

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, March 2, 1990.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 101—THE STATUTE RE-ENACTMENT AND BY-LAW VALIDATION (MUNICIPAL) ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 101, The Statute Re-enactment and By-law Validation (Municipal) Act; Loi sur la réadoption de lois et la validation d'arrêtés concernant diverses municipalités.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have from the Dawson Trail School seventeen Grade 6 students, and they are under the direction of Sherry Nadeau. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Anglophone Rights - Quebec Premier's Position

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My question is for the Premier. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of December, 1988, the First Minister withdrew his support for the Meech Lake Accord because he mourned the loss of language rights for Anglophones in Quebec, a condition he said which violated the spirit of the Meech Lake Accord. A year later the Premier's lawyers were in court arguing along with the Government of Quebec to reduce language rights for those same Anglophones of Quebec. Could the Premier please explain his reasons to the House?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Fort Rouge misrepresents or misunderstands the issues that are at play. He might want to read the comments of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) in response to the Supreme Court judgment yesterday. The fact of the matter is that we take the position which I believe the Francophone community of Manitoba takes, and that is that they are far more interested in utilizing scarce dollars to provide services to Franco-Manitobans rather than to translate items that are very costly yet provide no additional benefit in terms of either rights or services to that community.

* (1005)

The matter that was being discussed was one of what materials that are utilized in this Legislature, that are utilized in the course of the administrative arm of Government, ought or ought not to be translated into French. We take the position, supported by the Francophone community, that they are far more interested in French language services than they are in translating documents that are of no value to them.

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

Mr. Carr: The Premier said yesterday that the issue decided by the Supreme Court of Canada was narrow and would not have a significant impact on Manitoba. If there is not to be any cost involved, or an insignificant cost, exactly what principle was the Premier advocating when he argued against Anglophone rights in Quebec?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I was arguing on a principle that is contained within the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of this country. That is that I believe most of us hold dear, perhaps not the Member for Fort Rouge, the principle of freedom of expression for all people in this country regardless of where they live, regardless of their background, regardless of their language or culture of origin. I will continue to argue on behalf of that principle in Manitoba, in Quebec or anywhere else in this country. Regrettably, my colleague for Fort Rouge does not agree with that and that is his problem.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, the reason that the Premier gave for withdrawing his support for the Meech Lake Accord was the reduction for the linguistic minority, rights for the linguistic minority in the Province of Quebec. Why has he tossed his hat in the ring with Robert Bourassa attacking Anglophone rights in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. Filmon: The allegation that is put forward by the Member for Fort Rouge is absolute and total nonsense. We realize how low the Liberal Party in this Legislature has sunk when this kind of phony allegation becomes the basis of the lead questions in this morning Session in the Legislature. The argument that I put forward was one I might say that was regarded quite well by many of his colleagues. I might put aside the fact that his Leader agreed with me wholeheartedly and agreed by leave to withdraw that resolution from this Legislature. The reason of course that we did was that Premier Bourassa in invoking the notwithstanding clause said that he might not have had to do so had the Meech Lake Accord been in place. That was of grave concern because it gave credence to the allegations that many people have made, that in fact it may take precedence over the Charter of Rights.

Friday, March 2, 1990

Forks Development Corp. Historical Artifacts Protection

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, with a new question to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). For months we have been calling for a moratorium on developments at The Forks. The Forks is a very special place. It is unique in Manitoba and indeed in Canada and requires special planning and patience. We were shocked to learn that there is even a hint of a possibility that very important and precious artifacts may have been disturbed by excavation which began earlier on—

* (1010)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Carr: May I change my question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon), since he seems to be so anxious to speak? Will the Premier give assurances to this House and to the people of Manitoba that there is no hint of risk that any important artifacts are being excavated right now as we speak?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order. Honourable Madam Minister.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I totally reject the supposed hints that the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) talks about. Let me indicate to you that a heritage resource impact assessment was carried out at the North Assiniboine Node, which includes the boat basin, in 1988. The riverbank area where the boat basin is being constructed was found to be very disturbed and to contain a large amount of fill. Intact heritage resources were found at an area where the boat basin was originally going to be built, and the plans were changed to move it to an area after the impact assessment that was full of fill and that had been disturbed. As a matter of fact, and I must say fact, not hint, all precautions have been taken to build the boat basin where it is found to be built.

