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) has indicated, we on this side do support the Bill, with possibly a few small modifications, but in general we do support it. Generally I oppose any legislation which infringes on any personal freedom of anybody. I think in this case, through education, it has been brought to our attention very seriously that this second-hand smoke is definitely detrimental to people.

It reminded me of this one person that went to see his physician and the doctor says, the best thing for you to do is to go on a diet and give up drinking and smoking. He says, well, what is the second best thing? I think in that case some people are not prepared at this point in time to maybe give up some of their habits.

I overheard two of my colleagues the other day. One was saying to the other one: Well I am going to give it up very soon, but I still do not quite have the willpower. I think though in time, and like I indicated before, through education this can be done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those few comments I again also want to support the Member for having introduced this Bill and do concur with it.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the chance to just say a few brief words on this Bill. I also congratulate and commend the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) for introducing this legislation. I think it is a real important thing that we, by education or whatever means, cut down the amount of smoking

Thursday, March 1, 1990

and use of tobacco in this country. I, myself, was a heavy user of tobacco products of almost every nature. I think I quit at four o'clock, December 26, 1964, in Tampa, Florida. I remember the date and how happy I have been.

On the other hand, we do have people who are addicted to it. They try their darndest to get away from the habit. I think I always try to have a most tolerant attitude towards these people and try to point out to them in as nice a manner as I can what it is doing to their health, particularly, young people. We have to keep striving at that, and like other things, be tolerant with it. I respect that some people smoke still. You see them holing up the aircraft, the washrooms, sneaking them in there. I think those people should be prosecuted, but I think that education is the key. I certainly wholeheartedly support this Bill and any efforts that will get people in Manitoba, in Canada, and indeed the world, to cut back on the use of tobacco products.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 91—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), Bill No. 91, The Public Health Amendment Act; (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé publique), standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey).

Is there leave to have the Bill remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No leave? The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe the Bill has, up until now, stood in the name of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) for me, so that I might have an opportunity to speak to this Bill.

It is already a matter of public record that we support the initiative of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) with this Public Health Amendment Act, Bill No. 91. I, as recently as earlier this afternoon, attempted to be in contact with the Honourable Member, but was unable to track her down to tell her that I would indeed be rising in my place today formally to put on the record my support for this Bill, but also to ask her about the coming into force section of the Bill.

I will put briefly on the record the concern I have there. There are some pretty hefty penalties in this Bill, and may I say rightly so, but I do believe also that there are an awful lot of retailers out there who may not be aware that this Bill has been passed and on Royal Assent, they all of the sudden, some people out there with some of these substances on their shelves are lawbreakers. I do not think we want to make

lawbreakers out of people who otherwise, if notified, would not be lawbreakers, so that I would hope that the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) and her colleagues and the other Members of the House would agree to a small amendment dealing with when the Act comes into force. I think the fact that I am standing on my feet supporting this legislation should be evidence of my bona fides in terms of wanting to get on with putting this legislation into effect.

Indeed, last June, at a federal-provincial Attorneys General conference in Charlottetown, I arranged for a discussion of substance abuse to be placed on the agenda and, contrary to perhaps widely held opinion or view in Manitoba, this problem of the abuse of various substances, certainly things like fingernail polish remover and airplane glue and those types of things, while it might be a certain amount of a problem in some areas, it is a big problem in Manitoba. I am told by my provincial counterparts that depending on where you happen to be in Canada it is not very much of a problem in some areas, but it certainly is here in Manitoba. We know it is a problem also in Saskatchewan, perhaps in other western provinces, but the further east you go the less problem there is with those types of substances.

So that in that sense, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are kind of on our own. I do not think it is going to be easy to convince federal officials that there might be some way to beef up provisions of federal statutes to help us here in Manitoba when we have available to us the opportunity of the type that we have today to deal with our own provincial Public Health Act. The Bill addresses the problem that if Honourable Members were able to see close up the effects would be quick to want to alleviate because some of the things that our people do to themselves, through the abuse of substances, very often at an early age, some of those effects last a lifetime. You know, those are lifetimes wasted if the quality of those lives are diminished to a large extent.

