

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, June 13, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I beg to present the petition of Ben Davies, Linda Garson, Nell Federick and nearly 2,500 others, requesting the Government of Manitoba to reverse its decision to eliminate the General Insurance Division of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

We, the undersigned, urge and request the Government of Manitoba to reverse its decision to eliminate the General Insurance Division of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation inasmuch as:

1. The Division has experienced a significant financial turnaround and has shown a net income of \$1.5 million for the first nine months of the 1988 operating year.
2. Many small businesses, persons in remote communities and others would not be able to obtain adequate general insurance coverage from the private sector at acceptable rates.
3. There will be a serious loss of jobs in the province, including 55 in Brandon with a payroll of \$1.5 million which will have a detrimental effect on those employees as well as the economy.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I stand to table the Second Quarterly Financial Report for the six months ended April 30, 1989, for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present the Annual Report for 1988 of the Law Enforcement Review Agency.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Supplementary Estimates for Agriculture for 1989-90.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, may I direct the Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have from the King George School, forty Grade 9 students under the direction of Kent Coey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans).

Also with us from the George V School, 20 Grades 5 and 6 students under the direction of Cynthia White. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

Also with us this afternoon we have 86 students from Thunder Bay, Ontario, under the direction of Mr. Cliff Ojala.

On behalf of all of the Members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

* (1335)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Family Violence Charges

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there is grave concern and I think all Parties throughout all Manitoba—about the events which took place over the weekend and the senseless and brutal slayings of three innocent people. I am sure that all Members join with me in offering our condolences to the family and friends of the Reid family.

As we reflect on this very sad event, we will never know whether such tragedy could have been avoided. What we do know, Mr. Speaker, is that there are today in Manitoba at this very moment families who are struggling with many of the same problems that the Reid family faced, sickness, unemployment, alcohol and substance abuse, spousal and child abuse.

My question, therefore, is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). In light of this weekend's incident, will he review all practices and procedures in his department to ensure that the police are charging, in all situations that would warrant it, with respect to domestic violence?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I join with the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in expressing profound sympathy on behalf of all Members of this House to all those affected by the incidents over the past weekend. They were tragic in the extreme and that goes without saying. Certainly, it leaves us with a somewhat empty feeling today.

Today, the Chief Medical Examiner, Dr. Markesteyn, called an inquest into the deaths of the Reid family. The purpose of the inquest is to draw recommendations flowing from the circumstances of the deaths, recommendations which we would hope would contribute to the safety and to the benefit of all of us in this province. The inquest would cover the question as to what previous involvement the City of Winnipeg police may have had with the Reid family, and of course as Minister of Justice it would be my duty to review all recommendations that would come out of that inquest.

Mrs. Carstairs: I thank the Minister of Justice for that answer, but I would like to address the very specific question about charges being laid. We have had a number of reports this morning that would indicate there is a sense in the community that charges are not being laid when situations of domestic violence erupt. Can the Attorney General assure this House today that orders are very clear and that when domestic violence erupts in the community that indeed charges are to be laid by the police?

Mr. McCrae: It has been the policy of the Department of Justice for a number of years now that the police lay charges in cases of family violence, specifically, spousal abuse. The charges cannot be dropped at the wish of the complainant, and the police do proceed with those. That policy remains in place. There are times when sometimes the policy is called into question, but I believe it is the belief of all of us in this House that particular policy is the best policy for us to be following. We continue to monitor the policy. We also monitor cases of spousal abuse in our system and we are setting up a domestic violence tracking project at this time.

Firearms Seizure

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice, can he tell the House today what practices and procedures are in place in this province to seize firearms and other dangerous weapons from homes in which there is evidence of domestic violence and abuse?

* (1340)

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the Criminal Code of Canada sets out the rules for gun control in our country. The matter of gun control and control also of the use of knives was the subject of discussions at the federal and provincial Justice Ministers' meeting last week in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. The provincial Ministers of Justice expressed unanimous concern to the federal Minister of Justice. The federal Minister of Justice is now in the process of looking at what changes might be made in the Criminal Code and entering upon a consultation process.

Family Violence Counselling Availability

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with a new question to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), many neighbours witnessed first-hand the cruel slaying of Mrs. Reid and her son, and many of those were children. The impression, I think we would all admit, on a child is one that will probably stay with that child for a long period of time. Can the Minister tell the House today if her staff has now contacted the parents of these children and that resources have been offered in that neighbourhood for the appropriate counselling to children as a result of this incident?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): I have not had indication from staff that has happened, but I will inquire into it immediately.

Child and Family Services Referrals—Schools

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a supplementary question, as we know, the first people who sometimes discover what is going on within a family situation are the teachers within the school system. There is some evidence in this particular case that children seem to be coming to school with indeed indications of physical violence. Can the Minister tell the House if there are sufficient levels of communication between her department and the school systems in order to ensure that all of these cases are not only dealt with in the school environment, but are also dealt with, with Child and Family Services?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I have preliminary reports from the staff who are in contact with the agency. The preliminary report I have indicates that appropriate steps were taken with the family and referrals were made. I am awaiting further information, but the Member will recall that we are working on a Bill to be brought before this House later this Session to do with information being given between schools, families and agencies.

Mrs. Carstairs: In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that schools have been under some legal compunction for some time to report all incidents of violence.

Firearms Reporting

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister tell us today what procedures are in place to assist Family Service workers in the detection and the reporting of firearms and other dangerous weapons in homes where violence is evidenced?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I will have to inquire of staff to give me information on just what exactly the procedure is to do with firearms.

Workplace Safety Regulations Cancer-Causing Substances

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). On April 10, we alerted the public to the intent of the Government to change the Workplace Safety and Health regulations, to repeal the Workplace Safety and Health regulations in a way that was rejecting the Advisory Committee to Government on the Workplace Safety and Health Committee, to reject the advice of the Citizens' Committee and take the advice of the Chamber of Commerce to repeal the Workplace Safety and Health regulations which would, in effect, reduce the standards for cancer-causing materials at the workplace. My question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is, when was the regulation changed to repeal the old standard and why did the Premier reject the Advisory Committee's advice and cause greater risk to workers for cancer-causing goods at the workplace?

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

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the document we released on April 10 was a Cabinet document, given the fact that the Premier himself has switched portfolios from the old Minister to a new Minister, and given the fact that this is a Government issue and a Government policy that affects workers all across Manitoba, I would ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) why he has changed the regulations in his Government which, according to the department's advice would, in terms of the workers, mean that most controlled products will be affected but this will not protect workers using carcinogens or cancer-causing goods. There is no safe level of exposure for cancer-causing agents. Why would the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and his Government change the regulations, contrary to the department's advice, contrary to the advice of the Advisory Committee, and only on the advice of the Chamber of Commerce as documented in the original Cabinet document?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Doer: I am absolutely astounded, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) does not know or will not answer questions about his Government's change on the regulations in the workplace.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) on a point of order.

* (1345)

Mr. Filmon: I did not say that I did not know. The Member has asked specific questions about dates, circumstances, quoting from documents, quoting from reports, quoting from specific other areas of recommendation. I will take that as notice so that I can respond in full to him and not accept the premise of his allegations—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Filmon: If he wants to have a detailed question of that nature, he will have to wait for a detailed answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon) does not have a point of order. I would like to remind Honourable Members that we do not comment on non-answers. The Ministers have the option of not answering, taking as notice.

The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), with a supplementary question.

Mr. Doer: Well, I do not blame the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) for not answering the question when he is changing the cancer-causing goods at the workplace, Mr. Speaker—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) does not have a point of order. I have told the Honourable Member that we do not comment on non-answers. Ministers can take it as notice. They do not have to answer and they do not have to state why they do not answer. In this case, the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon) has taken it as notice.

The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), kindly put his question.

Mr. Doer: The changed regulation that his Government, that he is accountable for has passed, was gazetted and released to the public on the 6th of June.

I would ask the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) why his Government rejected the advisory committee's advice, chaired by Wally Fox-Decent, why they have rejected the advice from their own Workplace Safety and Health Department and why they have circulated documents in the workplaces—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order.

Mr. Doer: —why they would circulate documents in the workplaces—

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

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the rules laid down for us for Question Period are fairly clear. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) has been around here just as long as I have and knows the Rules of this House. He knows that questions, second and third questions asked in the House need not have preambles. We also know that there is a rule in Beauchesne that talks about repetitive questions. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party today seems to be breaking all the rules in the book. I would ask Your Honour to call him to order.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae). I would like to inform Honourable Members, Beauchesne's 410.(6), "The greatest possible freedom should be given to Members consistent with other rules and practices of this House."

The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), kindly put his question please.

Mr. Doer: I would ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) why the regulation was changed and gazetted, in the middle

of the night, I might add? -(Interjection)- This is cancer-causing goods at the workplace. This is not a funny issue.

My question to the Premier is, why did this Government change the regulations and circulate the lessened regulations in terms of cancer-causing goods to over 300 employers, many employee groups in the Workplace Health and Safety Legislation Manual that was sent out to all employers and workers in this province in April of this year?

Mr. Filmon: We, in Cabinet, have never met in the middle of the night. I will take that question as notice and bring back a full response.

Prevention Programs

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): In light of the comments about preventative health, Mr. Speaker, there is another change in the regulations that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has not articulated yet and this Government has not gone public with, to repeal the preventative plans that must be filed at the workplace, preventative plans for employers and employees. I think the Premier gave us a little bit of a lecture yesterday on prevention. Why did his Government remove the requirements for employers to have prevention programs at the workplace?

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

* (1350)

Budget Fiscal Stabilization Fund

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the auditor in British Columbia, after a year's experience with their Budget Stabilization Fund, has raised a concern that their financial statements portraying less than the whole of the Consolidated Fund are being presented by the B.C. Government and being referred to. We had a surplus last year and we will have a substantial deficit this year. Yet the picture the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) paints is one of gently declining deficits. My question to the Minister of Finance is, is he not doing the very thing that the auditor in B.C. is now concerned about with their fund?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member, I thought he would be standing in the House rejoicing a day, over the significant amount of rain we have had that will guarantee that we will work towards a 3.5 percent growth rate for 1989.

An Honourable Member: Well done, Clayton.

Mr. Manness: I take no claim for the fact that it rained.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has asked a question. I believe he is waiting for his answer.

Mr. Manness: I am not intimate with the auditor in British Columbia's report and the report that he has written, but let me say in general terms that the manner in which Manitoba presents its affairs in a fiscal sense is the most consolidated, is the most open reporting system that is in existence in Canada. We do not take full credit for that. That has occurred over a number and series of years of different Finance Ministers, who have listened to our Provincial Auditor and who have of course developed a consolidated reporting system. We still have a system that reports more openly, more consolidated than any in existence elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), with a supplementary question.

Mr. Alcock: That same situation exists in B.C., Mr. Speaker, but the Government chooses to refer to different sections of them rather than the summary statements such as we have here. When the Vander Zalm Government in B.C. set up their fund, the president of the B.C. Institute of Chartered Accountants commented that the fund did not follow normal accounting principles. Now, we have a respected Manitoba economist, Dr. Norm Cameron, who calls the Manitoba concept bizarre. How does the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) justify his decision to proceed in light of these concerns?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I find it passing strange that the Member quotes Mr. Cameron, because I was with him on the day of the Budget and he complimented our Government in bringing forward the best Budget he had seen in years in the Province of Manitoba. I am saying to the Members opposite, and again as I indicated in my response to the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), given the fact that this Government wants to present its finances in an orderly, open and consolidated fashion, that is the very basis for bringing before the House legislation seeking endorsement for the setting up of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund, i.e., our reserve fund, i.e., a savings fund. We are asking for support of the House to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Osborne, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Alcock: Legislation, Mr. Speaker, that is modelled on the B.C. Budget Stabilization Fund.

Fiscal Stabilization Fund Accountability

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Yesterday, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) referencing the Provincial Auditor made the point that funds which are funds of the Government of Manitoba ought to be dispensed in a way that is accountable to this Legislature. Can the Minister tell us how his new fund will make this Government more accountable?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, those funds will be reported indeed, and the use of those funds will be reported after executive decisions have been taken. Indeed, we have been elected by the people of Manitoba to govern, to make executive decisions, to make budgetary decisions, and they will be reported fully in an open and fashion way.

Manitoba Intercultural Council Russell Appointment

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): M. le Président, nous étions étonnés d'apprendre au mois de janvier de cette année que l'un des plus fervents militants contre le bilinguisme avait été élu à l'un des postes principaux au sein de l'exécutif du Parti conservateur du Manitoba.

Nous apprenons maintenant que Monsieur Russell a été nommé membre du Conseil interculturel du Manitoba. Le premier ministre a non seulement choisi un des bons amis conservateurs à siéger au Conseil, ce qui est déplorable en soi, mais il a aussi nommé comme conseiller culturel un individu qui ne cache pas ses opinions quant à ce que devrait être l'avenir de la langue et de la culture française au Manitoba.

Cette décision ne va pas seulement à l'encontre des intérêts de la minorité francophone de cette province, mais aussi est désavantageuse aux autres groupes ethniques qui cherchent à promouvoir leur culture au Manitoba.

Ma question est dirigée au premier ministre:

D'abord peut-il confirmer si Monsieur Russell a été nommé en fin de semaine au Conseil interculturel du Manitoba et si oui, comment peut-il justifier cette nomination?

(Translation)

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, we were amazed to learn in January of this year that one of the most fervent opponents of bilingualism had been elected to one of the principal positions on the executive of the Conservative Party of Manitoba. We have now learned that Mr. Russell has been appointed a member of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. The First Minister has not only chosen a good friend of the Conservatives to sit on the council, which in itself is deplorable, but he has also appointed as a cultural advisor a person who makes no secret of his opinions as to what should be the future of the French language and culture in Manitoba. This decision not only goes against the interests of the Francophone minority of this province, but it is also disadvantageous to other ethnic groups who seek to promote their culture in Manitoba.

My question is to the First Minister. First, can he confirm whether Mr. Russell was appointed on the weekend to the Manitoba Intercultural Council and, if so, how can he justify this appointment?

* (1355)

(English)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm from my knowledge that Mr. Russell was appointed to the Intercultural Council. For full and complete information as to that appointment, I will take the rest of the question as notice for the Minister of Culture (Mrs. Mitchelson) to report back to the Member.

Mr. Gaudry: M. le président, ma question supplémentaire: En nommant M. Russell à ce poste

le premier ministre adopte-t-il les opinions de M. Russell sur le bilinguisme?

(Translation)

Mr. Gaudry: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question, in appointing Mr. Russell to this position, has the First Minister adopted Mr. Russell's opinions on bilingualism?

Mr. Filmon: Non, M. le président. (No, Mr. Speaker).

Russell Resignation Request

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Le mandat de Monsieur Russell sera de conseiller le gouvernement sur tout ce qui a trait aux affaires culturelles de cette province. À la lumière de la position de Monsieur Russell sur la question du bilinguisme et des services en français, comment peut-il mettre dans une position si importante un individu qui est catégoriquement contre la langue et la culture française dans cette province?

Ma question: Va-t-il renverser la décision de son ministre du patrimoine et de la culture et demander, dès aujourd'hui, la démission de Monsieur Russell?

(Translation)

Mr. Gaudry: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Russell's mandate will be to advise the Government on all matters having to do with cultural affairs in this province. In the light of Mr. Russell's position on the question of bilingualism and French services, how can the First Minister put into such an important position a person who is categorically against the French language and culture in this province?

My question is, will he overturn the decision of his Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson) and ask today for Mr. Russell's resignation?

(English)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, as the Member knows full well, it is the Intercultural Council who will advise the Government. They consist of some 40 or 50 people who will indeed collectively advise the Government. No one individual has the authority to speak on behalf of the Intercultural Council. Any advice that we receive will be that of the council itself.

Public Corporations Executive Salary Review

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I took notice a question from the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) on June 8 in regard to salaries of the North Portage Development and the Forks Renewal Corporation. At the time, I knew the salary of the Forks Corporation CEO, Mr. Nick Diakiw, because of all the people who were hired, he was the only one that we had any involvement in. However, for the record, I would like to give the salaries for the North Portage Development Corporation.

CEO, Issie Coop, salary March 31, 1988, to March 31, 1989, his salary for the year was \$143,420.97; the

chairman, Dr. Arnold Naimark, March 31, same year, \$3,383.33; for the Forks Corporation, Nick Diakiw, salary and benefits, \$140,000; Cam McLean, for the same year, March 31, 1988, to March 31, 1989, as chairman, \$6,751.90. As you remember, as acting CEO to November when we hired Mr. Nick Diakiw, he was paid \$35,000.00.

Workplace Safety Regulations Chemical Detection

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Workplace Safety and Health (Mrs. Hammond). The Workplace Safety and Health regulation is a companion regulation to the federal Workplace Safety and Health regulations. The health hazard regulations allow for the setting of standards and exposure limits for hazardous materials, including carcinogens. The former health hazard regulations, which were tabled in February of '88, were recently gutted by this Conservative administration. It contained provisions for an objective setting of occupational exposure limits to hazardous materials.

* (1400)

The changes that this Government has made to the regulations have now entirely wiped out Section 6.2 which provided for the setting of the lowest detectable limits. Will the Minister rescind the changes to the regulations which will endanger the lives of workers in Manitoba, or will she continue to give in to the big business interests at the expense of working people in Manitoba?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister responsible for The Workers Compensation Act, as it relates to Worker Advisers): Mr. Speaker, the regulation was changed to make it easier for workers to be able to identify by using one label rather than a number, and by identifying the safety hazard of common chemicals. It is in no way endangering the lives of any of the workers. The intent of the regulation is still to protect the worker, and this was one way to make it easier for them to be able to detect immediately when there is a chemical that has a safety hazard involved.

Employee Education

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), with a supplementary question.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): It is surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the advisory committee did not agree with this regulation that you have changed. The former regulations caused the employer to ensure that their employees were instructed about all of the hazardous materials in the workplace. The changes to the regulations made by this Minister take away the requirement that employees be educated about each controlled substance.

Will the Minister rescind the change which has the potential of again endangering every worker who must work with hazardous materials, or does she feel that

instructing the employees is too onerous a problem for the employers in this province?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister responsible for The Workers Compensation Act, as it relates to Worker Advisers): Mr. Speaker, at all times our concern is with the safety of the worker, and this change was made to clarify the issue for the worker being able to recognize the designated material. Instead of having 12 labels on a particular can of materials, and I will just use that as an example, there will be one that will give the safety instructions on how to handle it. It makes it easier.

The instructions are there for the employees to see. The whole thing is not written on the can but does make it easier for them to see. I want to emphasize that we will make sure that the regulations are followed and that it protects the worker. That is the main thing. That does not change.

