

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 29, 1989.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Cliff Anderson, Marla Duguay, Len Rausch and others requesting the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation (Mr. Connery) to immediately announce legislative changes to The Workers Compensation Act and to stop the intolerable delays in processing claims.

The petition of the undersigned of the Province of Manitoba, humbly sheweth:

We, the undersigned, request that the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board immediately announce legislative changes to The Workers Compensation Act. Injured workers should not have to wait another two years to implement changes recommended in The Workers Compensation Review Committee Report of May 1987.

Currently, injured workers are faced with a huge, expensive bureaucracy where denial of just claims is routine and reduction of due benefits is commonplace. Some employers routinely contest legitimate claims made by injured workers.

The board must be pro-active in assisting injured workers receive compensation and opportunities for retraining or job placement, not simply attempt to cut costs as is occurring presently.

Furthermore, we request that the Minister immediately take steps to stop the intolerable delays that are currently forcing injured workers to wait weeks and in many cases months just to have their valid claims processed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the First Report on the Committee of Law Amendments.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as their First Report:

Your committee met on Wednesday, June 28, 1989, at 8 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building.

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 30, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), I table the Annual Report of the Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain.

On behalf of my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, I table the Annual Report for 1987-88 of the Film Classification Board.

* (1005)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have three tablings: first of all, as required by Section 65(1) and (2) of The Legislative Assembly Act, a review of all the amounts paid to Members of the Assembly for '88-89; secondly, as promised, the Divestiture Criteria associated with Manitoba Data Services; and thirdly, the Phase 3 of the Government's Review of Government Accountability, Openness, Effectiveness and Accountability in the Manitoba Government, a Report of Opportunities to Build Public Confidence in Departments, Agencies and Funded External Organizations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS BILL NO. 35—THE WILDLIFE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 35, The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Environmental Protection Policy

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). The First Minister (Mr. Filmon) went into the Western Premiers' Conference with all guns blazing at the federal Government for the way it has been treating Manitoba. The next day we hear that he has been muzzled by his counterparts. The military bases

would not be on the agenda and there would not be any fedbashing. Then, Mr. Speaker, comes a communique from the conference with a message to the federal Government to not get involved in environmental reviews. Instead of fedbashing to help Manitoba in a positive way, our Premier has chosen to fedbash in a way that can only be at Manitoba's expense, clearly jeopardizing the federal Government's protection of our environment.

My question to the Deputy Premier, how can the First Minister of this province endorse such a position when he knows that there are Premiers, such as Saskatchewan's Grant Devine, who do not believe in environmental protection? Who would have stopped Rafferty-Alameda to the benefit of this province, if it had not been for appropriate federal legislation?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think there is a little bit of reaching going on, on the part of the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), when it comes to talking about our relationship with the federal Government on environmental issues. We have discussed very often and continue to work toward making sure that environmental concerns are answered in a way, either by reciprocal or mere legislation, or that the federal responsibility is exercised when necessary, and that is exactly what the discussion took place about.

Provincial Jurisdiction

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Deputy Premier tell the House this morning how the Premier can call, on the one hand, for the federal Government to conduct an environmental assessment review and, on the other hand, sign a communique which says that the federal Government should stay out of provincial jurisdiction when it is that very provincial jurisdiction in both Shoal Lake and in the Rafferty-Alameda project that affects our province?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the federal Government will clearly be involved where there are trans-boundary waters, and that is exactly what we are talking about in Shoal Lake. Where there are federal interests involved, that is where they will be brought in.

* (1010)

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Environmental Impact Study

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Deputy Premier tell the House why the First Minister of this province was so easily coerced by the likes of Grant Devine who clearly used this opportunity to get back at the federal Government for its involvement, albeit very reluctant, in Rafferty-Alameda, an involvement which will ultimately protect the interests of Manitoba?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, there is no contradiction and it certainly

confirms that the actions we have taken on Rafferty-Alameda and the fact that the federal Government will be involved where there are trans-boundary situations makes eminent sense to me.

Mrs. Carstairs: That is reflective of the fact that we could not get this Government last year to put any pressure on the federal Government about Rafferty-Alameda. It was only a federal court decision that forced them to finally become environmentally concerned.

CFB Portage la Prairie Compensation

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a new question to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings), when the Premier left this province a few days ago he did so with fire in his belly, so we thought, with regard to the protection of CFB Portage and the base closure. Now we learned today that 14 contracts have been put on hold in Portage, that contractors in Portage are laying off employees. Can the Deputy Premier tell us today why the Premier did not stand up for CFB Portage when he was at the Premiers' meeting, and what he now intends to do to get some compensation from the federal Government with regard to CFB Portage?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the record of this Government and the Premier is very clear in defending the needs of the Portage la Prairie area.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of this province has taken forward the issue to Ottawa very clearly. We have put on the record all of our concerns. Those concerns were taken to the Western Premiers' Conference. You can rest assured on that. The needs of this province have to be recognized by the federal Government. We cannot continue to take that kind of abuse.

Federal/Provincial Meeting

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): The record of this Government with regard to CFB Portage is as clear as mud. They have yet to meet with the Prime Minister of this country in order to get an understanding from that gentleman of the needs of the people of Portage la Prairie. When will this First Minister (Mr. Filmon) meet with the Prime Minister, as has the Premier of Nova Scotia, as has been promised to the other Premiers of the Atlantic Region? When is this going to happen to our Premier and when is he going to stop accepting second best?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, it is obviously Friday on a Thursday afternoon. I believe this is rather traditional. The Opposition is going back over its book and trying to find issues that they have not properly dealt with before.

This province is very clearly working to the best of our ability to make sure that the losses that are going to accrue to the City of Portage la Prairie are either stopped or mitigated.

* (1015)

**Premier Gary Filmon
Federal/Provincial Relations**

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):

With a final question to the Deputy Premier, this Government has been consistently abused by the federal Conservative Government. When our Premier tries to speak up for CFB Portage, he is shoved off on the Minister of Defence and cannot meet with the Prime Minister. When he goes off to the Western Premiers' Conference, he is not allowed to put it on the agenda. When he tries to stand up for other cuts, he is always beaten down, even when it comes to the environment.

Can this Minister tell us how this First Minister (Mr. Filmon) is going to lead the fight to protect our nation, is going to lead the fight to get a better constitutional agreement when, so far, every time he goes into battle he falls flat on his face?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): I think you need a holiday, Sharon. You are blowing your energy all in one day.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I hear comments from the other side roar. I am not sure who they are referring to. Maybe it is the new-found bravery of the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) who chooses to attack the Premier (Mr. Filmon) when he is not here.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock), on a point of order.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rise in defence of the Premier. It is clearly unparliamentary to mention when a Member is not here.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: We would like to thank the Honourable Member. He does have a point of order.

Order, please. The Honourable Deputy Premier.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): I apologize for referencing that absence. It seems to me passing strange that, all of a sudden, we have a new-found concern about environmental issues when this province—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Deputy Premier.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, when I say new-found interest in the environment, as the new Minister of Environment in this House, the last six weeks the questions have been on day-to-day issues and not on the kind of policy and direction that we have been giving the environment. If they want to sit there and hypocritically criticize the direction we have taken, they are dead wrong.

**Solvit Resources Inc.
Independent Investigation**

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):

I am glad the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) talked about long-term environmental policies. We will allow the Minister today to practise what he just preached in the House.

Last Friday, we asked the Minister of Environment whether he would conduct an independent investigation under 39.1 of The Handling of Dangerous Goods, so that evidence can be clearly given from people and interested parties and Manitobans about the explosion and the almost catastrophic situation that developed two weeks ago in St. Boniface with the result of windows being rattled all across northeast, if not north-end Winnipeg. We cited at that time that, in an unprecedented way, toxic material was being dumped into the settling ponds in McPhillips. That was confirmed later in in media reports.

Would the Minister now today, given the questions of whether this company did in fact follow through on its permit requirements and it did not even have a licence, consistent with his statement about long-term environmental policy, give Manitobans what they are entitled to, and that is an independent investigation dealing with the causes, the conditions of the explosion and the clean-up operations that we have questioned in this House?

* (1020)

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): The New Democratic Party has always been consistent in its reaction to this issue. The fact is, as I indicated before and I am still prepared to indicate, as information is put together and the Fire Commissioner's report is finalized, I will make a decision at that time about an independent inquiry.

The allegations of wrongdoing and mishandling of materials in terms of the clean-up, we have redoubled the efforts of the department to recheck to see if there was anything that went into those settling ponds that should not have gone there.

I would like to make one point. When that issue was originally raised, I think there was an indication that what went into the settling ponds could eventually get into the environment in some manner through the water or through drainage. Those ponds in fact do not drain. They are meant to contain on a surface any of the product that is put in there.

The information that I have at this time is that all of that product that was put in the settling ponds was

tested both at the top and the bottom of the tanks. What was in the tank that was taken to the settling ponds was a liquid which contained some solvent which will evaporate out of the ponds, and the other was deemed to be a non-toxic. Those checks will be redone at the settling ponds to make sure there was nothing inappropriate put in there.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, we even had one of our sources phone the Minister at his own home on the weekend to co-operate with the Government, because we think this is not a political issue, it is an issue for public interest. We had our source phone the Minister, and I think he can acknowledge that.

Hazardous Material Handling

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, since that time, we have had further information that more material has been dumped into those settling ponds, something that could not happen, and the Minister knows this, if The Environment Act was in full force in the City of Winnipeg, but that is a separate issue.

We have been informed by a number of business sources that have dealt with recycling material that this company was way over its head when it was allegedly recycling the material. The company exceeded its permit, the permit that his department provided in not only recycling some of the material but transferring material which is contrary to the Act. The company had over a year's supply of material for the small still. It had to recycle the material.

Can the Minister confirm those facts for Manitobans and, with that information, will he give us the independent investigation that we are entitled to rather than an internal investigation which denies the public the right and full evidence that is necessary in this matter?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I have not dismissed the possibility of having an independent inquiry. I want to put that on the record again.

In terms of the operation of the company, and whether or not it was operating illegally, first of all in terms of whether or not it was exporting waste, it had applied to Ontario. We now need to make sure whether or not they had shipped there and if they had proper certification or permission from our controls to proceed with that. That is not confirmed, but it certainly is not rejected. We are assessing all the information that we have.

I have one concern about this type of discussion, Mr. Speaker. That is that in talking about some of these investigations we are involved in that we are starting a trial by public discussion without all of the information in front of us.

Mr. Doer: Thank you very much. I agree with the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings). It is much more appropriate for this investigation to take place in an independent way under the Evidence Act. That

is why, after two weeks, I cannot understand why we have a situation where transfer of materials is taking place contrary to the licence. A business source again told me the material went to Illinois, which is contrary to the licence, not just Ontario, so I would ask the Minister to check that out.

Independent Investigation

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the Department of Environment gave the permit. There are allegations that the permit and licensing provisions have been broken. It is the Department of Environment that is involved in the clean-up, and we find the materials for the first time ever have been put in the settling ponds.

My question to the Minister is, why should Manitobans be satisfied with an internal investigation when it includes part of the department that gave out the original permit? Why can Manitobans not have an independent, outside of Government, investigation under 39(1) of the Act, so the Evidence Act can be completely used and Manitobans can have the full and complete picture on this situation?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I have said consistently that I have not decided to avoid that process. We will make that decision as the information is brought forward. I respect the Member for encouraging to have an independent inquiry called. There is a multiplicity of information that needs to be brought together, including the Fire Commissioner's Report.

