



First Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

39 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan
Speaker*



VOL. XXXIX No. 16 - 1:30 p. m., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1990



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, November 1, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the First Annual Report of the Crown Corporations Council and also the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review, the Department of Finance.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., 1988-89, and also Channel Area Loggers Ltd. for the same period. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have from the Royal School twenty-five Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Yvette James. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Health Care Federal Funding

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier, who made the incredible statement about a year ago that the Mulroney Government has taken some promising steps in health services and health care financing.

We now have hard data from the federal Finance Minister, Michael Wilson, showing a steady decline in federal cash payments to Manitoba for health care over the next five years which when projected show the last cash payment to Manitoba will take place in about a decade.

My question to the Premier is: What is this Government's strategy for dealing with this totally

unacceptable federal plan which will have tragic consequences for the most valuable service Manitobans have and will mean the death of Medicare if this Government does not act and act soon?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I will not get into the discussion of the quoting out of context of the statements that I made in Ottawa. Nowhere will you find the quote as you have put it in your press release. It is quoted out of context, Mr. Speaker.

We will not get into that, because in the coverage of my comments at that meeting the story in the Winnipeg Free Press the next day said that the frankest attack on Ottawa was made by my presentation. The Member may recall that the Prime Minister was so angry that he was moved to refer to her former Leader, Mr. Pawley, as a statesman because he had been so much more co-operative and signed the Meech Lake Accord and done all these wonderful things.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest threats of course to Medicare are the lack of funding by Ottawa—and I have put that on the record over and over again—and also the huge debt load that has been left in place by the former NDP administration. Because of the debt load that has been put in place by the former NDP administration, we are faced with \$500 million that has to be paid in interest costs before we can spend a nickel on health care. Each and every year as we open the books, as we start the Estimates, a half billion dollars has to go to interest on the debt that was accumulated by the Howard Pawley Government of which she was a part before we can spend a—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1335)

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Speaker, that the Premier makes light of a very serious issue facing this Government, I would like to ask the Premier if he accepts Michael Wilson's calculations and if he as Premier and Leader of this Government has not arrived at a date representing the last cash payment to Manitoba for health care services and what he is doing about the incredible devastating impact that that will have on Medicare in Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the Member for St. Johns was when the former administration in Ottawa—both the Liberal administration in Ottawa and the New Democratic administration in Manitoba were in place when the cap on equalization payment was put in place. The cap on equalization payment was put in place under the NDP in Manitoba and the Liberals in Ottawa. That is what is reducing our transfer payments to Manitoba today. That is what is limiting our ability to get funds for health care, for education, for social services. That was put in place under the Howard Pawley NDP and the Trudeau Liberals. I wonder what toadstool the Member for St. Johns was hiding under when that was being put in place. She was working in the Premier's Office and obviously did not do anything about it, and now she wakes up some five years later to the realization of the damage that it is doing in our ability to pay for health care—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker—no projections, no contingency plans. I think I had better table the reports I am referring to, Michael Wilson's calculations and the projections done by the Canadian Health Coalition.

I would like to ask the Premier, given that he has obviously not dealt seriously with this issue, has no plan to fight the federal cuts, has not been able to convince the federal Government to revise its plans and has shown no contingency back-up programs, will this Government start now before it is too late to do what they promised in 1988, to reform our health care system by moving to community based preventative programs so that Medicare in this province is not threatened by federal cutbacks?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, we have been working on this issue for a considerable period of time because we realized that we had been left in the lurch by the Howard Pawley NDP and the former Liberal Trudeau administration. We realized the cap that was placed on those equalization payments was going to bind on Manitoba very seriously by the late 1980s and into the 1990s.

So, Mr. Speaker, at every successive Premiers' conference, Western Premiers' Conference, First Ministers' Conference I have raised the issue of federal offloading on transfer payments. At every successive conference I have enlisted the support of the other Premiers to tell Ottawa that they cannot do it.

We even entered into a court challenge to prevent Ottawa from reducing CAP payments, because in principle it was the same principle that if Ottawa could unilaterally cut its transfers to the Provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario on the CAP payments, they could do the same thing to us on other programs such as transfer payments for health and post-secondary education. We were successful in that challenge. We took them to court because we believed that they ought to be stopped, but the fact of the matter is that the NDP did not do that when they had the opportunity.

Constitutional Issues Public Consultations

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the First Minister. The Prime Minister is announcing a plan to deal with the Canadian Constitution today in Ottawa. We are told that the plan will have a committee to go around Canada and have a one-year time frame to report back to the Parliament of Canada.

Given the experience of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, of the roll-the-dice kind of timing that we had under Meech Lake and given the great trauma that it created in our country, I would ask the Premier whether he will oppose a specific time line, given that it has probably been established as an election timing rather than a timing for Canadians to develop their own values in this very difficult time. I would ask the Premier whether he will tell the Prime Minister that we are opposed to a time that is time sensitive based on our experience here in Manitoba and indeed Canadians' experience across the country.

* (1340)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think, like a lot of things, people put projections on how they think that public consultation should take place. I would hope that the Prime Minister would indeed be sensitive to the need to consult as broadly as possible and to listen to a broad cross section of opinions from the people of this country. I think it is a step in the right direction. I think it is what should have happened before the Meech Lake process. I think we all agree with that.

Both the Leaders of the Opposition Parties and I have consistently said that there ought to be this kind of open public consultation leading to future constitutional discussions and decisions by our First

Ministers and by the Governments of the provinces and the federal Government.

Under all circumstances I think that openness should in fact also be complemented by as much time as is necessary for the process. I would hope that if the process carries on longer than he has anticipated or projected that he will indeed give it the time necessary to achieve that kind of consensus, that kind of national review of constitutional priorities.

Economic Growth Public Consultations

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I have a further question to the First Minister. I think all Canadians know that the values of our country are eroding daily. Our economic values are eroding daily with the rich getting richer in our country, Mr. Speaker. Our Medicare values are eroding over the last 10 years. The things that make us strong, economic and social values, have eroded dramatically in the last 10 years.

Will the Premier of the province be urging the Prime Minister to include in any consideration of consultation with the public in Canada the economic and social values in this country that have been eroded and Americanized over the last 10 years and which are leaving us a very divided people and a very divided country?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I think our values of self-sufficiency have been eroded by Governments like the former NDP administration, who hooked the province on debt, Mr. Speaker, and made them so totally dependent on deficits and debt that they destroyed people's ability to provide for themselves, that they destroyed the ability of people to be self-sufficient in this province.

There are a lot of values that regrettably have been eroded by the ill-considered positions and policies of former administrations like the NDP of Howard Pawley and the present Leader of the Opposition. It is a said legacy, Mr. Speaker, but I believe the fact of the matter is that I believe there is a forum that I had called for two weeks ago that the First Ministers' Conference on the economy be reinstated as quickly as possible, that we ought to get the First Ministers of this country to the table to consider the serious economic issues that face us—the high interest rate policy, the high dollar value, the over-valued dollar that is causing havoc

for our exporters, our producers, that is very, very badly affecting our economy at the present time—have to be addressed.

Those are major economic policies that fall within the purview of the federal Government. We ought to get to the table to negotiate them, and that is why I have called for the First Ministers' Conference on the economy.

Constitutional Issues Aboriginal Representation

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps in terms of values we will look at petty politics as one of the values that we would like to change in our country as well.

My final question to the First Minister is: In light of the Speech from the Throne that referred only to the priority of Senate reform as part of the constitutional process in Manitoba, and in light of the great number of challenges and unresolved constitutional problems and challenges for aboriginal people in this country, that it became very evident during our period of time in Meech Lake in June and during the period of time since then, in the summer of this year, will the Premier revise the terms of reference that were in the Speech from the Throne to include consultations on aboriginal constitutional issues along with the Senate proposals that he placed in the Speech from the Throne?

* (1345)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to petty politics, one only need look at the questions of the NDP Opposition Party day after day in this House, and you can find the level of petty politics that has created that kind of backlash and that kind of cynicism that people have for their elected representatives in this Legislature and in every other Government in this country. They exemplify best the petty politics that the Leader of the Opposition talked about.

Mr. Speaker, I have said consistently and openly that the task force that we will set up will be on Senate reform and all other constitutional matters, so that issues such as aboriginal issues will indeed be open to be discussed at the constitutional task force that we set up in this Legislature. The all-Party task force that we set up will include the opportunity for people to speak about all constitutional priorities, including aboriginal issues.

Economic Growth Public Consultations

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister today is going to announce or has already announced that we are going to have a cross-country tour of distinguished Canadians.

We are going to talk about the future of our country. The future of our country is not the mere wording in a constitution. The future of our Constitution is also the discussion of values. Surely issues like equalization and transfer payments are part of that value system.

Since the First Minister has decided in this province to use a political explanation, will he now give us a commitment that he will speak with the Prime Minister and ensure that issues dealing with economic distribution in this nation be part and parcel of constitutional discussions?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the principle of equalization is enshrined in our Constitution. The principle of equal opportunities for people across the country is part of our constitutional discussion.

The major concern that people have across the country at not being fairly dealt with in economic terms has to do with the imbalance in our Senate, the fact that we do not have the Senate as a counterbalance to the Parliament, that in fact the Senate mirrors and multiplies the negative effects of having our representation and the decision making in Ottawa concentrated on where the populous regions are, central Canada having the most clout and the most influence on those decisions.

The way in which we can overcome that, one of the ways in my judgment, one of the most effective ways would be a truly reformed Senate with a triple E motto so that the other regions of the country will have a strong voice and a strong influence on economic decision making. That is indeed part and parcel of the kind of constitutional discussions that should take place in the federal one, that will take place in our provincial task force on constitutional reform, Mr. Speaker.

Federal Transfer Payments Equalizations

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as convinced that I am that Senate reform is essential, it is not a panacea.

It does not bode well for the citizens of this nation if they are told successively by people that it is a panacea. It will not solve their economic problems and will certainly not solve the distribution problems.

The issue affecting Canadians is the distribution of wealth. The distribution of wealth is becoming more and more unfair.

Will the First Minister direct his attention to the issue of the distribution of wealth in this nation so that we do not continue to see the erosion and the distance creeping in between wealth and poverty in this country?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): We are now getting into taxation policy. We are now getting into all sorts of things that may or may not be the subject validly of constitutional issues. Issues like regional disparities, equalization and so on are part of the constitutional ambit, are part of the legitimate discussion and the legitimate work of such an all-Party task force, or at least as we have in Manitoba, and the kind of citizens task force that is being set up in Ottawa.

I have never been one who said that Senate reform was a panacea. I said it is one of the serious options that should change the distribution of decision making and authority in this country in a positive sense to redress those kinds of regional imbalances and those kinds of inequities that exist. It is not the only answer, but it should be part of the discussion. I fully believe that it will be, Mr. Speaker.

* (1350)

Constitutional Issues Public Hearings Membership

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Can the First Minister tell us today if there is a commitment on the part of the Prime Minister to discuss names of individuals who would make the list of distinguished Canadians, because far too often when we have had these panels in the past there has been far too much representation from Ontario and Quebec and not nearly enough from the West and the Maritimes?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have not been consulted.

Residential Schools Public Inquiry

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): It is with mixed emotions that I want to ask the First Minister this

question. Yesterday, the federal Minister of Indian Affairs rejected all requests for an independent national public inquiry into allegations of physical, emotional and sexual abuse in residential schools.

Will the First Minister request that the federal Minister of Indian Affairs launch an independent public inquiry into this whole tragic part of our history?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the specifics of the allegations that have been made. I think that a good deal of investigation ought to be made into those allegations to determine the breadth and the depth of the circumstances that have been talked about.

I believe there is an obligation on the part of all those authorities, whether they be civil or clerical, to look into those allegations and to determine some of the circumstances, how widespread they are.

Before we go into major national inquiries I think there ought to be some level of investigation to determine whether or not such an inquiry is warranted. We are not in this province opposed to having public inquiries. I think we are leaders in the country in terms of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, so I would not shirk away from it if there was prima-facie evidence to suggest that the matter is widespread and is pervasive such as to require such an investigation.

Mr. Lathlin: I have a supplementary question to the First Minister. In order to have the healing process succeed, it is important that we finally have an independent inquiry. If the First Minister is not prepared to request the federal Minister of Indian Affairs to launch a full public inquiry, will his Government launch its own independent inquiry here in Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the allegations are made with respect to conduct in schools that were under federal jurisdiction totally, and it is my understanding that no one has contacted the Attorney General to request investigation into such matters nor placed any evidence before him that would become the subject of such investigations.

I would think that until some of these steps are first pursued that we are not in a position to be demanding such a broad and sweeping inquiry until some of these matters are at least brought to the attention of the Attorney General so that we have a basis upon which to make that judgment.

Mr. Lathlin: I have a final supplementary. Aboriginal people are not looking for sympathy. We want vindication for the thousands of people whose lives were torn apart by this experience. Will this Government not support such an inquiry? Does the First Minister not agree that we must expose exactly what went on at the schools to heal the emotional, spiritual, physical scars from those experiences?

Mr. Filmon: I am neither saying we would or we would not support such an inquiry. What I am saying is that it is a step-by-step process in which we have an obligation to have the relevant authorities, whether it be the legal system and others, take a look at allegations, at prima-facie evidence, and so on, and determine the nature of the allegations and whether or not there are grounds for such a broad and sweeping inquiry being implemented.

* (1355)

Agricultural Assistance Fuel Tax Rebate

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Manitoba farmers, who this year are facing low commodity prices, skyrocketing input costs, are now confronted with increased fuel costs, costs that are increasing because of world prices but also because of the federal Government's decision to reduce fuel rebates. Mr. Speaker, a fuel rebate at one cent per litre amounts to \$30 million. If the rebate was reinstated to the full level of 5.9 cents per litre, it would amount to \$300 million in the farmers' pockets.

Considering the pressure that farmers and interest groups put on the federal Government to reinstate the interest free cash advance, will this Government join with the farmers to pressure their colleagues in Ottawa to bring back the fuel rebate to its original level, and will this Government take steps to explore the possibility of processing alternate fuels in Manitoba, which could greatly stimulate the rural economy and have a particular effect on—

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

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, what the Member has identified is that clearly there are some problems in agriculture. They are very large problems and they relate to a large extent to the international marketplace. The

Ministers of Agriculture across the country are very aware of this and have for many months been working on a process of trying to find a way to address the big problem of low incomes in agriculture.

There is a meeting here in Winnipeg on the 14th and 15th of November where a wide variety of issues, including the cost of fuel, will be on the agenda. I would like to remind the Member that the Manitoba Government does not collect provincial taxes on farm fuel. That saves the Manitoba farmers some \$34 million each year.

With regard to alternative fuels, the Minnedosa ethanol plant has recently expanded with assistance from this Government. Clearly the day of ethanol in use as a fuel may be coming into its opportunity in competition with fossil fuels. There is very serious consideration of the issue you have raised. It is much broader than just the cost of fuel. It covers all costs for the farmer and the incomes they receive. That is being addressed in a very aggressive manner by all provincial Governments across this country.

Rural Economy Diversification

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): My supplementary question is to the Minister of Rural Development.

Clearly the grim state of the farm economy is having a devastating effect on the whole rural economy. What specific plans does this Government have to expand the production of alternative fuels and what specific plans does the Government have to diversify the rural economy throughout the province?

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): I want to thank the Honourable Member for Swan River for the question. It certainly is a concern of this Government as we have indicated on many occasions that the rural economy is in the state it is. It is largely we believe in the state that it is because of the economic policies initiated by the previous administration and the high interest costs that this administration is now forced to pay. If we had those \$500 million to be able to invest in initiatives in rural Manitoba a lot of the communities in rural Manitoba would be better off.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that we have in the last year taken significant initiatives

in establishing a department, a stand-alone department for Rural Development, which the previous Government never even considered. We are in the process of developing programs and initiatives that will address to a large extent some of the problems that communities in rural Manitoba are encountering.

Ms. Wowchuk: I am pleased that the Minister does have some plans, and we would like to know what those plans are. In particular, I would like to know what plans the Minister has for the Parkland area and the Swan River area where people have been promised jobs through the Repap deal, but these jobs have never materialized. We need diversification in that area.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I will recognize the Honourable Minister of Rural Development.

* (1400)

Mr. Penner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious that the Honourable Member for Swan River is relatively new and that she has not been following the issues in her part of the world during the last two or three years. We did in fact take the initiative to create substantial jobs in that northern region. We got rid of a money-losing company, and by doing that we received assurances that a new company, a new lumber or forestry industry, would be developed in that area, a billion dollar investment in that region, which would have and could have created a substantial number of jobs in the Swan River area.

However, it is very apparent from responses that we have received from the Opposition Party that they want absolutely no involvement in any new initiatives in that area. We are looking forward to the day that Repap will be able to in fact proceed with the expansion that they have indicated and create the jobs in the Swan River area that the Swan River people are looking forward to.