Prevention Programs

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): The Minister talks about the regulations. In the previous plan, there was a prevention plan which had to be prepared in the case of emergency hazardous material. Obviously this is another area that the Minister felt was too onerous for big business because she has changed that as well. Will the Minister stop caving in to big business and start looking after some of the working people in this province?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister responsible for The Workers Compensation Act, as it relates to Worker Advisers): We honestly believe that we are protecting the workers of Manitoba. Our main concern on this issue is for the worker and that we will ensure the worker is protected. The change in this regulation in no way diminishes the effect on the worker or the safety.

Educational Facilities Capital Projects

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) announced a capital budget of \$27.6 million and said that the school divisions would be informed as to their individual projects. Last week, I asked the Minister for a list of prioritized projects. However, many of the items are not defined, for example, "Winnipeg 1 School Division, replacement of one older school." Can the Minister explain how they can announce a budget of \$27.6 million when they do not even know what projects they will construct and the cost of these individual projects?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo), the process that has been followed with regard to capital projects is to have the school divisions per se, in this case Winnipeg No. 1, identify the project that they want to

have built. Winnipeg has been promised the reconstruction of one older school per year. That particular budget item was placed in the capital budget announcement and Winnipeg School Division now has to identify the school that they want to replace.

I hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) giggling. I do not know what she is giggling about, but certainly we consider the replacement of capital projects a fairly serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and it is up to the school division to identify the projects they want to replace. However, if that project does not fit the criteria, then the division will be asked to identify another project. In this case, Mr. Speaker, the division has been asked to identify another project, and to date we have not received that identification.

Public Schools Finance Board Mandate

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, can he then explain why when Winnipeg School Division No. 1 assessed their need in 1988—and forgive me, I understand he is saying that the school division should state their preference—stating that their one replacement school was to be Margaret Scott School, the non-elected, non-representative Public Schools Finance Board said no? Now Winnipeg School Division No. 1 has stated that their designated 1989 school is to be Robert H. Smith. Why is the Public Schools Finance Board making decisions of this nature?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Well, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Public Schools Finance Board to determine whether or not a particular request for building a school fits the criteria that I have set down for the Public Schools Finance Board. Now, when you have a school across the street and there is room in that particular school to house students, then it is very foolish for taxpayers to be spending good taxpayer dollars on building a school when there is one with room across the street.

Mr. Speaker, the Public Schools Finance Board has the responsibility to assess, on behalf of taxpayers of this province, the needs for school construction throughout the province. When a school division comes in with their wish list or an identified project, it is up to that Public Schools Finance Board to then assess the requirements to see whether or not in fact the criteria fit what the policy has been set down for.

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

Mrs. Yeo: In The Public Schools Finance Board Act, under Purposes and Objectives, I am wondering does the Minister believe that the Public Schools Finance Board is actually fulfilling its mandate and acting under the item, Purposes and Objectives of the Public Schools Finance Board.

Mr. Derkach: Not only do I believe, Mr. Speaker, but I can say to the Member for Sturgeon Creek that the Public School absolutely lives up to its mandate.

Manitoba Public Insurance Corp. General Insurance Division

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I have a question for the Premier (Mr. Filmon). With the assistance of many people in the City of Brandon, we have collected nearly 2,500 signatures on a petition requesting the Government to change its position on eliminating the General Insurance Division of MPIC.

In view of the fact that there has been significant financial turnaround in that division, and in view of the fact that liability and property insurance is not available to certain categories of small business in this province, in view of the fact that many people in remote areas cannot get insurance, and in view of the fact that this will have a negative impact on employment in the City of Brandon and Winnipeg, will the Premier tell this House whether he has changed his position on this matter? Will he allow MPIC to carry on with the General Insurance Division?

* (1410)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): It was because of the administration, or maladministration, of the former NDP Government that MPIC was driven into disrepute, into huge losses, into huge increases in premiums for every single motorist in this province—\$60 million lost in one year, \$35 million lost in another year on overseas reinsurance gambles. Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) persists in putting false information on the record.

The personal and commercial lines of MPIC, which he says are turned around, still lost money in the most recent quarter of the most recent year. No, Mr. Speaker, we have not changed our position. The people of Manitoba should not be paying for the losses of a Crown corporation, a business in which there is plenty of competition, 109 companies licensed to sell general insurance in this province.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Brandon East, with a supplementary question.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I do not want to get into a debate, but there has been a significant improvement in that division.

I have another question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Has the Premier acquainted himself with the discussion and the unanimous decision of the Public Utilities Committee of this Legislature, which was subsequently accepted by this Legislative Assembly, that all options should be seriously considered? How can he reconcile his position as the Premier of this province with the majority of the committee, which included the support of the Minister responsible for MPIC (Mr. Cummings)?

Mr. Filmon: We are considering all options, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Brandon East, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, they may rather treat it lightly, but the employees whose jobs are at stake are extremely concerned as well as many of the small businesses who may not be able to operate if MPIC gets out of this business.

General Insurance Division Report Availability

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Can the Premier or perhaps maybe the Minister tell this House when the report, which has been requested well over half a year now, will be completed and, on its completion, will it be made available to the people, to the Legislative Assembly?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am just told that the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) voted against the resolution.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), on a point of order.

Mr. Leonard Evans: The Premier is right. I voted against that resolution because I wanted a motion passed for MPIC to keep the General Insurance Division.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, there is convoluted reasoning behind the actions of the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). We can understand why he is confused, but the constituents of Brandon East will not be confused next time. They will know who to get rid of.

The answer to his question is soon.

Crop Insurance Cost Sharing

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Starting today and continuing on through Thursday, the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation are conducting public meetings throughout Manitoba where the producers will have an opportunity to have some input into the decision. I certainly welcome the fact that the producers are having this opportunity, but there is still some confusion, Mr. Speaker, as to exactly how much of the cost of crop insurance has been offloaded by the federal Government onto the provinces.

My question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). What will the cost of the Manitoba Crop Insurance be to the Manitoba Government in the current crop year?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): I would indeed like an opportunity to address crop insurance. Clearly we have gone through a lot of discussion in the past year with the new board, and a corporation

whose mission is to deliver the service to its clients in the best possible way. The public meetings are occurring as a result of several months of negotiations between the federal-provincial level to lay new proposals in front of the farmer clients in Manitoba and across all of western Canada.

The Member asks about the cost sharing. I can tell the Member that the level of participation of crop insurance is substantially up, so the premiums this year are substantially higher, from 41 million last year to 92 million this year. Previous cost-sharing formula was 50 percent by the producers, 50 percent by the federal Government.

As you well know, the federal Government is asking that if you go through these program improvements to improve the level of coverage of crop insurance to make it more attractive to the farmers, that the provincial Governments will be called upon to pay a portion of the Government premium. That discussion is still going on. We have now received a formal request in that direction, and a meeting on the 26th of this month in Ottawa is going to deal with it. It will also be probably finalized at the Ministers of Agriculture Meeting on the first of August of this year.

Mr. Laurie Evans: Can the Minister then tell us whether he as a Minister is prepared to assume 25 percent of the premium costs, and will he also assume some of the costs for administration in terms of the Manitoba Government input into crop insurance?

Mr. Findlay: Given the fact that the liability coverage that we had in Manitoba in crop insurance was \$375 million—this year it is \$700 million, an increased benefit to the overall economy agriculturally and to the entire province—yes, we are prepared to participate in it, provided all provinces do the same, and I believe there is a general agreement amongst all provinces. In fact, I guarantee it to him. There is an agreement that we should participate because of the benefits we receive as provinces.

What the final figure will be, it is not up to me to divulge at this time. As I said, it is still under negotiation.

* (1420)

Acreeage Covered

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, last year only approximately 50 percent of the producers and roughly 50 percent of the acreage was covered by crop insurance. Can the Minister tell us what has happened this year, what increase in the number of producers that are participating, and what increase in the acreage?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Just to correct the Member's figures, 47 percent of the acreage last year, 65 percent of the farmers enrolled. This year, we have gone from 12,500 contracts to 14,500 contracts, an additional 2,000 contracts, plus the

existing contract holders or the ones who were in crop insurance prior to this year have enrolled more acres or will be enrolling more acres through the course of this month.

The final determination on that will be at the end of June when the seedage acreage reports come in, but our expectation is that the level of participation will be two-thirds to three-quarters of the acres in the province will be enrolled in crop insurance, as opposed to 47 percent last year, a substantial increase. That is why the level of liability coverage has gone from \$375 million up to \$700 million.

Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Pollution

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings). More than a year ago, the people in Flin Flon petitioned this Government to get it motivated to deal with some of the pollution problems, the ground pollution problems that are being experienced in the community of Flin Flon, affecting the lives of some 7,800 people plus the workers in the plant at Flin Flon.

The Minister of the Environment undertook to provide reports to the people of Flin Flon on the continuous monitoring of the pollution in the atmosphere in the local area. I am wondering if the Minister of the Environment can tell us today what information he has provided to the concerned citizens against pollution in Flin Flon, to the City of Flin Flon, to the unions, the groups who expressed an interest and a concern over the environment in the immediate area.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, since becoming Minister of the Environment, I have not had direct contact with those organizations that he has mentioned, but we are actively gathering information on the fugitive emissions that are coming from the plant. Certainly, we are prepared to share that information and, as recently as last week, were actively seeking ways and means with the operators at Hudson Bay to try and ameliorate that problem.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the Government, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey), who has 25 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to continue on with my remarks in complete and full support of the Budget that has been put forward by the Government of

Manitoba, as I indicated yesterday, probably one of the best Budgets that this province has seen in many years and an opportunity for the province to expand, to develop and grow on the basis of which the people of Manitoba see it happen through private initiative. The policies of this Government are to create an economic climate where private initiative and private investment can show the Governments through example, and removal of some of the burdens and the roadblocks can encourage people to invest in Manitoba.

I just make a brief reference again to the position of the Liberal Party as it relates to this particular Budget, and their continued blocking, and I have to say blocking, and their detrimental comments to the development of Manitoba.

A good example, Mr. Speaker, was the development on the sale of Manfor to Repap and the economic opportunities that is developing for the northwest region of the province. It has such a major impact that we have to sit back and just imagine the magnitude of it. It is extremely important and, as I said last night and I will say it again today, that it is done on a sound environmentally planned basis. One would expect a responsible Opposition not to put forward irresponsible and block for the sake of political purposes of that Party.

I compliment, and I say this very sincerely, the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) and his realization of what it can do for his region of the province, whether it relates to the employment of Native people, whether it relates to local business. The whole generation of job opportunities is extremely important. I want to reiterate that.

Mr. Speaker, one has to as well take a look at some of the other initiatives that have taken place. I want to deal with one particularly as it relates to the Department of Northern Affairs. I continue to be somewhat surprised and shocked at the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), and I have to say this very sincerely, and his continued attempts to block the development of a community in his constituency.

When we came into office, elected into office last spring, there were a couple of things that were in the office of the Minister of Northern Affairs that had not been dealt with. One of those was the request for the establishment of two new communities. One was a community known as Rock Ridge, which is basically made up of Metis people, and the other one was the request supported by a petition for the development of a community known as Spence Lake, which is and has been a traditional school division, historic in the sense that it was a Metis community pretty much in control of itself.

I met with the Member for Dauphin -(Interjection)- For some reason, the Member for Dauphin is getting somewhat sensitive about it. The first reason that he is sensitive about it is because he asks a question of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) the day that I am not in the Legislature. That is a first indication that he does not want to deal with the response -(Interjection)- well, I have not heard anything from him since.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Well, why do you not ask?

Mr. Downey: I am prepared to do that. If the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) would cool down, settle down, because I know he is very politically nervous about this, and listen, I will try and put his mind to rest.

Before getting into office, we had before us when we came in two communities requesting community status, Rock Ridge and Spence Lake, Spence Lake supported by a petition of those community people who wanted to have their own community status.

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

We did a brief review of it. The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) cannot get his facts straight. He indicated that the review that we had done cost \$5,000.00. The truth of the matter is I think it cost something like \$2,500 to do a review of the potential Spence Lake development.

Secondly, the Member makes reference to the fact that I did not meet with the Meadow Portage Council and mayor. I met with the Meadow Portage Council and mayor. They did not necessarily agree with what I was going to do, but at least they had the opportunity to meet with me and we discussed the issue of making Spence Lake a community. So this whole comment about not meeting, not discussing is absolutely untrue coming from the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what did we base the decision on? Well, we based the decision on the whole area of the report that as long as we maintain the services in Meadow Portage and they could be shared with Spence Lake, nothing really would change. The only thing that would change is that Spence Lake would have a contact person. That contact person would be responsible for some of their normal civic affairs, but nothing that would impact on the cottages that are in that particular community that the Member for Dauphin has one right next door, nothing that would affect the financial support that the Government gave to Meadow Portage, nothing that would in any way in my estimation take away from Meadow Portage community, nothing that would take away from their support.

The Member for Dauphin, because he saw some political opportunism, took this on as a major, major activity. It caused a lot of problems, I have to say, for the Metis people in that community. How can the Member for Dauphin say that we are doing the wrong thing when we are giving the Metis community the opportunity to carry out some of their activities and civic affairs?

We are supported in our move by the Manitoba Metis Federation and they do not represent just a few people. They represent the Metis people of Manitoba. I think it is important to note as well that there were not any strong objections from the Northern Association of Community Councils. In fact, I feel that they are maybe not absolutely fully and totally supportive but they were not totally in opposite to it. They have agreed and said they would be quite prepared to work with both communities. My feeling and interpretation was because of the political involvement that the Member for Dauphin

got the rousing of that, it made them somewhat concerned, but I had a feeling that they were probably more supportive of the move than not.

I also indicated to the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) that in moving on one community—and he lobbied me to have Rock Ridge made a community. He had the contact person in to a meeting. He continually lobbied our office to have a meeting to form Rock Ridge. How could I justify moving on Rock Ridge as a community and neglecting Spence Lake in all honesty? How could I? How could I justify forming the Rock Ridge community, Metis community? In all honesty, it would be totally seen as an unfair act of Government. Well, maybe the Member for Dauphin could do such a thing, but I could not find it in my heart to do it. I did not think it was just and right to deprive the Metis community of Spence Lake from having their own contact person as was Rock Ridge.

So based on historical facts, because there was never any justifiable reason to make them all one in the first place, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the report said as long as they shared services that there should not be any major problems. The major problem that arose was that the Member for Dauphin saw an opportunity to try and make some political hay out of it and got involved.

* (1430)

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have a lot of respect for the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) when he makes his political hay on the backs of the Metis people of this province, and that is what he was doing. In fact, there was a time in which I was considering having the Human Rights Commission take a look at the actions of the Member for Dauphin because that is how frustrated that community was getting with his irresponsible actions.

I want the people to know, of Meadow Portage and all those communities around there, that the end of the world is not going to come, that it is an imaginary line. It is for more self-control at the local level. It is not going to cause any revolutionary change for those cottage owners, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In fact, they are not in the boundary of Spence Lake.

The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) had it all pumped up in everybody's mind that everything was going to change. In fact, I got a petition that was stirred up and developed by the Member for Dauphin where they had people who were signing it from Winnipeg, from Brandon, from everywhere all over Manitoba to try and stomp out the desire of the small Metis community from the development and their own determination.

So I cannot accept what the Member for Dauphin has done for that community.- (Interjection)- Well, it was running along quite smoothly until the Member for Dauphin got stirring around in it and started to try and get his own name forward on a political basis. So I hope the Member for Dauphin, because I have to be very clear, when we have the support of the Manitoba Metis Federation, when we have moved on Rock Ridge and we have moved on Spence Lake, nothing is going to change for any of those communities other than we

may have a little more self-determination for the Metis community at Spence Lake. Then I think we should proceed and we have proceeded.

I was unable to go to a meeting because of the forest fire situation and other responsibilities. My staff met with the council. They have agreed to the boundaries. We made a few changes. As far as I am concerned, we hope that both those communities are able to develop and grow as strong communities in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me get back more to the Budget. - (Interjection)- Certainly, it is on the record. At least I have enough intestinal fortitude to put it on the record in here. That is more than the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), who is skulking around in the back alleys, trying to cause problems for our Metis community and disrupting the lives of many people.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), on a point of order.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): This Minister is imputing motives for the actions . . . in my constituency, and I would like him to withdraw those motives, his imputing of motives. He is wrong on those, just as he is wrong on all of the so-called facts that he has put on the table today on the record. I am pleased that he has them on the record, so that I can refute them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will take the matter under advisement and come back with a decision. Thank you very much. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs has the floor.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for your fine advice and guidance. Realizing the sensitivity of the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) and how wrong he is on this particular situation, I can appreciate his feelings and will appreciate your response.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me deal with a couple of other areas that are extremely important to Northern Affairs and a commitment that has been made by this Government. We made a major commitment to northeast communities of which the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) is very interested in. I said it the day that we had the people here requesting support for the capping of the post-secondary education funding.

I will say it again, that it is very frustrating for our northern Native communities to see the major hydro developments taking place, sending that power to some of the southern communities, whether they be in the United States or into the southern parts of Manitoba, at the same time, being unable to connect in to that hydro generating system. It is unfortunate that we have not heard from the Liberal Party that they have a policy in any way, shape or form, as it deals with our northern and Native communities, as it relates to making their way of livelihoods better, their way of life better.

I do compliment the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) in his interest in the hydro development in the

northeast region of the province. I do have some criticism for him though, however, that he sat as a New Democratic for how many years? Six years—

An Honourable Member: Six-and-a-half years.

Mr. Downey: Six-and-a-half years, and he was not able to get the ear of the former Premier, the Member for Selkirk. He was not able to get the ear of the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman). He was not able to get the ear of the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) or any of his NDP colleagues. Why, if the NDP is so committed to Native rights and to making the Native livelihood better, why did they not act? One has to ask the question, how serious were they about supporting the lifestyles of our Native people?

An Honourable Member: They were not.

Mr. Downey: They were not. That is right, it was all lip-service. I tell you that negotiations are progressing very, very well when it comes to the development of the northeast power lines. That is one of the things that I hope to be able to complete as Minister responsible for Northern Affairs, and I am committed to that for his communities. One could say, why should the Conservative Party want to do that in an NDP riding?

An Honourable Member: We care.

Mr. Downey: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I tell you and I tell the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), the Progressive Conservative Party has a lot more in common with the Native communities, self-sustaining and non-governmental involvement than any NDP. Our objectives are the same as the Native people, self-reliance and determination by the people, not directed and dictated to by a socialist Government. The Native people in this country got along fine before the Government came along and started imposing regulation and rules on their lifestyles that we said were better for them. They had the freedom. That is what we believe in. In fact, my colleague from Lakeside (Mr. Enns) refers to himself as a freedom fighter.