* (1025)

Further to that, I think that the allegations about what has gone into the settling ponds—let us remember how that product was brought together. A great deal of that product was water from the firefighting exercise that was sucked up off the ground. Some of the sludge that was sucked in with it was mud. The mud and the sludge that were in the bottom of the tank after it had been lifted from the ground was tested and was deemed to be non-toxic.

Mr. Speaker, I have said before and I repeat it again, we are rechecking that. We are going to the settling ponds to recheck and make sure there has not been a mistake.

Additionally, the Environment Department is the policing department in response to this issue. The fact that we issued the licence has nothing to do with the fact that we will and have given instructions, that we must very carefully pursue every angle that has been raised in this issue.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, after we even raised this question on Friday there was a whole barrel of paint put in those settling ponds. If the Minister says that is water, it is a different interpretation of those chemicals than I have.

My question is a very consistent one. You have a Department of Environment that gave out a permit. You

have a Department of Environment that had a company that may have and, I believe, exceeded their capacity and their licence and their permit. It had blown up in the air. You now have a Department of Environment conducting, as you say, the policing procedures under this terrible situation last week. We need somebody outside of your own department, Mr. Minister, to do the investigation in an independent way.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Doer: My question to the Minister is, does he not realize it is essential for Manitobans to have an independent investigation on the permit and licensing and catastrophe that took place with this recycling plant that is over a test? Will he attend a session that I have set up after Question Period with some pictures that were taken by businessman on this very important matter?

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

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the clean-up is being handled by a company that is licensed to handle hazardous waste and being policed by people from the Environment Department. If there have been breaches of the procedure they have used in the clean-up, I suggest that the Member should consider the fact that when the plant had its catastrophic fire there was a great deal of product got on to the ground, then the clean-up process needed to proceed very quickly.

If there is evidence that can be produced that there was something put in those settling ponds that was not considered non-toxic, then we will do everything within our power to make sure that has not happened.

The accusation is that there was, in fact, paint sludge put in there. Now either the tests were done wrong or there was material delivered there improperly. The city has a very tight control on the admission to their disposal sites. There was a charge that barrels had been disposed of inappropriately with sludge in them. We have already double-checked that with the shredder and there were no barrels found to have sludge in them.

AIDS Reporting Confidentiality Breach

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, mass confusion in the Department of Health is sending conflicting messages to Manitobans. First, it was hiding of personal care home deaths, and now confusion about the wrong information about AIDS patients. Can the Minister of Health tell us, since his own official has contradicted him, can he tell us who is telling the truth?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): I can indicate my honourable friend is not, because in the preamble to his question he indicated we were hiding facts in the personal care home system, and that is wrong.

* (1030)

In the information that was released by Cadham Lab in terms of the AIDS infection, the HIV infection in the Province of Manitoba, there is a professional dispute between Dr. Greg Hammond at the Cadham Lab and Dr. Margaret Fast in the Department of Health as to the format of reporting, particularly in the 16 other cases. Mr. Speaker, the report is out. That concern was expressed after the report was out. That concern is being addressed between those two professionals and they will resolve it in a professional manner to assure compatibility of opinion on those figures when next released.

Mr. Cheema: The Minister's answers and the report from the media is creating confusion because of mismanagement from his office, Mr. Speaker.

Guidelines

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us now when will Manitobans have the guidelines for AIDS information put in place, so that they do not have fear, so that they can have some guidelines and they do not have to be afraid to go for a simple test?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): The guidelines, in terms of testing for the HIV antibody test is in place for approximately three years now. It was the process that Dr. Fast and Dr. Hammond both worked on in co-operation with high-risk communities and community health officials. Those guidelines were drawn up, as I say, with the full knowledge, compliance and input from both those professionals.

Those guidelines, in terms of confidentiality, have been maintained in their present form since their inception. That contrasts somewhat differently from other provinces that have had to go through some changes because of problems with their confidentiality code. Our code remains the same as it was because it has worked. I simply indicate to my honourable friend there has been no break of confidentiality in HIV reporting since the inception of the code.

Confidentiality Breach

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is for the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). This Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has given wrong information for speech therapy, for cardiac surgery, for personal care home deaths, and now about AIDS information. My final question for the Deputy Premier is, on behalf of this Government, can he tell us if this Government supports the provision in this House of information which is inaccurate? - (Interjection)- There is a question. Listen carefully. In this House, the information which is inaccurate, what guarantees do Manitobans have that full disclosure of the facts will be done by this Minister in future?

Tourism Action Plan Gender-Neutral Language

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) raised an issue in the House here with regard to a particular publication from my department. The preamble of the Member for Ellice would have led the public to believe it was a public document. When I asked to have it tabled in the House, the Member for Ellice refused on two occasions. I found out why. Perhaps she had refused to table that document because it is not a public document. Two copies were released for industry consultation, one to the president of TIAM and one to the executive director.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Minister is responding to a question he took as notice. The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, we had talk from the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), talking about inaccurate information. It is time we brought some more—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock), on a point of order.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): Well, if he is done now, Mr. Speaker, that is fine, but there was no question taken as notice yesterday, and he was provided with the document.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray), on a point of order.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, if the Minister responsible for Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) wants to justify and defend his document, no matter how many copies there are, they are in print and the discriminatory language that is in there remains.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): On the same point of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There was no point of order.

Mr. Ernst: On a new point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On a new point of order, the Honourable Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is it is not a public document. The issue has not been to my office. It has not been approved. If and when it comes to my office—

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

Critical Home Repair Program Re-implementation

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). I must say with all due respect I do not believe the Minister of Housing knows the difference between the Critical Home Repair Program and the RRAP Program. The Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program takes at least six months to process. This type of process is far too long for a senior citizen to have to wait to replace a roof or something of that nature. In fact, some people, because of the delays, put off going on that particular program.

Will the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) today fully reinstate the Critical Home Repair Program?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, it is still there. When the Critical Home Repair applicants call into the office, they are requested to identify the nature of their repairs. If it is urgent, it is done immediately. It is still there.

Residential Rehabilitation Program Delays

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): My supplementary question is again to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). A major component of the RAP Program has been cut, that being the landlord is no longer to make application. What has the Minister of Housing done to address this particular cutback?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): First of all, Mr. Speaker, he is referring to the RAP Program now, and he is referring to the RAP program of the landlord. That is a cut that was done by the federal Government on that particular part of the RAP Program.

I wrote to the Minister immediately, giving our concerns in regard to the program. We discussed the one conference. I assure the Member for the other side we will be discussing it at the Minister's conference early in July.

Non-Profit Housing Proposal Calls

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): The Department of Housing and the private non-profit housing program, in accordance to the housing co-ops, is one full year behind in terms of the proposal call. The proposal call should have gone out last summer.

Given that the housing call should have gone out last summer for these particular units, a decision made in December—unfortunately, we have groups and associations that are in a situation in which—my question is, when will the Minister of Housing put forward a proposal call for next year's unit allocation for non-profit housing for the co-op sector?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, it has been customary in the housing program to put the proposals not in the summer, in the fall. We did that last fall. We will have all the results of any of those projects within the next 30 days.

Day Care Workplace Centres

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). Over nine months ago, this Government promised to help create workplace day care centres through a commitment of \$200,000.00. Nine months later, it would appear that not 1 cent of that \$200,000 has been put towards creating new workplace day care centres, not one new workplace day care centre space created, not one child in need met through care in this area.

My question to the Minister is, has that \$200,000 been socked away in the Government's rainy day Stabilization Fund? When will this Government start to live up to its promises, promises made in the election, April 6, 1988, as a major commitment of this Government? When will it live up to its promises and develop workplace day care centres?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, to the first part of the Member's question, no, it has not been given to the rainy day fund. In some parts of the province, rainy days are really good days. Anyway, to the second part of the Member's question, this Government is still committed to workplace day care and announcements in that regard will be forthcoming very soon.

* (1040)

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: If it is not in the rainy day fund, has it disappeared into thin air?

My question to the Minister responsible for the day care is, given the fact that there have been at least two serious proposals before this Government going back many months, one from Manitoba Hydro, one from Burns Foods, one of which had to pay for space for six months and let it go, another of which was told that they may get the money next year, but they are not going to be happy, my question to the Minister is, what is she going to do about getting some responsible proposals in place and policies in place to deal with this? Is it the policy of this Government to not fund one year, to not meet its commitments in one year so that groups will be happy with less in the next year?

Mrs Oleson: I will indicate that we are actively pursuing the workplace day care. Announcements will be made shortly.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: The Minister again did not answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. As the Honourable Member for St. Johns is quite aware, remarks about non-answers are totally out of order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns, kindly put her question now.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: It is a shame that 100 day care spaces in workplaces have to go down the tube because of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), we all know, has an animated approach to putting questions in the House, but the second and third questions that a Member puts should come quickly to the question. The Honourable Member knows that and I would suggest that she get on with her question.

Mr. Speaker: We would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader. I have just told the Honourable Member for St. Johns to kindly put her question.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am certainly animated because this is a very serious issue.

Day Care Workers Salary Enhancement Grants

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): My question to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) is, given that she knows that with no degree program for child care at the university level and with no meaningful Salary Enhancement Grant to date, can the Minister tell us when she will meet her own task force report recommendation for doubling the Salary Enhancement Grant retroactive to January 1, 1989, and when will she meet her promise in her press release issued not too long ago that she will come forward with a complete child care enhancement strategy before the night falls or the day falls or the night comes?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that will be found in any press release that I issued. "Before nightfall" was not a term I used. I said, "as soon as possible." All matters concerning child care—

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

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that I table her own press release which states that by the end of this month, she will have tabled and released her complete child care enhancement strategy.

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

The Honourable Minister of Family Services, to finish her response.

Mrs. Oleson: Mr. Speaker, I will indicate to the Member that our Government is firmly committed to enhancing the day care programs in Manitoba and I am working to that end.

Literacy Programs Seniors' Needs

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach).

The Government's report on literacy, which was tabled last week, has ignored the growing problem of illiteracy among the elderly. According to the Seniors Network Report called Literacy and Older Canadians, An Unrecognized Problem, more than 39 percent of Canadians over the age of 55 are functionally illiterate. This Government's strategy for illiteracy has ensured that the problem will continue to be ignored. There is no section on the special requirements of seniors, and the Adult Literacy Council, which is established through recommendations in this report, identifies five major areas of concern, ignoring the special needs of seniors.

My question to the Minister is simple. How was this major oversight allowed to creep into this report and what does he intend to do about it?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to respond to that question because I think it should be noted that the Task Force on Literacy was not a task force of my department. It was an independent task force that went out—(interjection)—Mr. Speaker, I have to make an important point here because repeatedly the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has attacked innocent Manitobans who cannot defend themselves in this Legislature by accusing them of being political. Just yesterday, she has attacked a bureaucrat of this Government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), on a point of order.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the Minister to clarify that his own Premier (Mr. Filmon) has indicated that boards and commissions appointed by the Government are political, and that the chair of this particular was a former Tory candidate.

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

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), in her preamble to her question to me with regard to an appointment of an Assistant Deputy Minister, alleged that this was a political appointment, a Member of Treasury Board who has been a civil servant for 14 years, and in her allegation insinuated that this could be a political appointment. This is what I am referring to.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I am sure Honourable Members would like to get through Question Period. Order. I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions be as brief as possible. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question on the issue of literacy among elderly people, and we got in reply a personal tirade against the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs).

Literacy Program Seniors' Needs

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey) is, this issue of illiteracy among the elderly is one of the most important issues facing seniors today in Manitoba. With a literacy rate across the country of more than 39 percent, this Minister's Task Force Report has completely ignored the issue.