Forks Development Corp. Historical Artifacts Protection

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): With a supplementary question to whichever Minister wants to tackle this one, and I am sorry the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is not prepared to put his own words on the record on this important subject, so why do I not direct this question to the Premier?

If the Government is so convinced that there is absolutely no hint of possibility that important artifacts are on this site, would the Premier agree that we halt excavation until independent archeologists can assure all of us that there is no such hint? Is he prepared to give us those assurances in the House today?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) should learn that in the Liberal world of "if" nothing ever gets done. Nothing gets done because the Liberals say if this happens, then what will be, and if this might be, then what could be, and on and on and on, and they never do anything. They are paralyzed by fear of action, for fear that something, sometime, somewhere might happen. That is what we are dealing with.

The reality is that because people had expressed legitimate concerns, a study was done to ensure that we were not building the boat basin at a place where there might be archeological value and artifacts that might be recovered. At the same time that has been looked at by architects, by archeologists, it has been looked at by the Environment Minister's (Mr. Cummings) department in terms of all of the relationships. Under those circumstances, a decision was made by the relevant authorities to proceed with it based on having had that information.

Now the Liberals, who have no information but have a lot of innuendo, rumour and surmising, Mr. Speaker, come forward and suggest that we ought to stop it at a time when this is the appropriate time to do the construction under winter conditions. If it is not done now, it will be forestalled for a year. If that is what you want, let him say so and we will have no action, nothing under the Liberals—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable First Minister will take his seat, please. Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, if the timing is so appropriate, why would the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst) not give his approval to the project, which he has not done? The excavation began before there was any formal approval, so the Premier (Mr. Filmon) does not know what he is talking about.

Forks Development Corp. New Development Moratorium

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My final question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, no action is the best action of all. When it comes to development at The Forks, and when it comes to—

* (1015)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Carr: In the case of The Forks development, that argument could be made and could be made powerfully. Will the Minister of Urban Affairs tell us now if he is prepared to support our policy that there be a moratorium on all new developments at The Forks until the public has had a chance to have another round of consultation?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge is getting

more ridiculous every day. He wants more public information. In 1988 there were 27 organizations consulted. In 1989 there were nine citizen member groups from the Heritage Advisory Committee. There are 18 citizen member groups from the leisure centre advisory group. There are 13 citizen members on the site planning consultative group. The Native groups, there are four of those. There is a joint site for public archeology, 10 citizens.

Mr. Speaker, The Forks itself is having meetings after meetings after meetings of the public. I think in the year of 1989 there were 48 public events, activities held on The Forks, asking people to come forward and give that information. For him to get up on this floor and say, have more public meetings, is absolutely ridiculous.

Pornographic Material Film Classification System

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): This week's pornography raids have certainly caused us all consternation, especially since they give evidence of a growing prevalence of material that is violent, that promotes degradation, that uses children, that in fact promotes hatred against women and children. The most concerning thing about all of this is that there is nothing now that prohibits young people from renting this kind of material, yet there is power within this Legislature to do that.

I want to ask the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), given that a film classification system will at least help deal with this problem, how is she doing in terms of getting a system approved? When will it be implemented so we can put in a halt to the availability of this kind of disgusting material at least when it comes to our young people?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, we have indicated in the House before, as a Government, that we are very concerned about the type of pornography and the type of films that are available in our province. I know that they are worse in some other provinces.

We do not like to see adult video stores popping up, and we do not like to see pornography in stores where children have access to that material, Mr. Speaker. We have been working actively. The Attorney General's Department and my department have been working on a program or some regulations to put in place. We have communicated with the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and want to work in co-operation with them. We want to work in co-operation with the public and in co-operation with the video retailers, so that the process that we put in place is a process that is going to prohibit pornographic materials from getting into the hands of those underage and having access to that material available to them.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister said the same thing on December 11 and said that she would be making a positive announcement early in the year. We are now into March.

I want to ask the Minister, given that reports show that the primary consumers of pornography in Canada

are teenagers between the ages of 12 and 17, can the Minister give us some assurances today that she will have a video classification system up and operational in a very short order and at least put in some immediate provisions restricting access of this obviously disgusting material to young people in our society?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP was in power for six and a half years, and there was a proposal on the table under their administration that they shelved, so let not the information that the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) puts on the record indicate that we are not moving or looking very seriously.