So the idea in Manitoba is to promote and make opportunities available for a very fine quality of life and I enjoy that quality of life. I believe you do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the people in this Chamber, but there are still a lot of people out there who for various reasons get into habits that leave themselves somewhat enfeebled in mind and physically, otherwise as well.

So I think it incumbent on us to provide an environment, as much as we can through our social services, to make the quality of life good, and where we fail, and no one says we can deal 100 percent adequately with every problem that ever comes along. That being the case, we have to have legislation like this. It does not give us a lot of pleasure to find ourselves in a position where we have to get into legislation like this, but nonetheless we have to accept our responsibilities as legislators in the Province of Manitoba.

I also have discussed with the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) some concerns I have with one section. Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that those concerns do not go at all to the principle of the Bill, but go to its application. In the last 20 months—

and the Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) might get a kick out of this—a lot of my thinking has led me to, where will measures we take end up? They will end up in court sometimes and if we are going to end up in court then we better be ready.

* (1720)

I said Section 27, actually it is Section 2 and the proposed Section 27(1)(6) and the subsections thereafter referring to what the court can accept as conclusive evidence. My concern is an evidentiary concern, again a technical concern; I am certainly wholeheartedly in support of the principles underlying this Bill. I have discussed this with my colleague and I hope that when I bring forward an amendment, which I hope will improve that section to the point where it is workable and effective that we can have agreement on that.

The penalty section, there are some stiff penalties there, at first glance perhaps, exceedingly stiff, but they are maximums and not minimums so that the judges of our courts who deal day in and day out with some of the problems in our society will be able to use their discretion and I support that. I will be asking the Members to consider allowing the Government to move an amendment to, and successfully move an amendment to allow the Act to come into force on proclamation so that the Government can prepare itself for the application of this Act.

I have had occasion on two or three occasions to commend the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) for this, so I will not spend a whole lot more time commending her, but I trust that she will understand that Members on this side do appreciate her concern. We do not always agree with the Honourable Member for St. Johns, as you may have detected once or twice, but on occasion we have reason to agree and I think in a matter like this there is all kinds of room for agreement amongst right thinking and caring Manitobans, which I trust that all Members of this House are.

With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will sit down, offer my support, and look forward to a discussion of this Bill at a subsequent committee stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 95—THE CERTIFIED GENERAL ACCOUNTANTS ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), Bill No. 95, The Certified General Accountants Act (Loi sur les comptables généraux agréés), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak) who has eight minutes remaining, and the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) who has two minutes remaining. Is there leave to have—

Some Honourable Members: No, no leave.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No leave.

Is the House ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to put on the record the Members for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) and Transcona (Mr. Kozak), no doubt, would like to see this Bill go on to committee, and for that reason we had denied leave. I am sure they would be more than happy to forego the rest of the time remaining in order to see it go to committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank the Honourable Member for that advice.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 96—AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT RESPECTING THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHIEPISCOPAL CORPORATION OF WINNIPEG AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE OF WINNIPEG

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), Bill No. 96, An Act to amend An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Archiepiscopal Corporation of Winnipeg and the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Winnipeg; (Loi modifiant "An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Archiepiscopal Corporation of Winnipeg and the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Winnipeg"), standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae).

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): We, on this side, have reviewed the contents of Bill 96, An Act to amend an Act respecting the Roman Catholic Archiepiscopal Corporation of Winnipeg and the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Winnipeg, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), and are satisfied that it is a Bill that deserves our support. We look forward to discussing the matter further at a subsequent committee stage.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Deputy Speaker, my family, especially my in-laws, would never forgive me if I did not speak on this Bill. I certainly want to say that our Party supports the Bill and the provisions of the Bill. We have done an in-depth study with our strong Roman Catholic community, as I say even including our close families, and as an old altar boy I have to stand up on this resolution. We have also surveyed out good friends in the Ukrainian Catholic Church and we understand there are no jurisdictional problems with the proposed resolution. We certainly will be pleased to see the Bill go before committee and before the people of Manitoba. Therefore, we support it.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it now six o'clock?

Thursday, March 1, 1990

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned
and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).