Will the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey) make sure, in the implementation strategy that deals with these recommendations, that the particular interests and needs of the aging population of Manitoba will be given a high priority?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors): Mr. Speaker, as it deals specifically with the Task Force on Literacy, I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach), is very prepared and capable to answer the question dealing with that.

I am somewhat concerned and would have to get further clarification from the Liberal Party as to what they want. Do they want us to take action on behalf of the seniors, so they can criticize us for the money we are spending in the initiative, or really are they serious about helping the seniors? The last initiative that we struck, the only criticism they had is the fact that we took action and spent money on behalf of the seniors. I am somewhat confused, and I would hope the Liberals would finally clarify their position.

* (1050)

Mr. Carr: Through this Session, we have given every opportunity for the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey) to put his Government's position on the line. We threw him a lob ball last Friday on Seniors Day and he could not answer the question about the accomplishments of his own directorate.

Literacy Program Seniors' Needs

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My supplementary question, back to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). We will give him another chance to answer the serious question. Will he ensure, when he implements the literacy strategy, that the particular problems facing the aging population in Manitoba will be given a high priority?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Member himself has indicated this is finally a serious question. The Literacy Task Force went out to Manitobans to hear their concerns with regard to illiteracy. They did not pick any specific group or did not eliminate any specific group. They included representation, and presentations were made from every group that wanted to come forward. There was no plan to keep out either seniors or anyone else.

The programs that will be implemented will be designed in such a way that all Manitobans, including senior citizens, can partake of those programs and can enlist in those programs. Our commitment is to all Manitobans.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): I would like to have leave to make a non-political statement.

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

Mr. Doer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Members of the House. All of us in this House are subject from time to time with changing assignments in our life and our career, and I am certainly aware of that fully in terms of our challenge ahead of us. All of us as politicians also have an adversarial relationship built in with members of the press.

There is going to be a member of the press potentially changed in assignment, and I would like to pay tribute to him, Mr. Speaker. Don Benham is a reporter in the media. I know he will be embarrassed by my comments, but I think all of us believe that within our adversarial relationship he has the respect of all Members, he has the credibility and confidence that we all respect in fair and objective reporting, and he also has a sense of humour. We look forward to working with him, whatever assignment he has in his public life, as a member of the media in this province. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Can I have leave for a non-political statement?

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

Mrs. Carstairs: Don Benham has had an interesting history, both politically and in terms of his reporting. I too worked within the reporting industry for three years, and I in that period of time developed a respect for journalists. Like all professions, it has its highs and its lows and its middles.

I can tell you very publicly that I have always considered Don Benham, even when he has disagreed with me in great detail, to have the highest level of professionalism. When he works within his milieu, he has often been in this gallery by himself handling all the political events, and as someone who wrote for a newspaper not unsimilar to the one which he writes. At the end of the week when I tallied up those political stories that had been done, I would always note with interest that Don, in my opinion, had selected with limited staff the most important issues of the week. Sometimes I did not like the issues of the week, but they were the most important issues of the week. He knows he has my utmost respect, as I believe he has the respect of every Member of this Chamber.

I would just like to leave one thing on the record and that is that I have always felt, and I think it is very

important for all politicians, that Don was willing to take the time to find out the whole story, all of the facts, all of the details, and that is the highest kudos that I can give to a member of the working press.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to join with my colleagues?

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

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the others in saying so long, good-bye, to Donald Benham. I too have known Mr. Benham since my coming to this place and have appreciated his fair-minded approach to his work.

I think he is the kind of reporter who works in an in-depth kind of way. He ensures that he thoroughly investigates the matters on which he is reporting. I can attest to his objectivity and, by saying that, my test for objectivity is looking at the big picture. Reporters and news media can cover issues in an ongoing way. When I talk about the big picture, I say this to all politicians, that we should not get upset when one article or two comes out in a way that does not please us, because at the end of the year I believe we all look at the big picture.

I think Donald Benham plays a large part in making that big picture a very accurate one and leaving the people, his readership, with a pretty fair understanding of the issues he has been reporting. Having said those words, I regret to see Donald go. I regret that I might not be able to have as many opportunities to work with him. I wish him well in all his future endeavours.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Leave for a non-political statement, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. Connery: It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I had brought in to the House today a basket of strawberries for each of the Members. I guess maybe if we had eaten them right at the beginning this would not have been a Friday on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of the strawberry season for all of Manitoba. I think it is one of the first fruits that we have and of course we hope that all Members of the House and all people in Manitoba will visit their "pick your own strawberry" garden, no matter where it is in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this coming week, on Wednesday, will be the start of the Strawberry Festival in Portage la Prairie. I would invite all Members to come to Portage to the Strawberry Festival and to pick strawberries. I can assure that if you find a little speck of soil on them, these strawberries did come from Mayfair Farms in Portage. The soil is so good it is edible and if one is worried about the spray, I just found the cutest little bug walking on mine, so you can almost eat them

without washing them, Mr. Speaker. So, on behalf of all Members, I would like to say have a good season and enjoy the strawberry season especially. See you in the fall.

Mr. Speaker: We would like to thank the Honourable Minister, and I would like to inform all Honourable Members that eating in the Chamber is contrary to our rules for decorum.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): May I have leave to make a non-political statement?

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

Ms. Gray: Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg will proclaim Home Economist Week, which will be July 3 to 9, 1989. The Canadian Home Economics Association is celebrating 50 years as an organization, and Winnipeg has been selected as the site for the upcoming conference which will be held from July 6 to 10. Winnipeg is also the birthplace of the Canadian Home Economics Association, as it was 50 years ago that the national association held its first conference.

I am proud to call myself a home economist and to be a member of the profession. I believe that the skills and abilities that we learn throughout the learning in home economics in the faculty give us the strength, as a profession, and also lead to a diversity in the careers that we undertake as home economists.

As a profession, home economists are always concerned about the betterment of humankind. Whether that be dealing with families in northern Manitoba, families in rural areas or families in urban areas, and particularly the development of Third World countries and families there, home economists are always concerned about families and the work that they do.

* (1100)

The theme of this year's conference is 50 Years Challenge, Change and Celebration. The keynote address will be by Mr. Robert Glossop from the Vanier Institute, who will be speaking on Today's Families, Continuity, Change and Challenge. Over 300 home economists from across Canada will gather in Winnipeg to share ideas, develop strategies for the future, and also enjoy Winnipeg's fine hospitality and multicultural flair.

The Canadian Home Economics Conference Planning Committee of Winnipeg wishes to leave all Honourable Members of the House with this specially designed anniversary pin—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I am having difficulty hearing the Honourable Member for Ellice.

Ms. Gray: The CHEA Conference Planning Committee of Winnipeg wishes to leave Honourable Members with

this specially designed anniversary pin which symbolizes the logo of the Canadian Home Economics Association, and the organization celebrating the past 50 years and looking towards the future.

I hope all Honourable Members will join with me in wishing the Canadian Home Economics Association success in their 50th Anniversary celebrations. Thank you.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): May I have leave for a non-political statement?

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

Mr. Findlay: I would also like to associate myself and our Government on this side of the House with the comments from the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray).

Clearly, the home economist profession is very important to the delivery mechanism in my department of the extension services to farm families in rural Manitoba. I am pleased to see that they have recognized it with a pin for 50 years, and thank you for that, for all Members of the House.

Certainly, the conference that is to be held here in a week's time will highlight the role of the home economist, not only in Manitoba but in Canada. I see the theme of Challenge, Change and Celebration is very appropriate, because the challenge and change that faces the farm families of today is greater than it has ever been in terms of lifestyles and the associated problems that go with that.

So, thank you for the anniversary pin, good luck in your conference. We are very proud of the role home economists play in the Department of Agriculture and the lifestyle in all of Manitoba.

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

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I too, on behalf of our group, would like to associate ourselves with the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) and the Minister of Agriculture to pay tribute and provide best wishes for the home economists on their conference and the challenges that lie ahead in what I would consider certainly a very dynamic field that is everchanging, that is, human relationships and all the technologies dealing with the family. I wish the association the very best in the years ahead.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call the following Bills: Bill 30, Bill 3, Bill 29, Bill 27, Bill 6.

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 30—THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Bill No. 30 was read a third time and passed.

REPORT STAGE

**BILL NO. 3—THE HIGHWAY
TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: (By leave) Shall The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, as reported, be concurred in? (Agreed)

THIRD READING

**BILL NO. 3—THE HIGHWAY
TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT**

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader) presented Bill No. 3, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. McCrae: I expect that within a few moments Manitoba will be able to say that it has passed into law some of the toughest legislation in this country to deal with the problem of drinking and driving on our streets and highways, and also the significant problem of suspended driving in Manitoba. It has been said that some 50 percent of suspended drivers continue to drive. We think that the measures contained in this Bill, combined with assistance given to the City of Winnipeg Police Department and other police departments in this province on the enforcement side, will go a long way to assist in reducing the death, the destruction, the ruined lives, the ruined careers of men, women and children in our province.

We think that it is the responsibility of Governments, especially provincial Governments, to pass laws that inure to the better protection of the people of our province. It is fully within the jurisdiction of the provinces to make laws respecting the use of highways and streets in the provinces. I am very pleased to be part of this process, along with my colleague the Minister of Highway and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger).

I would like to extend thanks to the people in the Department of Highways and Transportation for the very significant assistance that has been offered and given to bring us to the point that we are at today. I also thank others, notably those within the Department of Justice and those who support this type of thrust.

In the interests of brevity, I would just say also thank you to my colleagues in this House for the assistance we have received in getting to this point. Thank you to staff for also assisting us in our committee deliberations and getting us to the point that we are at.

In closing these brief remarks, I would like to read a letter I received from a woman in Neepawa, Manitoba. It says, and this is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae):

"Dear Sir: I have just read with interest the article entitled, 'Manitoba Government getting tough on drunken drivers,' in the Neepawa Press. My tall, curly-headed 18-year-old son was killed by a drunken driver. He came over the hill on the wrong side of the road

at a terrific speed, sheared the corner of the car my son was driving, continued on through the ditch and out into a field. The police said he was very impaired and yet he got off with just a little 'smack' on the wrist, but my son lost his life. I would like to commend the Manitoba Government re their stand on impaired drivers and suspended drivers. My son was killed on June 5, 1967, and I have waited 22 years to hear this message. Thank you. Yours sincerely."

* (1110)

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): On behalf of the Official Opposition, I want to express our pleasure at seeing this Bill come to third reading. We are extremely pleased that it will be given Royal Assent, we understand, later this afternoon and passed into the laws of Manitoba.

As the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) has indicated, I think there was a fair level of co-operation between the Parties. I think that is indicative of what can be done in this Legislature, where there is a will to improve the situation. In particular of course, the problems of drinking and driving in our province are well-known and we certainly did need to act quickly and swiftly on this matter. I think we have achieved that.

I also want to say that I hope deeply that this law can and does withstand the challenge which I am sure will be taken under the Constitution of this country. I raised concerns throughout the debate about whether or not that would be achievable. I have some remaining concerns, however. I want to express today my personal desire that this piece of legislation does survive a challenge and of course the challenge will be inevitable.

I also want to say that while this will not cure the problems of drinking and driving in our province, we know that, we hope it will go a long way. Nothing will cure people who decide to drink and drive. Nothing will bring back the dead children as indicated by the letter from the mother that the Minister just read, and that story is repeated again and again and again in this province. However, we do hope that this goes some way towards dealing with the problem. We are very pleased to see the Province of Manitoba leading the way in getting serious with drinking and driving.