An Honourable Member: Bonnie, you have had two years now.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, we have had time, but there are all kinds of little things that have to be put in place. We are moving very actively in working with all segments of the community to make sure that we put in place a system that is going to address the concerns that the Member for St. Johns has raised. We are working on it. We are coming close to a resolution to the problem, Mr. Speaker, and that will be announced in the near future.

Substance Abuse Rubbing Alcohol Restrictions

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, on a related but new matter to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I have been asking questions about healthy minds and healthy bodies for our young people. I want to ask the Minister of Justice, given his support yesterday for Bill No. 91, our solvent abuse amendments and his obvious concern as well as the action he has taken on restricting the sale of rubbing alcohol—unfortunately it is not a foolproof system yet. I was able to purchase a bottle of rubbing alcohol this morning at a Biway store here in the City of Winnipeg. I know displays are not allowed, but I just wanted you to know that I was able to purchase it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Does the Honourable Member have a question? The Honourable Member, kindly put her question now, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Yes, I want to ask the Minister, since I know he is serious about these matters, what steps is he putting in place to ensure that sale of all kinds of rubbing alcohol is actually restricted?

* (1020)

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I would be happy to discuss the circumstances of the Honourable Member's experience with the material that she has displayed here this morning, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that we can let the commission know about those circumstances and the commission can advise the two of us on what steps are indeed in place.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Speaker, I certainly had no intention of breaking the rules. I just wanted the Minister

to know how serious the matter is. It is a serious matter—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: If the display of that bottle is not permitted, I would table the receipt that I have from that purchase.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: My question is that this is obviously a very difficult area to regulate and to ensure that everyone is abiding by the law. Does the Minister have a system in place for dealing with retailers on a broad basis for restriction of sales in terms of rubbing alcohol, but also in terms of the products that obviously will fall under Bill 91, The Public Health Amendment Act?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I will be checking with the commission to see what efforts were made to inform retailers of their responsibilities under the law. The law is there now, and the Honourable Member is wanting to produce receipts and so on. I have no problem accepting the word of the Honourable Member with regard to her own experience in this matter. I will be reporting this particular incident to the commission to find out if anything further needs to be done.

Forks Development Corp. Environmental Impact Study

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, we have just received information that Justice Schwartz has granted an injunction against further construction work at The Forks on the boat basin. Now apparently the judge felt that the boat basin project at The Forks in no way complied with the Manitoba Environment Act. In fact, he wondered why there had not been an environment assessment done complete with a thorough and complete archeological review. My question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) is—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Taylor: Why has he not required The Forks Corporation to comply with The Environment Act of Manitoba and a proper EIS carried out? Here we go again.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): I have not seen the injunction that the Member refers

to, and I will be looking very carefully to see what his comments are and the direction is within that. I can tell you that my department asked for information and received information in December on this project and in January made the decision that they felt this was not something that would normally fall under the requirements of The Environment Act.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I will not be commenting until I have seen what else is included in the injunction.

Environment Act Exemption

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, this Government did not think we needed one on Rafferty at first, and we did not need one on the Charleswood bridge either. Why is it that in court presentations today The Forks Corporation said to the judge, why do you not give us an exemption from The Environment Act, Mr. Justice? He looked at them rather quizzically and they said because the Environment Minister (Mr. Cummings) will give us one anyway. Why would they have been led to that expectation?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into a public hair-pull on hearsay—(laughter)—

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

Mr. Cummings: Bad choice of words.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1025)

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to accept the hearsay that the Member brings to this Chamber regarding what may have been said, hearsay, hearsay—heresy. I will be looking carefully to see what comments have been made in this relationship. I am not going to make comments in reaction to third-hand repeated comments brought to this Chamber.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, well, the Minister will be able to read it I am sure this afternoon.

How often do Manitobans have to resort to other measures such as the courts before they can get this Tory administration to follow its own Environment Act and to protect the environment? Will this Minister guarantee that he will not try to further exempt this project before—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley has the floor. Kindly put your question now, please.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, and I will complete the sentence, Mr. Speaker. Will this Minister guarantee that he will not try to further exempt this project—and fully I ask—before the injunction goes in place at midnight?

Friday, March 2, 1990

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to close any options in terms of how this needs to be dealt with until I have read— (interjection)- If the Liberals think that you should govern this province by third- or second-hand reports, then that shows an example of their management.

I will wait and see what the injunction says and then I will make a decision.