Industrial Technology Research and Development

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism. This Government has continually paid lip service to the importance of research and development to Manitoba's economy, yet it is only lip service. Manitoba's commitment to research and

development is a shameful 0.9 percent of the GNP, less than half the national average and well below Alberta's 3.6. Is it any wonder that Manitoba's economy is feeble?

Would the Acting Minister explain how the \$340,000 budget cuts to industry and technology and the health industry development initiative will enhance the Government's research and development in Manitoba?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): I thank the Member for St. Boniface for that question, and I will take it as notice for the Minister.

Industrial Technology Research and Development

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Of the \$18 million cash received from the sale of Manitoba Data Services, this Government has boasted of \$2 million for business venture development, but what about research and development? What commitment will the Minister make to adequately fund such necessary initiatives and raise them to respectable levels of support?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Member asks a good question. I can assure him that right now there is the development of a committee to try and direct that allocation of funding towards research and development. It is being done in conjunction with certain people from the university. Indeed we want to see that money spent, as I do know the Member does also.

Mr. Gaudry: To the same Minister, would the Minister state what further plan he has in place to ensure that Manitobans remain competitive in the areas of health, industry, technology and industrial technology?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, the Member has been in the House now for five or six days when we have been debating the budget. The whole thrust of that budget was to ensure that Manitoba is in a position whereby indeed it can provide attractive returns to investment capital that will create jobs. It is about deficits. It is about tax regimes. It is about proper management of Government affairs.

Women's Crisis Shelters Funding - Rural

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): My question is to the Minister of Family Services. On Tuesday, the

Minister of Family Services stated in this House that the Lundar, Erickson and Ashern wife abuse committee ended last year with a surplus.

I understand that the Honourable Minister may have not read through the budget of LEA very carefully and may have missed the fact that the surplus he mentioned was in fact not core funding for programming from his department, as he implied, but was actually money provided from the Jobs Fund specifically for a contract position.

My question is: Will the Minister now agree that LEA does not in fact have a surplus as he implied to the House, that this money is not available for the provision of services? Will he explain how LEA can expect to provide programming with the current inadequate funding?

Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the Members of the NDP are constantly calling for more funding in this department. I would point out to them that this budget shows an 8.2 percent increase in funding for Family Services.

I would also say that if we were not in a position where we are paying some \$500 million on deficit a lot of new initiatives could take place in all departments.

I would point out to the Member again that the Interlake crisis local board, who make local decisions—and I believe that I put correct information on the record when at the end of the last fiscal year they did show a profit. I think that certainly they have to examine management practices and fully understand why they have moved from that position into a deficit position.

Mr. Cliff Evans: I have a supplementary question to the same Minister. Will the Minister now assure this House that if his Government is really committed to funding and working with women's resource centres as he has stated, he will meet with the LEA wife abuse committee and he will now guarantee that his department will provide adequate funding to meet their programming needs?

Mr. Gillieshammer: Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to the Member that in meeting with officials at Osborne House the other day they indicated that we have the best funding formula in Canada for wife abuse shelters. The funding formula not only has core funding for operation but also a per-diem funding to take care of volume increases. Certainly, in respect to the question, my department is at the disposal of

that community committee and would be happy to meet with them over their issue.

Mr. Cliff Evans: To the same Minister as my last question, can the Minister justify to this House the extravagant expenditure of more than \$400,000 over two years to the Government's Round Table on the Environment, a mere public relations exercise, when women in the Interlake are being forced to go without services because of inadequate funds to the LEA wife abuse committee?

Mr. Gilleshammer: This certainly confirms the commitment of the NDP toward the environment. I have already indicated that this department received an increase of 8.2 percent this year. The Member and the critic are asking that we take money from other departments to add to this department. We have already given this department the largest increase. I have indicated as far as the committee is concerned that my department would be happy to meet with them.

Economic Growth Royal Bank Forecast

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River): On this side of the House we continually listen to the gloom and doom predicted by Members on the opposite side of the House, Mr. Speaker. Certain Members in this House have called into question the province's economy, forecasted rate of real growth in 1990.

My question is to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance share with this House the latest forecast of the Royal Bank?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Seine River has posed a question. I believe she would like an answer.

* (1410)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am just absolutely delighted at that question, only because I thought that maybe the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) would not be asking it tomorrow.

I want to indicate that officials of my department were yesterday or the day before with the economist one Alex Thomson, one of Canada's senior economists. He is the vice-president of the Royal Bank. At a meeting where indeed he forecasted the growth in the Manitoba economy—and I know three years is important to the Member for Brandon

East—he indicated that Manitoba's economic growth would be this year 2.1 versus the national average of 0.7. Next year our growth would be positive at 0.3 percent versus a negative number for Canada. The third year for '92 our growth would be 2.5—again, well above the national growth. Also, he said that the mood in Manitoba is cautiously optimistic, so much different than other parts of Canada.

Crime Prevention Government Initiatives

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. Today is the first day of Crime Prevention Month, 1990. This is the third Crime Prevention Month that this Minister of Justice has presided over. Every year he has talked high and mighty about his commitment to crime prevention and then he has done nothing.

Is this Minister of Justice planning to repeat his performance of prior years, dragging out the same platitudes and then putting them back in the drawer for another year, or will he now commit to showing real leadership on this issue in establishing a crime prevention council, which is the necessary first step for this Government to take in showing leadership on the area of crime prevention and coincides with the resolution presently before this House from this Party?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Similar to the day before yesterday, we have questions trotted out by this Honourable Member which hark back and are brought forward repeatedly in this House and do not really take us anywhere. All they do is give the Member an opportunity to engage in a little rhetoric in this House.

The Honourable Member's support—questionable support—for our impaired and suspended driving countermeasures was appreciated even though we were not sure if it was really there or not.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that crime prevention measure has had the effect of saving lives in Manitoba. We hope that in other measures that we will be undertaking in our department we will have the support of the Honourable Member and his Party when it comes to domestic violence and other issues of importance in the area of crime prevention.

The budget of this particular Department of

Justice has increased dramatically since this Government took office, thanks to the support of my honourable colleagues in this Government and no thanks unfortunately to the words of encouragement that we never seem to get from the Honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Mr. Speaker: I have two rulings for the House. -(interjection)- Order. Order, please.

On October 29, during Question Period, I took under advisement the point of order raised by the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) about the words "potentially racist attitudes reflected by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld)", which were used by the Honourable Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

I thank the Government and the Opposition House Leaders for their advice on this matter.

Having reviewed Hansard and researched the matter I find that the word "racist" has been ruled out of order in the House of Commons, and that in 1987 in our own House the phrases "smacking of racist" and "it's almost a racist assumption" were voluntarily withdrawn by the Member who spoke them.

I would therefore ask the Honourable Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) to now rise and withdraw the unparliamentary language, without qualification.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, there is an error in the ruling. I believe you have taken under advisement comments made by the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), not the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

I would ask perhaps that a corrected ruling be brought back in—

Mr. Speaker: Hansard will—I thank the Honourable Opposition House Leader (Mr. Ashton). I thank him, and Hansard will show that it was actually the Honourable Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli).

I would ask the Honourable Member to stand and withdraw the unparliamentary remarks.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the words.

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

Mr. Speaker: On October 29, during Question Period, I took under advisement a point of order raised by the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) concerning the content of a question directed by the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). The Government House Leader's point of order was, and I quote, "that the purpose of Question Period is to direct questions to Members with responsibilities within their own spheres."

I thank the three House Leaders for their interventions in this matter.

The following citations from Beauchesne's 6th Edition, I believe, apply in this situation:

409 "A brief question seeking information about an important matter of some urgency which falls within the administrative responsibility of the Government or of the specific Minister to whom it is addressed, is in order."

409(6) "A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government. The Minister to whom the question is directed is responsible to the House for his or her present ministry and not for any decisions taken in a previous portfolio."

412 "A question may not be asked of a Minister in another capacity, such as being responsible for a province, or part of a province, or as spokesman for a racial or religious group."

Additionally, the Speaker of the House of Commons in 1986 noted that "... it has always been a fundamental rule of questioning Ministers that the subject matter of the question must fall within the collective responsibility of the Government or the individual responsibility of one of its Ministers. This is the only basis upon which Ministers can be expected to answer questions."

In the matter of the October 29 question, I am ruling based on the authorities cited that it was not correctly framed. The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) could have directed a question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) asking what action the First Minister had taken or intended to take about the matter. It is not proper, however, to ask during Question Period a question of a

Minister unless it relates directly to that Minister's departmental or Crown corporation responsibilities.

I believe that if Members take care in putting their questions, we can avoid similar situations in the future. Also, I would note that later during the same Question Period, a question was placed by another Opposition Member that essentially made a similar point but was framed in such a manner that it did relate to the responsibilities of the Minister in question.

* (1420)

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek leave of the House to make a non-political statement about Crime Prevention Month.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Minister asking for leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. McCrae: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it will be non-political.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? Leave.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I thank all Honourable Members for granting permission to make this comment today.

Today, as pointed out earlier by the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), is indeed Crime Prevention Month in Manitoba. Today, being Day One, it is an opportunity for me to say thank you to all of those people throughout Manitoba who take part in activities that have the result of reducing the incidence of crime in our province.

Very briefly, thanks should be extended to, among others, volunteers associated with the Manitoba Society of Criminology and Project Prevention, Citizens for Crime Awareness, those involved with Neighbourhood Watch and Block Parents and Crime Stoppers, our Youth Justice Committees throughout the province and our honorary probation officers.

All of those people including members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the City of Winnipeg Police, the Brandon Police, and representatives of other municipal police forces in Manitoba, ought to be thanked today and this month for helping to create awareness about the importance of crime prevention in our province. They are helping us all to keep our neighbourhoods

as crime free and as safe as possible. I wish them well in the coming year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for St. James have leave?

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add my comments and the feelings of my Party to those of the Minister of Justice with respect to Crime Prevention Month, 1990.

Let me add my congratulations to the many volunteers who through their efforts have been working on such programs as Neighbourhood Watch, Block Parents, the Citizens for Crime Awareness, the offices around this province, and have done a marvellous job in the past.

Let me also add my congratulations to the organizers for this coming month and the events which will be taking place in this month. It is, by all accounts, going to be another successful Crime Prevention Month. I look forward tomorrow morning, I believe, to meeting, I am sure, with the Minister of Justice and probably a representative from the New Democratic Party at the annual kickoff Crime Prevention Breakfast. I am sure that will be an event which will be meaningful to the community at large and tell Manitobans the importance of crime prevention which we all share in this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan): Might I have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Kildonan, does the Honourable Member have leave?

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, I join with all Members of the House in concurring with the comments of the Minister of Justice and my honourable friend from St. James. There is probably no Member in this House, nor no Member's constituency, where people have not been touched unfortunately by the scourge of crime.

It is unfortunate we have to have a Crime Prevention Week, Mr. Speaker, or a Crime Prevention Month, but I certainly join in and support and the Members of this side of the House join in support of the organizers and all participants during this month. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I have some committee meetings to announce. Tuesday, November 6, Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will meet at 10 a.m. If required, that committee will also meet in the morning, Tuesday the 6th, to consider the 1988 and '89 Annual Reports of the Manitoba Telephone System; and Tuesday night that same committee to consider the 1988, 1989 and 1990 Annual Reports of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission; Wednesday, November 7, Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, in the evening, eight o'clock, to consider the 1987 and 1988 Annual Reports of the Manitoba Data Services; and Thursday, November 8, Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, convening at 10 a.m. in the morning to consider the 1988 and 1989 Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice to the House that I will table a listing of the departments of Government that will be reviewed. Their Estimates will be reviewed later today. I want to serve notice so that the first two committees that will be considered by the House are Executive Council in the Chamber and the Department of Finance in the outside committee room. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Did you want to finish something?

Mr. Manness: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add that by all appearances Estimates review will begin on Monday.

Mr. Lamoureux: On House Business, I would ask the Government House Leader, just for clarification, if it is his intention to ask the House Leader of the Third Party in the future prior to announcing committees, or if he is planning on consulting before actually making the enunciations?

Mr. Manness: The Member brings forward a good point. I apologize to him, and I can assure him that for the week following, when there are a number of committee hearings that I am thinking of, I will certainly share that information with him.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), the amendment thereto, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Co-operative Affairs who has 40 minutes remaining.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): This will be the second quickest 40-minute speech of my life.

I was astounded—and I had in my notes to speak today. I have a lot of notes, but because the time frame is short where I will not be using all of my time. I had planned on speaking a little bit on the environment, because we hear so much about the environment from the NDP.

I cannot express how astounded I was at the comments of the Member for Interlake (Mr. Cliff Evans) on his condemning of the funding of the Round Table on Environment. I can see why his Leader right now is talking to him and saying, my gosh, if you do this again, at least vet it through the process so at least we know what is going on. -(interjection)-

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

Point of Order

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there has been some impugning of motives. I want to make it very clear that I totally support the Member for Interlake. His position was a comment about environmental public relations versus environmental policy. I totally support his comments and his questions raised today.

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

Mr. Connery: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the sensitivity of the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), the Leader of the NDP Party. When they were in power, of course, there was no Environment Department. There was a name. There was a Minister assigned to it, and they did absolutely nothing. We hear now the rhetoric and the comment, especially from the Member for Radisson (Ms.

Cerilli) who speaks now so eloquently on what should be done on Environment. Really, if she would go back into the books and find out what has been done by her Government, she would realize that it was a disaster.

When I took over the portfolio of Environment, I got my first briefing book and I said, what has been going on for the last five to seven years, and the comment was, not very much. I said, we have got issues here that are five years old. What are we doing about these issues? They said, well, the Minister wanted to study it again. I said, well, how many studies does it require to make a decision? Well, the NDP did not want to make a decision on anything environmentally. -(interjection)-

* (1430)

The Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) says, what about Manfor? When we took over, Manfor was an absolute environmental disaster, an absolute mess. There was oil and there were contaminants in the soil, in the water. We were working with the company to bring it in line, because there was a high economic cost. This is carrying on at this very moment.

The little things, Mr. Speaker, that are so important to the environment—The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), who criticizes the fires that have taken place in the solvents and so forth, forgets Gravure Graphics who were, for years under the NDP, allowed to accumulate barrels of solvent in a field that had dry grass and everything else around it, did nothing about it. When we took office, we had that mess cleaned up in a very short period of time, working collectively with the company.

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

Talk about the Domtar creosote yard in Transcona, the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) is here. Does he remember when all they had was a run-down snow fence protecting the children and the people from going into that Domtar yard? When we came in, I met with the people in Montreal, and I spoke to them and said, look, this is not acceptable to our Government. There are people at risk, there are young people that can be playing in there. There is now a chain link fence around it. They are also doing some work to get rid of the creosote that is in the ground. That is what we are doing.

The NDP stood by and talked about the environment and did nothing. What about PCB?

PCBs were around all through the time that the NDP were in power. What did they do? Nothing. We brought in the strictest regulations on PCB storage that there are in the country. We brought those PCB regulations in; the NDP did absolutely nothing. They had the car, in Transcona, in that Member's constituency, sitting there. His Government knew that they were there; they did nothing about it. We had it moved out of Transcona. His own Party would not move those PCBs out of Transcona. We removed them, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Talk about lead in water, which there is concern over school children drinking. Part of the problem with lead in water is because of the lead solder that is being used to solder the pipes. The NDP sat idly by while they knew it was there. We put in a regulation banning the lead solder; very simple, it just took a little bit.

When you take a look at the increase in the budget, and I go back to the year before when I was the Minister and we got one of the largest percentages of increase in the budget to environment that has ever been. This year again, we have a big increase to the budget.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, when the Members opposite talk about environment, let them review what their own Government did and it was nothing. Who are they going to put in charge, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) who was a Member of that Government, who was on the front bench with them. No, he was not, he was in the last bench, but he was in Cabinet. Absolutely nothing, now they come in, and they talk about environment, but they are criticizing the round table.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think it is a disaster. It is a shame that the Member for Interlake (Mr. Cliff Evans) would be critical of the foundation of environment that we are trying to build here in Manitoba. In the sense of time and that other Members may have an opportunity to speak today, and we are going to be winding the debate up today, I would conclude my remarks. Thank you.

TABLING OF DOCUMENT

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Madam Deputy Speaker, I only want to stand to table an item, that is all. It will only take me a second.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in accordance with the provision to Rule 65(6.1), the sequence for consideration of Estimates in various Government

departments by each section of the Committee of Supply has been established as follows, and I have a listing here, and I will table it.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): I am pleased to be able to take part in the debate on this provincial budget, which was released last week. The massive deficit of \$383 million that was announced has caused me some great concern, particularly over the mounting debt load for this province.