I want to end by indicating that while we entirely support very harsh penalties for those who drink and drive, it is important of course to show that a person is guilty of that before meting out the particular punishment that is given, and in this case of course it is an administrative form of punishment. It is through the Motor Vehicle Branch and licence suspensions.

I hope that some of the amendments that I have been successful in getting through at the committee stage will prove to be important in allowing this piece of legislation to withstand constitutional challenge. I was not successful in all of my amendments—

Mr. McCrae: One subamendment.

Mr. Edwards: —but I was successful in some of my amendments. The Minister says one subamendment. However, he knows that points were made which then

resulted in Government amendments, and I think we did work together. We were very pleased to improve the Bill, and we were very pleased to have the support of the New Democratic Party finally, at the end of the committee hearings, on the one issue of the hearing, the hearing within 20 days for the oral hearing and 10 days for the written hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by indicating that we greatly look forward to the effective implementation of this piece of legislation as soon as possible, and we leave it to the Minister to achieve that. He knows how strongly we feel about this piece of legislation getting into force quickly.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly on this Bill which our Party has supported. We firmly support measures, as we did during our time in Government, to tighten up substantially on drinking and driving in this province and the carnage that is associated with it.

It seems that the debate is still going on between the Liberal Critic and the Justice Minister (Mr. McCrae) on this Bill. They have to be mindful of the fact that it takes three to tango in this House, and we have had I think a good co-operative approach on this Bill.

There has been consultation prior to the amendments coming forward by the Minister, extensive consultation with all three Parties that resulted in a lot of the changes that came forward in the form of amendments by the Minister. Subsequent to that, the Liberal Critic also brought in a number of other changes he believed were necessary that did not have the agreement of the other two Parties, and he believed those would stem the possibility of successful constitutional challenges to this particular law.

We, in the New Democratic Party, believe that the law will withstand any challenges as it stands, and we are very strong on the issue of separating the administrative and legal issues and processes. The fact is that we consider this, Mr. Speaker, clearly a matter of removal of privileges, not rights. An administrative procedure that is very quick and completed in a very short period of time will ensure that this will meet constitutional challenges, I believe, as a result of the information we received from other jurisdictions.

The amendments we supported during the committee stage dealing with the 10 and 20 days will I believe ensure that is the case. It is important that we separate, and I say this again to the Liberal Critic, the legal system from the administrative system. The legal system with all its technicalities and with all its delays is not something that we want to have entangled in this particular Bill, in order to ensure a speedy resolution of particular infractions.

We support this particular Bill, and we will hope that in the months and years it will stand the test. We will be looking very carefully for a review by the Government to ensure that if there are changes needed, they will be put in place quickly, and of course we will give our support to those changes.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), to close debate.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of this Bill I just want to make a few final comments, basically thanking all the Members who participated. It goes to show that when there is a sense of co-operation—we thought it was an urgent issue that had to be dealt with, and we explained that in order to implement the program it will take my department a number of months.

We are looking at an implementation date of October 1 and by the co-operation of everybody, the fact that we can give it final reading today, my staff can start working on the implementation of it and the program will be in place. Had we waited till the fall Session, till we come back, we would not have been able to implement that for the holiday season, which is always a time when there is possibly more abuse of liquor than at any other time. I would like to indicate, at this time, that both staff from the Attorney General's Department and my department have worked very, very diligently, long hours, in getting this legislation forward.

We would have liked to have presented it a little sooner, but I think there has been a fair amount of debate and co-operation. The fact that we brought in a variety of amendments and dealt with them the other day, I think in my view, makes it possibly as perfect as we could under these circumstances, not saying that possibly we will be looking at the program very closely. If changes are required, we will certainly be coming forward together with all Members of the House to look at making those changes that are necessary.

* (1120)

I feel that it is a very positive move that we have made. The responses that we have been getting from the public are very positive. This is some of the toughest drinking and driving legislation in the country. We will try and make it work to the deterrence for people who insist on drinking and driving and creating the kind of havoc on our highways that has taken place. We look forward to this thing very positively, and I once again thank all the Members for their co-operation to make it happen.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 29—THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation anticipée de crédits. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I took adjournment on this Bill on behalf of the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) so I would, therefore, give the floor to him.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make a few brief remarks on this Bill so that

we can allow the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to close it before we move into committee, and thus to end the business of this House for today.

I would like to start by responding to a comment that the Minister of Finance made when he opened debate on this Bill. He clarified a misunderstanding that arose between us about the amount of money that this Bill was for. I accept his apology for the misinformation that I was given, and I accept his explanation that it was not done with any intent.

I do, however, feel that the Government has asked for more authority than it requires. I think that the original date that had been discussed was an appropriate one, and that would have given us time to complete the work of the House on Estimates, and if we required more Supply we could have dealt with it at that time. However, we will facilitate the passage of this Bill today, Mr. Speaker, because we do feel it is important that the Government have the resources necessary to continue to operate while we debate the Estimates of this House.

I want, however, just to make a couple of quick comments on the Budget and on the style of operation which has emerged from this Government. I would like to begin by just talking briefly about some research and activity I was involved in before coming into the House. I had an opportunity to study with a professor by the name of Robert Reich who has written extensively on law, politics and industrial development throughout North America.

One of the points that Bob makes in his books and in the research he is doing is that one of the problems with the North American economy is that it has shifted away from the production of goods and services. An awful lot of entrepreneurial, legal and financial expertise has gone into shifting around pools of capital and redefining arrangements between companies. Indeed, great profit is made by the issuance of junk bonds and leveraged buy outs, and an awful lot of energy has gone into essentially non-productive activities, but activities that nonetheless produce great wealth. As a result of this, North America has been losing its position in the world. As a result of this, the United States economy is in a considerable amount of difficulty. We, in Canada, are being dragged along with that. It is clearly the belief of myself and my Party that the Free Trade Agreement only makes that worse.

What disturbs me, however, though is that rather than focusing on questions of efficiency, effectiveness and improvement of service, the focus has been on taking advantage of tax laws, of restructuring arrangements, of doing things that free up capital for personal use rather than put it to productive use, and essentially disguise that from the public at large by presenting changes in balance sheets, changes in stock profiles and such simply because money has moved from one corporation to another or into new organizations that have been created to allow these sort of changes to take place.

I think what disturbs me about what has happened with the Budget and what has happened with the style of management that this Government has brought

forward is that they have adopted that form of approach to managing the finances of this province, that they have essentially moved off the focus on improving services, on improving management, on delivering a better quality, more open, more effective kind of Government and have worked to disguise information, to move figures around, to change the nature of the balance sheets, to present a picture to the public that suggests that things are different than they currently are.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note in this document that was tabled today that is titled, Openness, Effectiveness and Accountability in the Manitoba Government, that in the preface and summary we hear things here about all responsible Manitobans have to pay the bills. Accountability has to foster a sense of partnership and commitment with shared values. Then it talks about, it follows that a reporting obligation to supply comprehensive, understandable and fair information and explanations about how well the responsibility and authority has been discharged. These are seen as principles in this report that the Government purports to support, and yet their own actions do not support that lofty statement. Their own actions have been quite counter to that. They produce financial information for the House that references one set of figures, and another they purport to remove a large chunk of revenue and create deficit when none exists and move money into next year to create smaller deficits where in fact bigger ones are.

Ultimately, I do not think the people will be deceived by that. Ultimately, I think that there will be an opportunity to pass judgment on that form of management.

I was pleased to note the remarks of the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) and the comments on Bill No. 27, which is before this House. It is not a matter of confidence in the Government, as one would normally see a matter of confidence, in terms of the three that normally come before this House. However, the Government is free to choose anything it chooses to determine that it would be a matter of confidence. I am pleased that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the Government have decided that Bill No. 27 is a matter of confidence. I think in fact it does raise a question about style of management that Manitobans should have an opportunity to express an opinion on.

We are studying that Bill quite carefully right now, we will continue to do so. I can assure the Minister and the House that we will be coming forward with a series of comments on it. All of my feelings on it at this point are quite negative and I do not think it is the kind of Bill that our Party can support. I am frankly surprised to hear that the New Democratic Party, after condemning the immorality of it, are also prepared to support it. In fact, it is a little confusing to me to note how desperate the NDP are and how quickly they have stepped aside from their principles in order to maintain their position in the House. I do want to make it clear, I recognize that it is a matter of confidence. I embrace that. I am pleased about that and I hope we will have that question before the House early in the new Session.

I guess the final comment I want to make, Mr. Speaker, in bringing this portion of this Session to a

close is just to note with some disappointment that we have not resolved the issue before the Standing Committee on Economic Development. There is indeed an extremely serious issue outstanding, one that you yourself have offered opinion on, one that I think affects the rights and privileges of all Members of this House, and one that leaves a blot on the record of this Government and the performance of this House. I would like to see that matter resolved. I have spoken about it with the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), I have written to him about it. I am told that we may have an opportunity to deal with it in the fall. I hope we do that as expeditiously as possible and remove that very serious problem which is impeding the functioning of this House.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think I will close and allow the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to speak on this Bill. I wish the Minister of Finance and all Members of the House well over the break and look forward to coming back in here to move into some substantive debate on this particular issue.

* (1130)

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I just want to take a few minutes to participate in the debate on this particular Bill and say that in one way while we all enjoy the summer holiday and are looking forward to it, at the same time it is regrettable that there is so much money that is being spent and will be spent of course over the summer before this House gets back, and we will be back in the middle of September.

I suspect we are well halfway through the fiscal year and we have not been able to get, because of the time constraints and so on, answers to a lot of specific questions we might have, Members of the Opposition might have, in the Estimates review of each particular department. To that extent, we are not serving the people of Manitoba as well as we might as Members of this Chamber.

However, the point I want to make at this stage, and Members of my caucus may have more to say about it in the committee stage of this Bill, is information on the Capital Supply. Perhaps the Minister can note this and give us an answer when he speaks, what particular departments have tabled their Capital Supply. We know Highways has given the House information on details of capital expenditures, which is fine, which is customary, but it has been done because Highways has been called. I am not clear on whether we have that information on public school financing, that is the construction.

Certainly I do not believe we have it on Health, which is a multimillion dollar one, a very huge expenditure, and Housing, there is a lot of money spent on Housing. I am not sure though, this does involve the private sector as well, and it is more difficult to state precisely what your capital spending may be, although you can still give the House an idea. Then of course, Natural Resources normally would be giving that information during an Estimates review. Again we are waiting until the middle of September and maybe—who knows?—late in the fall before we get to that department.

At any rate, what I am asking on behalf of our Party, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure all Members of the House would like this, is a clear commitment from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), from the Government, that they will give to the Members of this Assembly copies of the statements, the Capital Supply statements, outlining the construction programs of Health, Natural Resources, Education, Housing, and indeed any other department not filed who normally files.

We are talking about tens, in fact hundreds of millions of dollars, and I think it is appropriate that information be given. I would trust that the Minister can get up and make a clear commitment on behalf of his Government and his colleagues that those reports will be tabled, or at least mailed to the Members.

As a matter of fact, some Members on this side think we should not leave this Assembly till we get that clear commitment. Frankly, I would suspect that every department has prepared those statements. They should have by now. It should be printed; it is public information. I think it is in the public interest that those documents be made available as quickly as possible.

I would like the Minister to get up, tell us and give us a clear commitment that those documents will be in the hands of the Members of this Assembly at least within one week of today. I think all Members of this Assembly, including backbenchers on the opposite side, would welcome that information.

I trust we can get a clear commitment from the Minister that those reports will be within, I would say, a week is a reasonable time to be mailed, sent, delivered somehow to each MLA of the Manitoba Legislature.