LynnGold Resources Inc. Severance Pay

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). The Government has announced with much fanfare that they have successfully recovered 35 percent of the severance pay owed to LynnGold workers from the directors of a company worth some \$550 million. Of the roughly \$2 million settlement, the Government is taking back some \$240,000.00. That works out to approximately \$1,100 per LynnGold worker. In this settlement, which still leaves 65 percent of the severance pay unpaid to the workers, why is the Government insisting on recovering their investment in this time of crisis?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this resolution that has come with the workers in Lynn Lake was only done if the union would recommend it to their members. That was the first priority that this Government had. We would do nothing that was outside of that.

As far as the money with the payment of wages, that is an advancement. That was an advancement that this Government gave to them of money owed. They will be recovering every penny of their payment of wages and vacations. That money includes the money from the payment of wages under regulations that money comes back to the fund if we recover it for the workers, and that is what we have done. We advanced it before Christmas so they would have money. We have recovered the money. We take what we have in the fund, but everything goes to the worker as far as the payment of wages and their vacation pay.

Mr. Edwards: When people are on their knees they generally will take less than they deserve, Mr. Speaker.

* (1030)

Mining Reserve Fund LynnGold Workers

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): For the Minister of Energy and Mines this time, the mining and reserve fund set up in part to assist mining communities adversely affected by layoffs such as this presently has some \$9 million in it. Why would the Government insist on getting its \$240,000 back at this time, at the workers' expense, when this fund is sitting there available and earning some \$900,000 in interest per year and is set up to deal with this specific type of situation?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, the mining reserve fund is for the benefit

of all northern people, not just for the people of Lynn Lake. This Government has worked I think extremely hard and diligently for the last eight months to recover as much as they could for the benefit of the workers.

We must remember that for the first four or five months we worked to keep the operations going in Lynn Lake. When that became impossible, we took to getting the best possible deal for the employees that we could. We do believe that the deal that was struck with the directors of LynnGold, not the directors of the parent companies but with the directors of LynnGold, was the best that we could for the workers of LynnGold. I think that if the workers of LynnGold are satisfied, I am happy that they are getting the monies that they are getting.

Mr. Edwards: I think "happy" is quite an overstatement. As I have said, when people are on their knees, they generally will take less than they deserve.

LynnGold Resources Inc. Severance Pay Legal Opinion

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Finally, for the Minister of Energy and Mines again, will the Minister table the legal opinion that he relied upon to settle for 35 percent of the severance pay owed and tell the House if he even considered using the mining reserve fund of \$9 million or whatever part was necessary simply to tide the workers over until this action to recover the full 100 percent of severance pay could run its course?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, the recovery of both vacation bonuses and severance pay was the result of some lengthy renegotiations with the directors of the company. The possibility of recovering the 100 percent in our opinion was remote or nil. We recovered for the workers of LynnGold Mines the maximum possible amount that we thought we could recover. We had to make a judgment call. The judgment was that at the point in time that we agreed to settle was the point that was the maximum amount we could have gotten. As the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), my colleague, has already said, the employees were asked whether that was an amount that they were prepared to accept. The union member on behalf of his members indicated that they would recommend the settlement to their employees.

Brandon Airport Air Control Tower Closure

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the acting Minister of Transportation or the Premier. There is concern in the Brandon community that the airport control tower will be closed eventually, since Transport Canada still has it listed to be shut down at some future time.

I would like to ask either the Premier or the Acting Minister of Transportation, have they received any information? Has the Government of Manitoba received any information to indicate that the federal Government

Friday, March 2, 1990

will be closing the Brandon tower in the foreseeable future, or do they have some status report on this?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): A week ago today the mayor of the City of Brandon and I appeared at the airport to let the people know that we were concerned about the future of the tower at the airport because of mail that we had received from Ottawa that did not exactly close the case, although we feel that the federal Government is giving every consideration to the concerns that we have, including local M.P. Lee Clark.

The mayor of Brandon has put forward an eight-point plan which is a reasonable plan to try to build up the traffic in Brandon. We on this side feel that Brandon potentially has a very good chance of being a growth area in our province, and that would have an impact on our airport and increase the traffic.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), as MLA for Brandon West, has written to the Minister, but I am asking the Government of Manitoba to officially take a stand on this matter.