I say to the Native community, I say to the people of northeast Manitoba, we want you to have hydro coming out of those power dams that you have had to sacrifice to let the white people build for the betterment of all the economy.

That takes me to another point. Why were we able, why were my colleagues in agreement with me and my Premier (Mr. Filmon) when we committed \$10 million to live up to a commitment on the northern flooding agreement? He had six-and-a-half years. What did he do? I know what they did. They were led to believe something was going to happen but it never did. There is a tremendous difference.

I say to the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), who I feel is not a committed socialist—I do not think the Member for Rupertsland is a committed socialist at all. I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if he took a real hard look at his beliefs, at his community's beliefs, he would fit far more comfortably on the benches of a

Conservative Government. Yes, I am absolutely serious. This is not anything more than an opportunity for the Member for Rupertsland to stand up and say that I am wrong. I would hope in his next address that he gets up and says that the Native people in this province believe more in what Howard Pawley tried to administer.

Let me give you another example, let us give another example. The former administration under the Honourable Member for The Pas introduced a law known as an Off-Road Vehicles Act. The Off-Road Vehicles Act brought in all kinds of regulations, told people they could not drive without a driver's licence, told people they had to wear helmets. That is what his administration was trying to impose on the people of his constituency.

What was the first thing that happened? The first thing that happened was his constituents came in and said we have run our skidoos, we have run our three-wheeled vehicles, we have run our four-wheeled vehicles without restriction, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now you are going to tell me I have to have a driver's licence, I have to insure it, and where do I get it fixed if I wreck it?

* (1440)

We changed it so that communities like his, who do not have all-weather access roads, that they have the opportunity to live their normal lifestyles because they use those vehicles to sustain their lives. The elders in those communities would take their machines to go and fish or they would take their machines to go and get groceries or firewood or whatever, but it was the Conservative Government that made it so those people, his people, could live a freer lifestyle without the imposition of rules and regulations.

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) again assess—you know, he has to assess—what he was sitting with and the kind of the Government he was with. Those are some of the basic principles that he should be paying attention to.

I have made reference to the hydro development which we anticipate to develop for his communities. I have made reference to The Off-Road Vehicles Act which we have made easier for his constituency and his people to live their normal, unregulated lifestyle. I have made reference to the commitment, in fact we have now flown over \$5 million out of a \$10 million commitment on the Northern Flood Agreement to pay for some of the costs of the hydro development.

That is not done because we want the people of his constituency to vote Conservative. It is because it was what was right and what was owed to those people. Now we will leave it up to them to judge as to whether or not they want him to run as a Conservative in the next election or whether they want to vote Conservative. They are even freer to do that under our Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So I say to the Member for Rupertsland, we appreciate his support for the Budget because those kinds of things will flow from it. I think in one year of a Conservative Government he has been able to see

more happen for his constituents than has ever happened under the six years that he sat with the NDP.

The bigger disappointment though, and I say this very sincerely, that the Liberal Party in Manitoba is going to vote against those things that we are putting in place for his community. The Liberal Party is voting against those increased opportunities for the northern and Native communities. I think they should reassess their position. I think that they are truly, truly on the wrong path when it comes to voting against this very progressive document. It is a very progressive document.

One other area that I want to touch on because it is again extremely important, I have heard Members of the Liberal Party, but more particularly the New Democrats—and the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) keeps talking about where are we at with our ERDA agreements, our provincial-federal agreements. Yes, we have just completed the last agreements. We had a five-year agreement in place and it was extended for two years by the former New Democrats—not another five-year long-term agreement, but two years of extension. The Members of the Opposition, particularly some of the New Democrats, say well, we really need those agreements. We are making an assessment of them, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have heard the -(Interjection)- How much time? One minute? Holy lightning, time goes by fast when you are having fun.

I will conclude by saying that I was pleased, yesterday the federal Government announced \$800 and some million, and that is a Conservative Government, for the Native communities. We have already had three meetings and we will be signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the federal Government very shortly as to how we in the Province of Manitoba can tap into it. We are taking the lead in Canada to access that program. I have already met with the Minister responsible. We will be putting in place some very long-term meaningful programs.

The former programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, albeit some of the training programs were successful, some of the job creation programs did not succeed. We still have a tragic 90 percent unemployment in some of our northern and Native communities. We have spent millions of dollars; we still have not got the employment. We will be working on hydro development for those Native communities. We will be working on road development for those communities. We want unemployment to go down to zero.

If the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) wants to get on track, I would hope that he would continue to see fit to support such important documents as this Budget, which I am extremely pleased today to be able to support. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): I wonder if the Member would allow one very short question.

Mr. Downey: Absolutely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a long one if the Member desires.

Mr. Carr: My question to the Minister is very simple. Why in his 40-minute address in response to the Budget did he not reference his responsibility to seniors once?

Mr. Downey: Let me be very short and straightforward to my colleague, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr). We have many seniors in the Native community who are taking part in this great Budget. We have a lot of seniors in Manitoba of all stripes, of all backgrounds, but particularly the Native community. I am very concerned about it, and who would we be helping most with hydro into northern communities would be those seniors. That is who is going to benefit from the Budget—housing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. So let it not be said that I have not talked about seniors. I have not specifically singled them out, but some of the things we have implemented and I have talked about, will be of tremendous support to our northern and Native seniors.

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

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is a pleasure for me to stand here today and respond to the latest written dogma of this Conservative Government. We have listened to days and days of Budget Debate, and we have listened to the rantings of the Conservative Government, and we have listened to the rantings of their cousins on the left of us. We have listened to them attempt to berate the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) and we on this side of the House for choosing to provide responsible Opposition.

If you are dealing with a corporation or a large company, any good managers in those large companies and corporations will tell you that you do not rush into decisions quickly. We know that you must weigh very carefully decisions made in companies and corporations which will affect the company as an organization and which will affect the major stockholders. Surely here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Manitoba are the major stockholders when we look at this Budget and this Budget decision. Surely the people of Manitoba deserve an Opposition which carefully weighs the pros and cons of any decision that they make, and this is exactly what the Opposition has done.

Certainly, we know this Budget has some positive aspects. We do not deny that. We applaud the tax break for Manitobans, although we do feel that the Government had ample opportunity to work with the federal Government to ensure that Manitobans would receive this tax break much sooner.

We have seen in this Budget a deficit reduction. We know that the Government was lucky. The Government was lucky with mining tax windfalls; the Government was fortunate in that we received large amounts of equalization payments. We know, however, that this Budget, albeit some good points, certainly falls short in many, many crucial areas which affect Manitobans and which affect my constituents.

As I listen week after week to the many Manitobans from all across the province who call into my office and ask questions, and to my constituents as well, I do see that with the surplus that was available there were some crucial needs that could have been met for Manitobans. This Budget has not addressed those crucial needs.

Yes, it is easy to say that it is a good news Budget from the good news bears, but I think it is very important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to note that what are the real issues that are affecting Manitobans and what are the real day-to-day problems that families and individuals are faced with when they phone their representatives in desperation.

* (1450)

So I ask myself the question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, families call me and say, my mother, my father is on a waiting list for a personal care home and the waiting list is 800 or 900. The waiting lists have been like that for years and years. Will this Budget give relief to those families, many who are under severe stress? Even though they are receiving home care services, those families are still under a great deal of stress because of a concern for their parents? Will this Budget give those families relief? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it will not.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has indicated that he has developed another committee that will examine the long waiting lists in hospitals for surgery, but will there be a solution reached? How many individuals out there who are on waiting lists for months and months must actually go and seek surgery in the United States? Those are the individuals who are going in droves south off the border to receive and to get what they feel is the appropriate medical care, but there are many Manitobans who cannot afford to do that, who do not have the resources. What about them? What is this Government and this Minister of Health doing for those individuals?

What about the elderly in my constituency? We have a Minister of Health who has a program called Support Services for Seniors. Is there any increase in this Budget for Support Services for Seniors? No, there is no increase. So that means, in essence, there will not be an increase in recreational services, there will be no increase in transportation services, there will not be any more congregate meal programs developed in the future. What we are talking about here is not something that costs dollars and dollars. It is simply resource people within the Department of Health who are there to work with non-profit, community-based groups, who work on a volunteer basis to provide services to those elderly, a very cost-efficient method of service delivery. Is there any more support services staffed to assist these community groups in this Budget? No there is not.

What about families who phone daily and who phone all of us on this side of the House daily and say, I need a day care space for my child? We know that we have seen an injection of over \$5 million into the day care budget, but we do not know yet from this Government or the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), will those dollars translate into needed day care spaces? We have many day cares out in the community, particularly in my constituency, in the Inner City, in rural Manitoba, Portage la Prairie, in northern Manitoba, in Brandon, who are saying we need to know from this Government if we have approval to expand our present day care facilities. They have not heard for over a year,

and it will be another year before they have heard again. I find that very irresponsible. Those are the needs of the people in my community that this Budget and this Government are not addressing.

What about our other vulnerable citizens in Manitoba, the mentally handicapped? Again, families telephone me weekly and say, I have a son and a daughter who is living at home. We are elderly parents, we are concerned about this mentally handicapped individual. We are concerned that they do not have a day program, they have nowhere to go during the day. We are concerned that, should something happen to us, there is no group home or community residence for these people to live in. What about those mentally handicapped individuals? Does this Budget address services for the mentally handicapped? Again the answer is no, it does not. There are no increases in the Family Services budget which would indicate there will be day program spaces and spaces for group home residences in this Budget. The Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) has had one year to reorganize or re-evaluate her department and set a direction, and this Budget clearly shows that she has not done so.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I asked myself these questions and when I think about the phone calls and the people who are calling, who have these crucial needs, who need to get into personal care homes, who need services for the mentally handicapped, who are desperate for day care services, who need services in relation to counselling for families, and I say, does this Budget and this Government address those crucial needs, my answer very clearly is no.

Then I ask myself the question, do I really want this Tory Government to manage the province? Are these people good managers? So I think and recall back the last few days to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) who seems to have failed to provide strong leadership in the Department of Education. When you ask him tough questions about services for the mentally handicapped or about needed day care programs at the university level, he tries to pass the buck. It is somebody else's problem.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Get real.

Ms. Gray: When the Minister of Education was asked yesterday—and he indicates to me, get real, well, here is a get real example. He was asked about transitional planning in regard to services for the mentally handicapped at the high school level and he had a very perplexed look on his face because he really did not know what we were talking about. He should as Minister be aware of transitional planning, and the committees that supposedly have been formed a year ago to deal with the planning and look at comprehensive services for the mentally handicapped in the school system and without the school system.

We have a Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) who has failed to fully address the critical issues facing the poor in this province. We had a promise from the Tory Government in the last election that they would endorse a one-tier welfare system. We have seen

sporadic announcements from the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) regarding specific programs. We certainly agree and we support the concept the Family Services Minister has suggested that single parents should no longer have to wait that 90 days in order to access services of provincial welfare, but that is only one small issue in the entire social assistance system. Never once has poverty as an issue been addressed in this Budget or by the Minister of Family Services.

In a press conference the other day, the Minister of Family Services—and I asked myself, can this Minister be responsible as the Minister for Economic Security and Employment Services? She did not even know that social assistance is cost-shared with the federal Government, a pretty basic fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now we have a new Minister for Seniors (Mr. Downey). We thought that surely there had to be an improvement over the last Minister for Seniors who, whenever we asked him serious questions about the issues, thought everything was a joke. Now we have this new Minister who, in very pointed straightforward questions from this side of the House about seniors, does his best to baffle and to avoid the issues. I find it very disturbing that this Minister can stand up for 40 minutes in this House and talk about his response to the Budget and never once specifically mention his responsibility as a Minister for Seniors and mention the very issues, the gaps in services, and supposedly the needs that his Government has addressed. If he is so proud of the Budget and how it has assisted the seniors, why not one word in 40 minutes?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister for Seniors (Mr. Downey) in response to a question on elder abuse, a very serious issue affecting society, tries to trivialize the issue by saying, well, one of his staffpeople said on a bet. Surely the Minister for Seniors has read the Schell Report, surely the Minister for Seniors is aware of the studies and the literature across North America that do indicate that for every case that is reported that there are many, many others that go unreported. I would hope that the Minister of Seniors firstly would educate himself in terms of the issues that do affect seniors and learn from your predecessor who chose not to do that.

Then of course we have the Minister in this House, the Minister for Comedy and Tragedy, the Minister who when you look up the definition of arrogance in the dictionary, you see beside it, Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard), the Minister of Health. Now this Minister of Health attempts to accuse our Leader, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), of being arrogant when he himself exudes arrogance in his responses, or lack of responses, to questions.

* (1500)

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) stands here day after day in Question Period. He attempts to avoid answering the questions, and he appears with his very calm exterior and his hands folded together. What we really see behind that calm exterior is a fuse waiting to explode. It has happened a few times in this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Member for Kildonan

(Mr. Cheema) has asked very excellent pointed questions on the concerns affecting health-care in this province. When I chose to ask a question on re-organization, the Minister of Health got very, very angry indeed that I could possibly suggest that he was partially at fault for what was going on in his department. Well, if the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has no responsibility for his department, who does?

When I see this collection of Ministers across the House and I see the Budget and I hear from my constituents and I hear from Manitobans and I realize that—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Let us have some order, please.

Ms. Gray: —this Budget has failed to address many of the areas and I realize that I have no difficulty in voting no to this group of managers, I feel that I am being very responsible indeed.

I would like to go into detail a bit more about where this Budget does fall short in these crucial areas. What has this Budget done for women? We see an announcement of \$1.5 million for wife abuse services and we commend the Government that they have agreed to put in a crisis line. Three hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars will go to this needed service and we are pleased that the Government has chosen to do that, but what does that leave for the whole area of wife abuse services—\$1.1 million.

When one considers that every shelter across the Province of Manitoba, shelters for women and children, is struggling because of the lack of dollars in their system, and when we consider that there is even a lack of shelters in many communities, and when we consider that there are a lack of resources in the system for women and for families who are dealing with family violence, \$1 million does not go a long way.

We know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have waiting lists when we look at the area of family violence. Certainly we have the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre where there is a three-month waiting list. We consider the tragedy that has just occurred which has been brought to light over the past few days in Manitoba, but we should not be shocked because particularly Members of this House who are MLAs should be very much aware that although situations do not always end in tragedy, this type of family violence goes on every day in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what resources are really available for these families? If women had phoned Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre to seek counselling because of physical abuse and/or sexual abuse, they would have been told, we will have to put you on a three-month waiting list. If women had phoned Women's Post-Treatment Centre, they would have been told, our waiting list is over 100 individuals, we are sorry, we will not be able to see you for over a year. If families and women had phoned Family Services of Winnipeg, they would have been told, we can probably see you in a

day appointment maybe in eight weeks, but if you have to come in the evening because you work, it will be a longer period of time.

What services are available through the department which has now renamed itself the Department of Family Services? What services are available there? If this family in St. Boniface had phoned the Community Services or Family Services office, they would have been told, we do not deal with family counselling issues, we do not deal with that at all. That is the answer they would have gotten from the Department of Family Services, and when they called Child and Family Services which is again funded through the department, they would have been told, we will deal with the children but we do not deal with the family as a whole.

When you look at the services that are not available in the City of Winnipeg—and we even have more than in rural areas—when you look at the lack of services, \$1 million is not a lot to inject into a system because it is still woefully inadequate.

I do not want to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in fairness to this Government, suggest that they are being totally irresponsible in terms of services to families. I really do not want to suggest that, because I think it is very hypocritical for the NDP Government to suggest that all these services should be in place when they had six-and-a-half years to put those services into place.

My reaction is not one of criticizing this Government so much as actually being somewhat disappointed in the lack of dollars put into the services, and actually urging this Government to re-examine the whole area of family services and family violence and possibly take a look at enriching some of those services. I would really urge the other side of this House to look very seriously at those Family Services issues.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was trying to show some disappointment in the lack of dollars that were going into Family Services and seriously urge this Government to reconsider the whole issue of Family Services, but I can see that they are not even listening to the whole area.

What of other services available for women? We had an announcement about a Women's Health Directorate. I do not apologize at all for one minute for suggesting that I did not agree with the concept that to create a separate Women's Health Directorate would only seek to further fragment the already fragmented services within the Department of Health.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) has the floor.

Ms. Gray: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We see no mention of the Women's Health Directorate in the Budget. That would be fine because I do not feel that

it should have been a separate directorate, but then what other directorate is it incorporated into? We are not really sure because when we look at the main directorates in the Department of Health, there are no substantial increases in those directorates whatsoever.

I do question the seriousness of this Government, their seriousness in actually addressing women's health issues. Have they taken the Women's Directorate, who again is responsible for advising Government and making recommendations? Why did they not choose to give them more responsibility and accountability and give them more resources to deal with these issues? They did not choose to do that. There were no increases in that budget whatsoever.

When we look, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the other services available for women, we see an announcement by this Government that now women will have access who are on social assistance to Legal Aid services where husbands have defaulted on payments for maintenance. We agree in theory and we applaud this particular initiative on the part of the Government, but then we look at the budget for the Legal Aid services. We see that in the other areas in the Department of Justice there are increases in the range of 9 percent, but when you look at the increases to the Legal Aid services they are a mere 3.23 percent increase, which is even less than the rate of inflation. In fact, the 3 percent increase would merely account for basic staff salary increases which would be a regular part of the year. In effect, there are no increases in Legal Aid services. The director of Legal Aid services has certainly indicated to us that there is a high demand for this service.

With the change in the Government policy, there will be more of a demand. With the fact that the Government has chosen not to fund the Unemployed Help Centre and they are not able to accommodate all the people, there is even more of a demand because more people are now seeking the advice of lawyers through the Legal Aid system. One really questions the management abilities of this particular Government in not giving any increases to Legal Aid services. It will be interesting to note over the next year if Legal Aid services is able to keep up with the demand, given this change in Government policy.

One wonders whether the left hand knows what the right hand is doing in this situation. Also we ask that question particularly when we are dealing with the Departments of Education and Family Services. They never seem to know, those two Ministers, what one is doing versus what the other is doing.

* (1510)

Then we have a Civil Service Commission where we virtually see no increases. That is fine. It is the Civil Service Commission. We think, well, we have heard of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) at a Women in Government seminar talk about the importance of women in Government, the importance of staff development, so we look into the regional services of various departments to see if there have been any significant increases. We think, well, maybe they are going to really look at staff development for a change and really look

at career and promotional opportunities for women and for other members of the Civil Service, but we see no increases in these areas as well.