I consider myself to be a fiscally responsible person, Madam Deputy Speaker. I have great concern for the way in which this Conservative Government has let the people of Manitoba down.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we have all heard the fable of how astute the Conservative Members opposite are supposed to be when it comes to managing the economy. It is very evident when one views the economic havoc wreaked on this country and this province by the policies of the Governments intent on satisfying only the bottom lines of their balance sheets of their friends, that these policies are a failure. They are leading this province and this country into ruin. It is my belief that Government cannot leave the controls of our economy on automatic pilot and expect it to find its own way. This is a sure fire way to invite disaster.

I believe that Government, particularly in time of recession such as we are in the midst of now, must take control of the direction that the province is headed in and make investment to stimulate our economy.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this investment must be in people and not so much in the bricks and mortar. People are the foundation of this province, and it is investment in people that will move the province out of the recession. We must concentrate our efforts on several main areas such as: the quality of our health care, environmental protection and enhancement, and the creation of full-time manufacturing based jobs, amongst other important programs.

I would like to talk now briefly about job creation. We have seen the reduction or the loss of 12,000 manufacturing jobs in this province over the last few years, particularly I believe as a direct result of free trade and deregulation. Deregulation has had a significant impact on the transportation sector of which I was a member until I entered this House and

was elected by the people of Transcona. We have seen the loss of thousands of jobs, particularly in the railway industry, where when I started in the railway, we had over 100,000; we are now down to close to 30,000 employees across this country. That is a significant impact on good quality jobs in this country, I believe, as a result of deregulation.

Free trade is going to continue as well to have a large impact on the jobs that we have in this country; good quality jobs that are going to be lost to free trade to countries like the U.S. It is important that we move away from a Free Trade Agreement in my estimation so that we can get back to doing what is right for our province and our country.

I believe, at the same time, that we must make alterations in this particular province to the minimum wage. We must increase it to a level that maintains a decent quality of life, and then we must fix that minimum wage to the cost of living so that we can maintain the standard the living for all Manitobans.

Seniors' home care: we have seen through this budget, Madam Deputy Speaker, reductions in the home care, although the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) had denied that there are any cuts. I believe that there are cuts to this program. You cannot deny the cuts that have taken place in the community, such as I have seen when I have gone and talked to the residents of Transcona, and they have told me that they were on home care programs and had their service taken away from them. This is a disgrace.

I have seen, in the community of Transcona, where people that require this type of home care service have applied for it and have been rejected. These people, usually single women, elderly women, trying to live in their own home but unable to meet all but their own basic needs require this support service to enable them to remain in their homes so that they do not become a "burden" as they call it upon the other members of our society.

Yesterday, we had Members opposite that talked about the Grade 2 students in the anti-smoking campaign. I believe it was the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that talked about that. That, to me, since I am a non-smoker is a worthwhile campaign for the Government to be taking part in, but at the same time I saw that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) would not deal with the situation in my own community of Transcona where there was an environmental concern that was causing the same

type of problems with the families and the youth in the community, children of the families that have asthmatic conditions that are now being severely affected by the dust that is coming from a particular manufacturing plant in Transcona.

* (1440)

If this Government is truly committed to the health and well-being of the people in these communities, then they must take charge of what is being put out and produced into the environment by these plants. If all Members opposite were concerned, then they would deal with this situation that has been going on for well over a year and take steps to ensure that the quality of life for these people is affected no longer in a detrimental fashion.

We have seen decisions made by this budget where there appears to be—and I am sure there is—a reduction in the monies funded for the environmental department, that the hazardous waste funding will be cut back. This could have serious consequences for the people of Manitoba. The environment is very important, particularly to the people of my community, as I am sure it is to the other residences of this province, and that funding should be there to ensure that hazardous waste is being dealt with not in the future but now.

I would like to briefly talk now about transportation policy and strategy in this province. We have seen, as was announced yesterday, that VIA Rail, one of the most economic, environmentally sound means of transportation in this country, is going to have their services freed so they can slash and hack away the services that do not meet their own needs.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe that it is important to have good quality transportation, public transportation in this province and in this country, and that means using the services that present the most economical means, and that means utilizing the resources that we have in this province, such as electricity, of which we have an abundance and creating an electric railway system in this province and in this country to meet the needs of the people so it will lessen our dependence on fossil fuels.

There are many areas of which I touched on briefly through the Throne Speech Debate, and I will not go any further into them at this time. When we get into the Estimates process, we will be dealing further with some of the issues of which I have many questions. One question that I would like to raise right now, and it causes me great concern, is that

when we were in Government, when the NDP was in Government in this province, we had \$50 million a year in cost-shared programs for the economic regional development agreements.

I see by this budget that has been released, that there are no agreements, zero funding, Madam Deputy Speaker, taking place to develop the northern and remote portions of our province. To me that is a disgrace.

When we get into the Estimates process, I will be asking questions further of the Minister responsible to find out what developments are taking place and why we do not have these agreements in place. This will not help the northern and remote areas of our province to develop unless we get these type of agreements and these people and their quality of lives will be severely affected.

I will conclude my remarks now, Madam Deputy Speaker. I thank you.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): I am pleased -(interjection)- good, that is one thing I am going to say. I am pleased to add my remarks to the debate on the budget. I am glad to see that the Members opposite will again listen attentively, as they did in the past, as I provide an examination of the budget in my critic areas. I appreciate their special attention during my last speech. I am sure most new MLAs would also appreciate such attention in the press. I think it is interesting that, though the Premier gave me such attention, that was one of the most noteworthy and newsworthy things about his speech. It is also odd that although he could refer to what I said, he was not willing to quote me.

We have seen that when I find something objectionable about what a Member opposite says, that I will quote it, and I think that the words will speak for themselves in the public eye. Unfortunately, the Premier does not do this. I also would think that the remarks that I made are what is a recipe for sharing. I think that the Premier knows that if he actually quoted this, that the public would not take too kindly to his attitudes. I think that it is surprising that he does not believe in sharing which is what I was referring to when I said that we want to have a more fair society.

I would also like to add that the references that I made have also been made by a few other Members that have sat in New Democrat groups and that is Stanley Knowles and Tommy Douglas. They have wanted the same things that I do. They want policies

that are going to make our society more fair. They want systems that are going to give people more control over their lives.

Under this Government, workers bargaining for fair contracts will be less secure, since organized workers are what they would think not attractive to investment, neither does a decent minimum wage, pay equity or affirmative action seem attractive in their minds. Environmental law enforcement is also bad for business in the same way.

Filmon's team has already shown that whether it is environment protection or immigration, it is the profit motive that rules. There are no moral principles in their policy, and there does not seem to be a sense that there are some things that a Government should do just because it is right. This Government continues to espouse an ideology of minimizing fair corporate taxation, just environmental and labour legislation, in an effort to lure industry to come and set up shop.

Meanwhile, with their tenuous majority, they are too afraid to tax and generate revenue to pay for needed education, health and community service budgets. So under the guise of reducing the deficit, they are going to starve out those who are least able to cope with a recession. Well, they cannot carry this on for a full mandate. Eventually, they are going to have to raise some revenue and start cutting services, I would think, like the true Conservatives that they are.

If this is not enough to tell us that we are in trouble, in defending the record, the Filmon team is comparing us to Newfoundland. I have no offense in this statement, but there is no secret that this really means we are in trouble. Everyone knows the country as a whole is in a recession, thanks to six years of Tories in Ottawa, so it is no consolation when we are doing a little better than the poorest province in the country.

I never buy this type of Canadian economic rationalization that pits one province against another, but particularly now as we are in Canada, comparing our unemployment rates while the Americans are signing another trade agreement and buying the whole country like one big business merger.

Well, when Mr. Manness (Minister of Finance) said that in his budget speech that they would have to start cutting non-essential services to protect the essential programs, he must have been referring to

youth programs. Over \$1 million, it seems to be, were non-essential for youth programs in this budget. Over half a million was cut from youth employment services; almost \$400,000 was cut from regional employment services. Rural areas in Manitoba have lost enough young people, so it seems that it is an evacuation because rural economies can no longer support jobs for young people in rural Manitoba, so they may justify this to say that there is no longer a need for youth programs for employment in the rural areas.

They have also cut \$150,000 from Job Training for Tomorrow, which will mean that there will be fewer young people moving from social allowance and have a chance to work for wages.

Other cuts that will affect youth are to Inner-City Initiatives, Seven Oaks Youth Centre, Post-Secondary Career Development, northern community colleges, and this shows such a lack of this Government's understanding of the dire needs of youth.

* (1450)

This Government has blamed its losses, and the fact that it is increasing the deficit, on inadequacies from the federal counterparts. The cuts in transfer payments will be felt again by youth as they once again pay higher tuition fees. The sign to young people is that Manitoba Tories are about to practise the same policies as Mulroney in Ottawa.

Now all of these things are serious, but there is another area that has not been increased. Child and Family Services will not be providing shelter and services to the ever increasing number of homeless, abused, neglected youth and children. Even though caseloads at Child and Family Services have increased over the last number of years by 100 percent, and social workers are not able to provide the care and service that they want to, this Government refuses to hire more staff.

Young people, 16 to 18 years old, will suffer most in these situations and with this practice—because only violent situations affecting youth will be handled—what this does is ensure that situations that may have been intervened with to prevent violence will escalate so that there is violence, and then they will be dealt with, maybe.

It seems that this Government is hoping that young people will turn 18 before they have to do anything. What we will have is more young people ending up in more serious home situations that

require Child and Family Service intervention, and there will be fewer staff to do this intervention.

With the Tories, the economy will not be able to support the integration of young people into the work force, and they are refusing to help with youth in crisis. Their attitude is crassly, tighten your belts, and pull up your socks. Well, Mr. Filmon, I would like you to realize -(interjection)-

An Honourable Member: The Member from Tuxedo.

Ms. Cerilli: I would like the Member from Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) to realize that young people on the street have no belts to tighten and no socks to pull up. We have also seen, with this Government's attitude, it is unclear which programs would be the first to cut as Mr. Manness says they go back -(interjection)-

An Honourable Member: The Member for Morris.

Ms. Cerilli: The Member from Morris says, we will cut back to essential services.

It will be interesting to see what they think is a more essential service, programmings for youth or multicultural programs. We have seen how the Filmon Cabinet is divided on multicultural policy. The criticisms they have suffered this last week from ethnocultural groups showed they do not have the confidence of all Manitobans. The Minister claims increases in funding these organizations and the development of the need of the secretariat. The Minister of Culture and Heritage has said that these things will happen.

Well, what about the Manitoba Intercultural Council which exists? It is a nationally recognized structure which is being frozen out in this budget. It has not received the funds it needs to provide the ongoing co-ordination of the ethnocultural communities that they need to access their Minister.

All of the new functions of the Government's proposed secretariat could be provided by MIC. Instead, this Government is dismantling this democratically elected council and replacing it with an office of bureaucrats. MIC does not know what their relationship will be with this new secretariat. Will it become as paternalistic as this Government tends to be?

The Government must involve the different groups as it tries to address racism in Manitoba, racist attitudes that are so close to the surface as we have seen this week. -(interjection)- No, no. This

Government does not value the legitimate work of the groups that are working in this area if it does not maintain a democratically elected group to address the Minister.

Oftentimes what happens with cultural groups is in fact that they are doing services which should be provided by immigration and settlement. Criticism that multicultural groups are not needed is unvalidated. There are some things that are important to the economy that are tough to put a price tag on. How much do we lose when we are closed-minded and protectionists? How do you put a price tag on cultural identity?

The problems this province has with accreditation of credentials from outside of Canada are important. I was surprised by the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) comments that we should be more concerned with allowing only certain types of immigrants into Canada. Rather than going shopping for new Canadians, we should welcome those that want to make Canada their home.

I believe that money to cultural groups serves other functions as it helps bring more understanding and acceptance of differences. If groups need that organizational assistance to help create more equity to educate us as to their culture, any Government that is striving for equity must help cultural groups do this.

I look forward to Estimates when we can look more closely at other services like the Immigrant Access Centre, English as a second language program, affirmative action. The cuts to ACCESS and BUNTEP programs, the tenuous situation for the Core Area Agreement and Winnipeg Education Centre make it clear this Government has no commitment to changing the stratification in the work force. It makes the multicultural secretariat look like window-dressing. They are cutting the programs that they say that the secretariat would co-ordinate.

This Government, in the same way, has also tried to paint itself green and, as the public becomes more politically astute, it will see that issues like multiculturalism, racism and environment protection do have a political slant, and they do not cross all-Party lines.

This Government keeps blaming previous NDP Governments, and saying New Democrats want to spend public money and they should see it as not theirs. I would like this Government to remember

that when they are dealing with public land. Wildlife management areas are protected under the law, and we are beginning to see that environment protection under the law has no meaning for this Government as they are selling the public land at Oak Hammock Marsh to a private company. They are selling a wildlife management area so that a private company can put up an office building.

Public and environmentalist groups are outraged. They are organized and they are informed, and they want a Government that will listen. Unlike this Government, they know what needs to be done to stop the destruction of the environment. This Government, rather than consulting these groups when they are needed, is spending \$200,000 a year on a public relations campaign so it looks like they are doing something in the environment.

Consultation is great, but I expect a political Party to have environmental policy, an economic policy that will not destroy the environment when it is elected. I do not think they should be using public money while they are in Government, and stalling on responsible environment management, in the meantime conducting business as usual: damming rivers, clear-cutting forests, not replacing trees, allowing industry to pollute, and not pressing charges.

The same is done with the Institute for Sustainable Development, this \$800,000 that they are spending here in this budget. It is a fine grant and I support the chance for this Government to address international environmental problems, and I would encourage them to go after their federal friends, so that they would put their share into the Institute for Sustainable Development. Let us not try to fool the public into believing this is an increase in Manitoba's environment budget.

* (1500)

Hazardous waste is a Manitoba problem where we have been working toward establishing a treatment and storage facility which would be a solution. One would think that the Government would be moving full ahead to pursue this solution, but instead they have cut \$500,000 from the Hazardous Waste Management Corporation budget. Either this Government does not understand the importance of the corporation's current process of education and consultation for democratic citing, or they really do not want this facility, which is causing some concern.

Where is the funding for increased environmental cleanup in co-operation with community groups, and where is the funding for individuals participating in environmental assessments as intervenor funding? We will not see that kind of progress from this Government. We get promises, promises, promises.

As for sport, there has been only a small decrease in the money estimated of around \$100,000.00. It will be interesting to see where these cuts come from. I noticed that the Fitness Directorate has been moved from the Department of Health. Attention to personal fitness is part of any preventative health plan, and I would hope that this is not a philosophical move away from this. We have a long way to go in making sport accessible and equitable. The fact is that people who most need the healthful addition of sport or fitness in their lives can least afford it.

The focus of many sports events also contributes to the acceptance of violence and competition in our culture. Especially for young children, sport must encourage participation, not discourage it or restrict participation by structures that are elitist. There is a need for regulations to make sport more broad based using a more developmental model. This will not take more money, but we must then change our attitudes and the procedures and the way that we are spending the money.

I would like to think in these times of increased violence, of individual isolation and disparity in affluence that all Government policy and spending would be geared to reducing these societal problems. We cannot take for granted the impact of sporting events.

Thank you very much.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Madam Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in the Budget Debate. It is a budget that has some good points, but it also has some disappointments.

Madam Deputy Speaker, before I get into the budget I would like to share a few of my observations as a new Member. During the debate on the throne speech, we heard people speak about having different political views, having different ideas on policies, but they also spoke about respecting one another's opinions and working for the betterment of all of Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we heard the Members in this House speak of the First Minister (Mr. Filmon)

as a great statesman and a Leader who represented Canada. Well, I was somewhat disappointed in the First Minister when he made his closing remarks on the throne speech. He chose to ridicule Members on this side of the House for their left political views. Is this not a democracy? Do we not have the right to express our opinions? I say thank goodness that there are people who have ideas that are left of centre. For these ideas over the years have developed into policies that have benefited all Canadians. I would be far more concerned if everyone was on a right-wing agenda because throughout history we have seen what has happened to countries where the agenda has been on the very right extreme.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we have heard comments about changes that have taken place in eastern Europe, and I think everyone here is pleased about these changes. Many of us have families and friends in those countries, and I am particularly pleased because I am now going to have the opportunity to visit the village of my ancestors. Opposition Members seem to imply that because eastern Europe is going through a change, social democratic governments are somehow a thing of the past. I doubt that very much. Many countries have very successful economic growth under socialist governments. We see countries under socialist governments with low unemployment, excellent health care systems and solid growth, such as Scandinavia.

We have also heard Members from the opposite side of the House blame the Ontario NDP for the deficit when they have only been in Government for a very short time. On the other hand -(interjection)-

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River has the floor. Please let her continue her debate.