Since the existence of the air tower is important for safety reasons, and it is certainly important to maintain the air traffic that is now there and to attract new air service, would the Premier or his Acting Minister of Transport or the Minister of Transport undertake to contact the new federal Minister of Transport, Mr. Doug Lewis, and get his assurance that the federal Government will not close the Brandon Control Tower?

Mr. McCrae: The moment I received a letter from former Transport Minister Bouchard, which left the issue not quite closed in the sense that the Honourable Member and I would like to see it closed, I came right into this room, this Chamber, and spoke with the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger). He sent off a letter immediately to the federal Minister. The new federal Minister of Transport just happens to be my counterpart of a few weeks ago, the Honourable Doug Lewis. I have come to know him well, and the Honourable Member can be assured that in addition to the correspondence from our Minister of Highways and Transportation, myself, Lee Clark and the mayor of Brandon that the Honourable Member can be assured I will be in contact with the new Minister of Transport as well.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the MLA for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) has done this, but I am talking about the official position of the Government of Manitoba in this respect.

Increased Air Traffic

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): My last question is: the city has developed a plan to boost the activity at the airport. Would the Manitoba Government be prepared to co-operate with the city in implementing this plan aimed at increasing activity at the airport to help ensure that it does stay active, that it does not become a victim of federal cutbacks? I am particularly

thinking of the request that the Government of Manitoba locate some of its aircraft at the Brandon airport.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Well, I think we would all appreciate it if the Honourable Member and his Party, but even more importantly the Members of the Liberal Party, would get onside with regard to decentralization moved on the part of this Government, because you know, Mr. Speaker, any move toward providing more and better services outside the City of Winnipeg and beyond in areas like southwestern Manitoba is going to have the effect of increasing traffic at airports like the airport at Brandon. I would ask the Honourable Member, but I make this point more specifically for Members of the Liberal Party who have been so clearly against any kind of decentralization, I would ask them to get onside and help support our southwestern Manitoba and help support the airport problems that we have at Brandon.

Bill No. 42 Government Support

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). The Premier and his Government have finally come down and made a decision. Bill 42 will not survive, and hundreds of thousands of landlords and tenants in the Province of Manitoba are being deprived of good legislation. In the summer of '88 the Premier said that this legislation was going to be put on the back burner. It seems as if he has once again put legislation that is in need in this province on the back burner.

My question quite simply is: why has the First Minister once again put this needed legislation on the back burner?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this Government is listening to people who have expressed concerns, both tenants and landlords who have expressed concerns.

An Honourable Member: Take a little heat.

Mr. Filmon: Well, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) talks about taking a little heat. I know that Members of his caucus have been meeting with people who have concerns about it and have given indications to them in discussion that they are not really concerned to see this Bill proceed. Now they are taking this—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

* (1040)

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

Mr. Lamoureux: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The truth of the matter is the Liberal Party has been pursuing this time after time after time and the Government—

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

Mr. Filmon: We have the Liberal position firmly expressed in today's newspaper as the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) expressed his firm commitment to the repeal of FOS. He said, "never say never," Mr. Speaker, "never say never."

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This Premier is digging deeper and deeper. If he does not think that—

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

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable First Minister. Order, order. The Honourable First Minister, to finish his answer.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) makes my case precisely. We are listening to people who have expressed concerns about Bill 42.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: We are consulting with people who have expressed concerns. We are listening to them, and the Member for St. James makes the case exactly. That is what we ought to do legitimately, listen to those people and that is what we are. I rest my case.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Consultations

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and this Government have it all backwards. They have had 20 months to do their consulting. They should have done their consulting previously. The Bill itself has been passed into committee. The Government introduced it, passed it into committee.

Is it Government policy to draft legislation, to introduce it, to send it into committee, and then to

consult with groups? Should they not be doing it the other way around?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): When we do that, for instance, with respect to the boat basin at The Forks, when we go out and consult with people, when we get a study done with experts who conclude that there are not archeological materials and artifacts there that could or should be protected, we are told by the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), forget all those studies, forget all those consultations, forget all those public hearings, put a moratorium on in case something might happen in the future. If we listened to the Liberals, we would never do anything at all, Mr. Speaker, but we are consulting, we are listening, and we are coming forward with what we believe is an adequate response to the people on all sides who have expressed concerns about Bill No. 42.

Government Support

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, this Government is not doing what it is supposed to be doing. My question is quite simply, why did this Government introduce Bill No. 42 if there was no honest intention to bring it into committee and see it become law? It is going to die on the Order Paper because of this Premier.