There is a great deal more that we can speak of, Mr. Speaker, in Interim Supply. Maybe we will have a chance to raise some specific questions when we get into the committee stage. We have some specific questions on what is happening in various departments.

I just might add, to put the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) on notice, that I want to ask some questions about Careerstart, because we have had no information whatsoever. I appreciate we have not been into the Estimates for that department, but we will not be into that department until Careerstart is over.

I use that as one example. I know other Members have some other specifics they want to ask questions on, so I hope the Ministers will be around for those answers.

Having said that, I appreciate that the time is going, and I will not proceed—my colleague from Dauphin says we can come back tomorrow. We are prepared to come back tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, with those few comments, I will sit down, and I really trust and hope that the Minister can get up and make that commitment. It is not unreasonable. It is information that is available, and surely that is a request that can be acceded to without any difficulty.

Thank you.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): I wanted to make a few brief comments before this Bill passes. I want to focus

my comments around two main areas, although there are many more areas that concern Members of the Opposition, and I would hope would also concern Government Members with respect to the Bill before us and some of the actions of the Government.

I want to make note first that this Government, over the last period of time, has become increasingly sloppy in the way in which it presents its business to this House. I believe that reflects upon the competence of the Government, and I also believe it reflects upon the Government's willingness to be what they said they wanted to be but have not become, and that is an open Government.

My colleagues have made some reference to the fact that we do not have the Capital before us right now. That is certainly an inconvenience for Members of the Legislature when we are trying to make the determinations which are necessary to vote on Bills such as this, and to allow Bills like this to proceed. I am hoping that when the Minister takes to his feet in a few moments he will give us a firm commitment that the Capital Supply or the amounts of money that are going to be spent on capital projects that have already been determined by the Government will be made public within the next week. I think that is an important commitment on their part.

If they do not make that commitment, Mr. Speaker, I can only chalk it up to the fact that they do not want that information to become public, or they do not have that information available to them in a form that they could make it public. In either instance, they are either, in the latter instance, a sloppy Government, or in the first instance, a secretive Government. I think either case would reflect badly upon them. I hope they would want to make that commitment to bring forward those figures in a forthright manner.

I want to remind the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), about how to use a word that one of his Ministers used in the Question Period today, how they became quite "animated" when they were sitting on this side of the House and there was information which they thought was important to them to pass the Interim Supply, and they did not receive that information right away, they would become quite animated. They would go into hysterics almost and make threats about not passing the Bill and act in, what I thought at that particular time, a manner that was overreacting.

We have not followed that course, Mr. Speaker, because we believe that the Government has to have this funding available to them to govern. But we also want to make note of the fact that their refusal, if they do refuse to provide that information, is clearly indicative of a Government that either does not have its own act together or does not want people to know what it is doing. Normally, we would have that information available to us by this time of the year, and it is indeed an inconvenience to us.

It is more than an inconvenience to people outside of this building because there are people in northern communities who are waiting to find out what their capital projects are going to be. There are people in the municipalities who are waiting to find out what

capital is going to accrue to them under this Government.

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

There are people in the housing sector who do not know whether or not their projects are going to go ahead, yet we are probably six months behind, maybe even longer the normal period of time when they would know whether or not their projects would go ahead. They are going to lose some projects because of that, if word is not given very soon as to whether or not their projects are acceptable under the Government's guidelines.

I do not want to question the motives of the Government or impugn motives, but if a Government wants to save money on capital, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows this because it happened last year, all they need to do is hold off the capital announcements till late enough in the year that some of those projects cannot go ahead. Then they have, in the words of their own compatriot when he was in Opposition, they have it both ways. They can approve the projects knowing that they do not have to spend the money. That is extremely deceitful, if that is what they have in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I am not saying that is the case but one, at this point in time, has to question why it is they have not provided that information to the housing sector, to the hospitals, to the municipalities, to the Northern Affairs communities and to other areas that would expect that information and need that information. So while it is an inconvenience to us, if the Minister continues to refuse to provide that information, it will be a tragedy for many groups out there that are only trying to build a better province with the help of their Government. Their Government has turned their backs on them.

Maybe they want to create another rainy-day fund for next year by having a fair amount of money left because the capital projects could not go ahead. I do not know that to be the case, but one becomes increasingly suspicious over time. So it is going to be very difficult to pass this Bill on this day unless we have a commitment to that information being provided relatively quickly. We ask for that commitment not only for ourselves, so that we can be better legislators, but we ask for that on behalf of those people who sent us to this House to ask for commitments of that sort on their behalf, to make the Government accountable, to ensure that the Government provides full information, to ensure the Government responds to their needs.

So I hope the Minister of Finance will look upon his own words when he was in Opposition and how he demanded information, and treat our request in the same manner that he would have liked his request to have been treated, and in fact his requests were treated, because we did provide that information to him and he knows that to be a fact.

* (1140)

The second point I want to make, and I do not want to belabour the point because there is not a lot of time

available to us today, but I think it is important on this closing day of this part of this Session to once again remind the Government of the situation that is confronting the Port of Churchill. I made comments on the opening day with respect to the Port of Churchill. I made comments on every opportunity I have had in this House with respect to the Port of Churchill, and this is one more opportunity to do so. I want to remind the Government that it has failed to provide for the type of future which the Port of Churchill needs and deserves. It has failed because of its refusal to demand from the federal Government and the Canadian Wheat Board a commitment of 3 percent of Canada's total grain exports, on average, every year for the Port of Churchill.

I am also disappointed in the Liberal Caucus who have also refused to put forward that specific demand which would in fact provide for stability for the port. We met with federal Ministers, the Members of the New Democratic Caucus, and a grass-roots lobby group, and at that time we had a commitment that we felt was fairly firm with respect to shipments through the Port of Churchill this year, but we have seen no action since.

We have not seen the legislative all-Party committee meet and, quite frankly, I think that legislative all-Party committee is not serving the function that it was intended to do or we hoped it would do because the Government refuses to call that committee to meet. I have spoken to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) and I told him that there would be a day when I would stand in this House and be critical of him if that committee did not start to play a more forceful role in promoting the Port of Churchill. The fact is I talked to him on a number of occasions, as long ago as probably a month ago, with respect to that and I asked him to get that committee together and call that committee, and that committee has never been called.

I think this Government has turned its back on the Port of Churchill. I think it is afraid to take on the federal Government with respect to this very important issue. I think it is afraid to take on the Wheat Board with respect to this very important issue.—(Interjection)—It was not on the Western Premiers' Conference agenda. There have been many opportunities for this Government to speak up forcefully on behalf of the port and it has not. The result of that is apparent. The federal Government thinks that it once again can get away with very few shipments through the Port of Churchill, and that will mean another disastrous year for the Port of Churchill, that will mean another disastrous year for the community of Churchill, that will mean another disastrous year for all the communities along the bayline. I think that we cannot have that sort of economic disaster taking place in northern Manitoba and not feel it throughout the province.

What happens in Churchill, Ilford, Pikwitonei, in Gillam, Thompson, The Pas and Dauphin has an impact on the province overall. When they turn their backs on the Port of Churchill—and I have no fear of contradiction when I say that is what I believe they are

doing—they are also turning their backs on a large portion of our province and they are turning their backs on the future of our province, and they are turning their backs on prairie farmers who benefit by the continued use of the Port of Churchill.

I, in the strongest terms, condemn their lack of inaction, their inability to fight for fairness for Churchill at the federal level and, in equally strong terms, I encourage them to, in the future, take a more aggressive stance on the Port of Churchill because without them doing so I believe the federal Government thinks that it can get away with another year like last year, and that is totally unacceptable. I believe that is unacceptable to all Members of this Legislature, and if that is the case then I expect to see all Members out there aggressively promoting, aggressively lobbying on behalf of, and aggressively supporting the Port of Churchill. I think that can be best done by demanding fairness, and that fairness is a fair share of Canada's total grain exports on an annual average and we believe that to be 3 percent, on average.

I am not going to prolong the debate. I made my points, I believe, in the strongest terms possible. I am angry and I regret the fact that the Government has not taken more positive action. We are seeing a replay of the 1977 Lyon Conservative years with respect to the Port of Churchill. It was unacceptable then, it had damaging impact then; it is unacceptable now, and it will have a damaging impact now. If they have the faith they say they have in the future of that port, then they better start translating that hope, that faith and that vision into some concrete action which takes on their federal cousins in Ottawa who are doing irreparable damage to the port last year and this year.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to close debate on the second reading of Bill 29. I have listened carefully for the most part to most of the submissions made by Members opposite. Certainly Members of the Official Opposition seemed to have wanted to do a lot of debating on Bill 27, something that we will debate in greater detail when we return. Obviously, Interim Supply allows for a wide-ranging debate, and certainly Members opposite have afforded to themselves that opportunity to touch a number of areas.

Nevertheless, I have to reply in one area. There seems to be two forces at work here. We have the Official Opposition attempting to convince Manitobans that the Fiscal Stabilization Fund is something untoward. They use the term "slush fund." They are trying to make their case and develop public opinion accordingly.

As I have indicated on second reading of Bill 27, from our point of view, from the point of view of this Government and for Governments to come, there is very good reason as to why there should be a vehicle such as this. Maybe other Governments would like to set a savings account up in some other fashion, and maybe in due course they will have opportunities, but indeed the Government at this point in time, when it looks at extreme, incredible revenue fluctuations, senses it had no opportunity, if it is committed to long-range planning at all, but to set up this fund.

We will also be telling Manitobans why we consider this a very important initiative and why it should be set up in this fashion. I must admit I talked to many, many people, and nowhere do I get to feel that the community at large is distrustful of what it is the Government has attempted to do in setting up this fund or is in any way critical of trying to set aside funding for a day when it would be needed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Finance Critic of the Liberal Party does some injustice to our attempts to bring into place some greater long-range stability. He tries to make it appear as if we are presenting the facts and figures, the financial numbers of the province, in a way that attempts to in some way obfuscate the reality. I state again for the record that every number known to the Government was presented in the Budget. Indeed I have said on several occasions that, had we followed strictly the bookkeeping that is in existence now, it would have represented a surplus. I have indicated why it is. I have indicated over and over again what the numbers are, what the basic numbers are, and what we expect to see reconfirmed once the Provincial Auditor reports on the former year.

Let me also say that I, for one, insisted that any vote on the Fiscal Stabilization Fund, Bill 27, be a confidence vote, because I deem this to be a very, very important development in principle. We believe that if Opposition Parties do not believe that there is some rationale to some long-run, long-range management tools, taking into account the new context of revenue variations in which we find ourselves at this point in time, then they will vote against us. They have indicated, at least the critic of Finance has indicated that his Party will be voting against that, and let that be the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

If you are not an open Government, and if you do not believe that you should come forward when you have major alterations in the presentation of the accounts of the Government and the basis of that is not a confidence vote, I do not know how it is you can be more open. I will leave the court a public opinion to decide whether or not we have been totally open.

* (1150)

Now the NDP Finance Critic (Mr. Leonard Evans) said it was too bad that they do not have in their hands all of the capital plans. I can understand why it is that they would want that but I ask him, is it not too bad we cannot get this House back onto track in the sense of when we come forward? Indeed, if it is the common will or wisdom of Members that we now go to a new format of sitting for whatever reasons, such that most of the work is going to be done in the fall period, then we have to do one of two things. I would justfully suggest this. Maybe we will have to change the fiscal year-end of the province, because I can cite many examples, if the MLA for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) wants me, as to when Interim Supply was brought down by the former Government and what access we had to capital detail. We had none.