Ms. Wowchuk: On the other hand, they choose to blame the NDP for the deficit in Manitoba when they have been in Government for two and a half years. Madam Deputy Speaker, you cannot have it both ways. The Opposition Members can try to blame the NDP for a lot of things, but they cannot blame the NDP for the deficit that the federal Government has at the present time, Liberal and Tory deficit, a deficit that takes one-third of every dollar that goes through.

As we look at the budget, this is not a budget that plans for the future. It is a budget that will not

stimulate our economy. We have been criticized for our Jobs Fund and we have been criticized for running a deficit, but that Jobs Fund was an investment in our children, an investment to keep people in the province throughout low economic times. Quite frankly I am quite disappointed that there is not money set aside in this budget for job creation that will enable our young people to stay in Manitoba, because once they leave it is very hard to get them back.

* (1510)

We hear people say that we should reduce the deficit. Yes, we have a deficit, but we do not have to reduce it by cutting services to those who need it the most. We hear hence, that we are going to have to tighten our belts, and I believe that this budget is only the beginning of the belt tightening that we are going to see in the next budget.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have some concerns with the impact of this budget on Manitobans. I would like to address those concerns in relationship to my critic area and to my constituency. This Government made an announcement on rural development, on water and sewer, a commitment of \$90,000, an initiative hopefully to attract development to rural communities. However, there is no program to encourage economic developments in other parts of the province, in particular as I have said earlier in the Swan River area, that has been waiting for jobs to materialize, in the Lake Winnipegosis area where fishermen are needing diversification. This Government has neglected this part of the province and should have negotiated a development agreement that would look after rural Manitoba and northern Manitoba.

Most of my constituency is an agriculture community and I would like at this time to commend the Government for urging the federal Government to reinstate the interest-free cash advance. This is very much appreciated by the farming community, however, I am concerned that in order to get this cash advance, bankers are also involved, bankers have to sign the agreement. This takes away from the flexibility of the farmer to make decisions on his or her own operation and I urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) to work towards getting that agreement changed.

When you look at the Agriculture budget it looks like a very large increase, however, the Estimates were high on the last Agriculture budget and it was

underspent and I hope that will not happen again. There would appear to be cuts in staff in various departments such as the Soil and Water Branch and the Vet Branch, services that farmers need during these difficult times of change, also, large cuts in the Communication Branch and Educational Programs. It appears that there are no programs to help farmers through the short term. Farmers and fishermen are in need of jobs to carry them through.

I am also very concerned about the cuts to northern communities, because much of the Swan River constituency is in a northern community. Cuts to BUNTEP and ACCESS, programs that allow rural and low-income people to get an education in their own community rather than have to go away to school. Those are cuts that will deeply hurt the people in my constituency, programs of extreme importance to rural people.

Other areas that are cut that are of concern to me are cuts to the 55 Plus program and the CRISP. CRISP is a program that people in the rural area have been able to take advantage of during this time to help them through. We see cuts to health care and the dental program, again a program that has been very beneficial to rural people, cuts to children's programs, and the cuts to the air ambulance and the ambulance service is also a disappointment to rural people.

Yes, I am disappointed in the budget. This Government with a high rural representation has not addressed the immediate needs of the rural community and has offered very little to stimulate diversification. The cuts of education, health care services, will have a negative effect on all people, because as you cut services to the rural community it makes it very difficult for us to attract people to invest in that area. People are not going to come to an area where there is not a high standard of education or where there are not the proper services. The rural community will suffer from these cuts.

I will close with that, and I look forward to the Estimates process when we can address these issues on a more specific impact.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): It is a pleasure for me to rise and address our Government's third budget, the third in a series of budgets that work toward the establishment of a strong economy and sound provincial finances.

Just before I enter into the text of my remarks, I

wanted to just point out one of many examples of the misunderstanding of elements within the Estimates that are being called out day after day by Members of the Opposition. In fact, this is one I think that they have sent out news releases on to northern Manitoba.

The Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) just repeated the error again in which she said that we had made cuts to the air ambulance service in Manitoba. The reality is we have done nothing of the sort. There will be no cuts to the air ambulance service in northern Manitoba and, indeed, if only they would wait until the proper process of asking questions during the Estimates debate, they will get the full information. You cannot just take a sheet of paper and make extraneous comparisons without understanding what goes in to the information within those Estimates.

For example, just so that the Member knows what I am talking about, we have an air ambulance. It is a very expensive jet aircraft, a Cessna Citation. From time to time, there are major repairs needed in order to keep that particular piece of equipment airworthy. It so happened that last year there was budgeted for a major overhaul that included an engine replacement to that aircraft. That is not necessary this year because it has been overhauled after about six years in service, and so it brings it back to state of the art and airworthy state.

So you would not put in an amount of \$250,000 to replace an engine when you have just done that. That is the kind of silly budgeting that the NDP might do. That is the kind of ignorance that the NDP might put into their budgeting, but we do not believe in that. The people of Manitoba do not believe in that. The people of the North will not get any reduction in service; in fact, they will now get air ambulance service, safe and secure air ambulance service, because we put the money into that investment to keep it.

Now that is the kind of thing that I think does not do a service to the NDP, and does not show them to be caring. Well, maybe it shows them to be caring people, but it does not show them to be knowledgeable people, and it shows the kind of foolishness that resulted in the huge deficits and debt that we had under their administration.

By now it should be obvious to everyone that we, as a province, have some major financial challenges before us. This budget addresses the difficulties that

we face as we are hit by the combined impact of a recession nationally, debt servicing, and federal cutbacks. Those are the major elements that form the backdrop to the decisions that were made in this budget that was introduced a week ago in this Legislature.

Today I want to talk about those challenges, and about how we can meet them as a province. From our first days in office, even in a minority situation, our Government has consistently taken the long-term approach to the economy and to the province's finances. We recognize that real economic growth cannot be created overnight with quick-fix programs where the only lasting impact is a green sticker on a vacant office, and \$10 billion of debt, Madam Deputy Speaker. We cannot have that kind of a short-term, quick-fix approach to Government any longer in this province.

I have watched the Opposition, as all of us have on this side of the House, squirm every time we mention the debt, Madam Deputy Speaker. They squirm and they say, do not blame us for your problems, the NDP have not been in Government for the past two years. That is the message that they keep saying every time we mention that debt. The problem is that Manitobans cannot forget about that debt, nor can members of the media because the reality is that debt has built in a factor that affects every single decision that we make, and will continue to affect every single decision made by any administration in the future of this province until we get rid of a significant portion of that debt. That is, that every day we are in office we pay interest on the debt.

The difference is that the amount of interest we are paying today is something in the range of \$580 million a year, between \$560 and \$580, as compared to \$114 million when Howard Pawley took office. That difference of \$450 million is the legacy of Howard Pawley, and it does not change no matter how you cut it, no matter how you try and forget about it, bury it. It is there and it has to be dealt with in every single priority decision that we make as a Government.

* (1520)

That debt simply will not go away. It is not a student loan that you can ignore. We cannot appeal to the federal Government to forgive the interest because we have been having some hard times. No, Madam Deputy Speaker, every time this

Government sits down to plan its budget, we begin by setting aside over \$500 million to pay the interest on the debt. More than half of that debt was created in just six years by the Members across the aisle under the Pawley administration.

Even the Leader of the Liberal party noted in her reply to the budget, and I quote: "The writing has been on the wall since the days of the huge deficits run up by the previous NDP Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was a part." She continued, and I will quote again: "We must not forget the conditions for this Government were laid out by the previous NDP Government."

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, we understood that right from the start, right from the day that we took office. That is why we have always taken the long-term approach, an approach that recognizes that every single dollar that we spend as a Government must come out of the economic activity of our province and its people.

Last week I spoke to this House about our plans to spur economic growth in our province. I talked about building an economic climate that will foster investment and job creation, and our approach is working. I have seen many of the results myself in the past few weeks, even since the election campaign.

I have gone to the Boeing plant for the opening of their expanded facility, an investment of over \$30 million, an investment that they assured us, as part of the support that was given by federal and provincial Governments, was to carry with it 274 additional jobs. That is the assurances they gave in order to get federal and provincial support. I can tell you that they announced at that opening, just a couple of weeks ago, that they have increased their employment by over 300 jobs. They have exceeded the target even as they opened the new expanded facility. There are over 300 additional jobs in this province all within the past year and a half or so by Boeing.

I attended the sod turning, along with the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), of the new pilot plant that Dow Corning is building in the Selkirk region adjacent to the thermal generating station of Manitoba Hydro in East Selkirk. Now we do not know whether the Member for Selkirk supports that plant because some of his colleagues have suggested that we ought to be doing more for environmental protection and so on. Madam Deputy

Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there is a new pilot plant there, that that new pilot plant is creating a considerable number of jobs and Dow Corning officials indicated their optimism that the pilot plant would lead to a full-scale plant that ultimately will result in approximately 500 direct and indirect jobs in this province. That is good news and that is directly attributable to the kind of economic climate we have been striving to achieve and the use of our resources to create economic opportunities in our province.

Just last Friday morning, I participated in the opening of Digital Equipment's new office here in Winnipeg. These are all world-class facilities creating new and better jobs here in Manitoba because they are welcome here once again. These companies could locate anywhere in the world and they would take their jobs with them, but they are choosing Winnipeg and Manitoba as the place that they want to grow and expand.

Yes, we are in a recession in this country, and Manitoba cannot exempt itself from that reality, but we are also well under way to building the foundations of a stronger economy that will support new and better jobs, and world-class industries that will be able to help maintain our tradition of economic stability. We are faring better in this recession than most other provinces. While it is the Opposition's job to criticize, there are other groups that must take objective assessment of how we are doing compared to the rest of the country.

"Manitoba to outshine rest of the nation." That is the headline in the business section of this morning's Free Press. Of course, if it had been bad news it would have been on page one. It would have been on page one and it would have been the subject of their questions in Question Period, but this is good news and so it gets buried in the business section and ignored by the Members opposite during Question Period. -(interjection)- No, I am addressing my questions to the Members opposite who ignored it during Question Period today.

This story goes on to say, "Manitoba's economy will out-perform Canada's this year and again in 1991, the Royal Bank of Canada's chief economist predicts." That is one objective observers are saying, Madam Deputy Speaker, but we must look longer than just the next few years, we must look to the strength of our economy for years to come. We, in the Legislature, have the power to do something

about it. The greatest threat to this province's future is the spending decisions that we make today.

I was somewhat surprised, but I was thrilled to hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) begin his reply to the budget by expressing his concern about the size of the deficit. I thought that our preaching and our concentration on the deficit had perhaps struck a responsive chord because it concerns me very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. But I was startled after hearing him refer to the size of the deficit, to then go on and advocate new and greater spending. I was not alone in my surprise, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Brandon Sun was so shocked by that attitude and approach that they wrote an editorial headlined, "Mr. Doer's rhetoric." The editorial began by saying, "It is the job of the opposition to criticize government policy. But when the leaders of those parties speak out of both sides of their mouth, they should be the subject of the same criticism normally levelled against the party in power. As a result, NDP Leader Gary Doer should get a collective raspberry from everyone—including his supporters—for his machine-gun approach to criticizing this week's provincial budget." That is what the Brandon Sun editorial said.

It went on to say, "The opposition leader says the government should be involved on job-creation initiatives—perhaps the most costly programs a government could undertake. Such programs would only add to the deficit. On the other hand, he is telling us that the government should be more fiscally responsible. Mr. Doer can't have it both ways—even in opposition."

That is good advice, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I remember the Leader of the Opposition, when he was the president of the MGEA and what he said about those job creation programs of the former New Democratic administration of Howard Pawley. He said that their greatest contribution to job creation was the signs that they were putting up. They had to send out crews to put up signs throughout the province saying "Jobs Fund has contributed to this project," and that was the greatest creation of real jobs that he saw, because the rest of it he said was the work of white-wine socialists.

Do you recall when he said they were white-wine socialists and how he said that those people did not have the courage of their convictions, and that their principles were all wrong? Well, let me add that

these short-term quick-fix Government job creation programs end up killing the real jobs in the private sector in the long run, because higher spending means higher taxes and higher taxes means fewer jobs 10 times out of 10. No question about it.

We cannot afford to be all over the map as we come to grips with the economic challenges before us. We have to focus our efforts on one goal and one goal alone, and that goal must be long-term economic health in our province. This Legislature can take actions that will have a direct impact on whether our economy moves forward or slips backward into decline.

* (1530)

Chief among the tools at our disposal are taxes. I am particularly proud that once again we were able to avoid any increase in personal income taxes this year in the budget. I am committed to fulfill our pledge to keep taxes down throughout our term in Government.

You know, I heard the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) on the radio not too long ago saying it is cynical to promise to keep taxes down. Madam Deputy Speaker, it is only cynical if you do not intend to keep that promise. That may be the view of the Leader of the Liberal Party, but we intend to keep that promise. The only cynicism we are seeing in this House is from those who fail to recognize that Manitobans are already paying too much in taxes, from those who call for fiscal responsibility on the one hand, yet come to Question Period to demand we spend more, and more, and more money every day in this House.

Over the past two years, we cut taxes for families and for business, and we must continue to work to keep them down. We must look at the long-term impacts that all of our decisions will have, and we must do so in every area that Government is responsible for.

Just yesterday in my capacity as Chair of the Manitoba Round Table on Environment and Economy, I announced the release of our document entitled, Towards a Sustainable Development Strategy for Manitobans. The title, Towards a Sustainable Development Strategy for Manitobans was chosen very deliberately. It is the result of hundreds of hours of work from the round table members as well as our staff in the Sustainable Development Secretariat. This core document presents a vision for Manitoba, as stated by the

Manitoba Round Table, that will carry us in into the 21st Century and beyond. It is the long-term view of what we ought to be doing for our environment and our economy in combining those interests.

I guess I should not have been surprised at the comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). I should not have been surprised that he rejected it, that he belittled it, that he referred to it as being just simply fluff. I should not have been surprised at the fact that he attempted to compare the long-term strategy that we are putting forth for all future economic and environmental decision-making in this province with what he thought was the cheap trick of comparison to the Repap Clean Environment Commission decision.

In making those comparisons what he was really bringing attention to, was the fact that he as a Leader of the Opposition, as a Leader of the New Democratic Party, did not have any plans, did not have any principles, any framework for decision-making, that combined environmental and economic thinking when he was in Government.

Manfor, as it was then constituted, the pulp and lumber operation at The Pas, was dealt with on a totally ad hoc basis. It had no environmental licensing during the entire 20 years that it operated in the public sector. It was allowed to get away with such drastic negative practices as dumping bunker fuel oil right onto the ground, which ultimately soaked into the substrata, which ultimately polluted the ground water in the area. They followed a practice, Madam Deputy Speaker, that when they were doing some repairs, some system repairs that did not allow them to put their process effluent through the process it was supposed to, to clean it up from contaminants before it was put into the river, they just simply had an outflow pipe that diverted the flow directly into the river without any treatment, for periods of time that lasted as long as 48 hours while they were doing repairs to the system within the plant. Incredible, incredible. That was the environmental consciousness. That was the long-term view that was taken by the NDP in their operations of Manfor.

Now, of course, they are born-again environmentalists when they are in Opposition. They are jumping on an issue that they think is politically popular today and that is that they are jumping all over -(interjection)- we will talk about that too, we will talk about the Ducks Unlimited proposal

because that again is the example of the short-term, quick-trick mentality of the Opposition. No long-term view of it.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

When they were in Government just two and a half years ago they brought into law a new Environment Act. That Environment Act included with it a process for environmental assessment and review under the Clean Environment Commission. Just two and a half years old, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), because he thinks that he can see some cheap politics in it, is now abandoning the principles of that Environment Act and the environmental assessment and review process that is called for under that Act and the Clean Environment Commission. What he is saying is, that despite the fact that we have applied totally all requirements of the Act, that we have in addition to that applied totally the environmental assessment and review process that is called for under the Act, and applied totally the Clean Environment Commission process to the letter, he now calls into disrepute all of that, saying he rejects it.

He rejects it, Mr. Speaker, because now it is politically opportune and popular for him to do so, just two and a half years after he boasted that this was the best Act in the country and that his Government—

An Honourable Member: He said it yesterday.

Mr. Fillmon: That is right. I agree with it, Mr. Speaker.

Now he is abandoning all of those things and saying that we ought to reject the principles of the Act, reject the principles of environmental assessment and review and reject the Clean Environment Commission decision-making that is called for under the Act.

Why—because he believes that he can make political points from striking fear in the hearts of people, standing up here publicly before television cameras and saying that plant, as it has been licensed by the Clean Environment Commission, after public review, after the application of the environment Act—all of which had been formerly exempted by the NDP—that now that it has gone through that process and that the Clean Environment Commission has allowed for certain emissions to take place, that it ought to be totally rejected and abandoned and thrown out the window because it is politically opportune for him to do so.