Again, we have an example where the Government is on one hand paying lip-service to the concept of the Civil Service and their civil servants and their promotional opportunities, but you can tell when you look through the Budget, there are no actual dollars or resources that are put into those areas.

The Government loves to try to criticize this side of the House for supposedly failing to come up with positive suggestions or creative ideas. Well, we have gone over and over suggestions and ideas in the detailed Estimates. One can just read through many departments and Family Services, which is dear to my heart, and see where we have offered suggestions and advice to the Minister and to the Government about those departments.- (Interjection)-

I hear a comment, "which was ignored." Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, yes, much of the advice was ignored. We have given suggestions and I hope and I know that the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission (Mrs. Hammond) is listening, where we have said, yes, in theory, the Civil Service Commission and the Government have a policy on flexibility of hours, on job sharing, on training opportunities, on career opportunities for people in the Government. That, in theory, has never translated into any action.

We see time and time again, and we saw examples at the Women in Government seminar where in fact women in particular were asking the question, what is being done? If you want to job share, it is like pulling teeth to get a job share. Yes, the Civil Service Commission says, well, look at the statistics. Look at all these examples of people who are now job sharing. What really occurs is that it is up to the individual manager or supervisor to make that determination, and there is no clear-cut criteria or encouragement for individuals to enter into those types of job-share arrangements.

I was concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, actually about some of the Premier's responses at that Women in Government seminar. I was concerned that in fact in response to questions asked by the audience, he was saying, well, yes, when there is a particular issue or problem, we will deal with that. But he seemed to miss the general theme that came out of that meeting and that was that there are severe problems in the entire Civil Service that have not been addressed and need to be looked at.

I just noticed today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in fact we saw an announcement that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has announced that as a result of the Women in Government meeting and as a result of support from the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) and the Leader of the Third Party (Mr. Doer), that there would in fact be an audit of the Civil Service Commission. I am pleased to see that the Premier has followed through on that. I am pleased to see that he in fact will go ahead with that particular audit, which I think is certainly long overdue.

I know that the Minister of Labour and the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission (Mrs. Hammond), who was at that meeting as well, is certainly very much aware of some of the difficulties in the issues affecting women and visible minorities within the Civil Service. I am sure she became aware of a situation which was brought to her attention that particular evening, in regard to unilateral decisions by the Civil Service Commission to, in effect, demote individuals within the Department of Health and Family Services, and the majority of those individuals were either women or visible minorities.

Now, I happened to ask the question in the House one day, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) about his pending reorganization of the Department of Health and Family Services. In his response to that question he did mention that, in fact, there were some grievances on the books in regard to concerns from staff about demotions. The Minister of Health became very angry with me when I suggested that although the NDP were the beginnings of that problem in terms of what they did in regard to the regional services four years ago that this Minister of Health, who spoke so eloquently in Opposition and spoke in favour of the staff saying there are severe staff problems, there are severe morale problems in your department, Mr. Minister of Health, he spoke so eloquently and now that he is Minister of Health he has actually succeeded in making the problem worse over one year because of his inaction.

We have a lot of concerns, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the Minister of Health when a question is raised in the House and then the Deputy Minister, one would assume under advice from the Minister, decides to have all these individuals come to his office at 6:30 in the evening, incognito, and discuss the issue with him. I find that very, very strange that a Deputy Minister would do that.

Why was not the Deputy Minister of Family Services involved in that? Why was it not in an up-front meeting where the secretaries of the Deputy Minister phoned all of those individuals who, having grievances or pending grievances, and said, let us discuss this issue and see what we can come up with. No, it was done, what would appear to be, under the table. It was done at 6:30 at night. In fact, when we talked with the union representatives, who we have been speaking with, they as well were very concerned with what was going on. One does question the integrity of what is going on in the Department of Health. I have not asked the question of the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) because I am concerned that her Deputy Minister does not know what is going on and it is totally being handled by the Department of Health.

I raise these issues because I do have some faith in the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission (Mrs. Hammond). I hope that she will talk to her colleagues, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), and really begin to address this particular issue.

Whether this Government wants to realize or recognize it at all, there are over 15,000 civil servants in this province who do provide a valuable service. It

is very incumbent upon any Government to ensure, wherever possible, that staff morale, I would say, is maintained, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is so low right now that I would hope that it is not irreparable in terms of the damage. I would hope that some efforts would certainly be made to address these serious difficulties.

When we have a Minister of Health and his senior staff who allow regional directors to play favourites and to juggle and change job descriptions every other day, surely there is something wrong with the system. What really happens, in effect, and I make no apologies for having empathy with civil servants since I was a civil servant, but what it really translates into is poor service delivery for the clients. So when a client phones an office and is in stress and families are in stress and they need a service, they are not going to get that quality service because all the managers and supervisors and field staff are spending all their energy and all their time dealing with internal squabbles and internal grievances, and that service is therefore not being delivered to the people in the community. Surely that is the goal of any Civil Service, to deliver those services as best as possible.

When we examine the Budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I look at the Department of Family Services, I look at what services there are for the mentally handicapped in this province. When I read over and listen to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), who spoke the other day in her response to the Budget Speech, she indicates that she has had a number of reviews in her departments. She feels that these reviews will have, and I quote, "a major impact in how we deliver services in the future and how our social services continue to be shaped for the years to come." Now, certainly that may sound like a worthy statement and a worthy goal, but my question is, the Minister of Family Services indicated one year ago that she needed a year to re-evaluate her department, to get reorganized and to set a course, a direction, for her department of Family Services, in particular to set a direction for what the services would be for the mentally handicapped. Does this current Budget give us any sense of direction as to where that department is going? It surely does not give us any direction whatsoever.

* (1520)

We see increases in budget from this main Estimate which would indicate to us that there will be no more day programs for the mentally handicapped, that there will be no more services for group homes, so that the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) has failed to set a direction in her department. There are no objectives; there are no goals; they do not know where they are going. What this translates into is more and more people who are calling our office on a daily basis saying, I have a mentally handicapped adult at home. There is no day program, there is no money to put into day programs. They are sitting at home with nothing to do. There are 100 individuals who are on waiting lists in the City of Winnipeg alone who would wish a useful appropriate day program for themselves, never mind the individuals in rural Manitoba who are looking for this.

There are a number of communities out there in rural Manitoba where community groups would like to build

community residences for the mentally handicapped. They have individuals at St. Amant Centre, they have individuals at the Manitoba School and they want to bring those people back into the community.

Now I know we had a lot of problems with the former administration in terms of their Welcome Home Program and possibly the implementation of that, but surely this Government has been on the record as indicating, this Tory Government, they believed in deinstitutionalization, they believe it is important that people live in their community. When is this Government going to put their words into action in terms of the resources that are allocated in this Budget?

We had a review about the Wiens Report which talked about many serious issues affecting community residences. Again, I have told the directors of Winnserv this personally, that I give them credit for the way that community-based organization handled themselves in this very, very difficult time.

We see a situation where the Minister has been told by the Wiens Report and many others that staff salaries are at a minimum wage level in these homes and you cannot hire qualified staff because people will not work who are qualified for minimum wage. Have there been any increases? The Minister will indicate, yes, there have been increases to the whole area of community residences and their per diems have been increased. She is correct when she says that. When you still look at the fact that they must pay their staff only minimum wage and that the larger residences will suffer, we are still not addressing the main problems. Then we look at the residential care system and we look at the services in the regional services where monitoring should be done in those group homes, and we see there are no increases at all.

The Members opposite are accusing me of backing up the Brinks truck. I do not think they have any idea of how little it costs to put one mentally handicapped individual in a day program for one day. Do you know what the cost is? Ten dollars, \$10 a day plus \$20 a day for transportation. That is a very small cost in comparison to having four or five staff deal with these families and individuals six months down the road because they are in a crisis, paying for hotel rooms and paying for 24-hour workers because the person is not coping or sending them back to the Manitoba school.

It is very cost-efficient to deal with these community-based groups who are more than willing and have sent in proposals to the Government saying, here is what we want to do. We have got WASO out in East Kildonan who has a greenhouse project which is supported by Community Places, who actually will have the mentally handicapped working and getting a salary and taking them off social assistance. The Government is sitting on these types of proposals because you would not know vision if it hit you in the face. That is the problem with the Tory Government.

I want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to also talk about the Budget in relation to the Health Department. We have this Government who feels the need to put a one-liner in their Budget address about increased services to

home care, so that they can supposedly dispel this myth that they are not putting dollars into home care. Let us look at that situation.

They have thrown dollars at direct services to home care which means they are paying for more home care attendants, more VON services and more homemakers. Now, the problem that we know that has been in that department for the last four years is that there is not enough staff at the field level who can adequately manage those resources. So what the staff do, and I do not blame the staff for it, is they throw the resources. They cannot deal with the families. They cannot deal with the complaints. So if you want to get rid of the problem, you give them more services rather than working with the families to determine what the real level of service should be and putting in appropriate services and monitoring on a regular basis. That will not occur with this Budget because there are no resources to do that. They are just throwing money at the problems.

I could go on and talk about the lack of emphasis in health promotion and in disease prevention and talk about the joke that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has initiated about working closely to increase workplace safety. They should take a look at their own back yard where they have deplorable conditions in Government offices, and staff who hopefully are going to sue the Government because of their negligence, I hope, because maybe that will at least bring to the attention of this Government that they should be looking at their own office situation, because the civil servants are laughing at the Government's initiative because they do not believe it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this document is sorely lacking in the many crucial areas which affect my constituents, which affect the elderly, the poor, the families who are needing day care services, the families who have mentally handicapped and families who have elderly parents who need a personal care home. I feel, and I have no difficulty at all in saying, that it is a necessity for me and it is responsiveness on my part that I join my Leader and my colleagues in opposing this Government on this Budget. Thank you.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I wanted to note first off the ascension of two Ministers into the Cabinet, the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) and the Member for Kirkfield Park (Mrs. Hammond), both of whom I think are a plus to this Cabinet and certainly will give it some guidance that it certainly has been in need of over the last year.

I am also pleased to be back here and healthy once again. My doctor tells me I have another month of treatment before I am completely off the blood thinners. For a while there, you know, the thoughts of missing the smiling faces of the Government Members here and not being back home and well was so troubling to me that I made an extra effort to get well and get back.- (Interjection)- That is right.

I did want to spend a few minutes reviewing briefly the development of the Liberal Caucus since the election of last year, because do not forget that up until the

election last year they really did not have a caucus. I guess they had a caucus of one, I suppose. There is a term. It is probably still called a caucus, if it is one, but it became 20 and then it became 21. The problems with that caucus of course, or the development of any caucus I think, any Party would have a problem coming from nowhere to get 20 seats. You would have the tugs of war between the right and the left and an undeveloped right and left within the caucus.

At least, our caucus and the more developed Parties have a developed right and left, and people know who is where. In that particular caucus, I do not think they really knew who was where and I think that they are still developing. That tug of war is occurring over there. There is also the tug of war as between the polls and the attempt to appeal to everyone. You have differences of opinion in that caucus as to whether they should go this way or whether they should go that way. They do that on an almost daily basis.

* (1530)

The Member who is making some noise from his seat right now, the Housing Critic stood up at the beginning when the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) announced the Ladco deal and suggested that this was great, that it was time the Government got rid of this land and he was right with them. Twenty-four hours later, after he was blown out of the news coverage by our critic, they changed their tune. Now they come out finding all sorts of faults with the Ladco deal. So it is very difficult to follow an Opposition that is basically jumping around almost on an hourly basis.

We thought the previous Conservatives were bad. We thought they were bad but at least it took them a week or so to move the complete circle. But these guys, I mean a day in the life of the Liberal Caucus is nothing. I often wonder when the book, "The thoughts of Mrs. Carstairs" will be published and how thick it will be. I think that she is running her course. We sense that on this side of the House that the love affair could last only so long, that she could say one thing one day and another thing another day and only get away with it only so many times. Over time, she is becoming more exposed. I think that is to the people of Manitoba's benefit overall. Last year, we had darkness and that was all.

You could liken it, if you will, to the nights when you are at the cottage and trying to sleep, and there is a constant buzz in the air. You try to swat whatever it is that is making that noise and you do not have much success doing it. But then several things happen and happened here. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) bought a flashlight and he used that flashlight. He found it easier to track that buzz and he was able to score a few more hits. Then he sent a flare over to the other side, the flare from Springfield, to illuminate the back 40 and to give him a better sort of view of where the buzzing was coming from.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact of the matter is that dawn is now approaching and the head fly and a lot of the other little flies are being exposed. In another six months to a year, we are going to be approaching

high noon and there will not be any shade. It is going to be very, very hot and very uncomfortable for those little flies over there who are sitting out there in the scorching heat distorting matters on a daily basis. They will be looking for shelter and they will not be finding any.

It is quite possible that particular state of affairs may happen. It may happen sooner, it may happen later, but time is on our side. We have the time to wait you out and sooner or later you will find yourself in that situation.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

I have been wondering for the last week or so what it is that the Liberals do not like about this Budget. Now what do they really not like about the Budget?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): It is not theirs.

Mr. Maloway: My colleague, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), says that it is not theirs.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), we have looked into what she does not like about it. Her Party last year accepted quite a lot of money from a number of banking institutions in the Province of Manitoba. The Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) is here, and I wanted to ask him whether he knows how much money his Liberal Party accepted from the banks in the last year. How much -(Interjection)- zero. The Member for Assiniboia says that the Liberal Party accepted zero from the banks.

Let me tell him that the Bank of Commerce gave the Liberal Party \$1,000 last year and the Toronto-Dominion Bank gave the Liberal Party \$1,500.00. -(Interjection)- The Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak) says absolutely zero. The fact of the matter is that the Royal Bank gave the Liberal Party two donations last year, \$3,000 and \$7,000, for a total of \$10,000.00. The Bank of Nova Scotia, \$9,000.- (Interjection)- Well, the money did go into your coffers because it helps to pay your bills. It is as simple as that. The Bank of Montreal contributed \$5,000 and the National Bank contributed \$750.00.

Mr. Speaker: Order please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Elmwood has the floor, and I am having a great deal of difficulty in hearing him. Honourable Members wishing to carry on private conversations can do so outside the Chamber.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, these donations were made sequentially and there were a number of banks. There were three banks who gave very small amounts in the beginning of the year, so I guess to make up for it they came in at the end of the year and they made up for it by giving a second donation.

The National Bank came in with an extra \$1,500, the T.D. came in with an extra \$1,500 and the Bank of Commerce came in with an extra \$1,000 to bring up their totals to a respectable level, to be up there on a par with the others, but the total -(Interjection)- that is right. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) asked the question that we want to know. Does anybody in the Liberal Caucus know what your total contributions

were from the banks last year? Does the financial critic? -(Interjection)- He says no, the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak). Does he know how much you got from the banks last year?

An Honourable Member: You are going to find out.

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

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): I thank the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) for asking details regarding our donations from the banks. I can tell him that I myself received no such donations and that in fact I have a policy of receiving no donation of over \$100.00.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As the Honourable knows, a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not have a whole procession of Liberal MLAs standing up and denying that they get contributions because we know the money is going somewhere. The total for the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) is \$31,250—\$31,000.00.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), on a point of order.

Mr. Ed Mandrake (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: What is the Honourable Member's point of order?

Mr. Mandrake: Mr. Speaker, this Honourable Member is placing on record falsified information. He said that I received \$31,000.00. I never did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. As the Honourable Member is quite aware, a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

Mr. Maloway: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, this is public information. Perhaps the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) is not aware of that. He should consult with his caucus management and I am sure they would provide him with -(Interjection)- Ask his Leader, we asked him to ask his Leader and his Leader may be able to tell him.

* (1540)

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the point of this exercise is to question whose pockets are these people in? The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) when she was interviewed—a transcript of an interview she had, a scrum—just right after the Budget on Budget Day, here is what she said to the media when asked, what about the proposal for a corporate tax break. Carstairs: "This is a particular tax break for banks and banking

institutions. It is one that quite frankly they have discussed because banks had been paying much more corporate tax than it was anticipated that they would."

I do not know what you get from reading that, but I get the impression that somebody is in the pocket of somebody else, that perhaps the Liberal Leader is in fact backing up, supporting some of those people who contributed so healthily to her Party in the last year. Perhaps these banks are getting something for their \$31,250 that they gave last year.

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger), on a point of order.

Mr. Herold Driedger: Yes, on a point of order. I do hope that in his tirade which is emotional, and we can understand that he does go to excess, but there is the allegation that political contribution does affect how people vote and act in this House. That reflects—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Herold Driedger: —on all Members in this institution, that side, this side and everybody.

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

Points of order are justified when there is some flagrant misuse of the rules, but they are unfortunate necessities which should not be regarded as usual phases of procedure.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) has the floor.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, I did make reference to a parade and the parade seems to be developing a little quicker than I had thought. They are going to have to bring more of their Members into the House. The Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch)—I took the time to read his speech, I know some of you were here to hear it—made reference to the fact that he could not make reference to NDP Members not being available in the Chamber ad nauseam, at least twice in his speech. I wish he were here to hear some of this.

In any event, I just cannot let the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) go unscathed once again because he certainly knows how, over the years, to shake things up, going from the extreme right of the Conservative Party and sort of flipping, somersaulting right over the table there over to the second row of benches.

In last year's speech that he made, August 10, concerning the Budget, he had said, had the Liberal Party formed the Government, "What would they have done. Would they have done as we did, or would they have done as some of their Members say, spend, spend? We do not know. We may never find out. We are not sure."

An Honourable Member: Who said that?

Mr. Maloway: This is the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch)—well, the temporary Member for Springfield. There are not a lot more Parties that he can join. Mind you, there is a history in other provinces—and one should tell him this—that people tend to form their own Parties. I suppose he could do that.

The Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) has been referred to as a Trojan horse over on the Liberal ranks. He also said on page 439, "I think that to defeat the Budget would not sit well with Manitobans, and they would reply in like at the polls." Of course what is he trying to do just one year later? He is out to defeat the Budget at every opportunity.

We made reference last year, Mr. Speaker, to some of the spending commitments that the Liberals made last year in the election campaign. I certainly do not intend to dwell heavily on those at this time, but did you know, during the election last year they promised in election promises \$259 million? That is supposed to be a responsible Party running for Government. After the election, they promised a further \$453 million, so the total of their spending for last year alone, promises, was something like \$714 million.

With that, we have ample quotes from their Members where they want to reduce the deficit. Now how in the world can you do something like that? I mean, how can you have it both ways, the Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz) states. That brings us back to the famous Member for Niakwa who when in Opposition said he could have it both ways. He probably did not know at the time that quote would go on forever and books would be published on it. Even though he is not here any more in this Chamber, he still lives with us and in our hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I am also interested in knowing where the Liberals stand in some of the other items of the Budget, for example, the tax breaks. They have claimed that they are supportive of tax breaks. I do not know how they are going to be able to sell that idea when they vote against the Budget and try to convince people they voted against the Budget that would give the tax breaks, but they are going to try to maintain that they really did agree with tax breaks after all. I do not really think that position is going to sell that well, especially when you consider how good the tax breaks are going to be for the families in this province.

For example, did you know that a person who is married with three dependants and earning a net income of \$25,000 will have a net decrease, will have a saving of \$455.00? I want these Members, the Liberal Members, to go door to door in the next election and tell these people that they did not want them to have that \$455, or are they going to try to have it both ways, as the former Member for Niakwa wanted? Are they going to say vote against the Budget and also go out and say that they really deep down supported these tax breaks?

I think that we are going to be collectively on good grounds here, both the Government and the NDP as Parties in our constituencies battling Liberals with a Liberal record like this.

There are other interesting parts to the Budget that I am not certain where the Liberals come down at. One of them is a stock savings plan which we have yet to hear more fully about from the Minister. Not having talked to the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) about this, my suspicion is that it is probably similar to the worker-oriented plan that we were looking at bringing in as early as last year, although the Minister is aware that there are plans in Quebec and other provinces. I do not know to what extent he borrowed from the ideas of the previous Government in terms of what they wanted to do, but if he did, he did not take it the whole route because we were planning to come in with a labour-sponsored stock savings plan, which would be tantamount to the plan in Quebec which has worked fairly well.

Now to the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), and I knew he would be supportive of this idea, I do not know that the current Finance Critic (Mr. Alcock) would even understand this concept, but certainly the Member—well he may support it but does he understand it, but the Member for Transcona I am sure both supports it and understands it. That is perhaps why he should still be the Finance Critic, but I am the last person to want to meddle in the affairs of another Party.

An Honourable Member: We want Kozak.

Mr. Maloway: Without organizing a draft Kozak movement for a critic, a rehabilitation program without setting one of those up, I would just like to say that I do believe that the Member would understand this type of program, given his background.

We had problems in our caucus and our Party about this concept. I do not know whether you are familiar with the type of arguments that we have. I am sure the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) is probably aware of it, but many of you are probably not. That is there are a certain number of people who will argue philosophically against this program because they say that this is just promoting another tax scam. Wherever you allow people with money to take advantage of the tax system, essentially at the expense of people who do not have money, then you are perpetrating a raid, so to speak, on the Treasurer. There are those of us in the caucus and in the Party in the NDP, who did not like that proposal and felt we should reform the tax system first to have a more equitable tax system, and to get away from putting in yet another tax deduction scheme, scam, call it what you will, for investors albeit small investors by and large.

Let me tell you that the people who took that view in the caucus lost out to those who argued that this was a very good way to get employees money, keep employees' money in the province, to broaden the investor base of Manitoba from wherever it is now at 5 percent or somewhere around there, up to a higher amount, getting more people to invest, and that these workers would become the owners of their—in some cases, the owners would be investing in other companies in Manitoba and companies that they would even work in.

* (1550)

Now, of course, that is essentially what is happening right now. I mean the workers are giving their money to Investors Syndicate or ManuLife or other insurance companies who are turning round and doing precisely that, taking the money and investing it in small business ventures. This stock savings plan would, I think, have the advantage of allowing these workers to have a little more direct access to the process. I am sure they would develop a certain amount of bureaucracy around it, and so a certain alienation would develop over a few years whereby the worker would probably not feel any more control of his money or her money than if they gave it directly to Great-West Life, which is the case right now.

On balance, Mr. Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), I think that the plan is probably a good one and something that should be looked at and proceeded with. I do not know where the Liberal Party stands on this plan, but to be fair, I have not heard all of their speeches either. So I do not want to condemn them in advance, and hope that they come across with some more consistency on this issue than on some of the others.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to make just a few other comments on some items, some of which flow directly from the Budget and some of which may not, but I would like to commend the Minister of Finance for the issue that he had in the HydroBonds and that is nothing new. When we were in Government just a very short number of months ago, our former Member for Kildonan was constantly at caucus insisting that we bring out our own savings bonds issue. It is something that has been talked about for some time, but to give the Finance Minister his due and full credit, he did it.—(Interjection)—That is right, and that is important that he did.

One could argue whether or not he could have gotten the money cheaper in Switzerland at 6.5 percent rather than paying 11.25 percent, and all these other things.—(Interjection)—Just wait a minute, to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). One could argue those points but I am prepared to defer to the Minister on this point and say to him that on balance he is correct that the money, that 11.25 percent, is being paid out to Manitoba residents who more than likely are spending it here in the province. More than likely some of these investors may be taking it out here and taking it out there, but it is just another avenue to raise money. I think it is an important avenue and one that he should be commended for taking the initiative on, and I would hope that he would do that again next year. He knows that does not stop the necessity for picking up that 6.25 percent to 7 percent money in Switzerland. He is still going to have to do that, and well he should.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to, just before I finish, make a couple of comments about the consumer legislation that the Government sort of announced in its Throne Speech. The Minister wanted to be here. I know that. I do want to make a comment initially about the change in Ministers. Last year we had a Minister who certainly seemed willing to co-operate, but in the final analysis he did not. Maybe with the change of Ministers we are going to see some improvement. I have a feeling that will probably be the case, that the new Minister, with

less responsibilities and probably a desire to rehabilitate himself after a disastrous first season, may surprise you all in the House and come back with a Wayne Gretzky-type performance this year and put you all to shame.

The Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connerly) may become the star and the czar of Cabinet this year if he manages to manoeuvre through all these consumer Bills that he purports to support. I applaud his initiative and I wish him well. I hope he is able to and I hope the Conservative Caucus will support him in that effort.

We certainly did not get the support from the Liberal Caucus. That was clear. In fact, when we brought in the Bill last year dealing with the requirement that car dealers in Manitoba do nothing more than leave the stickers that are put on the windshields of cars at the factory, do nothing more than leave them on the windshield until they are sold—as is the law, by the way, in Ontario and in the States—what did the Liberal Caucus do on a very simple issue like that? Well, they had a meeting with the Motor Dealers' Association, and the Motor Dealers' Association came in and said, this is the way it is going to be, you are going to do what we say. The Liberals backed down and now they are big fans of the Motor Dealers' Association, in the Motor Dealers' Association's hip pocket.

The Government, to its credit because the Members have been around a little longer, are smart enough to realize that there are only 40 motor dealers. There are only 40 or 80 votes there and it is a very popular issue.

The Liberals may find themselves caught out in left field, middle field, right field, Lord knows what field they are in, but out in the field on this one, as the other two Parties carve up their territory, a territory that they could have had just one year ago, but they chose their bed, they chose to hop into bed with the Manitoba Motor Dealers' Association, the car dealers' association. You know, they will learn over time that there is probably more mileage to be made staying away from those dealers.

Just another comment, Mr. Speaker, here on the payroll tax, the Liberals were big fans I guess for the elimination of the payroll tax, along with the Conservatives, and of course it is just recently that the Ontario Liberal Government announced a payroll tax in Ontario, and now we have two Liberal Governments in Canada, in Quebec and Ontario, representing what?—50 percent of the population in Canada, two Liberal Governments who have the payroll tax.

These Liberals are hellbent on breaking with Liberal tradition and supporting a Government that is in favour of weeding out a tax that as they raise the threshold is affecting fewer and fewer people but is still catching the major revenue producers, the major revenue producers being the big companies who can afford to pay the tax, even if it was at 3 percent, and the federal Government who pays his tax. So I would think the Government, if it was wise, would stop before it bleeds away any more revenue on the payroll tax. It would stop and reconsider and perhaps leave the threshold where it is now, and consider that they have won whatever victory it is that they feel they have won, cast

off their Liberal allies on that fight and just consider this one a dead duck. Because I do not think that they can ill afford to lose the revenue that they are getting with the payroll tax that they still have right now.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to make just a very few more comments on a couple of the Bills. The lemon law is something that is very, very important. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), when he was the critic of Consumer Affairs for two years, spoke about the need for lemon laws and the Government has been in place for a year now. I think that it is incumbent upon them to honour some of the commitments that they made while in Opposition, their critic made. We have simply reminded them of that fact by way of a Bill, and we hope to see that coming out in due course.

The Unfair Business Practices Act, which is something that is now in effect in something like seven provinces, that really gives the Consumers' Bureau the tools to do things in consumer-related problem areas in this province rather than relying on mediation, which is a pretty haphazard way of doing things. It gives them the tools to get the job done. This is legislation that we are very hopeful that we will see from the Government in this Session. I believe that they will come out with this because once again it is in place in seven provinces. I believe Saskatchewan was the last province to bring it in. In fact, the trend here is that within the next three or four years every province will have this type of legislation.

* (1600)

Franchise protection legislation is an area that the Government should be looking at. It is an area that not that many people know a lot about at the current time, but there are a lot of people out there who have problems, who are in the franchise business, who have problems with the franchiser coming to them and forcing unreasonable terms on them. In fact, you become in many cases a slave to the person you bought the franchise from and some type of legislation, some type of law is required in that area.

The deposit legislation is another area that I would hope for some sort of action from the Government in this Session. Time will tell in what order these Bills come out or if in fact they do at all.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think that I have managed to clear the House of most of the Liberal Members in this Chamber. When they found out they could get nowhere by standing up and complaining about my speech, they just managed to leave. The Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) came back, but I am sorry I cannot give him a repeat. He will just have to wait until the next time or read it in Hansard, as I had to do with his speech. Thank you.

Mr. Mandrake: It is a great honour to speak to this Budget. Before I start, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell on the people on my left. Obviously, they are so scared that 50 percent to 75 percent of their speeches are directed at us. They must think that we are going to become the next Government, so I do not blame them. Please do continue so.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget Speech, although it might appeal to some people, certainly does have some flaws in it. What I would like to approach before I go into the Highways Department, that being speech therapy.

I have had letters from my constituents asking the Government to take a little bit more positive action on speech therapy. I realize that in the Budget they have allocated some three positions. One person in my area is presently paying something like \$90 per visit to have her child go through speech therapy. I do not think that is fair. If they do have to pay for this type of treatment, maybe the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) could go and speak to his federal Minister and maybe provide some type of a tax relief for these people.

Mr. Speaker, in the Budget Speech this Government has announced again another 1 cent tax on cigarettes, and it is hurting. I do not complain about the 1 cent tax providing it is used in its proper manner. Take that tax and educate our young people not to smoke. Why go ahead and put it into capital? Give it to educate our young people because you will never convince an old codger like me to quit smoking.- (Interjection)- No, you are not. The only thing you are trying is flapping your gums.

This Government is bound and determined that they are going to levy a tax upon tax upon tax. Again, they have done that to our gasoline tax. What they have done, they are going to accumulate some \$8 million this year on this particular tax. I want their assurance that they will follow what they said June 5, 1986. The Government should seriously consider some form of dedicated funding for the department. I would want to indicate to the Minister that it would be my intention to support any such move and I would encourage, to the best of my ability, my caucus to do likewise. Boy, that is not happening, Mr. Speaker. The other one, a dedicated tax on motive fuels, dedicated so that when it is collected by the motoring public, they know it is going to go back into the system. Mr. Speaker, these are not my words. They are the words of the now Government. What are they doing about it?

Mr. Speaker, April 30, 1987, the critic at that time said, Manitoba prides itself in being a transportation centre. Well, it certainly is. When reported in the Winnipeg Free Press on March 4, 1989, our Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) said that the province wants no part of control over the airport because it fears it will be stuck with some of the losses. He even rejected participating on an advisory committee. Now the least he could have done is sat on that advisory committee and maybe he would have learned something. June 8, the now retiring Mr. Elliott still reinstates what he has always said before that this could become the transportation hub of Canada. What is this Minister going to take us? Down to Gladstone? Not very likely.

This Minister has been in office now for well over a year. He has received letters, numerous petitions from people regarding the safety of our bicycle personnel on the streets. Have we seen just one, one initiative, that he has taken for the protection of our bicyclists? None.- (Interjection)- Well, maybe he should not drive a bike either, or a car, I should say. You know, just a

simple matter of maybe asking the bicyclists to use helmets. I mean, it does not take very much of an initiative to do that. But no, he does not want to do anything, he wants to sit around, do nothing—a do-nothing Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this Minister go from one disaster to another. July 19, 1988, reported in the Winnipeg Free Press, he is going to institute toll bridges for the highway, Highway 75; April 1, 1989, the infamous Gladstone incident. How long did it take him and his Party to apologize to the people of Gladstone? It did not take him until the 13th of April, and I find that in poor taste, very poor taste. The least he could have done is the next day, knowing you made a mistake, apologize. Apologize. The Member for Gladstone (Mrs. Oleson) should not be so mouthy because she was there.

* (1610)

This Minister is bound and determined that he is going to implement parallel parking in our rural areas, parallel parking. What is he going to do? He is going to destroy our rural little towns. Some towns, maybe angle parking might be the answer to attract people into surrounding areas to shop there if they do not have parking. I will use Killarney as a beautiful example, I was there.

An Honourable Member: When?

Mr. Mandrake: None of your business. I was there, Mr. Speaker, and I completely agree with Killarney in that case that maybe parallel parking was the answer. I am not going to be in complete agreement, but maybe. I suggested to the people at that meeting that maybe they could find some additional parking along the main route, and they did. Now this is the kind of attitude I like to see being taken by the people in our rural areas.

Then we had VIA Rail, our famous Mr. Mulroney, our Prime Minister said use it or lose it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have before me evidence that from Vancouver, end of May 1989, we have had increases starting at 14 percent to well over 80 percent and 90 percent travelling in those trains. Now that, we say, is not a very, very bad way of handling our VIA Rail. I went and wrote a letter to this fine Minister and asked him to appear before the Motor Transport hearings. He did not even appear. (Interjection)- Oh yes, he responded, he responded all right, but he did not even want to go to the hearings and advise the chairperson of how Manitoba feels about VIA Rail.

We have seen what happened with the Port of Churchill, and I have to compliment the people on my left-hand side for the Port of Churchill. This Minister had the chance to do something about it. He did nothing. He sat there with the finger, you know. I am not going to go any further than that. That is upsetting, very upsetting.

An Honourable Member: Now he has moved over and is sitting with that bunch.

Mr. Mandrake: Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, in April I attended a meeting at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. It was a very, very bad day. It was a Sunday at the time when we lost a life in Manitoba, a family by the name of Jurriens. I was travelling between here and Portage la Prairie. They were sanding the highway and I could see the reason why we have accidents on our highways.

The truck has one chute, and that chute is going on the left-hand side or the driver's side of the truck instead of being in the centre. Where is this Minister? He had been here for a whole year and he has done nothing. He has antiquated equipment.

An Honourable Member: Did Albert do anything about it?

Mr. Mandrake: No, he just sat there. Typical.

Reported in the Winnipeg Free Press on January 10, 1989, this Minister proudly stood there and told the Winnipeg Free Press that he has \$6.8 million more spending in the department. The Union of Manitoba Municipalities says this, it is a golden opportunity for the province to take advantage of lower prices and improve Manitoba crumbling road systems.

My question, Mr. Speaker, where did that \$6.8 million go? We do not know. There are no increases hidden this year in the Budget, nothing. Operations and maintenance in the present Budget this year received a plus \$2,446,900, and I compliment upon that, but guess what the winter roads received?

An Honourable Member: How much?

Mr. Mandrake: Three thousand dollars. Shame on you. You can afford to have a \$200 million slush fund and you cannot provide money for winter roads. You should not even be in power for being so—and the guy from Northern Affairs, the Minister for Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), has the audacity to say something like that.

An Honourable Member: He does not care about the northern roads.

Mr. Mandrake: No, he does not, but he certainly likes chirping from the seat.

Mr. Speaker, on your Planning and Design Department—the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) is laughing. I will get down to his area pretty darn soon and we will see what he says, whether or not he will have that big smile on his face.

Highway 75, the twinning of Highway 75, the great apple in the sky that we were told about in 1988, this year we did not get a mention of it in this Budget, not one word. (Interjection)- \$10 million, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says. I would like to see that \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, we are building a beautiful highway to join the southern part of Manitoba with Winnipeg. I am grateful for that, but one thing that really amazes me is why do we have to use up so much good agricultural land to build a highway, to twin a highway. We have

well over a hundred feet between the meridian and yet another hundred feet or so between the side of the highway to the farm access road. We are not talking small acreages here. That is a lot of land which we are chewing up for nothing, and I would strongly suggest to this Minister to go back to his department, kick a few butts and say, why are you doing this?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order. The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), on a point of order.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): By the language of the Member, although I agree with all his points he is raising in the condemnation of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger), I would ask you to look at those ancient documents that we have there to see whether that is a word of precedent.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, the Honourable Member—The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), on the same point of order?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would expect the Member to reconsider the words he said. Our Government certainly does not subscribe to the tactics of kicking employees, abusing employees in the Department of Highways. I think the Member should reflect. I am surprised that the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) would put himself in support of those terms. We do not believe in kicking our employees.

* (1620)

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

Mr. Mandrake: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Mandrake: Mr. Speaker, further on with Highway 75, this Minister promised to listen to the people for the by-pass. He did, particularly in Morris. I must compliment him on that, but what is he going to do with St. Norbert? I want answers—(Interjection)—indeed you will.

An Honourable Member: Gilles, give him your notes. He is lost.

Mr. Mandrake: Not very likely, Jim. I know where I am, not likely with you.

Mr. Speaker, Swan River airport, has this Minister acquired all the air rights for this airport? Not very likely. I know from one farmer he has not. Therefore, why is he asking for a variance on the air rights for that airport? We will be talking to him in Estimates about that.

Drivers in this province are now being subjected to what they call a centralized booking system which the

people on my left-hand side had implemented. During the last election, the now Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) condemned this action by the Government and asked them to decentralize this particular booking system. Numerous letters have been sent to the Minister asking him to address this issue and nothing has been done. Here is a golden opportunity for this Minister to decentralize at least part of his department into the rural areas, in areas like for example, Thompson, Dauphin, Swan River, areas that need it. Think about that, Mr. Minister.

An Honourable Member: You forgot Brandon, Ed.

Mr. Mandrake: They do not need it, they have you, Jim. The Budget, Mr. Speaker, is a complete shamble. We have lost money in our Budget. I mean, constantly we are losing money.

I would like to bring only one other issue, which is not very, very significant, about repair plates on vehicles. I know this because I travel a lot through this province, and they are being misused. I hope that the Minister will undertake either to instruct the constabulary to pay a little bit more attention for the use of these repair plates because at times they are being used for personal use. I do not think that is what it was meant for.—(Interjection)—

Repair plates, Mr. Minister, repair plates. Mr. Speaker, this Minister had the opportunity to ask for a greater budget to implement something that probably everybody on both sides of the House have been asking for and had been advocating for, including the then Conservative Leader, he is now your Premier (Mr. Filmon) of the province, said on April 15 in the Winnipeg Free Press, announcing proposed crackdown on drunk drivers. He said yesterday he would introduce photographs on drivers' licences to deter suspended drivers from getting behind the wheel with borrowed IDs.

Mr. Speaker, I praise the gentleman for saying that, but let us get it done. Let us not be sitting around thinking about it. Thinking does not do anything, believe me. In that case, the more they think the more dangerous they get.

An Honourable Member: All they are doing is amusing you.

Mr. Mandrake: Not even that. On June 7, 1989, the Registrar thought he would again impose upon the Manitoba public another little regulation that probably might require some correction if only the Minister had the proper budget for it, and that being able to drive a vehicle which has passengers from 12 to 15, they now require a Class 4 licence. The industry says, fine, we do not disagree with that but give us time to do it within. I mean, they received a letter in June and this is supposed to be implemented in August. Mr. Minister, that is being a bit autocratic. I mean do it now or else.

Now this industry needs some support. So why not delay it, Mr. Minister, until March 1, 1990, therefore giving these people an adequate time to go get their

drivers' licences because right now, Mr. Speaker, to get the driver's licence, it takes between four to six weeks to do it, and there is just no time. If this Minister had the budget to work with, maybe he could implement something like that.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed at the Minister's travelling show band on billboard changes. He went through all of Manitoba asking for input upon signs. So all I am asking is, when is he going to table that report? When is he going to table that report? That was done January 6, 1989. Again if he had the money, if he had the budget, he would be doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to touch on a very, very important area and that being the taxicab industry. Now, February 1, 1989, Mr. Norquay said, and this is reported in the Winnipeg Free Press and I will read: "As of yet, we have heard no evidence that would support an increase in the quota of regular taxi licences." Mr. Speaker, we are going to hold him to that. We are going to hold this chairman to that.-(Interjection)- Absolutely, absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, I had consultations with the taxicab industry. They have informed me that the Technical Advisory Board has been increased from six to 12 but yet no increase from the industry. Now, when do we have all the knowledge that we can tell a particular industry how it is supposed to operate? I would strongly suggest, listen to the people, listen to what they are saying, then maybe we will learn something, maybe we will learn. The Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) is laughing, he thinks it is a big joke because he does not listen to anybody.

An Honourable Member: Indeed, that has been a constant nightmare to me.

Mr. Mandrake: There is no sense of quoting somebody like that.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter before me that a particular person in the Minister's department was conducting a survey. I wrote him a letter, he writes me back and tells me, well, she had no business doing it. Now who is running the department, who is in charge of the store? Who is in charge of the store?-(Interjection)- Believe me, at times I wonder.

* (1630)

Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1986, the Opposition, when they were in Opposition, spoke about one very good area—and that is very dear to me because my cousin lives there—the critic said at the time, "we have experienced some fairly serious accidents on that corner under various conditions. The junction of 10A, the Yellowhead Route, and No. 10 North through the town, there were a number of deaths there for years, but they seem to have that under control now. They have rumble strips and a stoplight and God knows how many signs, and they still keep crashing through there." I am just reading what the critic said, so please do not quote me for bad grammar. I think there were something like 19 people killed there in the last 15 to 20 years, but the last couple or three years it is pretty accident free,

so maybe the last signage and rumble strips have been the answer to alert them that they are coming to a major intersection.

Mr. Speaker, again, if the Minister had enough money in his budget, I would strongly suggest that he put in place a safety infrastructure for this intersection, and by that I mean, lights, signal lights, something that is going to prevent any more accidents because we cannot afford to lose another Manitoban, absolutely not.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

I would like to now go into the part that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) was being so eloquent about, saying that we are going to get \$10 million. I do not know where it is going to come from, but according to my calculation in the capital budget, we have only received—and this has been appropriated—\$1,752,000.00. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister is looking at me in a very—I am talking about Expenditures Related to Capital, the top of page 93. Last year it was \$111,174,200, and this year it is \$112 million, so that is only—(Interjection)- I will come to that, Mr. Minister, I will come to that. You know, I will come to that, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they were in the Opposition on June 5, 1986, what did they say? They said, we need another \$100 million or \$150 million more in our Highways project. Where is that money? Where is that money? Now they are in power. Show some leadership. Give the Minister of Transport (Mr. Albert Driedger) that kind of money so he can build Highway 75 in the most expedient way instead of waiting for seven years.

The Manitoba-Churchill Agreement which expired in 1989, March 31, I have looked through the Budget for this year and you have not got one penny, not one penny, for the rehabilitation of boxcars for the forthcoming year, 1990; \$6,911,000 was taken out. This Minister stood in his Budget address and told us sincerely, and I am sure he was sincere, that he was for the Port of Churchill and he was going to work for the Port of Churchill, and of course he sent his blood brothers to Ottawa to lobby for him and they got it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find this type of action to be very inappropriate for a Minister who has been in office now for well over a year. He should have fought for the Port of Churchill in such a manner that would have made his twin brother in Ottawa shake in his boots because all he had to do is go there and say, look, we need it. No ifs, ands, or buts about it, we need Churchill.

June 12, 1986, when they were in Opposition, they are quoted, "Just discussing the rail traffic to Churchill and hopefully it can be developed. Has the Minister any studies," and that is directed to the Minister at that time, "at his disposal on the possibility of two-way traffic into Churchill? I realize that probably needs warehousing facilities, or what studies have been done to encourage or enhance two-way marine traffic in and out of the Port of Churchill?"

Well, I was in Prince Albert and I listened to the presentations which were made in Prince Albert. Of course the following was said, and I quote, "Phosphate fertilizer, the U.S.S.R. has got an abundant supply of

it." We have a trade imbalance with the U.S.S.R. at the present time. Now, what a better way to be able to use our railroad from Churchill, full, going back down south than bringing this fertilizer in from the U.S.S.R.? It is not only that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but we could also then have additional employment in Manitoba.—(Interjection)— See, what are you going to do with it, a Member says across the road. Well, hopefully you have enough savvy that you will find something to do with fertilizer, I hope.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the subject of the Port of Churchill, I would like to bring to your attention that when I rose on this floor, and of course I had some fun with the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) asking about the Port of Churchill, and I asked the Premier (Mr. Filmon) whether or not he would take some positive action on the Port of Churchill. He is recorded in the Winnipeg Free Press as saying this, "'Good news is coming for the Port of Churchill,' Premier Filmon said yesterday. Mr. Filmon told the Legislature, Prime Minister Mulroney," which is a big laugh—I mean he talks to him, sure he does, "has taken the beleaguered port's interests into his own hands.

My goodness gracious, I guess that is why we have to wait until today or a couple of weeks ago to find out what is going to happen with the Port of Churchill, because Mr. Mulroney had it in his hands. "We expect," and he went further on, "that there will be some positive announcement forthcoming in the near future."

This type of action we do not need from this Minister or from his Leader. Manitoba can no longer afford this lethargic type of attitude. We have to show people in the north, south, east, and west that we are a caring Government. Obviously we are not a caring Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This Minister had compiled Churchill Enhancement Initiatives, February 1, 1989, and there were 48 of them. I would ask, why is it he does not have some money in his budget whereby he could address these initiatives? Address maybe two of them, that is all we would ask. Address one, something that would diversify the economy of Churchill.

Why do we have to always rely on a one-base economy? I mean the people in Thompson already know what happened to them several years ago with the mining economy, so why can we not take some initiative? I realize the people on my left-hand side did nothing because they were of course floating money into Churchill. Why worry about diversifying it?

I ask the Minister to now, today please speak to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), appropriate some more money into his budget whereby he can address some of these issues.

* (1640)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have now told me I have only five minutes left and I am going to be very, very quick.

On the Hudson Bay Route Association, there were 24 resolutions. I ask the Minister, did he act on one?

No. Why did he not attend this association? He refused to attend this association. I will ask him one last thing and then I will terminate my comments.

The farmers of Saskatchewan and northern Manitoba are flying into northern Manitoba and they are going to be there July 31, leaving Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan. Would this Minister guarantee this House that he will appear with this group in Churchill to show solidarity for the people of Churchill? That is all he has to do. Take himself, people from the media and the two critics, and let us go to Churchill to show solidarity. Let us not drag our feet any more. This port is too vital for the economy of Manitoba. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) has the floor.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I am pleased that I have a little time in which to maybe make some comments. Most certainly some of the comments that have been put on the record, I will not even bother replying to, but I would like to straighten out a few things that the Member left on the record that concern me dramatically.

It is surprising what a difference a year makes. Last year my critic at that time and myself, I thought we had a relatively good arrangement, whereby when he had concerns my office was accessible at any time. I brought him in, had him meet some staff. We went through some of the concerns that he had, and now within a year, all of a sudden he already is a specialist in it.

Based on the comments that he has been putting on the record here today, I think we are going to have a very interesting Estimates procedure starting on Thursday. I would just like to suggest that before we go into the Estimates process, the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), as well as the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus), should maybe learn how to read the Estimates book, because when the Member for St. Norbert asked where the money was and had to be directed to where it was showing, when this Member here who is my critic asked where the \$6.8 million that supposedly were savings because of the contracts coming in lower, if we will look at what the— he says we do not know where it is. Well, if you will look on the left side on page 89, page 93, pardon me, on the left side, the top line, \$94,316,500 was expended last year. If you look at the right side, it shows the increase which gives us for the first time the highest construction budget in the history of Manitoba and if this—(Interjection)—

Well, see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my problem. This Member cannot understand what is going on. I thought I spent a lot of time in the Estimates last year trying to explain exactly how the process worked. That in the Highways program that we estimate, it is not \$100 million. If we want to spend \$100 million, we take enough projects to the tune of \$160 million, because you never know where these projects come on line with

the process of acquiring rights of way, survey design, the grading, depending on weather conditions, it is very difficult. I thought I had spent a lot of time trying to explain to this Member how the process worked. If he still does not understand how the process works, we are going to have a difficult time in the House.

I do not know whether he just had mean pills today or not but certainly, all of a sudden, he is a professional critic and should be. But some of the things that he has been leaving on the record here, in parallel parking he says on the one hand, which is typical for the Liberals, in Killarney maybe it is good, but on the other hand in Gladstone, because he was there as well, he says maybe it is not good. So I find it very amazing where the gentlemen wants to go. He says, this is my policy that I am bringing forward. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the parallel parking program has been in place since the 1960s and every Minister in the past has sort of, the department has been just normally doing it.

It is not something new that this Government or this Minister invented in the last six months, but all of a sudden he feels that he has an issue that he wants to—he does not understand the issue. He does not take time anymore to come and get information, and certainly we have that information available to him. I have always told him that any time you have some concerns, come into my office. I will make my staff available to you. I have offered that to other people from the Opposition Parties.

The Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) has asked me on various occasions information about the Selkirk corridor, things of that nature. I try to make provisions to have them come down and see what is available, to go through the information with staff. But all of a sudden, the Critic for Highways and Transportation, the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), does not feel that it is necessary to come and gather information any more. Then he gets up in the House and makes statements here that are totally wrong and I can understand that. Then he attacks and makes statements about my position with the Port of Churchill. When we established the all-Party committee, he was not even a Member of that committee and he is the Critic of Highways and Transportation under whose jurisdiction that should be. That shows the confidence that obviously the Liberals have in this Member.

I do not like to get vindictive in this House, but when the Member, the way he did this afternoon, starts making the kind of statements that are not right, that are not researched, and puts all kinds of irresponsible statements on the record, I have been here long enough, I will defend my position, and I can guarantee you that. I would suggest to the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) that before we get into the Estimates on Thursday, he better have a revised attitude about this thing, because I am prepared to take him on with his half-baked ideas and half knowledge of a lot of the things that he put on the record today. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) feels that I am a little upset about this thing, I am upset because I do not intend to take that kind of abuse with putting statements on the record that are totally wrong.

I have suggested to the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), come and talk to me about Highway 75.

He says nothing is happening on Highway 75. He says, why do you not put money into the budget for Highway 75? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not even tabled my program for this year. I know how much money is going to be spent and I will be tabling that program within a short period of time, and he will see that we will be expending close to \$10 million on Highway 75. That past the point—and we tried to explain this in the past, that past the point that we have construction right now there was not even survey and design done. This Member runs around and makes statements three months ago, saying that I have already made a decision where the Highway 75 is going to go, whether through Morris or around it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not even have the consultants' reports yet.

Then he indicates to the press out in the rural area that he has been a busy man running around picking up half stories wherever he smells there could be something coming forward. I think it is very irresponsible that if a critic wants to make statements that he should make himself aware of the facts and that is what has not been done. If we are going to continue on this kind of a route, the relationship between the Critic from the Liberals on Highways and Transportation and myself are going to get very strained. Most certainly, if he has concerns that he wants to bring forward, that is his prerogative to do. That is what we are in this House for, but not to go running around and making statements that are totally erroneous.

To indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how wrong the Member is, he says, what am I going to do about St. Norbert. Well, if he would check, St. Norbert happens to be within the City of Winnipeg, and I have no jurisdiction over that portion of the entrance. However, I am working together with the City of Winnipeg to try and resolve that aspect of it and we are looking at doing some joint funding on that. The critic does not even know that St. Norbert is not within the jurisdiction of the province and makes all kinds of statements of this nature.

I want to repeat, if that is how we are going to operate, this boy will look after himself all right, but I suggest that his attitude had better change when we get into the Estimates process. He can most definitely have different views on certain things and criticize that, but get your facts straight—get your facts straight. That has been a problem that has happened with the Liberals for the last while in many cases.- (Interjection)- You learn how to read it, that is what I am suggesting to you. Learn how to read it. You and the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) are both way off key on this thing. Get in there and figure it out.

* (1650)

The Member makes reference to the Port of Churchill. I had indicated before, I do not know why they do not have him on the all-Party Committee. Obviously they do not have the confidence in him. I will tell you something, he made a lot of cheap shots.- (Interjection)- That is right. That is why I am suggesting I will always take the high road. If you are going to put this kind of stuff on the record here, I will tell you something, I can play on the same level you want to play at. I will

tell you something, you better get your facts straight. You had better get your facts straight when we start on Thursday because it is going to be a wild time, I will tell you, if you want to start making these kinds of statements. I would suggest that you have somebody educate you in terms of how to read the Estimates process here because of what we are having here today.

Now I want to get down to the drinking and driving aspect of it and find out where the Member stands with that. Given the opportunity this week, I will be giving second reading to Bill No. 3 which deals with drinking and driving. I hope that there will be support from the Members opposite on that, to get this through as soon as possible. I want to suggest that I will be addressing this in second reading, that in order for us to get through Bill No. 3—

Mr. Mandrake: On a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), on a point of order.

Mr. Mandrake: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Minister makes remarks that I was putting things on the record, etc. We did not receive and he did not table his Supplementary Estimates until he gave it to me today. What kind of a Minister would do something like that? They should have been tabled this afternoon during Question Period.

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

The Honourable Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) has the floor.

Mr. Albert Driedger: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will clarify that issue as well. The normal proper process is to at least provide the Supplementary Estimates two days before we go into the Estimates, or sooner.

However, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) supplied his. I did not table my Supplementary Estimates. We had a little goof-up in the office there temporarily.— (Interjection)— Hey, and I admit this frankly. I tell you, I went back and picked them up and hand delivered it to the Member, including the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), I gave them both. I apologized and indicated that I would officially table the Supplementary Estimates tomorrow. We are establishing new rules here all of a sudden. Now it is important. At the time, when I delivered it, it was acceptable. I am just wondering what has happened to the Member? Last year, we had a good working relationship and all of a sudden we are going to get into a match, then we will get into a match.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member started criticizing the drivers' testing centralized booking. If he had wanted to have some information on this, it is working beautifully. Before we brought in this centralized booking, we had people and young kids sitting at six o'clock in front of Drivers' Licence Testing Stations and waiting to get on. Now it can be done by appointment. The system is working well. We had some bugs that

we straightened out in terms of the Telephone System, but it has been working well. We have continued to say to anybody, where we do have driver testing, if there are problems we will address them. If the need is there, we will address it.

He makes criticism towards decentralization and that aspect of it and says, set it up in Swan River. Set what up in Swan River? What are we going to set up in Swan River or Dauphin? I mean, we have a system in place. We have a centralized booking system in place. What are we going to set up there? I cannot understand this. Then he makes reference to photo licensing. I want to get into the photo licensing during the Estimates and indicate exactly the process. If the Member had taken some time and checked, they could have indicated that it is at best 18 months to two years before you can get that system in.

Now I will tell you something, and I will outline the whole process when we get into Estimates on this. I can envision, with the attitude that the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) has at this stage of the game, that he would be running down the street taking a snapshot and handing it out that way. It has to fit into the total system and I will try and explain that system to him when we get to that appropriate—

Some of the other things that the Member made reference to, I will not bother dealing with now and I will have a chance to deal with that later on. Just a few comments about the Port of Churchill. The Member makes reference, he says, why do you not have money in your Budget to deal with some of the initiatives in the Port of Churchill? In case the Member does not know this either, the Port of Churchill is a federal responsibility, that my role as Minister of Highways and Transportation is not one of decision-making there but of influencing and trying to lobby the federal Government in terms of the decisions that it should make out there.

However, the province by and large supports the complex out there. We have problems there, other problems that we are dealing with at the provincial level and we are dealing with that. The Member is suggesting that the two critics and myself and one or two others go down to Churchill and show them that we are all together on this thing. I think we have already established that over a period of time, that our concern, when it comes to Churchill, is an unparochial one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I possibly have responded a little bit out of character for myself but the fact that the Member put all these things on the record, as I indicated before, without having the actual information, without doing any research on it, sort of got me a little riled and I have responded in kind. I want to still indicate to the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) that if he so chooses we can go the high road in the Estimates process or we can go whatever level he wants. I am prepared to do that. At that time I would hope, because I have always tried to be very accommodating and will continue to do that. When I have made my opening remarks on Thursday, we will see what kind of response we get.

Certainly the objective of a good Opposition should be to look at what we have done. If they do not agree,

they can register that and give suggestions, but they better be constructive suggestions rather than just run around like a loose cannon somewhere and start shooting at things when you do not know what is in the gun.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Kozak: Will the Honourable Minister submit to a question and finally say something about the northeast Perimeter Highway?

Mr. Albert Driedger: I will accommodate the Member somewhere along the line but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel I am on limited time and I have not even touched on the things—I got a little aroused here and now I want to get down to the Budget Debate here.

I just want to indicate that the 12 years I have been here I have listening to all kinds of Budgets.

An Honourable Member: Has it been that long?

Mr. Driedger: It has been almost 12 years, yes. I have listened to some good Budgets; I have listened to some bad Budgets. I can recall sitting in Opposition when we thought the then Government of the Day, the NDP Government, was in financial problems and we anticipated that it would raise the sales tax at that time. We really thought that they were really squeezing, that they were hurting financially. What happened, I can recall we thought—and we had anticipated certain things. When they came down with the Budget, I should have anticipated this because I thought we would really be able to make some good political points on this. That is when they brought in the payroll tax. They got up as a whole group and cheered the then Minister of Finance and said what a great Budget he had done, he did not have to raise the sales tax. He put the 2.5 percent payroll tax in at that time. I felt a little—I was going to say cheated almost, because we did not really know the full impact of the payroll tax at that time. I know how I felt at that time. That is one of the Budgets I remember very clearly. The other one I remember and that is very fresh in my mind, and I am very excited about it, is this Budget today, the one that we are debating right now.

* (1700)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when that Budget was coming forward, you could see the sagging across in terms of the Liberal Opposition. You could just see the balloon going down. Since that time, when our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) brought forward what, I think, is the finest Budget this province has ever seen, the deflation has continued and in the desperation on that day did not know which way to go with it. That is understandable.

After a Throne Speech or a Budget Debate, without really going into that, if some media person comes and sticks a mike in your nose and says, what do you think of it? That particular day there was very little reaction. The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) had to almost say it was a great Budget, but the next day it

started. I guess instructions went out to her caucus and said, you find out whatever you have in your responsibility. If there is any little change, you have to pick on it.

I suppose that is what the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) was trying to do today. I am prepared to spend some time with him between now and Thursday to show him exactly which lines we should draw attention to. If he does not know, I will draw to his attention where the problem spots are. Certainly I am prepared to discuss them with him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sort of got off key a little bit. I had hoped to make a high-road speech and cover all the things that are positive things in this Budget, how it affects the rural area. I was going to gloat a little bit about the highest highway program that we have ever had.

All I want to say is that I am elated to be part of the Government that has come down with a Budget and shown financial responsibility, and has been open about where it came from. It did not hide the fact that we had some windfall gains. We feel that we have done well, and I want to take this opportunity to say that to my Treasury Board colleagues who spent endless hours going over these things to make sure that each department was as responsible as we could make it. With those comments, I have enjoyed the few minutes I have had on this Budget Debate. Thank you.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to rise in this House and address the second Budget of our Government. It is a Budget that I am very proud to defend. I know that it must have seemed like heaven for the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) to be able to come forward with a Budget that had a lower deficit, lower taxes and increased spending in all of the right areas of Government. Who would not want to come forward with that Budget? We certainly, as a Government, are very proud of this endeavour.

I remember in the 1986 election campaign when we suggested that because of growth in the economy, because of growth in source revenues, it would indeed be possible to implement certain small increases in expenditures in selected areas, carefully thought-out plans to make sure that our priorities were set right, and still at the same time not increase taxes and at the same time work on deficit reduction.

Some reporters—I recall one columnist refer to that as voodoo economics, but this is not voodoo economics. This is economic judgment, this is careful planning, this is sound management, this is hard work and this is selection of the right priorities to bring together all of these things. I repeat, because it bears repeating: lower deficit, lower taxes and increased services to people, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is why I am proud to defend this Budget and that is why I will be very, very proud to vote for this Budget.

I believe that this Budget can be best judged by looking back a year ago to our Throne Speech. In that Throne Speech we said, and I quote, our "vision for Manitoba is simply stated: A competitive and diversified

economy which will provide increased job opportunities for our citizens, and pay for quality health, education and social programs." This Budget builds toward that vision.

When I was in Opposition, I often spoke of the frustration I felt when I saw the failure of the previous Government to tap the full potential of our province and our people. Our province has many tremendous advantages that all Members of the House unite and recognize: clean air, clean water, abundant minerals, forests, fertile land, abundant hydro-electricity. But most of all, people, people who are willing to work hard, who care about others, who are enthusiastic, people from all backgrounds and all over the world who came here, like my own father, like my grandparents, like the forebearers of so many in this Chamber, to build a better, more secure future in this province.

Yet with the ever-increasing taxes, fees, levies that the previous Government had put forth, they established a climate that discouraged individuals from pursuing opportunities, creating growth and prosperity for us all.

This administration has a very simple premise. The source of the initiative that built our province is the individual. Our economy grows not as a result of Government, but because of the hard work of enterprising individuals who are willing to take risks and turn their dreams and ideas into reality. Even the Soviet Union is beginning to recognize that principle today.

Our Government is dedicated to providing an economic climate that will encourage small business to take risks and to grow, a climate that will encourage new entrepreneurs to risk their time, energy and savings in a new venture to create economic opportunities that will make our province strong.

I believe that Government's first job is to remove disincentives to grow. If we want to increase investment, we first have to examine the range of policies, regulations and taxes that impact on the private sector. We have one of the highest tax regimes in Canada, thanks to the former administration. We have, as well, (Interjection)- as my colleague has just indicated, a tax on jobs. That is the kind of crazy message that the last Government sent to businesses wanting to move to Manitoba. Move here and we will tax you to death, and just to make sure, we will penalize you every time you create a job.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I note with some chagrin that the Ontario Liberal Government is following suit, following the leadership of the former NDP administration in this province, bringing in a payroll tax of 1.95 percent, sad, sad, sad. It is a recipe for disaster, it is a sure-fire formula for economic stagnation.

But we are turning that attitude around through Budgets like the one we brought in last year and the Budget that we are debating right here in this House today. We have lessened the burden of taxes on Manitobans, we have cut personal taxes, we have cut the payroll tax and we have cut the education tax on

farm land. Personal income tax in Manitoba has been cut 2 points down, from 54 percent of federal tax to 52 percent. Families will see the Manitoba tax reduction for dependent children increased from \$50 to \$250 per dependent. Those cuts mean a family of four, with one working parent earning \$25,000 a year, will save \$441 per year. That is \$441 more to buy clothes for their children; \$441 to make those repairs to their houses that they have been delaying; \$441 that will be helping in a small way to improve our quality of life. Those tax reductions are not just good news at an individual level, they are a \$61 million injection into our provincial economy. That means more consumer spending and business activity to spur economic growth and sustain and create jobs.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

There will also be another \$3.4 million for the Education Tax Reduction Program for farmers, to reduce school taxes on farm land by another 10 percent for a total of 35 percent reduction so far in our mandate in our first two Budgets. That is an additional boost to rural Manitoba over and above the personal tax reductions.

Small business and entrepreneurs remain a key focus of our Government's activity. We are continuing to make progress in our plan to remove the payroll tax and its disincentive to job creation. Once again, we will double the payroll tax exemption, this time from \$300,000 to \$600,000 of payroll annually, with partial exemptions extended upwards to employers with payrolls of up to \$1.2 million.

We are establishing several programs to provide support for entrepreneurship. Building on the tax holiday for small business established in last year's Budget, we are creating a new loan guarantee program known as "Manitoba Business Start" to help women and rural residents form new businesses.

We will also work with the private sector in our efforts to establish the Vision Capital Fund, working together with the Small Business Growth Fund. We will provide up to \$30 million in additional funding both for innovative new ventures and expanding mid-size businesses, as well as bringing new businesses and entrepreneurs right here to Manitoba.

* (1710)

These measures taken together move us well along the path to a stronger and more vibrant economy. They are restoring incentives for Manitobans to pursue their dreams, to take risks, to build a stronger economy with more opportunities for all Manitobans.

The May employment figures show that 11,000 more people are in full-time jobs in Manitoba today compared to this time last year, an increase of 2.7 percent compared to the national average of only 2 percent. Employment and finance, insurance and real estate areas of our economy has increased by 21.5 percent compared to the national average of a 2.4 percent decrease in those areas.

Let us talk about the story behind those numbers, a story of new and better jobs throughout Manitoba.

Let me outline very briefly some of the success stories that rarely hit the headlines, success stories that reveal the opportunities being created in our province today.

Otto Bock, world renowned for excellence in medical devices, research, development, and manufacturing, expanding their Winnipeg facility with a \$4.6 million plant addition, bringing 50 new jobs on stream, and enhancing Manitoba's research and development capacity.

The Manitoba Energy Authority, Dow Corning have completed the test phase of a project to process Manitoba silica sand in a plasma furnace. With Manitoba's hydro-electric resources, the silica sand can be inexpensively processed into silicon metal. They are now entering the pilot plant phase. If the full program becomes a reality, it would create employment for up to 500 people over 20 years, and in addition to that they would use between 150 megawatts and 200 megawatts of firm hydro-electric energy, becoming the largest electricity user of one source in the province, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, what is so tragic about this good news is that the Liberals are opposed to bringing Dow Corning into Manitoba. Their Member, their critic, the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) went out to the public hearings at the Municipality of St. Clements on the land use proposal. Even though he had no reason to criticize it, he openly acknowledged he knew nothing about it, he got up and told the people at the meeting that they should be concerned about Dow Corning coming there. Mr. Speaker, the people of that area had a great deal more common sense than the Member for St. Norbert. They told him to keep his comments to himself and go back to his constituency and try and find something to be concerned about in his constituency because they certainly were not concerned about Dow Corning. They were excited. They were enthusiastic. They wanted the jobs. They wanted the investment, and they wanted the economic stimulus for the Rural Municipality of St. Clements.

Kitchen Craft, a well-known quality kitchen cabinet manufacturer announced plans for a \$2.1 million plant expansion, ultimately resulting in 130 new jobs over three years.

Morphy (phonetic) Wheel Manufacturing will spend more than \$1.5 million for its new plant, creating better truck and trailer wheels and creating 52 new jobs.

Out at Marchand, Pinewood Pure Spring is expanding and modernizing its bottling operation, spending more than \$1 million establishing a new and refreshing Manitoba export product, bottled Manitoba water, and creating 13 additional new jobs in the process.

In Steinbach, Loewen Windows has launched a \$6.5 million expansion, creating 50 new jobs and introducing state-of-the-art technology to its manufacturing process.

I recommend to Members opposite that they listen for all of these announcements because many of them are in rural Manitoba. They are part of our rural development scheme, part of our plan to ensure that rural Manitoba benefits as much as the City of Winnipeg

does by virtue of these economic stimuli that are going into the various areas of our economy. We are spreading out the benefits. We are spreading out the jobs and the investment because it is good for Manitoba and good for our future.

With the support of the province's Industrial Opportunities Program, Palliser Furniture, already an international leader in the production of fine quality furniture, has announced plans for a \$6.1 million particle board manufacturing facility. They will bring a new industrial technology and diversification to Manitoba and provide a company with a secure material supply. With that secure supply comes at least 200 secure jobs over the next five years.

Some of the other businesses enjoying increased expansion in our province: Canadian Occidental Petroleum in Brandon, Manitoba, a \$50 million investment with 27 new jobs; Dominion Malting in Winnipeg, completion of a \$7.4 million equipment modernization will allow the company to expand export sales with 72 additional jobs; Burns Foods Ltd., a \$27 million dollar modernization and expansion, 200 new jobs, increasing total employment to 1,100 people in this province of ours under Burns Foods.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to speak to a gathering that was arranged by Burns Foods last week in the company of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) and to talk about the good news in Manitoba because Burns was embarking on their 100th year in business. They are proud of their history. They are proud of their expansion and their growth. They are proud to be a part of Manitoba and they said so.

I was disappointed that the Leader of the Liberal Party did not share in my optimism and share in my pride about Manitoba and its growth. In fact, I might say that was mentioned by many of the businesspeople there.

Versatile Manufacturing, expanding this year with a \$10 million investment; Minebea of Tokyo, Japan, investing in hog production facilities, Phase 1 and 2 investment, \$20 million, total employment, 62, again a commitment for rural Manitoba; Boeing Canada is undertaking a 350,000 square foot expansion, \$13.3 million investment, 98 jobs per year for three years, for a total of 274 additional jobs, and the Liberals and the NDP said that they were not happy with it.

The Liberals said, why would you give the money to a big corporation. Why would you give the money to a big corporation? Firstly, it is a repayable loan. The fact of the matter is, why would you put money out to a small company that is unstable? Why not have a large company that you know is secure that will carry out its expansion plans, that has the resources to be able to do what they say they are going to do, to create 274 jobs? They do not want the jobs in Manitoba. That is a very unfortunate set of circumstances. I cannot believe the negativism of the Liberal Party in Opposition. They are the very same people who, when these jobs are being created, criticize every one of them. They criticized Repap. They criticized Dow Corning. They criticized Boeing. They criticized every single one of

these investments and at the same time, out of the other side of their mouth, they say, why are you not creating more jobs in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe, but I know that people are getting tired of all that negativism, the gloom and doom. They recognize that the Liberals are speaking out of both sides of their mouths and they are wrong, wrong, wrong.

Wang Canada, a new centre for imaging technology, will focus on research, development and marketing of integrated imaging solutions for worldwide markets. Wang will invest about \$15 million over the next five years. At least 50 direct jobs will be created.

Of course, I have to refer to Repap, an initial investment of \$132 million and a \$1 billion renovation expansion program to be completed by 1992, the largest single private sector investment in the history of our province, creating 350 to 400 jobs; Monarch Industries, a \$1.9 million modernization and upgrading of their production equipment, 37 additional employees; Ancast Industries, \$1.8 million to improve quality and increase their output. Twenty-two new jobs are expected to be created.

* (1720)

I am repeating this because the Members of the Opposition do not listen, they do not understand. They look at the job statistics from Statistics Canada. They find 11,000 more people in full-time employment in this province than were there when we took Government and they cannot understand it. They are so upset they are eating themselves up with envy, and they cannot understand why it is happening, so I am telling them where it is happening chapter and verse in every one of these instances because that is why we have 11,000 more people in full-time employment in our economy.

Canadian Tool & Die Company of Winnipeg, \$2 million upgrading and modernization. Again 22 new jobs are expected to be created.

Those are real jobs in the private sector contributing taxes to Government, increasing spending in the economy. Government did not create those jobs. They were created by businesspeople who responded to the climate that we created, yet the Opposition claims we are not doing enough to create jobs. They quote statistics, rail against the prudence we demonstrated in the Fiscal Stabilization plan.

Manitobans are only too familiar with the NDP style of job creation. Put some money into a fund, hire a communication staff and print up a bunch of green stickers that will last long after the short-term, make-work jobs disappear. I remember when the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) was the president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association. He said the Jobs Fund created more jobs for the people who were putting up those signs and those stickers than it did for the people who were being employed by the Jobs Fund. Now, when he is Leader of the New Democratic Party, he is trying to convince us that was the best way to create jobs. Well, the people know.

We remember all of his statements. You know, I have not used a lot of them lately but they are still here in

these clippings. The one about the white wine socialists, do you remember that one? You remember that one, okay. There is another good one in here about a piranha who cannot decide who to bite. That one is in the Free Press editorial, if you want it, from the weekend. It refers to the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs), the piranha who cannot decide who to bite.

Mr. Doer: Oh, that one. I thought it was me.

Mr. Filmon: No, it was not you. You are becoming irrelevant. It is okay.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are no better. Just look next door if you want to see what Liberals are all about, just look next door if you want to see what Liberals are all about. Ontario is in the middle of an economic boom, the greatest growth in tax revenues of any province in this country, yet the Government cannot manage on the taxes that are rolling in day after day after day because of their huge overheated economy.

Let us take a look at some of the things that are being said about them. Firstly, let us make a comparison. We reduced the payroll tax; the Liberals in Ontario introduced a new payroll tax, 1.95 percent. We reduced personal taxes by two points, the Liberals have increased theirs by one point in Ontario.

What about the stellar example of the Newfoundland Liberals, because the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) wanted to take her example and advice from the Newfoundland Liberals. In fact, just last week she said why can you not be like the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, the Liberal Government of Newfoundland. Well, I would not like to be like them, Mr. Speaker, because they raised taxes. They raised personal income taxes by two points at the same time we were cutting them by two points in Manitoba. That is Liberal tax reform, increase the taxes.

Sometimes the Liberal Leader reminds us of a children's program, you know the one, "The Friendly Giant," the one where he says, look up, look way up, there go the Liberal taxes.- (Interjection)-

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) to please stop his interjections, I am not going to get through my notes again this time and I have got a lot of material that I know you will like to hear.

We have here an article by Jeffrey Simpson, called "Deep in the Heart of Taxes," and it is about, of course you could imagine, I will quote the first paragraph, "The Ontario Government's third tax grab in five years, coupled with higher taxes in the Quebec and federal Budgets, is pushing Canada relentlessly upward in the big leagues of heavily taxed countries." It says further, "Neither Quebec nor Ontario was prepared to curtail Government spending in their Budgets. That spending will grow by more than the rate of inflation in both provinces, by 6 percent in Quebec, 6.7 percent in Ontario. With increases like those, higher taxes were inevitable." Then he goes on to tell about the higher taxes. What about some of the higher taxes? They are bringing in a billion dollars through their new payroll tax, Mr. Speaker. Personal income tax will rise for the

third time since the 1987 election, that is when the Liberals were elected in Ontario and three straight Budgets, three straight personal tax increases now up to 53 percent of the base federal tax. That is higher than Manitoba's is after our tax reduction.

"Some of the new taxes brought in will impact heaviest on metro area residents. They will pay the highest fees for driver's licences and licence plates. As well, a new commercial concentration levy on commercial property in the greater Toronto area will likely result in higher prices for goods and services as well as parking rates. Car dealers in metro will now have to administer four new taxes: payroll tax, commercial concentration levy, tire tax, and a tax on new fuel inefficient cars. The cost of doing so will be passed on to the consumer who also must pay the latter two taxes directly."

That is exactly what happens when you get a Liberal Government. As part of the Budget Speech, the Treasurer presented an overview of the provincial economy. Do you realize that the forecast growth rate for the Province of Ontario is 2.8 percent, 2.8 percent below the national average? Compared to ours, which is projected to be, depending on which of the sources you use, between 3.5 and 4 percent, a full percentage point higher than the Ontario Government and well above the national average, Mr. Speaker. That is the difference between Liberal economics and Conservative economics and we will take ours every single time.