What we have here is tradition. We have a situation where some Ministers, some departments decide that

they are going to release their capital budget. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) has released his because he is in Estimates. That is tradition. That is the long-standing tradition of this House. I know, for instance, in 1982-83 when The Interim Appropriation Act was given Royal Assent on March 30, 1982, that there was no capital detail provided at that time. I know when it was given Royal Assent on March 28, 1983, there was no -(Interjection)- Well, at that time we could have had those capital schedules presented too. We could have had them. Why did the NDP not give them to us?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not my fault and it is not the Government's fault that we are sitting here considering the Budget two or three months late. We appealed to Members opposite to try and reduce the length of the Session last fall so we could get this thing back onto course. That is the reason why we are debating some of these matter issues a little out of sequence.- (Interjection)- I have got the former House Leader from the NDP yelling incompetence and he is yelling sloppy management across the hall. I am only reading into history the numbers. Again, he says the very thesis of the MLA for Brandon was when you are voting on large money matters, regardless of the time of year, you should have access to the capital budget. That was the thesis.

I am refuting the thesis using the history of action of the former NDP Government.- (Interjection)- Now the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) says that we used an animated approach, that we demanded information. On Loan Act, we did. I can remember where we prevented one Loan Act going through because there was a request for spending authority and there was not even a criteria around some of the money that was going to be granted to the Minister of Small Business and Development, the MLA for Logan. There was not even a criteria around that and, yes, we did demand the information. We did forestall the passing of certain monies within that. This is Interim Supply. This is to grant sufficient spending for the current accounts and for the programs of Government to the end of this calendar year.

I know that there are questions that Members opposite want to ask of Ministers. I would recommend that we therefore move into committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, we are going into committee now, are we not?

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bill 29, The Interim Appropriation Act 1989, for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation anticipée de crédits, with the Honourable Member for Burrows (Mr. Chornopyski) in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

THIRD READING

**BILL NO. 29—THE INTERIM
APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989**

Mr. Chairman (William Chornopyski): The Committee of the Whole, come to order, please. We will consider Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act. Does the Honourable Minister of Finance have an opening statement?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Chairman, I will not read into the record explanations with respect to all the sections of Interim Supply Bill. I, though, wonder and I will ask for some advice from staff whether or not this can be written into Hansard, or this can be taken into Hansard without my reading. If that is agreeable, by leave, then I will give a copy of my speaking notes so that it can be recorded.

Mr. Chairman: It has been agreed, by leave.

(Mr. Manness submitted, but not read.)

Mr. Chairman, Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989 is required to provide interim spending, commitment and borrowing authority for the 1989-90 fiscal year, retroactive to April 1, pending approval of The Appropriation Act, 1989.

Bill No. 29 differs slightly from the 1988 Interim Appropriation Act with the insertion of clauses to provide transfer authority from the general salary increases appropriation and the authority to pay accrued liabilities.

The amount of interim spending authority requested in Section 2 of Bill No. 29 is \$3,241,346,100 or 75 percent of the sums to be voted as set forth in the Main Estimates. This amount is expected to last until approximately the end of December, 1989.

Section 3(1) (Commitments for Future Years): Includes \$300 million which represents 75 percent of the total 1989-90 forward commitment authority of \$400 million provided for last year. The \$100 million increase relates primarily to the commitment authority required for the long-term lease obligations under MPI expenditures for future years' commitments cannot be made in the 1989-90 fiscal year unless additional spending authority is provided.

Section 3(2) (Voting of Funds in Subsequent Years): This section provides that the estimated amount of expenditures which are committed under subsection (1) shall be included in the Estimates of the fiscal year in which the actual expenditures are expected to be made.

Section 4 (Authority to Pay Liabilities): Provides Government with the authority to make payments totalling \$2,272,000 for liabilities accrued and unpaid as at March 31, 1989. This includes \$2,104,000 for the settlement of litigation with the Manitoba Milk Producers' Marketing Board and \$168,000 for Manitoba's share of 1988-89 premiums under the

National Stabilization Plan for Honey. Appropriation authority for both these requirements was provided during the 1988-89 fiscal year. However, since the payments will occur subsequent to the closing of the 1988-89 fiscal year, authorization to make the payments against these liabilities is required. The authority to pay the liabilities covered by this Interim Supply Bill, will not be replaced when the Main Appropriation Act is passed.

Section 5 (Limitation on Expenditure for Items): This section is self-explanatory and permits expenditures up to the full amount of each individual item to be voted in the Main Estimates, even though total expenditures authorized by Bill No. 29 are only a portion of 1989-90 requirements.

Section 6 (Effect of Passing of Main Appropriations): This section stipulates that once the Main Appropriation Act is passed, any funds expended or committed under the authority of this Interim Act will be deemed to have been made under the authority of the Main Act, with the exception of Sections 4 and 13 which are not affected by this clause.

Section 7(1) (Transfer of Certain Funds): This section allows for the transfer to the appropriate departments of any part or all of the money to be authorized for expenditure under the Canada-Manitoba enabling vote.

Section 7(2) (Adjustments in Main Estimates): This section requires that any transfers of money made under Subsection 1 will be adjusted, if necessary, in accordance with transfer provisions included in the main or any supplementary Appropriation Acts.

Section 8 (Expenditure in Anticipation of Recoveries): This section provides that departments, in order to render services or provide materials, supplies or property to other departments, that are cost recoverable, may make the required expenditures in anticipation of recovering the costs from the other departments.

Section 9 (General Salary Increases): This section allows for the transfer to departments of Government of any part or all of the authority required for general salary increases which come into effect during 1989-90. Under a number of existing collective agreements, wage rates will be increased by a factor based on the increase in the Consumer Price Index over a specific period of time. The majority of the funds will be required for the September, 1989 increases under the Government Employees' Master Agreement (MGEA).

Section 10(1) (Agreements with Canada): Provides that money, authorized under this Act for expenditure in respect of an agreement with the Government of Canada, may be expended in anticipation of the agreement being entered into notwithstanding that the agreement has not been and never is entered into.

Section 10(2) (Expenditures in Anticipation): Provides authority to expend money on projects in anticipation of cost-sharing on these projects when an agreement is entered into with the Government of Canada notwithstanding that when the agreement is finally entered into, the Government of Canada may not cost-share or will only partially cost-share project costs.

Section 11 (Abatement of Authority): Provides that expenditures made under the Special Warrant issued pursuant to Order-in-Council 345/89 shall be deemed to have been made under the authority of this Act and the said Special Warrant shall cease to have effect on the coming into force of this Act. The Special Warrant provided estimated expenditure authority for the period April 1, 1989, through June 30, 1989.

Section 12 (Application of Money): Is a standard section which requires no further explanation.

Section 13 (Power to Borrow): Is included in this Bill to enable the Government to borrow money in the 1989-90 fiscal year prior to approval of the 1989 Appropriation Act. This section provides authority to raise money by way of loan or loans, up to \$400 million as may be considered necessary for making any required payments out of the consolidated fund. Unlike the expenditure authority provided by this Interim Supply Bill, the power to borrow authority is not replaced when the Main Appropriation Act is passed.

Mr. Chairman, with these comments, I commend the Bill to the Members of the committee.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Chairman, I thought I was making a very reasonable request asking simply for release of documents that are already prepared. Given the time to do it and given the fact that we are adjourning for about two-and-a-half months, it seems to me that it is in the public interest that these reports be made available. So I would like to ask the Minister very specifically then, can Members of this Legislature obtain the Capital Construction Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission? Can it be made available to Members of this House within one week of this sitting?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairman, there is an awful lot of tradition associated with the tabling of the capital detail. We have inherited and it has been in place for virtually decades. What our Government has said is basically said to Ministers responsible, if you sense that you want to provide that information, you are free to do so. If indeed you want to maintain tradition and table them in the manner they have been for countless decades at the time that you are moving into your Estimates, that is a free choice of the Ministers involved.

So, Mr. Chairman, to answer the question directly, no, the Government will not direct Ministers to provide that within the week.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I would like to ask the Minister directly then, will the Government make available the report on the construction intentions of the Public Schools Finance Board in the Department of Education? I do not believe that has been made available either. Will that particular report be made available to Members of this Assembly within the next week?

* (1200)

Mr. Manness: My response was very clear. I will take that up with the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). Should he want to provide that within the week, he

certainly will. Failing that, he will provide that information during the consideration of his Estimates.

I must say that much of that detail, with respect to the capital budget of the Department of Education, is fully public. I would say 80 percent or 90 percent is fully public.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask then if the Minister of Finance does not want to answer directly, I guess I could ask the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns)—he too has a capital supply—whether he is prepared to make it available to Members of the Legislative Assembly within one week of today, which is not unreasonable. As I said previously, all these reports should be printed. They should be easily made available to Members of the Legislature. It is not a matter of preparing some new report or having to do additional work. Surely, the Government knows how much it is prepared to spend under Capital Supply. So I would ask the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) whether he would be prepared to make this information, this report, available to the MLAs.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Chairman, I have difficulty . . . with Honourable Members opposite. I will do my best to see that both Parties receive this information. Allow me simply to say, though, that part of the difficulty has been—many of the projects that are being contemplated are covered by the capital allotment in my department, are co-shared with the federal Government. It was my privilege to have met with Mr. Charlie Mayer in Ottawa just Tuesday of this week. We are, hopefully, concluding as early as this week Tuesday some of the projects that will then enable capital to flow and, hopefully, some start-up work this summer or this fall to commence.

It was for these reasons, as well, other than simply the timing of our own budget that has brought about this delay. We have allocated those portions of my capital supply to these projects, but until we had that full commitment from the federal Government that would allow these projects to proceed, it would not have been very helpful material to Honourable Members opposite, by way of an indicator, as to what draw down on the capital supply, and I am speaking about the Department of Natural Resources, would be.

I spoke to the Honourable Member privately, and I have no difficulty in putting it on the record here in this committee, that I will undertake perhaps as early as mid-next week to see that his offices or the offices of the respective Leaders, the caucus offices of the Opposition Parties, gets that information from my department as Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I thank the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources for that information, for his co-operative attitude and his very reasonable approach.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has said, we have got to ask the other Ministers. The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) is not here to ask, the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) is not here to ask. So I will ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), who has a great bundle of money available, I hope, for

construction of hospitals, personal care homes, renovations and the like.

There is a great deal of interest in this particular area and, therefore, I would ask the Minister of Health if he would be prepared in the public interest to make available the capital supply, the report that normally is tabled in this House, to the Members of this Assembly either today or within the next week.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I am unable to accede to my honourable friend's request, and will be tabling the capital budget of the Manitoba Health Services Commission during the Estimates time which—(Interjection)—is there some problem with my honourable friend?

I believe the capital budget for the Manitoba Health Services Commission was tabled approximately October of last year when we got to that line in the Estimates.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Chairman, last year if it was tabled at that time, that was not satisfactory either. The fact is that information is available. I do not know, for what reason, why the Minister wants to hold back. It is not in the public interest, unless he can explain to us why it is in the public interest not to make available a capital spending program that has been agreed to presumably by the Cabinet, is included in the main Estimates, and for some reason or other now it is not available to us. I just do not understand that.

It is not as though the House was carrying on, Mr. Chairman. If the House was carrying on over the next several months, we would patiently wait until we got to Health and follow the tradition that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) speaks of, but we seem to be evolving a new pattern of sitting here, and if we are evolving a new pattern of sitting, maybe we should evolve a new pattern of tabling the Capital Supply Bill.