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

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, very straightforwardly, we—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Filmon: Very straightforwardly, we introduced the legislation because we believe that it is legislation that should be proceeded with. Clearly, there are concerns that have been expressed by people on all sides of the issue. Many, many—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member has put his question. I am sure the Honourable Member would like to give the courtesy of the Minister to respond to your question. The Honourable First Minister.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) would do well to follow his practice of Monday night, and that is to keep quiet.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Friday, March 2, 1990

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, some 64 separate concerns and issues have been raised by people on all sides of that Bill, people who have concerns about various elements of it, legitimate concerns. We as a Government want to take account of those concerns, find ways in which we can adequately address those concerns before we proceed with the legislation, and that is what we are doing. We are listening to the people.

Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corp. Chairman Replacement

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for The Pas has time for one short question.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation has been doing an excellent job of going out and having information meetings and informing the public of the need for a hazardous waste location and the importance of the job that Crown corporation is doing. Nick Carter, the person who has been a chairperson of that corporation since it started, has offered his resignation for 1991. The Minister has chosen to accept that resignation now. Can the Minister confirm that the new chairperson of that corporation will be Don Vernon?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carter has done a good job of carrying the Hazardous Waste Corp. The previous Minister of Environment continued his appointment. I have been Minister of Environment close to a year, and I continued his appointment in that position. Mr. Carter, however, said to me that he was prepared to resign and would in any event resign before '91. I felt it was prudent to accept that resignation, and I therefore have appointed Don Vernon.

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill No. 56, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail); Bill 72, The Securities Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les valeurs mobilières); and Bill 75, The Insurance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances) be withdrawn from

the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations and that these Bills be transferred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the following committee meetings for next week. By leave, on Monday at 8 p.m., the Law Amendments Committee would sit to consider Bill No. 63, and the Industrial Relations Committee would sit to consider Bill No. 31. That is Monday evening, the House will be sitting and we would require leave.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to have that committee sit Monday evening? There are two committees. Is that agreed? Agreed.

Mr. McCrae: I thank Honourable Members. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday at 10 a.m. the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee will sit to consider Bill 9 and Bill 92 and, if necessary, the Industrial Relations Committee will sit to consider Bill No. 31.

Also on Tuesday at 8 p.m. the Municipal Affairs Committee will sit to consider Bill No. 61 and Bill No. 62 and, if necessary, the Industrial Relations Committee will sit to consider Bill No. 31.

On Wednesday at 8 p.m. the Law Amendments Committee will sit to consider Bills Nos. 59, 60, 75, 78, 73, 74, 72 and 56; 72 and 56 having just been transferred from the Industrial Relations Committee. Also on Wednesday at 8 p.m., the Industrial Relations Committee will sit, if necessary, to consider Bill No. 31.

On Thursday, March 8 at 10 a.m., the Private Bills Committee will sit to consider Bills referred to that committee. On Thursday at 8 p.m., Law Amendments Committee will sit to consider Bills Nos. 47 to 52 inclusive and, if necessary, the Industrial Relations Committee will sit to consider Bill No. 31.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader for that information.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

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

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, Friday 2 p.m. session be amended as follows: Downey for Burrell, and Praznik for Derkach.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed? Agreed.

* (1050)

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call the business as listed on today's Order Paper?

Friday, March 2, 1990

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS
BILL NO. 99—THE APPROPRIATION
ACT, 1989

Mr. 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, standing in the name the Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose), who has 21 minutes remaining, the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, when I left off yesterday, we had I think shown once again a lesson to the Tories of what really goes on in this province, and some management, in that I think we convinced them that along with all the other stripes and different types of backgrounds in Manitoba Liberal farmers are probably rating at least as good as the average, and corrected that slight against any farmers indeed who do an excellent job in this province, contrary to the comments that we hear from the NDP who exaggerate the number of bankruptcies amongst farmers in Manitoba.

I think it is a real credit to the agriculture industry in Manitoba that even though the tough times we have had now for at least two or three seasons the bankruptcy rate is low, they have kept their houses in order, do efficient farming and produce food for not only Manitoba and Canada but indeed the world.