We know about that because we have talked publicly about the \$700 million that this Liberal Opposition would have added to last year's deficit by way of increased spending and decreased taxation. In just four weeks they made those commitments publicly here, and day after day in Question Period, in the speeches they made on the Throne Speech, and the Budget—\$700 million. Liberal promises mean increased taxes, time after time after time. What the Liberals do not seem to understand is that with the privilege of office comes the responsibility of decision. No matter how well our economy is doing, we will never be able to meet all of the demands that are placed on Government. You have to set clear priorities if you are going to get the most for every taxpayer's dollar. We have set those clear priorities.

* (1730)

The creation of a strengthened economy is not the end in itself, Mr. Speaker, it is a means to the end. The goal toward which we work is to enable all Manitobans to enjoy a standard of living in which individuals are free to do what they want and to do what they do best, to grow and to create and to achieve.

There are certain values that are important to preserve and protect. They are fundamental values of justice and dignity, or freedom and rights of pride and self-worth. My father came to this land with his parents to find those values and to experience that freedom. He and other immigrants like him, who knew what it was like to live in oppressed regimes, honoured those values and taught their children to honour them also. To negate the importance of our traditional values and

institutions would be to betray everything that I was taught as a youth to believe, and everything that I have come to recognize as an adult is worthy of preserving.

We have, in the Throne Speech, spoken to the social priorities, to health care, to family service, to justice and to reform. Each of these areas has an inherent component, the kind of fundamental value that must be safeguarded. The newly created Department of Family Services reflects the importance that Manitobans have always placed on family life. The nature of the family is changing, Mr. Speaker, but whatever its makeup the family unit should exist as a secure haven for its members. We recognize that many families in today's society have only one parent living in the family home and that in two-parent families it is often the case that both parents are employed outside the home.

As indicated in the Throne Speech, we will be releasing our report on the Child Care Task Force. We are committed to building upon the existing child care system to ensure that parents have viable options available to them to ensure the nurturing of their children. In families where trust is betrayed by violence, we intend to strengthen measures to address that violence. You have heard that we will base Government initiatives in this area on the recognition that abuse is a crime, both inside and outside the family unit.

The establishment of a new abuse treatment registration and support programs for the victims of child abuse will protect the child and work to resolving emotional damage so that the cycle of abuse will not be continued for successive generations. A family home should be a place where love dwells. Where it is not, society must help. Society is made up of individual family units and we, as a society, will reflect ultimately what is experienced within that family unit. That is why the creation of a Department of Family Services is so fundamentally important and that is why the initiatives dealing with aspects of the family deserve the support of all Members of the Assembly.

Members opposite offered their expressions of concern about the tragic incident that we had this weekend. It takes love, it takes dedication, it takes a great deal of hard work for all of us as parents. Each of us with children, I think, thank the Lord and pray that sort of incident could never happen to us, but the fact of the matter is that we, as a Government, have to try and do everything possible to ensure that sort of incident cannot happen again.

You know that in the last year my Government has expanded Unified Family Court Services. This expansion gives Manitoba one of the most comprehensive province-wide unified court systems in Canada. The main advantage of this expansion is that access is now provided through a single court to judges who specialize in Family Law and have powers to deal with all matters before them.

Of equal importance is access to a professionally staffed conciliation service which is intended to protect the best interests of the child when a couple decides to separate. This expansion has been hailed across the country as a model and we are proud of the accomplishment.

In talking about the family, we recognize that the family is composed of individuals and we know that each individual has both rights and responsibilities. We have an obligation, as Government, to protect the rights of individuals. We also have an obligation to ensure that no one in exercising his or her rights tramples on the rights of others. It is a difficult balance, one with which fair-minded and caring legislators must grapple every day.

There is an old saying that your right to punch stops where my nose begins. There is truth in that saying. Ask any policeman who has had to clean up the bloody carnage left at the scene of a traffic accident caused by a drunken driver how he or she feels about the rights versus the responsibilities of those who drink and drive. Ask the family members of those who have been crushed or dismembered or left dead or maimed as the result of a drunk driver exercising his so-called right to get behind the wheel, or how they feel about the rights and responsibilities of those who drink and drive.

Our Government has indicated its intention to strengthen the laws and the administration of laws relating to impaired and suspended driving so that the public will become as conscious of its responsibilities as it is of its rights. One of the values that is so deeply entrenched in a caring society is the need to care for those who are vulnerable and at risk.

I spoke of our desire to assist families and family members at risk. We also seek to address the needs of the disabled. Just two weeks ago, all the Leaders and many of the Members of the Legislature spoke in a forum that you, Sir, organized for the disabled in our province because we want all of them to take their rightful place in our society. We hope that all Members will see their way clear to supporting the establishment of a working group on community living and the implementation of recommendations from the Wiens Report as well as additional reforms which arise from the Women's Initiative, the Child Care Task Force and the Task Force on Literacy.

We all have the potential to be vulnerable, Mr. Speaker. None of us is immune from sickness or accident. None of our family members are immune. We have a responsibility to see that systems of support are in place for all people in terms of health and medical care. We have established the Health Advisory Network which has created a liaison between Government and the stake-holders in health. The input provided by this network is a new and much needed innovation which can only assist with the provision of improved health care.

Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating to hear criticism from Members of the Opposition about why not enough money is available for health care. The fact is that years of fiscal mismanagement by the previous administration had run our debt up to the point where \$1.6 million a day has to be spent on interest on that debt alone. That is \$1.6 million a day that cannot be spent on health care, \$1.6 million a day that could not be spent on justice and reform, \$1.6 million a day that could not be available to protect or enhance the quality of life for Manitobans.

We know that in order to provide a high standard of living there must be a secure, stable economic base, so our prime goal has to be to repair the financial mess that was left as a legacy by our predecessors. We have had no support from the Official Opposition represented by the Liberal Party that has advocated increasing our provincial deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars, thereby destroying the only viable means to achieve the end desired and deserved by the citizens of our province.

We have presented to this Legislature a strong Budget, a sound Budget, a Budget that meets our commitment to get Government under control and to live within our means. There is a very important number in this Budget, a number that has been somewhat overlooked. It is our growth in spending and it is one of the main reasons why this Budget has come forth as a good news Budget.

This year, provincial Government spending will increase by 4.5 percent. That is the lowest increase of any provincial Budget in this country. This year, Mr. Speaker. If you look at the program areas, they have increased by 5.5 percent. Why? Because we are putting our priorities where they belong. Areas such as health, education, human services will grow by much more than the 4.5 percent.

Liberals in Ontario increased taxes because their spending increased 6.7 percent. Liberals in Newfoundland increased taxes dramatically because their spending increased 7.6 percent. Quebec did the same thing, Mr. Speaker, in order to achieve their 6 percent increase in spending.

Our program spending is in the areas where it belongs: 9.1 percent for Family Services increase; 10.6 percent for Environment increase; 7 percent increase on Health Care; 7 percent increase on Education, the highest increase in expenditures for universities in six years. We are putting our priorities where we said they belong.

* (1740)

Mr. Speaker, we have made a commitment to rural Manitoba in a variety of different ways, but the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) has the highest budget for construction of highways that has ever been seen in this province, above \$100 million for the first time ever.

Why -(Interjection)- because we have managed, and we have managed well. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) has always pointed to my Budget from last year mainly because it had in it some \$350,000 of severance pay to his political hacks, and he kept referring to it as being one of our priorities because we increased spending in Executive Council. Well, I want to tell him now that Executive Council spending is down over last year. I want to tell him that overall, administration in every area, research, planning, all of those areas of administration have been reduced so that we could put the money where it belongs in providing services to people.

We saved the money by getting out of foreign currency borrowing. We got out of some \$600 million

of foreign currency borrowing. If we had been in those same foreign currency borrowings, and I would like the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) to listen to this, because if we had been in those same foreign currency borrowings, which he advocates—in fact his critic, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), when we were going out to borrow money on HydroBonds so that the money would stay in Manitoba, that Manitobans would get the interest, that we would benefit and use that as a source of capital, his Member for Flin Flon said we should be borrowing on foreign markets because it would be cheaper, that is what he said. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that if we would have been in those same foreign currencies, we would have had \$125 million more on the books of this Budget. That is what is from good management. That is what is good fiscal management, getting out of foreign currency.

We got out of ERSA, we got out of The Energy Rate Stabilization Act. Again, there is another \$20 million to \$30 million that is not in this Budget because we made that move. Those are the areas of savings so that we could put the money where it belongs, in programs on Health, on Education, for universities, for families and all of those areas that are our priorities. That is management.

We have held our spending down because we believe that Manitobans deserve a break. We know that the last 10 years have not been easy. The recession was tough in the early '80s and then when recovery was slow, we got hit with a drought, two years of drought, Mr. Speaker, that knocked the stuffings out of the farm community.

Everything seems to be getting more and more expensive and tax increases make it so much more difficult for families in Manitoba. Manitobans have had to make adjustments in their personal lives. We have all had to plan better, reorganize our priorities and keep our households, businesses, and our family farms running on an even keel.

Manitobans do not expect anything more of their Government than they expect of themselves. They want us to keep costs down and we are, in spite of the Liberals' wanton disregard of good management and fiscal prudence. I know the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) says she does not like the Budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, what else would we expect? She feels it is her role to criticize. That is a legitimate position to take, but in a minority situation there is an obligation from time to time to provide constructive criticism, positive alternatives, not the knee-jerk reactions that are based on solely partisan calculations. That is all we hear.

Members of the New Democratic Party in particular may remember the criticisms of the Liberal Leader's first term in this Legislature. She was called the schoolmarm by some in the legislative gallery because she took great delight in lecturing Members of both other Parties.

She scolded, she lectured, she said, oh, is this not awful, the behaviour that you see in the House? Oh, the decorum. She would say: I am embarrassed. Look

in the gallery at those children, those school children up there. Look at the gallery at those seniors. What are they going to think of this awful behaviour?

What has she been saying lately? I have never seen such disruptive, agitated, outrageous actions by the Members of the Liberal Party in this Legislature. Question Period is disgraceful. It is a howl. You can hardly be heard over the din of the Liberal heckling and jeering. You can hardly be heard over the din of the jeering of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, they are out of control. From time to time, she is even out of control, raising her voice and shouting and demonstrating here in Question Period. I am the one who is now becoming—I never thought I would see this day—concerned about the decorum of this House.

You may recall, even in the '88 election campaign, how she claimed to be the voice of reason. She was not political, Mr. Speaker. She was always offering the sane and sensible alternative to those radicals at either end, but what do we see today? Who is the radical, rattling her sabre all the time, saying we are going to hammer them, we are going to defeat them, we are going to get rid of them, we are going to take over? Who is the one who is the most partisan, blatantly political person in this entire Legislature? That very individual who lectured us, that very individual who scolded us, that very individual who went across the province to women's groups, to school groups, and tut-tutted about the behaviour and the terrible partisanship that she saw, that she never, ever would see repeated in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, she is doing it in spades like this House has never seen for decades. That is what we are seeing.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): She . . . 142 votes and making you history, too, by the way.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) is showing exactly what I am talking about. He represents that remark. They have lost total sense of the public interest. They would vote against anything—and I repeat anything—that we put forward if they thought there was a chance of defeating this Government, no matter what it contained.

I think John Kennedy said it best: "Leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality, and the plausible with the possible, will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem. There will always be dissident voices heard in the land expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favour, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable."

Does that sound familiar? Does anybody here represent that remark?

We have been seeing it time and time and time again in their opposition to Dow Corning, in their opposition to Repap, despite the views of the local people in each case. I talked about Dow Corning but the same is true

of Repap. Go up to The Pas and talk to the people there. They say that Repap is going to be a better operation than Manfor ever was or ever could be. They do not complain about environmental concerns because they know that Manfor operated without a licence, without an environmental impact review or assessment. They know that right now we have environmental clean-up orders on Manfor that were left in place throughout their operation. They know that Repap is going to take the responsible action and clean all of that up, that Repap is going to be happy to appear before the public for the full environmental impact assessment, to have everything made public to answer all questions and to satisfy all doubts.

They know that the Repap deal represents the most progressive view of forestry harvest in this country—a replacement growing tree for every harvested tree. Better policies, a cleaner process, a better operation and in fact a company that is known for its employee relations as being a good employer and a good company. They know that a billion dollar investment and 400 additional jobs is good for the local people. They cannot understand why the Liberals would be opposed to that sort of thing, opposed to anything just for the sake of opposition.

It is like the casino, Mr. Speaker. You recall that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) took great umbrage and made a great public scene of her opposition to the casino. That was on the one hand, but on the other hand of course what did she say in the rural newspapers, the Portage Leader Press, she said that we should have more casinos in rural Manitoba. So it is on the one hand and on the other hand. Of course, she was trying to gain favour from those people. Even the reeve of the local rural municipality recall that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) took great umbrage and made a great public scene of her opposition to the casino. That was on the one hand, but on the other hand of course what did she say in the rural newspapers, the Portage Leader Press, she said that we should have more casinos in rural Manitoba. So it is on the one hand and on the other hand. Of course, she was trying to gain favour from those people. Even the reeve of the local rural municipality of Portage la Prairie said as long as the money that is raised is spent on rural hospitals and health care facilities, he sees the plan as beneficial. He did not think Mrs. Carstairs spoke for him.

Just one other thing, when you go through all these clippings, I found something new that I had not found the last time. Members will recall that the Opposition Liberals voted against the reduction in size of Winnipeg City Council. There was a Bill that was put forward last year that they amended to remove that provision. Here I have an article from the Winnipeg Free Press, on March 7, 1986. I am sure that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) does not realize that people have not only memories but sources of information. This is what she said when she was running for election in 1986, "commenting on municipal reform, Carstairs said The City of Winnipeg Act should be changed to give more power to community committees and the mayor and to reduce the number of councillors." The number was wrong, if it had been 22, she would have voted for it.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is fulfilling John Kennedy's prophecy. The New Democrats have chosen a different course. They have recognized their responsibility to the people of Manitoba to try and make this minority work. They acknowledge from time to time that its administration does do one or two things right, but they also criticize and criticize regularly when they disagree with us. That is responsible Opposition.

* (1750)

The NDP of course have not fully absorbed the message that the people delivered to them in the last election. The former Government was not narrowly defeated. They were not just defeated by a few hundred votes scattered among a few ridings. They were routed in the last election and for good reasons. Manitobans do not expect anything more of their Governments than they expect from themselves. We are giving them what they are asking for, which is a sensitive but compassionate reasonable Government. The New Democratic Party is filled with its rhetoric of compassion and attacks us day after day after day, saying that we are not interested and we are not listening to and we are not concerned about the real people. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, all you get from them are words, because all of the things that they are demanding of us today are the things that they did not do when they were in Government for six-and-a-half years. For six-and-a-half years, the Child Protection Centre had been starved for funds as it desperately attempted to meet the ever-growing demands to help children in need. We doubled their budget in our first Budget.

The Foster Parents of Manitoba were given a bill of rights and a pat on the head by the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) and the NDP. We are providing them with a living wage on which they can survive. Osborne House was handicapped by an overcrowded facility, an urgent deadline from the city. We secured new accommodation for them. River House, the residential care facility for women with chemical dependency, was to be closed under the NDP. We have kept it open.

They did not lose because of some bad break by the former Member for St. Vital. They lost because they were a bad Government. The adult day care, they are chortling but I will tell you they cannot afford to be smug. The NDP were condemned by the people of Manitoba. The Liberal Caucus have been condemned by their own Leader. Their own Leader said that leading her caucus is like running an adult day care. I must say that I think that is one thing upon which all three Leaders in this House agree.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): At least they are adults.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), on a point of order.

Mr. Doer: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is unparliamentary to reconfirm the comments from the

Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) about her comments about the adult day care centre.

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

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) said, at least they are adults. That reconfirms, of course, this day care statement that she is proud of the fact that they are adults. Just a few months after making that statement, the Liberal Leader said they are ready to govern. Then they could not decide what to do with the Budget. I do not know whether it was that they did not like the fact that we were reducing taxes, they did not like the increases in health care, they did not like the increases in Education, the tax break for families. I do not know what the reason was, or was it just sheer lust for power?

You know what they have done by their decision to vote against the Budget? They are going to take away over \$400 a year from middle-income Manitobans just to put forth their own partisan agenda. Manitobans expect better than that. The Leader of the Liberal Party has yet to learn that our purpose in politics is not merely to defeat another Party. The purpose of her Party is certainly—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Filmon: She has yet to learn that the purpose of her Party is certainly not the personal advancement of a single individual. No, Parties exist, at least our Party exists to provide the positive ideas and direction that Manitoba needs if we are to live up to our reputation as Canada's keystone province.

This Government and this Budget are providing that positive leadership. We are creating a climate of opportunity. Private sector investment is increasing at a rapid rate. Businesses and entrepreneurs have chosen Manitoba as the place to create jobs and to expand. I have listed many, many of them already and I have another list, Mr. Speaker, but I do not have the time. We are running out of time. I could go on all night revelling in the good news that Manitoba is indeed very definitely on the move again. After only one year in office, we have new investment increases of approximately \$1.2 billion, and a lot of that is new money, money that is coming straight from the pockets and the boardrooms of Ontario and Quebec and going into the pockets of Manitobans. They are hearing our message, they are responding.

The future I want for Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is built on a solid economic foundation just like the one that

Manitobans strive for in their homes, in their small businesses and on their farms. You do not spend more than you earn, you do not promise your family what you cannot afford. You live within your means, and it is time that Government did the same thing. That is what this Budget is all about.

We have a lot of strengths of which we can be proud in Manitoba. We are, indeed, in a land of opportunity here in this province, a land filled with promise, so long as we do not lose faith in ourselves. So long as we do not lose faith in our ability to be strong we have tremendous potential, Mr. Speaker. The prophecies of those who speak of have-not will remain unfulfilled, I guarantee that to the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs).

We have ambitious, creative people who welcome challenges and seek opportunities. We have well-educated, young people prepared to show their responsibilities and help our province grow. We have caring people who willingly share their good fortune with those less fortunate. We have resources that make us the envy of other parts of Canada, indeed the world—rich farm land, forests, minerals, hydro capacity, clean air, clean water.

Our Government recognizes the potential of Manitobans. We recognize that our business community has the capacity to compete nationally and internationally. This Budget responds to the priorities of Manitobans. It reflects our commitments to responsible financial measures. It takes significant steps toward lowering the burden of taxation upon Manitobans, and it provides the resources necessary to support needed programs in health care and human services.

We have begun the process of ensuring that Manitobans have opportunities and a sense of hope again. I am very proud of what has been done by every Member of this Government in preparing this Budget, and in putting forth one of the best news Budgets that I have ever seen in my observation of political life, certainly the best Budget that I have ever had the opportunity to support in my 10 years in this Legislature, and I am very proud to vote for it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

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