He stood up and he said and he repeated, and he shouted at the top of his voice that we were allowing for cancer-causing dioxins to be emitted into the river system by way of effluence from that.

Let us examine the honesty of that statement, Mr. Speaker. He wants to talk about dioxins. Let us talk about dioxins.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) if he knows where most of the dioxins into our environment are injected in North America—60 percent of them from automobiles, 60 percent of the dioxins. What proportion does he think is coming from all of the pulp plants in North America into our environment—2 percent to 3 percent. So he will not say anything about the automobiles. He will not say anything about it.

The other thing is, what did the Clean Environment Commission licence call for by way of dioxin emission into the river system from that plant in The Pas—10 parts per quadrillion. What that is equivalent to is one second in 32 million years. That is what he says is going to cause cancer in people.

If the Leader of the Opposition -(interjection)- no, we are listening to the Clean Environment Commission who listened to both sides of the argument. We are listening to the environmental experts. We are listening to the scientists, the engineers, the health care professionals who had their opportunity to appear before that commission, and that commission is set up under the legislation passed by the NDP.

What do you suppose are the odds of cancer being contracted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) or any of us here in this House who go for a winter vacation and spend too much time in the sun? How many times higher than the odds of cancer causing from those dioxins in 10 parts per quadrillion—many, many, many, many times.

Will the Leader of the Opposition stop going out for his vacations in the winter in the sun, Mr. Speaker? Will he stop coming back with a tan to this Legislature, time, after time, after time and risking cancer—no.

* (1540)

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about honesty. We are talking about honesty. We are talking about the fearmongering and the ignorance that you want to spread versus honesty. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) yesterday called down our announcement on the Sustainable Development Strategy for Manitobans as being fluff. This is the same—and today he said that the funding ought to be taken away from the Round Table on Environment and Economy. That is what he said, that it ought to be taken away from that. This is the same Leader of the Opposition who got up many, many times in the fall of 1988 and said, when are you going to create the Round Table? When are you going to appoint the Round Table? This Round Table has achieved more in two years than any other Round Table in the country, and you can get Round Tables right across the country to say so. They are going to take this Sustainable Development Strategy as the blueprint for their own strategy, because none of them have been able to put one together. None of them have been able to put one together.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, the New Democratic Party, when they were in Government, exempted Limestone from any environmental assessment and reviews, exempted Manfor from any licensing, and allowed Manfor to willfully pollute the environment in ways that have never been dreamed of by people. They had no grand plan. They had no vision. You know what people say about that: "If you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there." That is what the NDP did. They took any road that they thought was convenient to get some cheap public support. They took the easy road. When a Government takes a concerted, planned, long-term view of environmental protection, they tried for the cheap trick by making comparisons to the dioxin levels from the Manfor plant.

Without going into much detail, the core document addresses from a strategic standpoint the specific areas of environment, economy and health in a whole host of areas. Firstly, you have personal behaviour; secondly, education and research; thirdly, environmental management and protection, land and water, energy, waste management, economic development, environmental businesses, market incentives and fiscal policy, regional development, institutional change, but this is not a final draft, Mr. Speaker. It is only a beginning. It is a beginning that we hope will spark the involvement of Manitobans from all across our province.

The challenge of Sustainable Development is not one that can be met by any small group of people

no matter how dedicated they are. Public involvement will be the key to the success of the development of a Sustainable Development Strategy. It was the public itself that first raised the concern on the environment. It certainly was not the NDP or any politician. No politician lead the way on the issue of the environment. It was the public that rose up and said, we are killing our planet and it has got to stop. We need public involvement now—

An Honourable Member: What does the public say now about your projects?

Mr. Filmon: They support it. They support the Clean Environment Commission and they support it.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Filmon: Yes, yes, yes, yes.

An Honourable Member: That is a good point. Listen to the public—

Mr. Filmon: Absolutely. That is what we are doing. That is what we did through the clean environment process under your Act. We followed it to the letter. Now we need public involvement to ensure that our plans for future economic growth in this province will adequately respond to environmental concerns as well.

Now is the time for Manitobans to have their say, and we will use the core document as a basis for an extensive public consultation process. There is an elaborate questionnaire that accompanies the core document. This is the same workbook format that is being followed, that has been followed very successfully in our land and water strategy. Not everyone will agree with everything that we have put forward.

I think I speak for all the members of the Round Table when I say that we expect the consultation process will show areas where there is need for improvement. We are open of course to those suggestions. The document that we presented yesterday will be improved, and at the end of this process Manitoba will have a blueprint for responsible future economic growth that respects and supports our environmental heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you it is no accident that I have chosen to chair both the Round Table and the Treasury Board. As I said when I addressed the throne speech, the ideas of fiscal and environmental responsibility are founded on the same principle, protecting the ability of future generations to enjoy the same quality of life or better than we enjoy today.

Both of these organizations are vital to the long-term strength of our province.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to squander the financial resources of our children any more than we can afford to abuse our natural resources. I would hope that every Member of this House can see the inherent logic and the justice in that statement. That is why I am so concerned about the deficit in our debt. Deficits are just delayed taxes. Our debt is a mortgage on our children's future.

Now I recognize that there is a need to spend more than we take in during a recession, but we have an obligation to the future to keep that deficit within tight limits and to ensure that the money is used to the best possible effect to protect vital services. That means that you have to set priorities and to stick with them. We are prepared to do exactly that. Our current economic difficulties have many causes. Some of them are international.

The grain war, for instance, is a good example. The increasingly competitive and interconnected global economy is another. We cannot bury our heads in the sand and ignore these forces no matter how much we wish that we could. We live in a trading province. Early on in our history it was the fur trade, then the grain trade. Now we export a wide variety of items from hydro to nickel to airplane parts to computers, but international forces are only a small part of our current difficulties.

By far, the greatest problems facing us as a province have been created by the federal Government's actions over the past decade. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Government of this country is deliberately running our economy into the ground with their high-interest and high-dollar policies. Year after year, at conference after conference and meeting after meeting, my colleagues and I have expressed our concern, indeed, our outrage at the federal Government's insensitive and damaging fallacies.

We have even secured the support of the former Premier of Ontario in calling for lower interest rates, but the federal Government did not listen to us. High interest rates drive down housing starts. They add to farmers already perilous position. We have taken action in this budget to help them, to help farmers against those high interest rates. High interest rates slow down investment in the private sector, particularly in the small business community, the

area that creates most of our jobs. High interest rates dampen consumer spending.

In terms of the Manitoba Government, we are hurt by high interest rates in two ways. Firstly, the slower economy hurts our revenues right across the board from sales tax to corporate income tax to personal income tax. Secondly, our interest costs go up even higher than they are today, and I will speak a little more about that later.

Yet, as damaging as the impact of federal Government interest policies are on our Government, they pale in comparison to the 10-year-long Government retreat from its commitments to equalization, federal Government retreat, from its commitments to equalization and health care, and post-secondary funding.

* (1550)

Before the Members of the Opposition get too carried away with their partisan glee, let me remind them that these cutbacks began in 1982 when the Liberals were in power in Ottawa and the NDP were in power in Manitoba. Let the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) try to explain his Party's record on intergovernmental relations. Let him explain why under his Party's administration in Manitoba the federal Government eliminated the revenue guarantee to health and post-secondary transfers. Let the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) explain to the people of Manitoba how her heroes Jean Chretien and Pierre Trudeau made a single cut that has cost the health care and post-secondary education communities \$375 million in Manitoba since 1982. This year alone that decision will cost Manitoba \$64 million in reduced transfers.

Let me remind Members opposite of the federal Liberal decision to apply the six and five program to EPF payments. That decision has cost us \$78 million so far. It will reduce our EPF transfers by \$15 million this year and by \$16 million next year. It was during the Liberal and NDP terms in office that the first ceiling was put in place on equalization payments, and I will talk more about them in a few minutes. This is not—I repeat, not—a partisan issue. Federal Governments of both Liberal and Conservative stripe have cut social transfers to both this administration and the former NDP administration. I can tell you here today that if a united front was important in Meech Lake it is crucial

in the fight to preserve federal responsibilities in equalization and in health care.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) has attacked me in his speech to the budget over our relations with the federal Government. He claims that we were too soft at the last FMC. His Deputy Leader went on to repeat those allegations in a news release in today's Question Period. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me read from an account of that conference in the Winnipeg Free Press. This is not my version. It is not the version of the Leader of the Opposition or his deputy, it is an objective version.

The headline says, Filmon, PM exchange barbs—and that is not Biggar and McDougall. Filmon, PM exchange barbs, reads the headline. Premier Gary Filmon—I will quote—Premier Gary Filmon questioned Prime Minister Mulroney's image as the great conciliator yesterday and challenged him to improve federal-provincial relations. In the frankest attack on Ottawa yesterday, Filmon said that while Mulroney enjoys the image of a nation builder since being elected to a second term, he has forgotten the formula that allowed him to proceed with initiatives such as free trade. The article goes on, quote, but in the year since the federal election, Filmon said Ottawa has stopped listening to the provincial Governments and started acting in a unilateral fashion reminiscent of relations under former Liberal Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau. The Premier attacked the proposed federal sales tax, reduced regional development spending, VIA Rail Canada Ltd. cuts, high interest rates and national defence cuts. Quote, the message must be starting to sound familiar, Filmon said, quote, GST, the military bases, VIA, telecommunications—in every case we are asking the federal Government to stop and to consider the full impact of these proposals.

The frankest attack, Mr. Speaker, that is what they said in the Free Press, and I think that is what the Prime Minister might say as well, because he did not respond with kind words to me for my comments to him last November. No, he responded with kind words about Howard Pawley for signing the Meech Lake Accord. That is what his response was. The frankest attack, Mr. Speaker, more so than the Liberal Premiers. I will never let my Party affiliation stand before the interests of my province no matter what the Liberal ad agency would like people to believe. Despite my efforts and despite those of nine other Premiers and the parliamentary opposition

and a host of others, the federal Government has continued its agenda of offloading onto the provinces and retreating from their commitments.

Last February the federal Government announced measures to cap the Canada Assistance Plan and to freeze EPF funding. Like every other Member of this House I was outraged at those cuts and have fought against them. Earlier this year we joined with British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario to fight the cap on CAP. We won that fight.

At both the meetings of the western Premiers and at the annual Premiers' conference here in Winnipeg, the EPF cutbacks were very high on our list of criticisms. Let me outline the total impact of federal cutbacks just in equalization and EPF. The total cost of the five separate cutbacks to the EPF spread over the last 10 years to Manitoba has been \$606 million. This year alone we will have \$197 million less for post-secondary education and health care than if the Government in Ottawa had lived up to its responsibilities. This is a story that is told in the document that was prepared by the western Finance Ministers and released publicly in July of this year.

In the next budget the loss will be \$256 million. That is a very serious shortfall. Over \$65 million of that can be attributed to the last cutback alone, and like it or not it is a part of the reality that we in Manitoba have to plan for. In 1987 the federal Government lowered the ceiling on equalization. Let me be clear. We believe any ceiling at all is totally contrary to the idea of equalization. It was a Liberal Government that first introduced a ceiling to EPF transfers, to equalization transfers.

Recent federal estimates of equalization put the cost of the ceiling to Manitoba on a yearly basis at about \$67 million. Because of the cash flow process, that meant \$114 million was taken from Manitoba's entitlement in 1989-90, an amount that would have brought us close to a balanced budget. This year we estimate our entitlement will be reduced by \$78 million. Let us clearly understand that this lowered ceiling was announced while the NDP were in power. I am not blaming them. It was a federal Government decision, not a provincial one, but they should not pretend that those decisions are ones that this side of the House agrees with either, because we do not.

I do not relish dwelling on federal Government actions. I sincerely wish to establish a renewed spirit

of co-operation with the federal Government. We do not serve Manitobans well by squabbling with each other if it can be avoided, but we must send a clear message to Ottawa, that we will stand united if Ottawa rejects our willingness to work co-operatively and instead acts unilaterally in a way that is harmful to our interest.

We will fight politically-motivated federal invasions into provincial jurisdiction especially while current federal responsibilities are being abandoned. We will fight for lower interest rates to prevent a made in Canada recession from going on too long. We will fight to protect vital services such as health care and post-secondary education from federal spending cuts, which break freely-negotiated commitments. We must all work together to oppose these cuts, and we must all work together to deal with them as a reality of budgeting, that we have to face every time we sit down at the Treasury Board table. The recession is real and we cannot opt out of it from this province. So are the federal cutbacks, so are our interest costs, the legacy of Howard Pawley and the NDP Members opposite. These are all part of reality and no Member in this House can hide from that reality.

This budget addresses those issues honestly and openly as we have from the beginning of our mandate here in this Legislature. The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) acknowledged that we anticipated the drop in mining revenues. We recognized that the windfall equalization payments would end, and we planned, and we planned carefully and considerately for that day. We believe we should not make our children pay for the quality of life that we enjoy today. We think it is time that this generation lived within its means.

In the 1989 budget, our Government established the Fiscal Stabilization Fund to act as a rainy day fund and to even out the fluctuations in Government revenue. That fund was established in legislation with two key principles. I hope that the Members of the Liberal Party, who are chirping now, will listen to those principles because they did not understand them before. They misrepresented them during the election campaign, and they still do not understand them now, Mr. Speaker.

* (1600)

The two principles are: fiscal stability for the Government to maintain existing programs and services, and secondly, a limitation on transfers

from the fund to no more than one a year directly to general revenue. Now let me explain those principles in more depth for the benefit of the Liberal Members opposite, who voted against that rainy day fund.

The greatest threat to health care and other social services comes from fiscal instability. The Government must have the ability to support our health care, education and social services in good times and bad. The rainy day fund gives us the ability to do just that. The principles of good management in Government and in our homes and businesses are very much the same. There are only two ways of overcoming an expected shortfall in our revenues over our expenses. We can save ahead of time or we can borrow.

In previous federal and provincial Governments the Liberals and the NDP have borrowed to cover their deficits, and they have never ever paid back their debts. When we this past year reduced our total net provincial Government debt in this province it was the first time in 20 years. It had never happened under all of the NDP administrations of almost 15 years of the past 20. It is just like using your credit card, Mr. Speaker, to buy groceries and never paying off the balance. That is what the NDP did in all of their time in Government.

The result is absolutely startling. In this year alone we are paying over \$500 for every Manitoban to cover the interest on our debt, just this year's interest. We are committed to ending that approach to budgeting, to finance and to Government. We think it is time for a new approach throughout Government, an approach that ensures that we meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Those are words that are quoted directly from the Brundtland Commission report. We meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

We are talking about dry, abstract accounting principles. We are talking about our children's ability to make their own way in life without carrying the burden of their parents' mistakes. That is why I was so outraged when the Liberals flagrantly abused the rainy day fund in the last election campaign. That is the fund they voted against. That is the fund that they spoke against, that they called a slush fund. Then they proceeded with their promises in the midst of the election to flagrantly abuse it. The

Liberals wanted to rob this savings account to buy votes with the taxpayers' own money.

What makes this even worse is the reason the Liberals gave for opposing that legislation in the first place. The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) said, and I quote: We do not like this slush fund. Well, who was wanting to use it as a slush fund—only one person in the election campaign, the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker.

The Fiscal Stabilization Act has specific guarantees to prevent the misuse of the rainy day fund for political purposes. Our legislation allows for only one transfer a year, and that transfer is directly to general revenues. The legislation prevents politicians from accessing that fund on a weekly basis to pay for specific political projects the way that the NDP used the Jobs Fund for instance.

The rainy day fund is a fiscal shock absorber. It exists to cushion the Government's overall budget from short-term drops in revenue.

The vast amount of Government spending goes into services to people. A full one-third of Government spending is for our health care system. More than one out of every \$6 goes to Education and Training, and one out of every \$10 is spent on Family Services.

The net effect of that is that almost two-thirds of all of the money goes to those three areas, health care, Education and Family Services.

That is what the Liberals were jeopardizing when they wanted to rob the rainy day fund for election goodies. They were jeopardizing health care services, education support and social services. -(interjection)- Indeed, as my colleague says, the public judged them and found them wanting.

That is why we created the legislative safeguards to that fund in the first place, because we feared that an irresponsible Opposition Party would try to get their hands on it and would misuse it, Mr. Speaker.

With a transfer from the Fiscal Stabilization Fund in this budget we have been able to present a budget that achieves our goals of keeping taxes down while protecting vital services. Personal taxes are frozen. Business taxes will not increase. There are targeted tax reductions to encourage training and to protect jobs, and important social services are receiving the increases that they require.

We recognize that next year the challenge will be even greater. We in this House, and those who we

fund, must recognize the need to keep costs down and to find new and better ways to deliver essential services.

We have to take the long-term approach, not the short-term, quick-fix mentality of the NDP or the kind of political maneuvering and manipulation that the Liberals were trying to promise in their election campaign. We have to take the long-term approach if we are to build a strong and vibrant economy in Manitoba.

If we can meet that challenge we are back on track to a strong future. The throne speech laid out the full scope of our efforts to attract investments, to expand our markets, to strengthen our work force. By keeping taxes down and protecting vital services this budget will make a strong contribution to that overall effort to have a strong future and a bright future in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be voting against that wrong-headed, ill-considered amendment of the Liberal Party in this Legislature and to be voting in favour of a budget that I know is so well supported in this province that even the NDP and Liberals are floundering in Question Period, finding no way in which they can attack this budget, no way that they can attack this, Mr. Speaker, because the fact of the matter is this is a good budget. It is the right budget for Manitoba for the present and for the future. I am very proud to support it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): What a difference, Mr. Speaker, a few months makes. We remember this Government telling Manitobans how well they have been managing the economy and our physical resources. For the past two and a half years, this Government has not had to make any difficult decisions about our financial position. They crow about what good managers they are, the deficit being reduced and their ability to offer tax breaks. I feel this has nothing to do with their management of this province.

The Conservatives while in Opposition condemned the NDP for huge tax increases, then they reaped the increased revenues along with increased income from Ottawa so they could create an impression of good management. Political maneuvering and PR has nothing to do with the ability to manage. Their political family has their own set of Conservative policies to inflict on Canadians, and silently this Government agrees with these

policies, but with the unpopularity of these same policies sit quietly. Once in a while you hear a whimper that it hurts, but not, Mr. Speaker, a scream because in reality they believe that these policies are right whether it is cuts to farm programs, high interest rates, the GST or whether it is massive offloading of costs onto poorer provinces and Canadians for education and health care.

The holiday is over, Mr. Speaker. This Premier (Mr. Filmon) received the distinction that he could and would stand up to the federal Government, but now that a majority has been won we may see that perhaps the sharp spurs of the Oppositions kept the First Minister from showing everyone the Conservative he really is.

Mr. Speaker, Manitobans continue to demand leadership of our elected officials. For those of us new to the arena we must prepare ourselves and work hard, but if we are prepared to show this leadership, in the long term I feel we will all gain the respect of Manitobans. How is this Government going to show its leadership? How are they going to stand up and fight their federal family when they believe that what is being done on so many fronts is the right thing to do?

* (1610)

This budget shows us the right-wing Conservative hand is being camouflaged by the rhetoric of this Government. We keep hearing that health care remains our first priority, but what if they had a larger majority, Mr. Speaker?—might we have seen the true Conservative agenda implemented. We asked the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) what he would do. Would he stop at just cutting the budget in home care equipment and supplies? Would he allow a below inflation increase in home care of 1.9 percent when inflation is between 4 percent and 5 percent?

Knowing what has already been done over the last two years, Manitoba families are already feeling the cold reality of reduced services with more to come. Will our children in rural Manitoba and in the North have a dental plan program, let alone have services reduced to the tune of 15 percent in one year if this Minister had his way? Or would we have the same situation as under the Sterling Lyon Government when more than 20 graduating dental nurses, who had been given commitments of employment under this program, were told the program was on hold?

Yes, the Minister may say, let us look at the 1990

budget, \$5,147,000, and the 1991 budget of \$4,883,000, that is only a 5 percent reduction. The real meat of a program is Other Expenditures and here there is a reduction of 15 percent, some \$400,000.00.

What about the situation in health care and Family Services regarding my constituency and the Lundar-Eriksdale-Ashern Wife Abuse Committee? Were they not promised funding during the election campaign? But the Minister of social services continues to give us the same answers over and over and over.

The people from this area are mostly volunteers who have been doing a yeoman's job trying to provide services in a vast area of our region. They are just starting to touch families, and in particular, women and children who have not had any knowledge of options and support. These people do try to help the situation with fund-raising activities at the community level.

The people in this area are not sitting back and saying, we want the Government to do everything for us, but they need assistance. I ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to instruct the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) to follow through on the increased funding for such services, so that options, such as having to consider closing their doors and services, will not be hovering over them.

Another area of the budget I wish to mention is the overall reductions in Northern Affairs. A number of communities in my constituency will be affected by the reduction in support grants. Along with reductions, we get executive staff to the Minister's office to perhaps try and deal politically with the cuts that he has made. It is little wonder that Native and northern communities shut out the Conservatives time and time again, and will continue that trend knowing the insensitivity this Government has towards Natives and Northerners.

When communities such as Pine Dock, Matheson Island and other Native and Metis communities raise their concerns, what are they going to hear from this First Minister (Mr. Filmon)? There are no initiatives at all to deal with the multitude of Native concerns, no new northern development agreements, and the programs in place are winding down. I will give you an example of the ARDA agreement that is being reduced by \$650,000, an agreement which provided much needed assistance for fishermen and trappers in my

constituency alone. These communities need support to become more self-sustaining.

I believe that we, as citizens of this fine province, have a right to expect that the Government should try and support those who have not had access to services and basic infrastructure because of remoteness. These communities just dream of some of the services which most of us take for granted. Rural Manitobans are also being taken for granted. While we do have increased emphasis for rural infrastructure through the much delayed agreement, we find the basic program of the board is being scaled down. What does that mean for rural communities?

In the area of Natural Resources, I feel that I could describe the management as being a caretaker fashion. Little or no new initiatives are evident. There seems to be a small increase in the Fisheries budget when you examine it in totality. However, I find it strange that there is a cut in Fisheries Habitat Management as described on page 144.

The slight increase in Fish Culture may not be adequate to begin the process of dealing with the smelt from the U.S. into our watershed. I find it strange that after the disastrous 1989 forest fires, the budgets for reforestation, development and removal are standing pat, which in real terms is a 5 percent reduction. So much for Conservative rhetoric about Sustainable Development.

Mr. Speaker, there is a 50 percent reduction in the Habitat Enhancement Fund, as well as more than 50 percent reduction in the Special Resource Projects area. We will see what the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), the long-time veteran of this Assembly, will have to tell us when we discuss his department's Estimates. I wonder whether he is proceeding with the Washow Bay project, and at what pace.

Farmers in the Interlake and elsewhere in this province continue to be hit by low commodity prices, rising fuel prices and a depressed farm economy. Dairy farmers in particular are facing great pressure while this Government ignores a tax on marketing boards and agriculture support programs. Due to pressure from farmers, the federal and provincial NDP across the country and other concerned citizens, the cash advance program has recently been partially brought back, but the overall farm crisis remains. The budget offers promises for

farmers. We will see how much the Government underspends in agriculture in a few months.

Tourism in our region has already been hit hard by increased gas prices and a recession. The GST alone will make matters much worse. All along, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans who have lost their jobs as a result of the Canadian-made recession and the Free Trade Agreement will find very little in this budget that shows this Government has any plans to deal with their predicaments.

I predict that we will really see the Conservative agenda in the next budget as all the federal cuts and offloading take effect. I cannot support this budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by taking advantage of this first opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this Chamber. We know from the experience of watching you and working with you over the last two and a half years that you will perform your duties with grace, with humour and with fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the Budget Debate with amusement, with bemusement and sometimes with a little bit of disdain even. As we listen to the speeches of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), of Members of the Government, of leaders of the Opposition and Members of the New Democratic Party, if you were to line up those speeches—the Government speeches on one side and the speeches of Members of the New Democratic Party on the other side—you would think that each has a monopoly on all virtue and all wisdom, that there is no room in between for debate, there are no shades of gray, that there are competing ideologies at work. One is always right, while the other is wrong.

The Premier is a much better Leader of the Opposition now that he is Premier than he ever was when he was Leader of the Opposition, who spends most of his time during debate and when he answers questions to tell us why his Government will not do what the New Democratic Party did when it was in office and all of the challenges that face him as First Minister are as a result of the mismanagement of the NDP.

* (1620)

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and Members of the New Democratic Party, on the other hand, believe that every pronouncement, every statement, every policy of the Government is by

definition wrong and therefore must be opposed. If you look at the ideology that is contained within these speeches on both sides of the House, you think of the new right and you think of the old left.

When you hear the speeches from the First Minister and from Members of the Treasury Bench, you get the strong impression, Mr. Speaker, that market forces, the free will of the market economy are the only forces that are worth listening to by decision-makers, that it is the role of Government to stay out of the free market economy. The Government has no role to play. Government governs best which governs least.

You hear these apostles of the new right criticize every decision made by past Governments, whether it is of the Trudeau Government in Ottawa or of the New Democratic Party of Howard Paulley, whenever Government chooses to intervene as a partner in the economic affairs of the province. When you listen to speeches from Members of the New Democratic Party, you get quite the opposite impression, that Government always has the answers to society's problems and that free market forces are always wrong. That I think, Mr. Speaker, is the old way of Manitoba politics, that we establish idealism of the right and ideology of the left, and there can be no truth in between. That is why we approach politics in Manitoba a little differently. -(interjection)- The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says that is why there is no consistency, and he should remember the remarks of the sage that consistency is the last refuge of a scoundrel.

When you always have to look to the book, Mr. Speaker, to find the answer to whatever current problem faces Government, then you realize that there is no room for flexibility. There is no room for identifying the problem on its merits and for looking for innovative solutions because always, to the Members of the Conservative Party, Government should stay out; and always, for Members of the New Democratic Party, Government should intervene. We, in the Liberal Party, think that the truth, as best as we are able to define it in our own mortal ways, is somewhere in between.

It is in the political interests of both of these Parties to try to establish a rigid, ideological framework for all of their decisions in a political attempt to try to squeeze the Liberal Party out of debates.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is an enormous difference, and now that I have two and a half years

of experience in the Chamber I have more experience to discuss this than I would have had last year or two years ago, and that is the difference between the attitude, the performance, of a minority Government and a majority Government.

I would like to make some comments, some observations, that are based largely on the performance of Ministers in the House and some Members of the Opposition over the last several weeks that we have been in this Chamber. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) has stood up in Question Period, in response to questions, taken a cheap personal shot at whoever is asking the question, then referred the question to another Member of the Treasury Bench after he has had his cheap shot on the record. This is not something that the Premier did in a minority situation. I think that the reason he does it in a majority situation is because he knows that he is not going to have to face the people for another three or four years, and therefore he can get away with it.

I was struck by the comments of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) only a week or so ago, the Minister of Northern Affairs who is known, or at least was known, for his political acumen, for his astuteness. He was after all the co-chairperson of the Tory campaign, probably rewarded in the appointment of the Member for Arthur as Deputy Premier of the province. I stood up for a question, Mr. Speaker, and he wondered whether or not I would be discussing a constitutional crisis, and I said then and I repeat now that the last constitutional crisis was when he was appointed Deputy Premier of Manitoba.

The comments the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) made about Northerners are comments that he never would have made in a minority Government, because he is a Member who is known for his political astuteness and acumen. He would not have dared insult the people of northern Manitoba, especially as Minister of Northern Affairs, if he did not think there was a little time between the comment and the time of accounting when he has to go to the people.

Then there is the case of the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) who made comments only a few days ago that he never would have made had we been involved in a minority House. Presumably he made these comments—because again he thought he could get away with them—because a majority Government does not daily have to account

to the people through the threat of being defeated in a vote in the Legislature.

Then there is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) himself, a man who prides himself on integrity—and I do not question his integrity and I never have—and who also values accuracy. Who after all ought to be more accurate than the Minister of Finance, the politician most responsible for the expenditure of some \$5 billion in this province?

The Minister of Finance made a \$10 million mistake in response to a question posed by the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). The Member for Osborne dealt with cascading and the effects of cascading in foregone revenue as it related to the Manitoba Telephone System and those phone bills. The Minister of Finance put on the record a figure of \$13 million. The following day he had to apologize and say that, "oops", he really meant two and a half million dollars, a mistake of more than \$10 million from the Minister of Finance.

I do not think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) would have made that mistake in a minority Government. Here is why I say that. I think the Minister of Finance would have been more careful about using figures in the Chamber. I think the Minister of Finance would have been more sensitive about the accuracy of the figures he brings to the Chamber.

As the Government House Leader, he often stands up and tells Members of the House that they ought to assess the accuracy of what they bring to the floor of the Chamber. Yet himself, as Minister of Finance, makes a \$10 million mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I have given four examples of the difference in behaviour between a majority Government and a minority Government, and I am sure there are many more.

The budget itself and the throne speech are indications of how we are seeing the true Conservative nature of this Government coming to the fore, because we are already seven months into the fiscal year we are not seeing a hundred percent of the agenda. We will see that next spring.

The Minister of Finance has put us on fair warning that the decisions facing him are tough. He has already sent a signal out to the public service unions, directly and indirectly, because we are about to negotiate new contracts moving through the fall of this year and into next year.

The budget we see reflects the kind of ideological

speeches that we have heard from the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and other Members of the Treasury Bench, speeches that tell us about the virtue that these apostles of the new right are parading us of the value of the free market economy.

I would like to use some examples from my own areas of responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to make the point that in a time of recession, at a time when the spending decisions of Government are critical, even more so than in other times, the object and the focus of Government decisions is to spend smart, to use the best you can the limited resources that are available to you, therefore, to look towards the future and to spend smart.

Has this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), through his budget, taken smart decisions? Well, let us look at some decisions that were taken in some departments.

Energy and Mines, we see that the Manitoba Energy Authority is given \$2 million more than it had last year. Why? We will find out during the Estimates process exactly how the \$2 million will be spent. This is only on a budget of some \$1.4 million.

At the same time that the Government is giving \$2 million more to the Manitoba Energy Authority it is freezing, or cutting energy conservation programs and the search for alternate sources of energy in an era when we have skyrocketing energy prices worldwide. Why has the Government chosen to give \$2 million more to an organization and a board that many people think is redundant in the first place and ought to be scrapped, and simultaneously starving the department that is charged with the responsibility of conserving energy with innovative programs and searching for alternate sources?

We will ask the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) these questions when we have a chance.

We have also asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to allow us to question the chief executive officer, Brian Ransom, of Manitoba Hydro on the plans of the \$5.5 billion Conawapa deal and the export energy agreement to Ontario Hydro.

Why is it that Members of the Legislature may or may not have an opportunity to question decisions to spend more money in one mega project than the Government of Manitoba spends in one entire fiscal year? It is a lot like the issue we raised in the last Legislature of the North Portage Development Corporation coming in front of a legislative

committee to account for how it spends money that comes from Manitoba taxpayers.

* (1630)

The argument at the time from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and others was that it was a tri-level corporation, that we could not force other levels of Government to enforce the same kind of accountability that we wanted to ourselves. It was somehow not traditional in this House to call tripartite corporations to account.

Manitoba Hydro is not a tripartite corporation. Manitoba Hydro is a Crown corporation of the Province of Manitoba yet we have no assurances, none whatsoever, that a \$5.5 billion deal will be debated in this Legislature. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) talks about The Loan Act and we will have an opportunity to question the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), when we debate The Loan Act some time later in this Session.

Mr. Speaker, The Loan Act talks about \$278 million in capital expansion for Manitoba Hydro, but I am told by the Minister of Energy, that none of that is Conawapa, that is the ongoing capital requirements of the corporation in addition to Limestone. How can those of us who expect to be accountable for our own actions in our own constituencies, live with the fact that we may or may not have the opportunity to question Manitoba Hydro and the Minister of Energy on a \$5.5 billion deal? This is not forward looking. This is not spending smart. To give \$2 million to the Manitoba Energy Authority while starving alternate sources of energy, and starving conservation efforts, is not smart.

In the area of culture and recreation, we have been asking the Minister of Culture and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) for almost three years now to reduce our ongoing reliance on lottery revenues, because we believe that our cultural organizations ought not to be dependent on the whims of the gambling public. Yet we see in this budget a continuing reliance on lottery revenues such that the trend that we have asked the Government to arrest over the last years is beginning to escalate. That is not looking toward the future; that is not spending smart.

In the Department of Urban Affairs, we see that the grants to the City of Winnipeg are not keeping pace with the rate of inflation. Therefore, while the Government complains about the offloading from

the federal Government to the Government of Manitoba, it chooses to offload itself to the property taxpayers of Winnipeg. How is that action of this Government any better than the actions that it so bitterly criticizes for the Government of Canada? That is not spending smart, Mr. Speaker.

Neither is it spending smart to continue to operate independent tripartite corporations such as the Forks and North Portage. It takes about a million dollars a year to fund the administration of The Forks Corporation, about \$600,000 a year to fund the North Portage Development Corporation. North Portage determined that once its chief executive officer had resigned there was no need to replace him so they did not. Therefore there was a saving. We ask the question, why is the same thing not true of The Forks? Again these are ways that the Government can look to the future and save money, not ways in which it has to spend more money.