I would appeal to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to reconsider his position and tell the MLAs, in the interests of the public, the interest of information be made available to the taxpayers of this province that he will table that report or make it available within the next week. Failing that, he has given us no reason why he cannot do that or why he should not do that, so I would appeal to the Minister to be reasonable. It is a reasonable request. I suspect that report will not be any different three, four or five months from now than it is today. It should not be. It has surely been agreed to. It should be the same report.

Again, I appeal to the Minister to be reasonable and to get up in his place and tell the Members of this House that he indeed will make that public information available to the MLAs, and thus to the taxpayers of this province who are, after all, paying for all of this.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated to my honourable friend, I am always prepared to be reasonable. We could have, for instance, debated the Department of Health Estimates out of this Chamber instead of the Highways Estimates if my honourable friends were so concerned in terms of debating the

issue and seeing the direction of Government. That was not the choice of the Opposition Parties who, I believe, had first choice in terms of the Estimates departments that are—

Mr. Chairman: The Honourable Member for Osborne, on a point of order.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): I do not know whether the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) consults with his House Leader (Mr. McCrae), but it was at the specific request of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) that the order was established in the way it was. To suggest that we somehow step back from this responsibility is incorrect, and I would ask him to withdraw it.

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

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of clarification, what the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock) says is substantially correct. The order was to be Highways and Agriculture, although I do say that if Honourable Members were interested and concerned enough to get onto Health, that could have been through my office, and I am sure the Opposition House Leader's office would have been amenable to such discussions. I am just saying it is not quite the way the Honourable Member is putting it or the impression is not quite correct.

Mr. John Plohma (Dauphin): The Health Department is a huge department and traditionally takes weeks before they get to the Health Services Commission when that budget is tabled, that capital budget. We would not have gotten into it in any event and that is clear. Let not these Ministers mislead the House on that issue.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. That is not a point of order.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Chairman, we have been interrupted in our debate, and certainly the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), I guess, was interrupted.

I would like to ask the Minister directly why he has a problem in making that information available now, public information, which the taxpayers of Manitoba are entitled to through their MLAs. Why will he not make that information available now? It is a printed document. It is a reasonable request. Why is he holding it back? I mean what does he have to hide? What is the problem?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to be hidden in the Department of Health. One of the things my honourable friend ought to be aware of is an announcement I made in the some 30 minutes that we discussed the \$1.2 billion last year, in terms of the capital Estimates. The Health Advisory Network is studying the issue of extended treatment beds, in terms of the role of Municipals, Concordia and Grace Hospitals, who have construction projects that have

been before the House for a number of years. In addition to that, Deer Lodge Hospital, we just recently about a month ago opened up 100-and-some beds in Deer Lodge Hospital, primarily extended treatment beds.

* (1210)

The Health Advisory Network has been charged to give me a report, and I am hopeful that report can be incorporated into capital budget when we get to it during the Manitoba Health Services Commission Estimates so that honourable friends will be aware of the decisions made by Government in the direction they are taking.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I do not believe I got an answer. The Minister said, we will be aware when we get the details and so on, but I still have not gotten an answer. Why? Why is it not being made available now? It is public information.

If the Minister wants to give some explanation to why the numbers are where they are, there is nothing preventing him from adding a note of explanation or a few pages of explanation, if he so chooses. He has not given the Members of this House, and I say, to the public of Manitoba, because we are the public of Manitoba, representing the public of Manitoba, fully reported in the media, fully reported in the press.

I think it does this Government no good to be seen to be holding back information. It is simply not in the public interest. We have no explanation, just that it does not suit the convenience of the Minister. The fact is we are going to adjourn, maybe we will be adjourning for two-and-a-half months, taking a recess. It is in the public interest to make that information available now. Surely we should have better debate, more rational questioning, and better discussion of those Estimates by having that information earlier. It is not as though we are asking for anything that is out of the ordinary. It is not out of the ordinary. It is a public document. It should be made available.

Will the Minister explain to us why he cannot make that document available? He has not really explained it. I would like him to reconsider and get up and say, yes, I will make that document, that public document available to the people of Manitoba, who are paying for all this, within the next week.

Mr. Orchard: I explained to my honourable friend why it is not going to be tabled within the next week as he requests.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I did not get the explanation. Would the Minister please get up and explain to the Members of this House why he cannot table a public document which has been prepared months ago, why he cannot table it in this Legislature? Would he please explain it? If he explained it, I did not hear the explanation. Could he please give the Members of this House the explanation?

Mr. Plohman: This is appalling, what is happening in this House today. In a minority Government situation, this is appalling.

What we have here is a situation where hundreds of millions of dollars of capital expenditures, of taxpayers'

dollars, which is usually outlined to the House in April, May, or June of each fiscal year, only three months into the fiscal year, is now being held back by this Government until October, November, December. That is their proposal, seven, eight, nine months into the fiscal year.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) talks about tradition, that this is somehow tabled during the Estimates, and that is the tradition. The tradition is early in the fiscal year. That is the tradition. That is what that Minister should not be hiding behind at this particular time. He should bring forward that program, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), along with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). Only the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has been straightforward because he does not have that big a capital program so he is going to provide it to us.

What about these Ministers who have hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars? What are they hiding? Why are they keeping that? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I in no way would want to see this House adjourn until we have that information. I know that there has been some agreement and negotiation with the Government, but frankly we expect the Government to be forthcoming and provide all information. We do not know why they are hiding it. They are hiding it from the people of Manitoba. They need to provide an explanation to this House why it cannot be done.

Those documents should be prepared by now, long ago. This is the end of June. Those documents are prepared in the bureaucracy, in the departments. The Ministers have considered them. They have completed their consideration at Treasury Board. There is absolutely no reason why that information cannot be tabled in this House, and should not be tabled. I want an explanation from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) why he will not table that capital program here today and, if he will not table it today, why he will not table it within a week, which is reasonable on our part.

Mr. Manness: Just a brief remark, you see, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) destroys his own argument. He says the documents are prepared and they are ready. This Government has never claimed that the Capital Supply documents are not ready. Indeed we cannot print Estimates unless they are ready. Just like they were ready in March of '82, in March of '83, that is when that Government brought in Interim Supply.

The only point I am trying to make—I have never indicated they were not ready. I have indicated the tradition was that they were brought forward during the Estimates consideration of the various departments. If there is a common will or if there is collective wisdom that says that approach should change through the Rules of the House or some method, then let us look at a different approach.

I am saying we are resting on tradition. Tradition is very important in this House. Tradition is very important in parliamentary democracy, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Plohman: The Minister has just admitted that the documents are all printed and ready to go. Why will

he not share it with the Legislature of this province, with Manitobans at this particular time? Is it because he wants to change those documents, manipulate them from now until October? Why will he not table them if they are ready?

I recall when we were in Government and the Minister of Natural Resources at that time, the Member for St. James, had his Estimates reviewed and he said perhaps we will change this program after, even though we have reviewed it now at Estimates. He said maybe these are not the projects we will be doing. This Minister, these Opposition Members, stood up and cried for hours about that. They said, no way will we put up with that. That was only in one department, one small program.

Now they want to keep hundreds of millions of dollars, all the capital projects under wraps. Why will this Minister not table those documents that he says are ready at this time in printing?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairman, all the yelling and screaming cannot change what I put on the record. I have never denied the Capital Supply that has been developed, which was reflected in the line Estimates, was not prepared. I have never, ever said they were not. They were prepared in March 30, 1982. The Government chose not to. The details were there also. In March 28, 1983, they were also there in the detail, the details were there. April 1, 1985, when we passed Interim Supply the former Government should have had, would have had their Capital Supply schedules well documented.

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

Mr. Plohman: On a point of order, this Minister is providing misleading information to this House. He knows very well the capital programs in detail, the Highways program, all of the hospitals, nursing homes and so on are not approved at the time that the Budget is brought in and necessarily all the details. They came after, in the months after, and Treasury Board has an opportunity to consider them. Let him not try and mislead this House by saying that in 1982, 1983 all of those projects by detail were put in place and were already approved.- (Interjection)-

Mr. Chairman: A dispute of the facts is not a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness).

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairman, I will continue. I am saying that if we are presenting to the people of Manitoba honestly Budgets which reflect also a line which refers to capital, that when we budget, when this Government budgets, there has been some basic understanding of what it was we were talking about that went into that line Estimates with fair considerable detail.

* (1220)

I am saying to the Member opposite, as they chose not—remember Mr. Chairman, we are talking about Interim Supply. Interim supply has been passed almost

every year, going back. If we listen to the Members opposite, if they believe what they are requesting of us was something that should have been in place when they were in Government, why did they not show us the courtesy of the Capital Supply in March, April, May, June and July when they passed Interim Supply or asked the House for support in passing of Interim Supply?

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Chairman, I hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) admitting that the documents are complete and ready for the various departmental capital projects. In fact, in some instances he has indicated that a large portion of the capital budget has been announced but he is not prepared to share that information with Members of this House. Nothing has prevented the Government from coming to this Assembly in February rather than in May. What prevented the Government from coming in February? At that point in time, the Ministers would have had to present a portion of the Estimates with an Interim Supply Bill as they are bringing forward, and by this time all the capital projects would have been announced.

One can only assume one thing from my perception of seeing what is going to happen, that Ministers, either if they have got it complete will want to use with the flexibility that they have got, to tell communities and community groups that you will give you a project, and we have got yours on hold and it is a question mark. Now if the public pressure comes on, great, we will give a little bit to this group. They will be able to play one community against another on the capital budget. If they are sincere in saying no, we are not going to do it and it is there, we have got it ready. The request of the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) should be very easily accommodated. All Members of this House will have the capital budget in a week, 10 days. We will even give you 10 days. You have got it ready. Give it to all the Members of the House and do not play games with the people of this province.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) is in the Chamber, and I would like to ask him if he can now take this opportunity before the House adjourns for a period of several months, to provide to us the approvals that his department is going to announce with respect to non-profit and co-operative sector housing programs in this province. I ask that question, not because I particularly need the answer on a personal basis, but I ask that question because I have been in contact with a large number of groups out there that are awaiting word as to approval on their particular projects. They are becoming increasingly concerned day by day as that word does not become available to them that they will lose those projects. If they lose those projects, then what the Government will have done is saved itself some more money for another rainy day fund, but they will have done it at the expense of non-profit and co-operative groups out there that are trying to build a better province by providing their volunteer services to provide better housing for many hundreds of Manitobans, and thousands of Manitobans, if the projects are fully funded.

I would ask the Minister if he can now provide that information to this House, so that those groups do not

have to wait any longer before they can begin to take strong and positive action to build the construction projects which they have been working on for so long. Before sitting and allowing the Minister to answer, I just want to reinforce the fact that normally this information would have been available months ago to them.

There is a time urgency here with respect to the money lapsing. On December 31, on the part of the federal Government, those 75 cent federal Government dollars will lapse on December 31. If the groups cannot get their projects far enough along stream by that time, they will lose the funding, the province will lose that funding as well. There is that sense of urgency. The groups are telling me time is becoming very short.

The Minister has consistently refused to provide that information. We are told now by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that the Minister knows what capital projects are going to be going ahead and what funding is going to be provided, so if he knows why does he not share that information with those groups that are working as volunteers to make this province a better province by providing more affordable housing?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Anyone will not lose any of our committed unit of CMHC. We will be announcing all those projects that we have negotiated with these people and these different people throughout. We have corresponded with them. We have reviewed their needs. We have reviewed what the wants were. We have not changed the criteria in any way in which we measure these different projects. They are all on a percentage point basis. I will guarantee the Member across the way that we will not lose our CMHC commitment unit.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I am quite surprised about what we are seeing taking place here today. The Members—(Interjection)—well, the Liberal Members here. I think Members of the Opposition have been more than co-operative in terms of recognizing the need in terms of Interim Supply. It has been a tradition in this province, recognizing the fact that it just takes a period of time to develop the Estimates procedures. It has also been a tradition to have this type of capital information available.

The Members of this Legislature, prior to—(Interjection)—this information has been available at this time of year. I cannot understand, for the life of me, what this Government hopes to achieve by keeping this information secret. I do not understand the motives. We have at least one Minister, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) who can provide that information. Why will they not provide the information?

Mr. Chairman: The Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), on a point of order.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have leave, temporarily, to suspend this committee so that the Speaker can resume his seat so that we can ask the House if there is agreement that the House sit a few minutes past the regular sitting hours.

Mr. Chairman: Is it agreed? (Agreed) Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there would be agreement among Honourable Members not to see the clock until one o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement for the Speaker not to see the clock until one o'clock? (Agreed) The Honourable Government House Leader.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House return to Committee of the Whole, by leave.

* (1230)

Mr. Speaker: By leave, it has been moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House return back into committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (Cont'd)

Mr. Chairman (William Chornopyski): The Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Chairperson, I want to make it clear for the record that if it were not for the fact that the Government has refused to provide the information we have requested that I consider a very reasonable request, this information that is available that was confirmed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and I do believe he would not have had to have gone through the process of getting leave to sit past the normal adjournment hour, but it certainly was not our intention today to do anything other than pass the Interim Supply and deal with other items of business before us.

So, quite frankly, we did not expect that the Government would not provide the information. I am quite concerned about the possibility that we are going to be in Estimates, establishing a new tradition in this province of having this type of information unavailable until October or November of each year, well into the fiscal year, well past the time which many people out there, in our communities in Manitoba, need that information. I am very concerned about that.

As Members of the Legislature, we are used to not getting full information, certainly from this Government we do not get full information, despite their protestations of being an open Government. But it is not for us to ask any information. We are asking, Mr. Chairperson, for the public of Manitoba, and I do not think it is unreasonable, when those documents are available, for this Government to be providing it.

That is the point we have been trying to make here. As I said, we did not expect it. I, quite frankly, am

shocked that the Government will not provide this information. I am very concerned when they start a **new tradition** because, as much as the Minister of Finance wants to talk about it in various different terms, last year we had this information unavailable until late in the year. There were exceptional circumstances. Perhaps there was an election. But this has not been an election year, it is well over a year where it was slack and which has not been affected at all by the election.

The material is available at this point, perhaps it was not available last year, but it is available this year. That has been confirmed by the Ministers. I do not think it is unreasonable for the Government to provide this information.

I can tell the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that we are going to continue to raise this. I am sure he is going to be hearing from community groups, as well, who want that information. This is just not acceptable. As I said, if this Government perhaps tried to be as co-operative in this matter, as the Opposition Parties have been in ensuring that Interim Supply is passed prior to the summer break and this is something which we certainly are living up to today and trying to accommodate in every way, shape or form, I would just ask that they try and be as accommodating as the Opposition Parties are being. We are trying to facilitate Interim Supply. We would just like to ask one thing, Mr. Chairperson, from this Government in regard to debate today, and that this is for the information. I do not think that is unreasonable.

If this Government wants to talk about being an open Government, Mr. Chairperson, I think it is going to be quite clear that we are going to be reading this back to them as a clear evidence that is not the case, and not just on our behalf, but on behalf of other people.

With those comments, Mr. Chairperson, our caucus certainly is willing to pass through the committee stage with Interim Supply but, in doing so, I would like to state for the record, we are not happy with what we have received in the way of responses today from the Government, and we will continue to debate that when the Session resumes on September 18.

Mr. Chairman: We shall proceed to consider Bill No.—the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Chairman, there is some inconsistency here. The fact is that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has been very co-operative and is making that information available. So, on principle, there is no reason why this information cannot be made available now. We are simply asking the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme)—I do not know what the Minister of Housing's response was—the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) to make those reports available. It is not unreasonable and it is in the public interest.

So I would like to know, is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) saying categorically that this Government will not make available the reports of the Department

of Education on public school construction? They will not make available any reports on housing construction nor will they make available the report on Manitoba Health Services Commission capital construction. Are we being told that categorically now that is the case?

I would say it is not to the credit of this Government if that is their position, because it is unreasonable and it is not in the public interest. Are we being told that categorically? I would like to know. Is that the case? Would the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) respond on behalf of the Government?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, was there a question? I heard most of the comments, but I did not hear the final question.

Mr. Leonard Evans: My final question, is the Minister on behalf of the Government now saying categorically, because I did not hear the response of the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) or the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), that these reports will not be made available? Is that the categorical position that even though the Minister of Natural Resources said it could be made available? We appreciate that, and thank him very much for that but these other departments will not be made available, Health, Education, and Housing? Is that a categorical position?

Mr. Manness: I will repeat exactly what I said for the very first answer I provided to the question. I have looked into this. I am not surprised by the requests of Members opposite. I guess, on behalf of the Government, we are trying to decide what is the best decision to make with respect to the traditions of the Legislature. Traditionally, this information was always released during the consideration of the Estimates.

To that end, Mr. Chairman, there have been other cases in other years, in other Governments, when Ministers from time to time have released that information prior to the consideration of their Estimates. Indeed that was the prerogative of the Minister in charge of Natural Resources. That is again what I indicated earlier on in the question, that the Ministers are not under orders to provide that information. The tradition that information be released during Estimate consideration was brought into place for a good reason, I am led to believe, so that the focus of the Estimates would be directed toward the consideration of the capital and that focus would not occur either during other times of business during the legislative Session, including Question Period, including a whole host of other areas.

That is why the tradition is in place. If the Members opposite are saying they feel that we are now going, we are terminally involved in a situation where most of the Estimates are going to be considered in the fall period of time, then I think we have to sit down collectively and try and see if there is a better way. That is the only point I am trying to make.

Mr. Chairman: We shall proceed to consider Bill No. 29 clause by clause. Clause 1—pass; Clause 2—pass; Clause 3(1)—pass; Clause 3(2)—pass; Clause 4—pass.

Clause 5—The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans: It is not my intention to delay the proceedings in any way, but I have one specific question I would like to ask of the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) regarding Careerstart.

I tried to get the information earlier this year. It was not available. Careerstart has been announced. I would like to know what the budget is this year. Is it the same as last year? Is it higher, is it lower? We do not need to know to the last dollar or cent, but approximately how much is being spent on Careerstart this summer? How many jobs are involved with that? High school students are about to come out onto the job market next week. It is a very critical question. I know university students have been out. Could the Minister give us that information now?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Chairman, I have not got a comparison between last year's budget or this year's in front of me. From what I recall, it is the same. I could tell the Member though that the positions approved to date are 5,264 and the number of employers approved are 3,496 persons. I would have to check and get the information for the Member, but I think it is the same amount as last year, but I stand to be corrected if it happens to be a few dollars here or there.

* (1240)

Mr. Leonard Evans: I thank the Minister for that information. If she could then undertake to provide us some additional detail, I would appreciate receiving it by mail. Maybe others would like to get copies, but I would appreciate getting that. Thank you.

Mrs. Oleson: Yes, I could undertake to get the Member some more information on that. That program of course, the numbers I gave the Member may not be final because of appeals and so forth, because the program is still just getting under way. I can later on provide the Member with some more information on that program.

Mr. Chairman: Clause 5—pass; Clause 6—pass; Clause 7(1)—pass; Clause 7(2)—pass; Clause 8—pass; Clause 9—pass; Clause 10(1)—pass; Clause 10(2)—pass; Clause 11—pass; Clause 12—pass; Clause 13—pass; Clause 14—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Is it the will of the committee that I report the Bill? (Agreed)

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. William Chornopyski (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989, and has directed me to report the same without amendment.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the report of the Committee of the Whole be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READING BILL NO. 29—THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Bill No. 29 was read, by leave, a third time and passed.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock), that when the House adjourns on June 29, 1989, it shall stand adjourned until September 18, or in the event of an emergency, such earlier date as may be fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on the motion, I want to indicate that our caucus would certainly support the motion. It is my understanding, and I have raised this point with the Government House Leader, that we would be consulted, because in this particular case we do have an all-Party agreement to adjourn until September 18. Obviously, if an emergency does arise, we do feel that the House should be called back into Session, but we would want to be consulted to ensure that there be a true emergency, because I think we have an all-Party agreement on it. With that comment, I would like to indicate that we certainly have no difficulty with the motion.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to just put a couple of remarks on the record regarding this motion. The Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) has indicated that it is necessary to have such a motion that allows us to come back should there be an emergency, and he has agreed that it would be after consultation with the Opposition. I thank him for that. I think that is a necessary condition, given the agreement that we have.

While the Session is not over, I would also like to just take a moment, at least for this portion of the Session, to thank the staff and the Pages and all of those who worked so hard to support us, the Hansard staff, and to thank all Members in the House. It has been an interesting opening to this. I have certainly learned an awful lot. I now am pleased actually that I have some two months to reflect on this before we come back to have debate on all the important matters that do stand before us and to you, Mr. Speaker, I wish you the very best this summer.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I stand to acknowledge that discussions have been held with House Leaders about arrangements for returning on September 18, and about

the matter of the motion for adjournment itself, referring as it does to situations which might occur which would **cause the** Government to advise the Speaker to call **the House** at some point earlier than September 18.

I agree, as I want to do as Government House Leader very often, with my opposite numbers in this House in order to keep some balance in our business dealings and to do the work of the people of this province in as co-operative a manner as we can, recognizing the minority nature of our Government in this province. I think there is room for that kind of co-operation, under most circumstances, and I have acknowledged to my opposite numbers that indeed they would be consulted should an emergency arise that the Government felt it was necessary to ask Your Honour to recall the House, so I acknowledge that.

I join with my colleague the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock) in expressing profound thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the staff of this Legislature, all of those people who sometimes have to jump through a number of hoops to accomplish the work of this House, sometimes a very short notice. For those times when notice has been short, I express regret to the staff of this place, and I express thanks on behalf of all Honourable Members for the yeoman service they do to us and to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I will resist any temptation to comment at any further length on the performance of the Opposition Parties in this House in the last little while. I think on the closing day of this portion of this Session it would not be useful for me to indulge in my own thoughts on the performance of the Opposition.

Needless to say, we will be ready, Mr. Speaker, on September 18 as a Government to continue to serve the people of Manitoba in the best way we know how, and to put our shoulders to the wheel on their behalf. On behalf of my own colleagues, I thank them too for their support of me in my duties as Government House Leader.

* (1250)

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Mr. Speaker: The Administrator of the Province of Manitoba is about to arrive to grant Royal Assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Cliff Morrissey): His Honour, the Administrator.

His Honour, Alfred Monnin, the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba,

having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed his Honour in the following words:

Mr. Speaker: Qu'il plaise à Votre Honneur.

Au cours de la présente session, l'Assemblée législative a adopté deux projets de loi qu'en son nom je prie respectueusement Votre Honneur de sanctionner.

(Translation)

May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed two Bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

(English)

Bill No. 3—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route.

Bill No. 30—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille.

Mr. Clerk: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable, the Administrator, doth assent to these Bills.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of this Bill:

Bill No. 29 - The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation anticipée de crédits.

Mr. Clerk: The Honourable, the Administrator doth thank her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this Bill in Her Majesty's name."

The Honourable, the Administrator was then pleased to retire.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, shall we call it one o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it one o'clock? (Agreed)

The hour being 1 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until such time fixed by Mr. Speaker, which is September 18.