It is interesting to see again this morning that the Tories almost learned a lesson about how to get permits. Yesterday, in questioning of the Government about The Forks and the new boat basin, there were comments across the floor and indeed a question of whether the proper permits had been received. In consequent gestures—and I think I took them right—the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) held up a document, pounded and indicated, yes, the documents are in order; the permits are in order. Then we read in today's paper that there are no permits in order, or there is not a specific permit in order. Later in this House we learned that a judge, because there is no permit, has ordered an injunction on the whole thing.

Look at, Mr. Speaker, the cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba for the stopping of that project at midnight tonight, unnecessary the guarantees that have to be put out, money that could be spent on social programs if nothing else in this province. This Government continues to not manage properly, give proper direction or consider the right priorities.

Just some time ago when this Forks, which agreeably is a tri-level Government program excavated on The Forks site, dumped the refuse north of the highline without any environmental permits, without any building permits, and they took it from one riverbank to another riverbank—and only because I discovered it there one day and reported it to the city, did the city come back and order bulldozers to be put in there to clear the required distance from the riverbank. So the lesson was out there then. Then we learn later on that not

only have they dumped the refuse on the riverbank, the excess soil, but it is just full of artifacts, valuables. We wonder just how such careless management can go on. Let the Tories not say that it was the city's responsibility or Core Area or anything else. This is well known to be a Tory project. It is to employ Tories, to put them in business, and all the way along the line, because I am sure if you went into that operation at The Forks you would find little if any people with any other stripe in there. So that is clearly a Tory project. Even having pointed that out at that point, they still went along and made the same mistake again, and that they did not get an environmental permit, even though in the House yesterday they clearly sort of indicated that was not the case and they did have a permit.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, getting on to the question at hand. I find it appalling that a large department like Economic Security, that the Minister of Economic Security handles, does not have any clout in Cabinet. That is that she allowed and saw some \$150 million to \$200 million put away in a slush fund in preparation for the next election and did not cry out for the needy in Manitoba so that they would be able to take part in the mainstream of Manitoba and Canadian life. I do not know whether this is a philosophy or whether a lack of management, but it is a disgrace to the Province of Manitoba.

One in six children under 16 are in poverty, that is Canadian. We know the figures are worse in Manitoba, and yet the Minister when she announces an increase is below the rate of inflation does not take into effect the new agricultural Canada food basket which recommends an increase of 18 percent to take into effect a more nutritious diet for all of Canadians. What we are saying here is that this diet is all right for all Canadians except those of the working poor and those on social allowance.

On social allowance, may I point out, for refreshing everybody's memory, that social allowance has almost 40 percent of the recipients are disabled and certainly a large proportion of the remaining 60 percent are single parents. So it is not what most people envision it to be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as well as those statistics, the high school dropout in 1986, we know that it is now worse. It is something approaching 25 percent in Manitoba. This is indeed 2.2 times higher than in the non-poor. The child mortality rate is twice as high and indeed even things like drowning is three to four times as high as the regular population amongst the poor and disadvantaged. Psychiatric disorders amongst those people are 1.7 percent higher. These are only 1986 figures and any trend shows us it is getting worse. Conduct disorders amongst the poor children is at least twice as likely amongst the general population.

Indeed, one of the problems of today is birthrate for the high infant mortality. It is inversely related to the family income, and this is indeed a very much growing problem in Canada. Yet this Government does nothing

Friday, March 2, 1990

to fill the gap between the haves and the have-nots in this province. In fact, it is a disgrace to see the Government and look around us and see the ever growing number of food outlets. It appears to me that the food banks for people, the poor, are starting to outstrip the number of fast food outlets in this city and indeed this province. It was quoted that between 1980 and 1986, the child population in this country dropped 4 percent, and yet under those circumstances the number in poverty, the number of youths in poverty, rose by 13.5 percent. Indeed, these are 1986 figures, and we know from all the trends it is getting worse and worse and worse. This at a time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when selling in record numbers are Mercedes, Porsches, Cadillacs and other expensive cars. You see the gap between the rich and poor is not closing, it is lengthening.

Canada has the second highest level of children in poverty among seven industrialized countries in this world. We take pride when we say this, and I will repeat it, Canada has the second highest level of children living in poverty among seven industrialized countries. Where does Manitoba stand on that, with a country as the worst, where in the line of action is Manitoba?