We look at the whole area of tourism. Expenditures on tourism are frozen or down. Our commitment to marketing Manitoba is down from previous years. I do not know whether Members of the House know this, but tourism is the number one industry in the world. More money is spent on tourism than any other industry in the world and we are not getting our fair share. People are not going to come to Manitoba unless we invite them, but this Government has chosen not to invite them, not to be clever about the way they market those fabulous tourist opportunities in Manitoba.

We are not keeping pace with other provinces, we are not keeping pace with other nations, and it has a lot to do with the self-image we have as Manitobans. We ought to be proud of what we have and we ought to invest in our future by inviting people to share that with us.

In the whole area of education, it is remarkable when one thinks of how you can invest in the future, that this Government's commitment to education, which is one of its own stated priorities is entirely wrong-headed and misplaced. While it gives an \$8 million grant really to big business, who can already afford training programs and access to training programs, it cuts opportunities for Northerners and for Natives. What kind of priority setting is that? Is that spending smart, Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have to be very careful about how we use our limited resources?

Federal-provincial relations are as bad now as

they have been in the last 20 years in this province, and we see in the estimate of revenues in the budget speech of the Minister of Finance that the trend of declining revenues from Ottawa is going to continue. Yet at the same time, we do not see a strategy or a way in which this Government is coping with it.

It all has to do, I think, Mr. Speaker, with the agenda of the federal Government. The Mulroney agenda has an awful lot to do with the crisis in confidence that Canadians are feeling now about their political leaders, and it affects all of us in this Chamber. It is not easy for us to dismiss the reasons and always blame others. It affects all of us just as when a lawyer reads of a malpractice case or a physician reads of a malpractice case it affects them because it affects the public's image and perception of the profession that they seek to serve and practise.

Mr. Mulroney has tried to move too far, too fast, in too many areas and he is failing. He is failing because he has made the fundamental mistake of not bringing the people with him. It is top-down politics. It is the same kind of top-down politics which we are beginning to see from this Government.

Arrogance has begun to seep into this majority Government within weeks of the calling of this legislative Session, and if that is true early on when they are still constrained by seven months of the fiscal year that we are in now, what is going to happen next spring when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) introduces his first fresh budget of the minority (sic) Government?

The crisis in confidence that Canadians feel about their political leadership is not helped when we hear election promises such as those that were made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer). The Leader of the New Democratic Party—and he can correct me if I am wrong—promised, as part of his Party's platform, that he would not increase personal income taxes for 10 years. Does the Leader of the New Democratic Party forget, conveniently or otherwise, that rich people also earn money, Mr. Speaker? Rich people—and here I think I am playing to the ideology of the old left, if not the new left—perhaps ought to be in a position where they pay more taxes in 10 years than they pay today; but, no, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, as part of a campaign promise—and remember I am talking about credibility of politicians and the crisis that we feel in Canada about political

leadership—says, 10 years from now the rich person is going to pay exactly the same rate of taxation as he or she is paying now.

What responsible politician can make that promise in the midst of an election campaign? It is precisely that kind of irresponsibility that breeds cynicism and makes 76 percent of Canadians say that they believe that politicians do not tell the truth—76 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to point out in these few remarks that the budget presented by the Minister of Finance does not spend smart. The priorities that have been chosen by this Government, at least through its rhetoric, are not bad priorities, but the way in which the Government has chosen to fund them are often wrong-headed. I have tried to give several examples, concrete examples, of why I believe that to be the case. I have also tried to point out the differences in tone, in nuance, in argument, in presentation between a minority Government and a majority Government, and I believe that the people of Manitoba will reject the arrogance and the pomposity that is beginning to filter through the responses we are getting from the Treasury Benches on the Government side.

I believe that the people of Manitoba will again reject the kind of ideology and rigid thinking that comes from the New Democratic Party. I believe that when presented with the alternatives, most Manitobans believe that it is not the ideology of the left or the ideology of the right which conforms with their thinking, Mr. Speaker, but it is the ideology of pragmatism. It is tolerance, moderation and the ability to look at every problem and every solution on its own merits, and not to consult the book whenever there is a tough decision to be made.

* (1640)

This budget, Mr. Speaker, is a disappointment because of its missed opportunities. It is for that reason that I will support the amendment proposed by the Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), and that is the reason I will oppose this budget, given the opportunity only a few minutes from now.

Mr. George Hlckes (Point Douglas): I just wanted to speak a little on the budget, because this was supposedly a budget for the people. It sure was not a budget for the people of the constituency of Point Douglas. -(interjection)- Probably not, because I think they only got about 11 percent of the vote, I think you know.

With this budget introduced, there was absolutely nothing in the budget for support of education programs which are very, very vital to the constituents of Point Douglas, -(interjection)- I am glad to hear that. It is like we have a lot of training needs and job opportunities. We have excellent training programs there that are in jeopardy of losing their funding. The Winnipeg Education Centre is a good example of that, and there was absolutely nothing in the budget to address that problem.

We look at expanding training opportunities, so when you do that you need bigger and better facilities. There have been proposals that have been submitted by the Winnipeg Education Centre that have been totally left out of this budget, for expansions of or assistance of training facilities. The Winnipeg Education Centre, for some of the Members who are not aware, is an excellent tool for aboriginal and visible minority groups.

One of these days, the Government opposite the floor will realize that some of us were born with caribou ribs in our mouth, not a silver spoon. We are the unfortunate ones. We need some form of assistance at times. With this budget and with the recession that is in place across Manitoba, there will be more and more social needs. We talk about fair taxation. There is nothing mentioned in there for an increase of corporate taxes, but there were sure some training dollars for corporations to get into the apprenticeship training program.

I do not know if the Members of the Party that is in power in Manitoba realize that Apprenticeship Branch has been servicing Manitoba for many years. They have just started escalating their training opportunities, apprenticeship programs, and the key is to have qualified journey people in Manitoba. We need more, not less.

The Government talks about a huge major development in northern Manitoba which should ensure more Manitobans obtain adequate employment opportunities. -(interjection)- Conawapa? If the environmental issues are looked after, yes, I do support it. So with the additional jobs that will be required to build Conawapa, we need adequate apprenticeship training programs. The Apprenticeship Branch has been in place for years, so why switch into a new model where you rely totally on contractors to deliver training programs? They are contractors; they are not educators. We should leave that kind of educational program to the experts in that area.

Some of the other education components that fall under Point Douglas, that have been neglected, which I have raised in this House, are the aboriginal language programs. In fact, in this budget the aboriginal individuals were totally left out of this budget. There was a small little tokenism mentioned in there.-(interjection)- The Member asks, where do you take the money from? Tax some of the corporations, make them pay their fair share for a change.

So when we get into the aboriginal training programs, like I mentioned earlier, there are 53 language programs and a federal study conducted by the federal Government states that there will be three aboriginal languages left. I, for one, am fortunate that one of those will be my language and the others are the Cree and Ojibway. What better age to teach an individual's own language and culture than when they are small and they absorb like a sponge.

That training program that is in jeopardy because of the Government's reluctance to put any funding into it, is training individuals from two to five years old. We talk about multiculturalism, we even joke about it at times, and it is not really a joking matter, but it is because of the statements mentioned by a Member of the other side. I am sure that if that Member could reflect on his own past and the future of his children, I am sure that Member would be proud to say, yes, I and my children speak my original language. I think that is what the aboriginal people are asking.

We do not have the funds and the means because of the education system that is public, it only teaches in one language. We need additional help to make sure that we retain our language and our culture, that is what aboriginal people are saying. I heard absolutely nothing in the budget -(interjection)- Pardon me? -(interjection)- yes, but there was absolutely nothing in the budget that addressed that.

I think, as all Governments, not only here in Manitoba but federally and across Canada, we have to get serious and address and retain aboriginal languages and cultures. I think it is long overdue, and if we have to negotiate packages with the federal Government to make sure that this happens, I think any Government that is in power has to take that initiative, show leadership. That is what the aboriginal people are asking, show leadership. This

budget with the omission of the aboriginal issues and concerns did not show that.

So I hope that the Government will reconsider, and they say where do we find the money? There are tough choices to make, we all realize that, but when you are hit with hard times and going into recession, which everybody will admit today, that is when the needy needs more and that is a fact of life. So when we need to help individuals, we should be looking at social programs, more assistance in that area.

One of the examples from Point Douglas, right in Point Douglas was a program that dealt with prostitution and it was the POWER program. It was even used and recommended as a national example for other provinces to consider, and that program has not been funded. They have lost their funding and that kind of a program that deals with those issues, when you have the danger of drug abusers, syringes laying in the parks, syringes laying in children's playgrounds, those are very, very serious concerns, and those have to be addressed. I saw nowhere in the budget that there was room to address that sort of situation and encourage the funding of that kind of a program.

Another program that is really in need in the constituency of Point Douglas, throughout other parts of the city and across Manitoba is the housing issue. We heard nothing in the budget to deal with the problems in housing in the constituency of Point Douglas. There has to be support and money in place to continue infill housing, affordable loans so people can purchase their own homes, which if you reflect in your past lives, if you have ever rented a house or an apartment, you know that when you have the opportunity and you are fortunate enough to purchase your own home, you will care for it. You will maintain it, and you will make the area as clean as possible because it is your home. That is what people in Point Douglas would really like, because we have some people that are not on high income, and they need some form of assistance in order to purchase a home, and affordable payments.

* (1650)

So those are the kinds of things that I see that are totally missing from this budget.

We also have cultural needs, whether some individuals recognize it or not. Cultural programs are very important. We have different ethnic minorities right across Winnipeg. If we do not work and help

those individuals maintain and preserve their culture and pass it on to their children—and hopefully their children will pass it on to theirs—those will be totally lost. When you say or an individual says, "pay for it yourself," if you have the means and good job opportunities, maybe you can pay for it yourself, but I know a lot of cultural-minority people in my constituency that are working on minimum wages and the spouse is on minimum wages. They are also trying to hold down other jobs just to meet their rent and put food on the table. They cannot pay for their own efforts to preserve their culture. They just do not have the money.

So those kinds of things, they should really be seriously addressed. I strongly say again that it is not a laughing matter. We have joked about it, but it is a very serious issue. I am sure the Member really did not mean what he said, but it is a Government policy. That is what the Premier (Mr. Filmon) told us, that it was a Government policy. Well, when you have that Government policy, make sure you enforce that policy so that everybody benefits from it.

Also, the other issues that need to be addressed are crime prevention issues. The Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), hopefully, will address them in the future, because Point Douglas has one of the highest crime rates in Winnipeg. If we work co-operatively with the city and ask them to assist us or assist them in implementing more policing programs, more foot patrols—also, when you deal with that, we need to enforce affirmative action policies that are funded by the city, but use the money from the Government. There are very, very few visible minorities in the Winnipeg police force. I think we all understand that, but more has to be done. That is the kind of stuff that I see missing.

Seniors' programs, there is very little in the budget for seniors. When we talk about seniors, we talk about our parents, our grandparents. I am sure we all respect our parents and our grandparents, but not only do we show respect, we have to show concern and make sure that there are adequate dollars in order for the seniors to live comfortably with dignity. In Point Douglas there are a lot of senior people who live there who were from different countries who have chosen to make Point Douglas and Winnipeg their home.

When I was door knocking during the campaign, I ran across one individual who was 93 years old. They brought his daughter over; she came over from

Romania. She was just in her early fifties. They said, well, you can look after your father. You do not need home care any more. Because of the language difficulty and the problems, that is where they were left. She was left to look after her father. They did not even take the time to check out that she had a serious problem with her back. She could not even bend down. When I knocked on that door, the gentleman, through the English that he could relay, stated, you know, he said, I have not even had the opportunity to wash my feet in three weeks. Three weeks, he never even washed his feet, because he could not do it and his daughter could not do it.

He said, I had home care, but when my daughter came over they cut me off. Those things should not happen in Canada. Those are the kind of problems that we hear about and we make the recommendations and they get caught up in the bureaucracy. Things have to be taken care of for the seniors.

One of the programs that some of the seniors were taking advantage of was a door and window program. That is all it was, a door and a window program. It was the CHEC program. I can tell all the Members in this House that there were many seniors who took advantage of that program to make sure that they stayed in their homes and did not have to be forced into moving into seniors' residences. For individuals who are fortunate enough to get into seniors' residences by their own choice, that is fine, but if an individual chooses to stay in their own home, they should have that opportunity.

I see I just have a few minutes so I will be very brief. One of my biggest concerns was in my critic area of Energy and Mines. There was really nothing in the budget that dealt with the impact of energy conservation on what we call the demand side. Even if we looked at every Government facility across Manitoba, even if we looked at that and ensured that we installed compact fluorescent bulbs in every facility that is under the jurisdiction of Manitoba, it would be amazing how much money we would save in order to continue programs such as Home CHEC, home care.

Now, that is where you have to have a little imagination in the budget and make sure that the people in Manitoba are looked after and are addressed. People keep saying, where is the money? When you are into recession you are into tough times, you might have to open the purse

strings a little more in order for people to live with dignity and with comfort. If they talk about taxes, why not start making it a fair tax system where the corporations start paying their fair share, where they make millions and millions of dollars of profit and they do not pay one penny.

* (1700)

Each of us individuals in here pay, I bet you, at least a minimum of 30 percent of our salary to taxes. How about the companies? Some of them do not pay a penny. If I had an opportunity to pay zero taxes, I would probably be smiling too. I am glad to pay my 30 percent in order to help others who need it and who hopefully will benefit from it. Thank you very much.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on this first opportunity that I have had to formally rise in the Chamber other than the budget presentation, let me stand at this time and acknowledge your selection as our Speaker. I have watched carefully your growth in that role as a presiding officer of our House, and I have come to the conclusion you do have the right mix of qualities to be the Speaker. I do not claim to have the right mix of qualities to be the Government House Leader at times so there may be difficulties from time to time, but hopefully you will forgive me.

Mr. Speaker, one more platitude and I say this seriously, you wear the mantle of office well and that is important, of course, very important. I would also like to welcome officially all the new Members of this House and let me indicate that although it is not my place to sit in judgment of anybody, I feel that the crop of '90 certainly demonstrates some high intellect, good intentions all and, of course, I will use another opportunity to talk about, as others have already to this point in time, the special calling that all of us are so honoured to have, being representatives of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly will be interested in watching the individual growth of the new Members. I will be interested to see which new Members not only balance their good intentions in areas in wanting and support of the well-being of Manitobans to beseech the Government to spend more, but which Members also balance that desire to see how it is that the Government of the Day creates genuine economic wealth in support of those good intentions because, of course, if you do not have one, you do not have the other.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I will be interested to watch with particular interest the rise of the new Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) and her particular approach to public policy. I sense that I will be listening carefully to many of her representations in the times to come.

Mr. Speaker, Calvin Coolidge said, and I quote, nothing -(interjection)- well, this is an important quote. I think it has merit in this time -(interjection)- I say to the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), he should maybe at least listen to the quote. Okay, he said in the 1920s and, of course, the Member opposite from Thompson would say, well, the people in the 1920s did not say anything meaningful then, that we have a greater wisdom today. But Calvin Coolidge in the 1920s said, and I quote, Nothing is easier than spending public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody, end of quote.

Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the debate on the budget, it becomes apparent to me that most of the Opposition speakers have not seriously understood the underlying issue of this budget. They have missed the point and the significant point of the budget, which to my way of thinking is addressed in the last five or six pages of the budget.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain. If they had, I say they would have concentrated their attacks and indeed their criticisms and their comments on the deficit, on the ability of the province to raise revenues, also on taxation in general and, of course, they would have presented their differing views on the debt and the interest bill, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members opposite had taken seriously the issues expressed in this budget, I think they would have concentrated their attacks in these areas. They chose not to do that. No, instead most of them chastised us for underspending in specific areas. This is unfortunate and does little in my view to elevate public debate as to our economic future.

I listened to most of the presentations, and those that I missed I tried to read. My colleague, the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard), made I think a very strong contribution in pointing out how indeed ideology and economics are so related.

If you borrow money in my view you give away your independence. I am not against borrowing money. I have borrowed a lot, and I have a lot of money borrowed. There is nothing wrong with

borrowing money, but you better believe you give away some of your independence. You ultimately, and I would say this, Mr. Speaker, give away therefore your ideology, your philosophical belief as to how the means of production should be structured and the fruits of that production should be distributed.

Let me explain. I will say to you that there is not a socialist country in the world or free-market-loving Government anywhere that can defy the basic law of economics. Someone once said: Almost any system will work if the people behind it will work hard. Mr. Speaker, someone also said: Any Government big enough to give you anything you want is big enough to take everything back that you have. That is where we are going.

Many Opposition speakers over the past several days are basically stating this, whether they agree with me or not. As I listened carefully to them, they said—they are basically saying to the Government: We do not take seriously your projections on deficits or on economic growth. I think they were also saying: We believe you should spend more to help us through this period of malaise. If people asked me to summarize what it was that I heard from the Opposition benches that is basically what I have heard.

I would like to talk a moment about where the money is going. This is a real life episode, and it happened in the former Minister of Family Services' office. I have used this on the speaking stump and it is true. There was a representative, Mr. Speaker, of one of the caring agencies there who had come to beseech the Government, Mrs. Oleson and myself, to contribute much more funding to one of the caring agencies. Nobody could argue at all with the tremendous intentions of this basically a volunteer from the community who wanted to see Government create more money in support of the very genuine needs that she was directing.

I asked this person, I said: What is happening? The Government is bringing in roughly \$5 billion; where in your view is the money going? She said: I do not know where it is going, but I do know, as I look at this budget versus others, I believe that the caring agencies are receiving less as a percentage term of that \$5 billion of revenue than they did before. I said: You are right, there is a culprit. She said: Who is that person? I said -(interjection)- no, it was Clayton Manness, the big spender in

Government over the last 10 years. The biggest increase spender is me, the Minister of Finance.

An Honourable Member: Shame.

Mr. Manness: The Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) says "shame," and he is right.

Mr. Speaker, where is the money going and who is spending it? It is the Minister of Finance, today approaching \$800 million, roughly \$10 million or \$15 million of it to collect taxes, roughly \$200 million to go out in terms of property tax credits and cost of living tax credits and the other \$500 million to going out in public debt. The biggest increase spender in the last 10 years is the ministry of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, for one second it did not last much longer, but for one second that member of the community saw what I was talking about and indeed what this Government was trying to preach, that indeed debt, debt in itself of course, is what is causing our problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, what about this \$500 million plus deficit? Do the Members opposite realize these things, that they have absolutely no vote. These are the Estimates and every area of expenditures in this book is covered by way of a vote. They have a right, indeed, under the democratic system to pass judgment as to whether or not the Government of the Day should spend a dollar in every area.

Mr. Speaker, there is one area in here, basically there are two. There is one area in here worth \$530 million they cannot touch. They do not even have a chance to vote on it. You know why, because it is a statutory expenditure, no control. Let me put it another way. Do you know why it is frozen into law as a statutory requirement? Because indeed some day a Minister of Finance of the Government may be tempted not to pay it back and direct it in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members opposite realize that if the Government were only to receive \$533 million of revenue this year they would not have to spend one minute in Estimates, because there would not be one vote, because the first \$533 million leaves this province. It is gone. So why is this? To whom do we owe this debt?

Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all we pay the interest first, because if we miss one payment, one payment, we will not be allowed to borrow a dollar for years to come. Some may laugh about that and say it will not happen, but I can tell you the time is drawing perilously close in the context—and I am not talking

now about Argentina. I am not talking now about Brazil. I am talking about Canada, because as I will dialogue later, there are some provincial Governments in Canada who are drawing perilously close to that point in time.

* (1710)

Mr. Speaker, as Members opposite trust their savings to credible savings institutions only, so the bondholders in the world will only trust those who will pay back on schedule, on time, the debt they owe. To whom do we owe this \$11 billion, those of us as Manitobans indeed, through the general Government programs and Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System? Do we owe it to the banks in New York and Tokyo and Zurich? Well, we like to say that. We use those terms that we owe it to the bankers, indeed, the investment houses. We do not. They are simply the mediaries, that is all they are.

I would like to tell the Members opposite, in case they really want to know to whom we owe this debt. **Mr. Speaker,** our last three U.S. issues, this is to whom we owe the debt: Manufacturers Life Insurance, Capital Holding, Bimcor Incorporated, Texas Teachers Retirement, American National, Confederation Life, Fiduciary Trust, Primco, Western Asset Management, Lutheran Brotherhood of the United States, California Teachers, California Public Employees, and Hancock Advisors. That group of investors have taken basically a billion dollars of our debt.

Mr. Speaker, are these big corporations? No, these are people who are holding in trust the savings and the life earnings of individuals. That is who owns our debt. So let the Members opposite say, well, who is it that we owe this money to? Recognize that they are people, individuals who have worked hard for their earnings, workers, individuals, people who trust Manitoba to pay back that debt, people who put savings in trust with pension fund managers who are paid very well, very well to avert risk, but earn good returns.

So whom, Mr. Speaker, do they look—these pension managers—for advice as to whether Manitoba bonds or HydroBonds are a safe risk for their life savings? To whom do they look? Well, these portfolio managers, they look toward to the rating agencies to help with the risk analysis. The rating agencies, they look at our ability, the province's ability to raise revenue, our ability to

attract investment, our ability to manage. If they do not like it, they do not give the province a good rating. If they province does not receive a decent rating, I can assure you it will not be able to borrow money for a long period of time.

I know this will bring the attention back of the Members of the Opposition Party, but I ask them, do they think that Eugene Kostyra, for one minute, wanted to impose a 2 percent tax on net income? Do they think for one moment that the New Democratic Party under Howard Pawley wanted to bring forward a 2 percent tax on an income? I do not know of a vote that a Government brings toward itself when it levies a tax. The answer is no, but they had no choice. Why did this tax attack the rich, and it did in parts? I am talking about the 2 percent tax on net income. Why did it also attack the \$11,000 a year worker at Safeway? Mr. Speaker, because there was no alternative.

All the Members had to do was look at the imposition of the tax that was brought down in the last NDP Government. Mr. Speaker, they can use the rhetoric of their Leader and say, tax the dickens out of the corporations, but the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) knows fully well the corporations do not have it to tax. That is why the last big tax haul the NDP brought down were on individuals, because they are only people who have means, not much, but they are the only ones that have means, and they know it. The corporate welfare bum theme rings hollow, because they know better themselves. It was desperate taxation. I say again that Eugene Kostyra did not want to bring it down, but through the rating agencies, the Texas teachers who lent us the money demanded that it be brought down. Never forget the connection.

Mr. Speaker, I want to—and I will reiterate, there is a province in Canada today that cannot borrow in its own name. It requires a guarantee of Canada. So let us not believe that this problem that we have talked about ad nauseam over the years, in the minds of some, is not real and, secondly, is not far away in the context of many, many provincial Governments.

We as a province are not masters of our own House. We are beholden and we are dependent. What do we hear in debate? Do we hear the deficit discussed? Do we hear the real challenge of the debt and how it is that we should begin to share the cost of trying to bring in the line expenditures? No, Mr. Speaker, we hear Members opposite asking us

to spend more. Why is it? Joan Cohen said on Monday, October 29, and I quote: "Deficit, too, is a word you rarely use in opposition, unless to point out the finance minister cannot count."—as was done by the MLA for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr)—"Otherwise the word can get an opposition politician into trouble. Deficits, after all, justify higher taxes and/or spending cuts." End of quote. That is why the Members opposite will not talk about the underlying issues that are so relevant to this budget.

Mr. Speaker, to continue one more quote: "How novel it would be to see opposition politicians strike a constructive note in economic matters, . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I listened again carefully to the contribution of Honourable Members to the debate on the 1990 Manitoba Budget. I first heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and he spoke about "Echoes in the Chamber".

Let me talk about echoes. Let me talk about it. What about the echo of excessive taxes that we inherited? Mr. Speaker, when the former Government was defeated in '88, Manitoba had the dubious distinction of the highest personal and business tax rates in the country. Businesses were saddled with high income taxes, high in capital taxes, high payroll taxes, and an anti-business environment which undercut our development potential.

There is an echo of burgeoning debt also that is addressed in this Chamber, compounded by successive deficit. Listen to the numbers: 435 million, 429 million, 483 million, 528 million, 559 million, and 300 million in six successive years, and those deficits did not include the losses of the Crown Corps because the strict accounting of the province at that time kept those two figures separated.

Mr. Speaker, there is the echo of the ongoing annual interest costs on the debt of a half a million dollars, and I have talked about them.

We are of the strong view that Manitoba's current tax regime on business ought not to be further increased. Let us look at some of the business taxes in Manitoba and how we compare to other provinces. Members opposite tell us to increase the corporation taxes.

Mr. Speaker, on corporate income taxes, Manitoba's large-business rate, at 17 percent, is tied with Newfoundland as the highest in Canada. The large-business tax rate in every other province is lower. Is this the business tax that the NDP want us

to increase? If it is, I ask them to stand in their place and say so, because we all know that corporations have a great degree of flexibility. They will go, they will go quickly, and they will go to the areas of the least taxation, and it should be remembered that large businesses in Manitoba face other significant businesses taxes as well.

* (1720)

Our capital tax on large business is tied with Saskatchewan as the second highest in the country, and six provinces do not even charge such a tax. Is this the business taxes that the NDP want us to increase?

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba large businesses also face a payroll tax on every job they create. Only four provinces levy payroll taxes and Manitoba's rate is the second highest.

With the highest large-business income tax rate and the second highest capital and payroll tax rates, I challenge the NDP to tell businesses and Manitobans which taxes they would increase. They will not do it, Mr. Speaker, but I challenge.

Another echo in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Doer) remarks is his continuing NDP focus on ways to increase spending. I will not dwell on that, but indeed Members opposite will be challenged. Every time they rise in this House and encourage us and implore us to speak more, we will challenge them to show us the source and indeed—or what else should be cut.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) echoed many of the same criticisms as the NDP, only she exhibited greater cynicism. She spoke about areas where she felt more resources should be deployed, but she wanted the added spending accommodated with no increase in the deficit and without any revenues through tax increases. How do you basically do that? The formula is A plus B equals C—a fundamental algebraic formula—and if you change one variable, the other two are either changed or if one of them is constant the other one changes. -(interjection)-

The Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) used the word "bemused." Mr. Speaker, I was bemused at the speech of the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs). It made no sense. It would not square itself. It did not come about.

Mr. Speaker, in summation, the budget that I presented to the Legislature was intended to reflect a cautionary note, to indicate that prudence of the

highest level is necessary in fiscal matters at this time in our province. It would be most important, and it is most important that we position ourselves well during what most people within Canada believe will be a fair lengthy period of recession.

Certainly the Royal Bank of Canada, in an economic presentation in Winnipeg this week had this to say, and I am going to—no, I am not going to talk about the things they had to say about Manitoba. I am going to read what they had to say about the world and Canada's role in it. These are very, very critical matters and I only ask that the Members opposite realize that every one of the factors that I am about to read has as much impact on ultimately whether more money or less money is spent in the areas that they think are so important, and indeed that we think are most important.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian dollar is looking extremely vulnerable in the world international market. There will be weak economic growth in Canada. Offshore currencies will strengthen against the U.S. and the Canadian dollars. The U.S. dollar will move lower. There will be a balance of payments problem for Canadian dollars.

As well, it is clear from talking to the experts who advise the province, that there is some fair degree of uncertainty as to the trend of interest rates. There is no guarantee that interest rates will be dropping significantly in Canada, indeed in all other parts of the world over the next two years. We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where although there may be moderation in the Canadian and the U.S. rates, we have another situation where you have rates in Germany and Japan coming up from the bottom.

I say to Members opposite, indeed I caution myself, that if we believe that lower interest rates are going to come quickly as a salvation, I am saying to you, that the wisdom today of an economist is that may not necessarily be the case. Most believe that short-term rates will decline somewhat. We are not certain whether there will be a significant decline in long-term rates.

The whole question of financing Governments could well become, and will become, more difficult. The provinces require significant amounts of new capital to carry them to the end of this current fiscal year. This is such a large number I do not know whether it can even make any impact, but the provinces of Canada, Mr. Speaker, are going to require \$10 billion to just carry us through to the end

of the fiscal year. That is March '91. That is all of the provinces in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I digress for a second to tell you when it was announced the other day by the new Government in Ontario that they were now approaching a \$2.5 billion deficit, I thought it was purely as a result of dropping revenues. I looked at the numbers the other day and what was obvious there is that the revenue growth did drop off by a billion, but the expenditure increase, revision half way through the year is a billion and a half higher. I am just telling you, that programming is locked in and next year when Ontario has to go to the market for \$5 billion, or \$6 billion, or \$8 billion, or \$10 billion, the provinces like Manitoba will not be able to borrow a dollar in our nation. So this is where we are headed.

Mr. Speaker, this is without—and I am talking about the \$10 billion of borrowing in the next five months—this is without providing refunding monies or lengthening the term of the huge amounts of short-term debt being carried by the province and major utilities. Of course, growing deficits will increase the size of the financing requirements.

If the Members do not take anything from my presentation, I ask them to take one thing, that today one of our provinces cannot borrow money in its own name. We have been advised that 1991 is going to be a tough year for financing. Borrowing will be difficult and uncertain. Offshore markets will not be as reliable or available as in the past. There is extreme uncertainty on the part of lenders. More provinces will be chasing fewer dollars.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the watchword through all of this, of course, will be careful fiscal planning. We cannot exceed the limited resources available to us.

Members opposite I know will say, and I say to Members opposite, we are not sabre-rattling. We are not trying to lay before you a false scenario. I ask you to take my remarks and those comments of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) earlier, and indeed many Members on this side, and those comments in the budget very seriously.

We are prepared to make the proper decisions. Some will not be easy. Someone once said, smooth seas do not make good sailors. I ask Members opposite to not implore us to continue to spend. You do not know what havoc you may ultimately cause to this province if you continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members of the House. I would like to end by commending the 1990 budget to this House. I hope Members would feel that the correct action, given the circumstances of today, is to support the 1990 budget.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) to the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)

THAT this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

Do you wish the amendment read? Yes.

THAT all the words following the word "House" be deleted and the following be added:

Regrets that the Government has:

1. failed to portray accurately and clearly the financial affairs of the province;
2. ignored the need for a Manitoba labour adjustment strategy in the wake of the free trade deal;
3. failed to see the real impact of the Mulroney-Reagan Free Trade Agreement on the Manitoba economy and accordingly the Manitoba work force;
4. failed to address the need for a skilled work force;
5. failed to address the challenges faced by post secondary education institutions;
6. begun the downsizing of the Department of Agriculture;
7. failed to develop innovative programs in order to develop a community health program thereby lessening our dependence on the institutional model of health care delivery;
8. failed to take any action to stem the destructive tide of bankruptcies in Manitoba;
9. failed to take any measures that would lead to job creation so we can retain Manitoba jobs for Manitobans; and
10. failed to recognize the need for research and development in this province thereby denying a viable future for our province.

* (1730)

All those in favour of the proposed amendment will please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, Yeas and Nays.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members. Order, please.

The question before the House is the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) to the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Alcock, Carr, Carstairs, Cheema, Gaudry, Lamoureux.

NAYS

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Chomiak, Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Dewar, Doer, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Filmon, Findlay, Friesen, Gilleshamer, Helwer, Hickes, Laurendeau, Maloway, Manness, Martindale, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Plohman, Praznik, Reid, Reimer, Render, Rose, Santos, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey, Wasylcyia-Leis, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 6, Nays 46.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

All those in favour of the motion will please say

aye. All those opposed will please say nay. In my opinion the ayes have it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. Does this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the Government?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshamer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

NAYS

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carr, Carstairs, Cerilli, Cheema, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Friesen, Gaudry, Hickes, Lamoureux, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Wasylcyia-Leis, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk: Yeas 29, Nays 23.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that the House adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Manness), seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice, that this House do now adjourn. Agreed? Agreed.

The House now adjourns and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Thursday, November 1, 1990

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Tabling of Reports

Annual Report Crown Corporations
Council; Supplementary Information
for Legislative Review, Finance
Manness 624

Annual Reports: Moose Lake Loggers
Ltd.; Channel Area Loggers Ltd.
Downey 624

Oral Question Period

Health Care
Wasylycia-Leis; Filmon 624

Constitutional Issues
Doer; Filmon 625

Economic Growth
Doer; Filmon 626

Constitutional Issues
Doer; Filmon 626

Economic Growth
Carstairs; Filmon 627

Federal Transfer Payments
Carstairs; Filmon 627

Constitutional Issues
Carstairs; Filmon 627

Residential Schools
Lathlin; Filmon 627

Agricultural Assistance
Wowchuk; Findlay 628

Rural Economy
Wowchuk; Penner 629

Industrial Technology
Gaudry; Ducharme; Manness 629

Women's Crisis Shelters
C. Evans; Gilleshammer 630

Economic Growth
Dacquay; Manness 631

Crime Prevention
Edwards; McCrae 631

Speaker's Rulings

Points of Order, Oct. 29, 1990
Rocan 632

Non-Political Statement

Crime Prevention Month
McCrae; Chomiak 633

House Business

Standing Committee Notices
Manness; Lamoureux 634

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Budget Debate

Connery 634

Tabling of Document

List of Estimates Sequence
Manness 635

Budget Debate (Cont'd)

Reid; Cerilli; Wowchuk; Filmon;
C. Evans; Carr; Hickers; Manness 636-666