Estimated welfare income for a single disabled person in Canada which covers 40 percent of people on social allowance is by far the worst in Canada, in fact some 10 percent lower than the next province of Saskatchewan, right next door to us. So there is one strike against us. What do we have on liquid assets? Manitoba by far is the lowest province in Canada, \$400 versus even Prince Edward Island \$900, over twice our allowance; Newfoundland and Ontario, \$3,000; and British Columbia \$2,500.00.

* (1100)

How about the niggardly approach that the Government takes to allowing disabled persons and others on social assistance to earn money, therefore gather work experience and get themselves into the mainstream of Manitoba life? We find Manitoba at the lowest level of all Canadians, all Canadian provinces at \$50.00. If you have a job and you are on social assistance, that is how much you are allowed to keep. Whereas, I must say that is not an area where there is a lot of generosity in Canada, but still we see Alberta at over three times Manitoba at \$165; Saskatchewan in a similar case at \$150; Ontario, \$175.00. We remain on the very bottom.

I think that the most startling statistic, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that estimated welfare income for a single person, and I think that the most appropriate one there is by provinces—these are 1988 figures that I am quoting—again, we find the figures are worse. We are in Manitoba at 56.6 percent of the poverty line. Quebec is just slightly worse than us at 56.2 and New Brunswick at 50.6. In one statistic we are third which we probably should take a lot of pride, but these figures are from 1988 and my guess, from the tight-fisted approach to the Government and their building up of the slush fund rather than treating priorities in this province, is that these figures indeed in regard to Manitoba vis-a-vis the rest of Canada have gotten worse.

We know two things. We know that the amount of money spent by CAP in Ottawa is up some 20 percent in 1989, and we know for sure that the amount of money coming from Manitoba was in the 4 percent ratio. Somebody obviously in the rest of Canada was getting part of the money that was deserving for Manitoba, indeed the underprivileged people of Manitoba. If we only got 4 percent and the national average is 20 percent, it must mean that some provinces got well in excess of 20 percent.

This is understandable, because the Liberal Government in Ontario injected \$450 million more into their social programs this year than they previously had. Oddly enough, the fight for this was led by industrialist Conrad Black. He saw that the social evil that existed in Ontario because of the impoverished state of the poor people was harming all programs in Ontario, because for instance how do you expect children to learn when they go to school—in the Province of Manitoba 60 percent at least in the core area of the City of Winnipeg go with an empty stomach. We are wasting educational dollars, we are wasting health dollars, we are wasting psychiatric dollars and many, many more things and they recognize this in Ontario. What we have in Ontario is an injection of another \$450 million, 50 percent of it from federal funds, that is \$225 million more of federal funds were spent to the poor in Ontario, the best and most prosperous province in Canada right now.

Now we give some credit perhaps, we will see the details as they come out, but apparently the Government now has said that they will put a cap on this so that the rich provinces like B.C. and Ontario and Alberta to some degree will not continually drain CAP funds which instead would go to provinces like Manitoba. It is not good enough for the federal Government to do that. What is needed now is for the Manitoba Government to open the purse strings for the poor. I stress, this is not an expense; this is an investment. This will be shown up in savings in education, in health, policing dollars and what have you. We have to see the Government of Manitoba open their purse strings and address the problem such has been done very adequately by the Province of Ontario. We cannot allow this social stigma to continue in Manitoba because of Government inaction.

Now we have discussed rental. I think that is one of the keys of the social program, rental units, particularly in the City of Winnipeg where the problem is most prevalent. The Social Planning Council of Winnipeg has indicated that between 1983 and '88 the number of rental units in Winnipeg available for the working poor and those on social allowances declined by 42 percent and it continues to decline since that period of 1988. Yet the Minister of Economic Security insists that there are enough rental units out there for the poor. I cannot understand why she does not read the statistics that have been very well put together, acknowledge it, and instead of giving a measly rental increase of 3 percent give something that is reasonable. What is happening is the people are paying more for their rent on social allowance than they are receiving from the Government. Where do they get it from? The only place they can get the money—

Friday, March 2, 1990

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am wondering if we can have the Chamber count at this time, for quorum.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Members please rise?

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): The Honourable Mr. Ducharme, the Honourable Mr. Ernst, the Honourable Mr. Findlay; Mr. Burrell; the Honourable Mrs. Hammond; Mr. Lamoureux, Mr. Rose, Mr. Chornopyski.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As there is not a quorum—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. As there is not a quorum in the House present, pursuant to Rule 4.(2), this House is adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday.