

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, March 7, 1990.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

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

Your committee met on Tuesday, January 23, 1990, at 8 p.m. and Thursday, January 25, 1990, Tuesday, January 30, 1990, Thursday, February 1, 1990 and Tuesday, February 6, 1990 at 10 a.m., in Room 255 and Wednesday, February 28, 1990 and Monday, March 5, 1990, at 8 p.m., in Room 254 of the Legislative Building, to consider Bills referred.

Your committee heard representations on Bill No. 63, The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur, as follows:

Mr. Ken Mathews - Private Citizen
Ms. Jennifer Hillard - Consumers Association of Canada (Manitoba Branch)
Mr. Dale Mulhall - Private Citizen
Mr. Les Stechesen - Private Citizen
Mr. Lefty Hendrickson - President, Manitoba Motor Dealers Association
Mr. Brian Lutz - Private Citizen
Mr. Art Elias - Private Citizen
Mrs. Glennis Kaczmarek - Private Citizen
Ms. Olga Foltz - Private Citizen
Mr. Maurice Paul - Private Citizen
Mrs. Bernice and Mr. Lyle Heaman - Private Citizens
Mrs. Heather Lamontagne - Private Citizen
Mr. Bill Hanson - CKY Television
Mr. Peter Gustavson - Money Mart Financial Service Centre
Mr. Frank Zador - Private Citizen
Miss Lynn Martin - Social Assistance Coalition of Manitoba (SACOM)
Ms. Charlotte and Mr. Mark DeCorby - Private Citizens
Mrs. Joan Johannson - Private Citizen
Ms. Maxine Hamilton - Private Citizen
Mr. Alan de Jardin - Private Citizen
Ms. Becky Barrett - Private Citizen
Mr. Garth Whyte - Canadian Federation of Independent Business

Written Submissions:

Mr. Bill Stokes - Private Citizen

Mr. Sanderson Layng - Director, Children's Broadcast Institute
Mr. Rick Wieler - Private Citizen
Ms. Patricia Morrison - Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization (MAPO) Inc.
M. L. Spence - Association of Canadian Financial Corporations
Mr. John Evans - The Trust Companies Association of Canada

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 63 - The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur,

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT section 12 of Bill 63 be amended by striking out "10" and substituting "7".

MOTION:

THAT proposed new section 123 of The Consumer Protection Act, as set out in section 23 of Bill 63, be amended

- (a) by striking out "10 days" wherever it appears in subsections (2) and (3) and, in each case, substituting "7 days";
- (b) by striking out "subject to subsections (6) and (7)," in clause (4)(a) and substituting "subject to subsection (6).";
- (c) by striking out clause (4)(b) and substituting the following:

"(b) on the buyer's demand, the seller shall repay to the buyer immediately all amounts already paid by or on behalf of the buyer in respect of the contract, whether paid for or on account of the contract price or for or on account of any fee, cost of borrowing or other amount paid under or pursuant to or as incidental to the contract, and whether paid to the seller or another person, but the seller may retain any portion of the amounts so paid by the buyer for which services have been provided, and the portion to be so retained by the seller shall be calculated as that proportion of the amounts so paid by the buyer which bears the same mathematical relationship to the total of the amounts so paid as the period of the contract ending on the date of the cancellation bears to the total period of the contract.";

- (d) by striking out subsection (7); and

(e) by renumbering subsections (8) and (9) as subsections (7) and (8) respectively.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

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 James Nisbet Community School, we have thirty-eight Grades 4, 5 and 6 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Inderjit Claire. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Headingley Jail Raw Sewage Disposal

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the dumping of raw sewage from Headingley jail represents another Tory blow to, and not for, the environment. Raw sewage creates a very large demand for oxygen at a time of year when low water flows and ice cover have already lowered the oxygen levels available. Dumping of raw sewage into the ice-covered Assiniboine River represents not only a public health threat, but a very serious threat to all aquatic life.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) tell Winnipeggers why the sewage was not pumped into tanks, transported and then disposed of through a sewage treatment process, rather than simply dumping almost 1 million litres of raw sewage into the Assiniboine River?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, this was a process that our department and the Department of Health were carefully monitoring. The reason for this is that the sewage disposal system at this institution is falling into disrepair and needs to have some work done on it.

We wanted to avoid any possible detection of leakage when we get into the high water season in the spring. This work was done as a preventative measure. I might refer to the biological oxygen demand. The changes that were made by this discharge are about one-quarter of what are the daily discharges of the city treatment plant just up the river a little piece.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Taylor: It is very interesting to see a justification of damage to the environment. Mr. Speaker, given that

the sewage system at Headingley jail is forecasted to have a long life, this situation was in no way an emergency. Why did the Minister choose what was obviously the most environmentally damaging option available?

* (1335)

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, this is an examination that was intended to prepare for works to be done in the spring, so that when the rush of water in the spring down the river has passed, when the high water levels in the area of the sewage field have been reduced, then they will be able to put the effluent into an old lagoon system that apparently is unused, so that they can treat it while they do repairs on this system.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that they were faced with apparently was that they could have potentially undetected leakages from this which would be very environmentally damaging and would have a greater opportunity to get into the ground water than dealing with it in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, this is not something that we do lightly. It is one of those situations that you would rather not have to deal with, but frankly we felt that taking precautionary measures now so that system could be repaired was the best thing to do.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the issue is not one of whether there should be inspection and precaution taken. It is when you do that, how do you handle it? The question is, if the Minister for some reason, which I cannot imagine what, does not support the idea of sewage treatment with holding tanks and transportation, why has he at least not explored other safer options of handling this 1 million litres of raw sewage?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I take a little umbrage at that question coming from a city councillor who lives on a combined sewage area that every time it rots, he does not give us any commitment that he stops flushing.

Mr. Speaker, the problem—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order please.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, this discharge is a very small discharge, not one that we are proud to have to take that action to deal with it, but one which seems to me to have been minimizing the risk as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that all across this province, we do use our river courses as discharges from our sewage systems. From time to time, we have had other examples of where larger systems have allowed sewage to go through. This was kept to a minimum. The direction to the institution was to reduce water usage, reduce the volume as much as possible. We believe that this was the best alternative to what may have been a very difficult situation.

Mr. Taylor: After that set of answers, I hope the next set the Minister can be more responsible and less reactionary.

Pembina River Diversion Hearing Delay

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the plan to divert the Pembina River into Pelican Lake is a major project which could have far-reaching impacts on the downstream local agricultural communities. Given that the opponents to the deal, who had registered with the Clean Environment Commission, were not given copies of the new impact statement until this Sunday past, with the hearings commencing this Thursday, i.e., tomorrow morning in Ninette, will the Minister of the Environment request the Clean Environment Commission to delay for a few weeks so the report can be properly circulated and—

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

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, if the Member chooses to come to this House to misrepresent the process, then I will have to take a minute or two to give my answer. The Natural Resources Department has brought forward an assessment which my department passed some comments on. Those comments led to some improvements of that assessment prior to it going forward. If the Member thinks that those changes being brought forward before it goes to the Clean Environment Commission somehow abridges the process, then I am afraid he concurs with the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) that the best thing to do in this province is do nothing.

Mr. Taylor: I guess the best thing to do in Manitoba is stop and think before you impact on the environment.

Impact Farming Community

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the Clean Environment Commission did not receive in adequate time those reports. The algae problem will not be solved by this project and there will be virtually no benefits, only downstream negative impacts for farmers and ranchers. Why is the Government taking a stance in opposition to the interests of Manitoba farmers?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Members of the Government benches, I would think that you would understand the ludicrousness of that suggestion.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Cummings: I am not sure what the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer) is referring to, but I do not think I was ever part of a gang. Mr. Speaker, the concerns that the Member raises will be dealt with during the Clean Environment Commission hearings. That is one of the reasons that we have an independent body to examine

the proposal and hear the concerns of proponents and those who are opponents. It would seem to me that if he is prejudging this as being extremely damaging, then he is unwilling to let that process work.

* (1340)

Pembina River Diversion Environmental Impact Study

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, this project has already been through the planning stage. The monies are budgeted. The question is: Why is it all the time the Tories use the EIS process not at the planning stage but at the approval stage where it is more difficult to change and correct problems and more difficult to deal with the already raised expectations of people? Why have they always got the cart before the horse on EISs?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, all of these works are subject to environmental approval. While I do not intend to minimize the importance of that, the fact that the Government plans ahead on certain initiatives and developments, those are all subject to environmental approval and acceptance or mitigation of whatever concerns or damages may be indicated by a proposal. Certainly I think the Member is misrepresenting the quality and the independence of the commission when he reflects on whether or not they will be able to make an independent decision at this time during the process. That is totally wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Bill No. 42 Alternative

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). Manitobans generally are disappointed with the lack of political will power and especially the lack of courage on the part of the Conservative Government that has now decided not to bring forward a Bill that would, and I quote the Minister in his opening remarks, a Bill that would "place Manitoba in the forefront of Canadian provinces with progressive legislation benefitting both the landlords and the tenants."

Especially disappointing are those who live in substandard housing because they are most affected. They live in rodent-infested housing. They live with rotten flooring underneath them. They live with peeling paint around them. They are the ones who need this legislation the most.

My question to the Minister is, what action will his Government now take, given that they have given up on Bill No. 42 to deal with those very immediate problems that are being created by his caucus' lack of will power for so many Manitobans while his caucus and his Cabinet make their back room deals with landlords and moneylenders to stall this Bill?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), not

that he was part of the Government when they brought in this Act almost 20 years ago, but where was he to deal with the slum landlords? To the Member across the way, he did absolutely nothing for the six and a half years that they were there.

We are committed to bringing in the Bill, and we will do that in the next Session.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, we brought forward rent control, rent legislation. We fought the Government when it tried to repeal that legislation, and we gave to the Minister a Bill that was fully complete after many months of consultation. All we had to do was bring it in the Legislature and have it passed. We need no lectures from that Minister about what the NDP did or did not do for tenants.

Minister's Position

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): My question to the Minister is, given that he had indicated on January 29 that, and I quote, "we are still on track to bring forward this legislation to this House during this Session." He now tells us that he is not going to do that, and he will bring it forward next Session. The question is, why should we trust the Minister any more now than we trusted him a few months ago when he said he would bring the legislation forward this Session?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the Member for Churchill is, trust me, not like the person across the way who has brought these questions, who is trying to indicate that they did something for slum landlords. He might have brought in legislation, but he brought nothing that would bring in law enforcement powers to deal with slum landlords. In our legislation we are doing that.

Mr. Cowan: What we had before the House, and I quote the Minister again in his opening remarks.

An Honourable Member: Let us see now. No preamble on the third question.

* (1345)

Mr. Cowan: Listen, at least we talk publicly in this House about this issue, not behind closed doors with our friends the moneylenders and the landlords. At least we will put our position on the table publicly, not behind closed doors—

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

Residential Tenancies Commission

Mr. Speaker: The question please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Churchill will kindly put his question.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, given that the Minister indicated that it is necessary to have greater accountability and improved services to the public by removing several levels of delay-causing bureaucracy

and by implementing a residential tenancies commission, will the Minister bring forward at least that portion of the Bill now which would do what he said was necessary a few months ago, eliminate that bureaucracy and improve access to legislation by tenants and landlords alike?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Churchill is getting more ridiculous all the time. He is telling us to bring in the Housing court. If we would have brought in the Housing court, as suggested by his Government, it would have been thrown out by the courts as it was in Ontario.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, the Minister himself brought forth a residential tenancies commission in the legislation. Hopefully, he had it checked with his own lawyers to determine whether or not it was constitutional. We would assume that it was.

Will he now bring forward what he said earlier was constitutional, and that is a residential tenancies commission, immediately, so that those tenants living in substandard conditions have some resource that does not force them to go through long delays in the bureaucracy in order to deal with their own personal problems?

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, there is a very clear indication that even the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) is confused. It is irresponsible—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ducharme: —to bring in that part of the legislation without bringing in the receiver part of the legislation to have the control to at least repair the slum buildings that they would not do in their legislation.

Forks Development Corp. Boat Basin Contract

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). For the last week we have been asking questions about excavation at The Forks for a boat basin. Can the Minister of Urban Affairs tell us if there has been any funding approval for the project, how much the funding is for, and under what program it has been funded?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): To the Member across the way, I guess he is not reading the headlines lately. There is no boat basin proceeding at this time. There is a walkway that is going to proceed.

They will abide by all the rules, The Forks has decided today. As a matter of fact, they are having a press conference at one o'clock today to say they would like to complete the walkway so people in Winnipeg can enjoy the walkway that it started of last year and complete along the Assiniboine.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, last week, the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst) had a very different answer to the

same question. The Minister of Tourism talked about the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement, and now the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) does not know what the Minister was talking about.

Boat Basin Contract

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): I have a supplementary question. Can the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) confirm that no contract has been signed with the company which began excavation last week?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): The Member across the way is trying to twist words again. I said a few minutes ago that he did not know that the Environment has stopped that, the courts stopped that the other day. What they are proceeding with right now is the walkway so people can enjoy that, people in his own constituency can walk all along the walkway, enjoy The Forks. Does he have something against the walkway?

Boat Basin Delay Costs

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) does not know if there has been funding approval to the project. He does not know under what program. He does not know whether or not a contract has been signed with the company doing the excavation. Does the Minister of Urban Affairs know how much money the delay is costing The Forks Renewal Corporation each day and who is footing the bill?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, too much.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

* (1350)

Goose Farming Impact Environment

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): To all but the residents of Rivercrest in West St. Paul, having 2,000 geese in your backyard may seem amusing. However, these people have been submitted to horrendous odours, noise and other environmental pollutants to the point where many are becoming physically ill.

To the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), during the summer last year when only 15,000 were at large, did the Minister of Environment have an environmental officer assess the effect these farming practices have had on the environment?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, we spent some considerable time agonizing over this situation last summer, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) did as well. This has been primarily a planning problem inasmuch as the land was still zoned for agricultural production and led to some

considerable difficulty obviously when the owner of the land chose to put geese on there. I am unaware of the numbers that the Member is talking about, but I am certainly prepared to provide her with any information we have on the work that was done by the department.

Mrs. Charles: The riverbank at the end of this goose farm has been levelled which allows excrement and feathers readily to flow into the river. Is this acceptable to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), and can he not enforce the Act to halt such pollutants going into the river?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, if there is effluent from livestock operation flowing directly into the river, which the Member seems to be indicating, although she referenced feathers, but if there is effluent from this operation, then I would suggest—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cummings: —the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if it is only a few feathers, or if it is a lot of feathers, I would be more concerned if it was a considerable amount of waste and sewage, excrement, if you wish. There is a colloquial term for what it is that geese do, but—I would be prepared to seek further information about whether or not that is being allowed to happen. It was not my information that it was.

Mrs. Charles: I just point out to the Minister that I did refer to excrement and we have pictures of large doses of excrement, feathers and the whole bit floating down the river. I hope he will look into that.

My last question to the Minister, odour, noise and excrement and feathers from these geese make this an invasion of this community. Will the Minister meet with the residents of Rivercrest to explain his responsibilities and help these people in their environmental problem?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, there are very few people that I have not been able to meet with during the course of my time in Environment, or Municipal Affairs for that matter, and I would be more than glad to meet with the owners from that district. This is an example of a situation where we have residential and planning concerns that are in direct conflict.

In fact I would be more than prepared to work, not only with the owners, but with the municipal officials in the area, to see if we can seek a solution to this problem because it is simply reaching a stage where all parties are going to have to sit down and come to a suitable conclusion.

Private Schools Funding

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, we have watched this Government systematically abandon Medicare, introduce rationing in the health care system.

We are now watching the betrayal of the public school system by the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). Today the Minister of Education announced a pledge to move the Government to 80 percent funding to private schools, a pledge that was issued by the Liberals some time ago.

My question to the Minister is, has this issue been discussed with the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, those people who were responsible for collecting taxes to pay for local school activities and responsibilities? Has the Minister discussed in any formal way with these groups the announcement he made today?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I was happy to announce today that we have introduced some very serious and very important accountability measures into the independent schools of this province. If that is a betrayal of the public school system, then I really do not know what the Member for Flin Flon is talking about. Today, for the first time in this province, we have introduced measures of accountability in administration, in program and in finances that have not been present in the education system of independent schools in this province to date. I would have to say, I am proud of that.

Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate also that the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Manitoba Association of Superintendents and also the MASBO association have been consulted with and have been informed and met with the Deputy Minister this morning so that he could go through the details of the announcements.

* (1355)

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, the issue of accountability is a smoke screen for the largest single betrayal of the public school system in the history of this province. My question is, one week ago I asked the Minister of Education whether he had done any studies, was aware of any studies that had been done, could provide to this Legislature any information indicating that the Minister and this Government understood the implications of what they are about to do, the implications of raising to 80 percent the level of funding to private schools, what the implications would be on the public school system, on the taxpayers who support that system, to the students and teachers and the people for whom that system has been the educational source.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate very confidently that the results of the accountability measures that have been introduced today will ensure that independent schools are accountable for the dollars, the taxpayer dollars, the public dollars, that are expended in those schools. It also will ensure that there will be some accountability with regard to the programs that are being delivered in those schools and that now independent schools will have to follow the administration Act that is followed by all public schools in this province.

Mr. Speaker, that was not present up until this time. When the former Government, when the New Democratic Party was in Government, they in fact did support independent schools without any accountability measures.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, the guidelines the Minister has introduced are welcome. What is not welcome is the change in policy and the decision to fund 80 percent to private schools. How can this Minister stand up in this House and say that the Winnipeg School Division has to look to its own resources to maintain a school, that the Winnipeg School Division has to cut services and cut programs and cut teachers and tell the other school divisions in the province the same thing, while today he can announce a \$100 million increase to private schools over the next eight years—increase—\$100 million increase in the next eight years? How can he justify that to the people in Manitoba?

Mr. Derkach: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate that the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has not done his research very well, because his figures are all wrong. Secondly, I have to indicate also that when his Government was in power they had no accountability measures for independent schools.

We have funded the public schools of this province very adequately. We have indicated that there needs to be a balanced approach. The parents who send their children to independent schools are taxpayers in this province. It is only reasonable that their children should be supported in a school system that they send them to.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like to indicate that in our province it is only reasonable that parents should be allowed to have a choice of where to send their children to school.

West Broadway Family Centre Funding Review

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. Oleson: Last week the Premier took as notice on my behalf a couple of questions, one of them from the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) regarding the West Broadway Day Care. I would just like to indicate to him that he may not be aware there are two different questions here. There is a 32-space facility day care that we do fund. There also is another facility in which they are asking for eight infant spaces, as well they were requesting funds for casual day care.

The eight infant spaces are under consideration. As I had indicated to the Member before, our priority is for full-time day care, but we have to go through the licensing process. We do license other casual day cares, but we do not fund them. So the matter of the staff working with them was a matter of licensing. As I said, we are considering the eight spaces, and I will be meeting with that group shortly to discuss that.

* (1400)

Day Care Space Commitment

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): The Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) also asked a question, Mr. Speaker, if you will indulge me. He asked a question about the allocation of spaces from the announcement last week. I would like to indicate to him that we do take into consideration rural needs when we are making allocations. They have not all been allocated yet. With regard to the Fisher Branch centre, it is on the waiting list and is being considered for funding.

Forks Development Corp. Boat Basin Delay Costs

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). If I heard the Minister correctly, in response to my last question, which was: How much was the delay of the boat basin costing, the Minister's reply was, "Too much."

Since the Minister has said on many occasions that he is politically accountable in this House for what goes on at The Forks Renewal Corporation, will he please tell Members of this House how much is too much?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the board met yesterday to assess the situation of the court ruling that was put down earlier in the week. They have a penalty clause with the contractor. They are assessing those monies. I know it is in the thousands per week. They are assessing their position and hoping that they can make it clear before the ice melts that they can proceed with the boat basin. Right now, because they are dealing with the contractor on just the walkway, they are into negotiations to what it will cost to do just the walkway without doing the boat basin at this time.

Mr. Carr: The Minister tells us now there is a contract. Before, he did not know whether there was a contract or not.

Forks Development Corp. Boat Basin Funding

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst). Can the Minister of Tourism tell us if there has been any agreement between the federal and provincial Governments to set aside money, something around \$2.8 million, in the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement for the building of a boat basin at The Forks?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated last Friday, to questioning from the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), that in fact an application had been filed with the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement by The Forks Renewal Corporation for that project. That application is presently before us—obviously thrown somewhat awry over the events of the past week—but nonetheless

before us at the present time, and we are giving it consideration.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst). Did he or any of his officials encourage The Forks Renewal Corporation to proceed with the project with the full knowledge that the project had not yet received funding approval by himself or the federal Minister?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge perhaps is not aware, but the mechanism for approval of projects under the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement rests with the agreement co-managers. The agreement co-managers are on behalf of the federal Government, Mr. Rainer Anderson of Industry, Science and Technology Canada, and on the Province of Manitoba's behalf, Mr. Paul Robson, Assistant Deputy Minister of Tourism.

With respect to the question, Mr. Speaker, raised by the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), the federal Minister responsible for Manitoba, Mr. Epp, and myself have had a number of discussions obviously over the question of this project, and have between us agreed in principle that the project is a good one and should be proceeded with, but the application comes before the agreement co-managers, and they are the ones who decide unless there is a dispute.

Farming Industry Government Initiatives

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Yesterday, I raised with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) his rationale for his position of supporting federal Government programs and policies that are hurting rural Manitoba as they are Saskatchewan, where the Premier of Saskatchewan announced a \$250 million program for agriculture in Saskatchewan just two days ago.

He also says, Mr. Speaker, that \$2 billion is required for the agriculture industry in Saskatchewan. I ask this Minister, how much has he calculated that the agriculture industry in this province is requiring at this particular time on an urgent need? Why has he not gone after the federal Government for those dollars instead of sitting quietly while this emergency is taking place in our province?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Member makes reference to Saskatchewan announcing a \$250 million package. I am not aware that they have made that announcement. I am aware at this point that they have indicated that there is some difficulty and future announcements will come in the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, in this House about a week ago, in answer to a question from the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), I had indicated very clearly that we have been in consultation with the federal Government, having put a proposal on their table with regard to assistance for the drought-affected area of Manitoba. We did that back in January and we are awaiting response from the federal Government in terms of funding that particular proposal.

Mr. Plohan: Mr. Speaker, how does this Minister expect the industry in Manitoba to survive, particularly the beef and livestock industry, as we see more and more employees being laid off at East-West Packers, when we do not have a level playing field, when Saskatchewan is already subsidizing to a much higher degree than Manitoba? What action is he going to take to ensure the survival of this industry in this province?

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, everybody knows the difficulties that the farm community has faced in the past number of years with drought, low commodity prices, high interest rates, high dollar value. That Member seems to say, throw money at it, compete with other provinces. That is how you create a level field: throw money at it.

We have to deal in a rational fashion with keeping the subsidy level down to prevent the countervail actions that come from the countries we are exporting to. Over 50 percent of wheat produced in Manitoba, in fact 80 percent of the wheat must be exported. We must have a viable market out there without countervail. We cannot go around subsidizing production that is going to draw countervail. The Member is way off base. I have been in constant consultation with a wide variety of farm organizations, and they agree the process we are involved in is the right one in terms of maximizing our opportunities, of being a competitive exporter in the world in the future.

Mr. Plohan: Mr. Speaker, it is our own provinces led by Conservative Governments who are engaging in unfair trade practices that are hurting our industries in this province, never mind exports.

Debt Restructuring

Mr. John Plohan (Dauphin): I ask the Minister, in view of the federal Government's policies of high interest rates that are hurting the agriculture industry, what specific action will this Minister take to assist in debt restructuring and assisting those farmers who are not able to cope with the financial pressures that are facing them?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that Member, who was in Cabinet, basically tried to destroy the feedlot industry in this province and did a fairly good job of doing that while he was there.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of industries that are growing and doing well in this province, and agriculture is one of them. Debt restructuring is a difficult process, and the process that presently is being handled by the Mediation Board in the Province of Manitoba and the federal Debt Review Board is doing an excellent job in terms of being able to restructure farmers' debt situations that are potentially restructurable.

I can tell you that when those farmers come to the Debt Review Board they in essence have an average of about \$2,000 net value. When the restructuring is done, they have had an average net worth of \$73,000.00.

So they are in a lot better position to survive after they have been through the process. About 60 percent of the farmers are still farming. I think that is a very commendable record for the people who are involved in that process.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Child and Family Services Report Recommendations

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Ellice. Order.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The saga continues with the Minister of Family Services stalling on decision-making with respect to Child and Family Services Agencies. The Minister established a joint committee last year to look at funding formulas. That joint committee was composed of her own senior staff and the presidents of the agencies. They produced two reports, the last report being last May. Can the Minister tell us why the major recommendations of that report have not been acted upon?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Some of those recommendations have been acted on and we are working with the agencies to work through their problems. As the Member well knows, I had a meeting with the agencies last evening, the sixth meeting that I have had with them since I have been the Minister. We worked in a co-operative fashion to attempt to resolve their problems with funding. As the Member well knows, I announced a \$2 million deficit relief fund for them and also some relief with regard to special needs children.

Deficit Reduction

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, the report in May clearly concludes that the Government has two options. They either build the deficits into the base of next year's budgets or they cut services.

My question to the Minister is: Which of those options is she accepting?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): The Member well knows that I have indicated to the agencies that they will not cut service to children, and we are working through ways of solving their problems, not like the Liberals who would just give them a blank cheque.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

* (1410)

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

Ms. Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a final supplementary to the Minister of Family Services. How many years of this continuing review of the funding mechanism, and I quote from her own press release of yesterday, must go on before the Minister starts making the crucial decisions? How many years?

Mrs. Oleson: Last night when I met with the presidents of the agencies, one of the announcements that I made to them was—one was the immediate help and relief for this past year or this current year and also a long-term strategy to get out of this business of deficit budgets. They have indicated they will work with me in that regard, and we will hope to solve the problem very soon.

Child and Family Services Funding Formula

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, on this same matter, as this is very critical, yesterday the announcement by the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) was a somewhat disguised but very apparent attack on the integrity and dedication of child and family agency staff and volunteers. Despite the fact that this Government has done audits and reviews and studies to pass the blame on the agencies for the fact that deficits exist and come up empty-handed, when will the Minister stop blaming the agencies and the hard-working staff and volunteers and come up with a realistic funding formula that takes into account the very real and sharp increase in case loads throughout the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I was not casting reflection upon the agencies. All I have been doing is asking them to be accountable and work with me to solve their problems. If they had been left with a significantly better funding base when we took Government, we would not be in this problem.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism have leave to make a non-political statement? Agreed. The Honourable Minister.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This evening, 1,300 athletes, coaches and officials will gather in Carman, Manitoba, for the opening of the Manitoba Winter Games. The focus of the Manitoba games is on grassroots participation, community-based sport development. As a matter of fact, over the course of the regional events leading up to the finals to be held in Carman starting this evening, we have had 6,783 participate in the Manitoba Games competitions, an increase of some 30 percent over the last Winter Games held in 1986.

This is the largest multisport event held in the Province of Manitoba, 12 sports, 1,300 athletes, coaches and officials, but beyond that it caters to both young and old. We have, for instance, an 81-year-old five-pin bowler, Alf Barnett from the Interlake, who will

be participating in that competition. We have - (interjection)- Yes, you are probably right, Mr. Speaker. In addition to that, we have the Clark Wilkie family, four members from the Parkland region who are also participating as part of the Parkland team.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is an event for everyone. I encourage all Members of the House over the next four days to try and visit Carman and the environs around it where these events are taking place. It is well worthwhile, and I encourage all Manitobans to support this very worthwhile event. Thank you.

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

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): I would like to also rise on the non-political statement on the Winter Games in Carman. I had the -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: He has been granted leave.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, as all of us are in twilight of mediocre sports careers, it is a quite interesting topic. I had the pleasure of being in Thompson a few weeks ago where the regional games were going on in northern Manitoba. Although I did not directly participate in some of the events, I did visit many of the events in the North. It was extremely successful in terms of the participation of citizens in coaching, volunteers, participants and spectators.

We are delighted with the grassroots efforts of Manitobans, the 6,700 participants that the Minister mentioned, and we too support the Winter Games in Carman, the 1,300 participants, the many people who will be involved in the various sports. It is consistent with the total participation of Manitoba in these games, and we all applaud all members involved in it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I would also like to join in the remarks of the Minister responsible for Sport (Mr. Ernst), and specifically his expression of best wishes to the Manitoba Winter Games in Carman. Fitness, amateur sport and volunteerism are three extremely important priorities for Manitoba, and the Winter Games reflect the best our province has to offer in these areas.

I applaud the athletes and volunteers who make this great event possible, but I would be remiss today if I did not add that we are keenly aware, as we look at the seat of the Honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard), that he will likely not be able to partake of the events associated with the Winter Games in Carman. We hope in fact he is able to partake of them, but in any case, we wish the Honourable Member representing Carman to understand that our wishes are with him today for a speedy recovery from his present illness.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 98, The Manitoba Data Services Disposition and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur l'aliénation de la Commission des services d'informatique du Manitoba et modifications corrélatives), be withdrawn from the Committee of the Whole and be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources. That Bill would be considered, along with the other Bills, tomorrow morning in committee.

MOTION presented and carried.

REPORT STAGE

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call the report stage Bills, please?

**BILL NO. 6—THE LAW REFORM
COMMISSION ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Report stage—Bill No. 6, The Law Reform Commission Act; Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill No. 6, The Law Reform Commission Act (Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 39—THE HUMAN
TISSUE AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 39, The Human Tissue Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les tissus humains. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, did you call Bill 39?

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill No. 39, The Human Tissue Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les tissus humains), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 40—THE LAND SURVEYORS
AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 40, The Land Surveyors Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les arpenteurs-géomètres. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

* (1420)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill No. 40, The Land Surveyors Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les arpenteurs-géomètres), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 65—THE FATALITY
INQUIRIES ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 65, The Fatality Inquiries Act; Loi sur les enquêtes médico-légales. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill No. 65, The Fatality Inquiries Act (Loi sur les enquêtes médico-légales), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 66—THE SUMMARY
CONVICTIONS AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 66, The Summary Convictions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill No. 66, The Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 68—THE COURT OF
APPEAL AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 68, The Court of Appeal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour d'appel. The Honourable Attorney General.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill No. 68, The Court of Appeal Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour d'appel), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 69—THE LAW SOCIETY
AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 69, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill No. 69, The Law Society Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 70—THE PROVINCIAL COURT
AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 70, The Provincial Court Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill No. 70, The Provincial Court Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 71—THE LAW SOCIETY
AMENDMENT ACT (2)**

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 71, The Law Society Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), that Bill No. 71, The Law Society Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 6, The Law Reform Commission Act; Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit.

Bill No. 39, The Human Tissue Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les tissus humains.

Bill No. 40, The Land Surveyors Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les arpenteurs-géomètres.

Bill No. 65, The Fatality Inquiries Act; Loi sur les enquêtes médico-légales.

Bill No. 66, The Summary Convictions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires.

Bill No. 68, The Court of Appeal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour d'appel.

Bill No. 70, The Provincial Court Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale.

Bill No. 71, The Law Society Amendment Act (2); Loi no. 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau.

Bill No. 69, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau, were, by leave, each read a third time and passed.

* (1430)

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Government House Leader, what are your intentions, sir? The Honourable Member for Gimli, with a committee change.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for Wednesday evening session be amended as follows: Derkach for Neufeld.

I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Private Bills for the Thursday 10 a.m. session be amended as follows: Praznik for Gilleshammer.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I have asked you what order to call the Bills in today, but would you call the second reading and then debate on second readings; first 101, 100, then 99?

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

SECOND READINGS

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

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General) presented Bill No. 101, The Statute Re-enactment and By-law Validation (Municipal) Act; Loi sur la réadoption de lois et la validation d'arrêts concernant diverses municipalités, for second reading, to be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, you caught me a bit by surprise, I am sorry, I did not understand the Minister was going to make comments.

Mr. McCrae: Does the Honourable Member wish me to make my comments, making my tablings, and then leave the floor open to him? Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Mr. McCrae: I thank the Honourable Member for his accommodation. I will say no further than that.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to second reading of Bill 101, I would like to table documents mentioned in that Bill. I have had discussions with the other House Leaders, and I believe I have their agreement to maintain the procedure put in place earlier for the re-enactment process whereby the number of copies of Acts to be re-enacted is limited.

I believe there is agreement as well, Mr. Speaker, to waive Rule 84 such that it will be sufficient for me to table one certified copy of each by-law and agreement being validated by Bill 101, as opposed to appending copies of such by-laws and agreements to every copy of the Bill. I would at this moment await Your Honour's confirmation of unanimous consent for me to proceed in that way.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

An Honourable Member: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister could reiterate.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Justice, to reiterate his statements. The Honourable Minister.

Mr. McCrae: I will say it again, Mr. Speaker. I will start over.

I believe I have the agreement of the House to maintain the procedure put in place earlier for the re-enactment process whereby the number of copies of Acts to be re-enacted is limited. Here is where we require the agreement. I believe there is agreement to waive Rule No. 84 such that it will be sufficient for me to table one certified copy of each by-law and agreement being validated by Bill 101 as opposed to appending copies of such by-laws and agreements to every copy of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is it understood and is it agreed now? Agreed. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Mr. McCrae: At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the roll of statutes that are being re-enacted by Bill 101 and the certified copies of by-laws and agreements that are being validated by Bill 101. I might say it would be interesting to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) and all Honourable Members that we not only are not burdening everyone with a large pile of papers, but we are saving our forests. I think that is worth saying.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to begin my remarks at second reading of Bill 101, The Statute Re-enactment and By-law Validation (Municipal) Act. I know that all Honourable Members are familiar with the re-enactment

process in which we have been engaged since the 1985 order of the Supreme Court of Canada which declared Manitoba's laws to be invalid for failure to enact in English and French.

We have recently had the opportunity to discuss the matter in connection with our review of Bill 38, which Honourable Members will recall was given Royal Assent on December 22, 1989. That Bill re-enacted all Acts related to the City of Winnipeg. The Bill we have before us today completes the re-enactment of laws relating to municipalities outside Winnipeg.

The preparation of this Bill and Bill 38 involved a review of over 8,000 pages of material. The part of that review that results in this Bill was undertaken by staff of the Department of Rural Development in consultation with officials in municipalities around Manitoba, and Legislative Counsel.

Bill 101 re-enacts 21 Acts related to municipalities outside Winnipeg and has the further effect of validating by-laws and agreements which had previously been validated by statute. The by-laws and agreements tabled today were validated in the past by this Legislature and Section 4 of Bill 101 has the effect of ensuring that the validation already effected by the Legislature does not lose its effect on December 31, 1990.

I am sure Honourable Members would want to join me in thanking those people in municipalities around our province, those people in the Department of Rural Development and in the Legislative Counsel office, who worked many hours in the last two and a half years to ensure that Bill 101 could be presented to this House within the time frame prescribed by the Supreme Court of Canada.

* (1440)

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that Bill No. 101 has the following three effects: First, re-enacting in English and French all current laws related to municipalities outside Winnipeg that to date have been in English only; No. 2, repealing obsolete Acts related to those municipalities; and No. 3, validating by-laws and agreements of certain municipalities outside Winnipeg which had formally been validated by this Legislature. With that, I will commend Bill No. 101, The Statute Re-enactment and By-law Validation (Municipal) Act, to the attention and support of all Honourable Members.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain if this is the last in the series of re-enactment statutes. I see the Minister of Justice shaking his head, so I presume it is not. It is certainly part of the series, perhaps, I might guess, the third or fourth that we have addressed in this House in the last months.

It is with pleasure and some pride that I think we all see these statutes come forward and see that Manitoba is complying with the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada to deal with our legislative enactments in a responsible way, understanding that we have a commitment to French speaking people in this province, a commitment which we made, a commitment which

we were obviously reminded of by the Supreme Court of Canada decision, but a commitment which we have been willing to see through in this House and in this province. It has not been without pain. I do not think we should underestimate the hard feelings that were felt in this province as we made our way to becoming a more bilingual province, as was indeed our mandate and our constitution in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reflect on this occasion on some discussions which I happened to have last weekend with members of the Meech Lake Committee who came to Winnipeg to attempt to convince us in our Party that we should sign the Meech Lake Accord, because if we did not, we would be the authors of the demise of this country as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, I resent that threat; I resent the implied conclusion in that threat, that our position has somehow led even to the state we find ourselves in today. I think it is important to note that Sharon Carstairs, very soon after the Meech Lake Accord was signed—perhaps the day after—expressed reservations about it. She was but one lone voice in this country, as an elected politician, when she made that statement. We then saw her lead this Party to 21 seats in this Legislature in the last provincial election, and the day after that election she said in a press conference, Meech Lake was dead. She sent the message to Ottawa and to Quebec City and around this country that Meech Lake was in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, it was not too long after that the New Democratic Party agreed with Mrs. Carstairs and indicated they too would not see this Meech Lake Accord signed without some changes. They were equivocal at first with respect to what those changes were; they were not too sure. I think they came on board faster than they probably thought they wanted to, but in any event they were into the battle on the side of the Liberals in that debate. We welcomed the recognition that the Meech Lake Accord had serious flaws which had to be rectified before we could sign such a document.

Of course, shortly after that, we saw the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province make an about-face on that issue. Again, we welcomed his joining that side of this debate, but for illustrious persons from Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec City to come to this city and this province and tell us that we are at the 11th hour, and is it not terrible, and you must move because we are at the 11th hour; you have caused this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, it is hypocrisy in the extreme. We have now had almost two years since the last provincial election, in which 20 people came to this Legislature saying, we do not agree with Meech Lake. The Leader of the official Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), at that point, sent an unequivocal message that the Meech Lake Accord was in trouble. If they chose not to respond—if the Prime Minister of this country chose to sit on his hands and get to a stage now where he says it is the eleventh hour, the blame rests solely on him.

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, accept the statement that somehow the people of Manitoba, who have gone through the only real public participation in this debate

in the entire country, we cannot accept that that process, that decision taken by the people in this province is in any way responsible for coming to the eleventh hour.

Mr. Speaker, it was something I think which was extremely interesting to most of us who participated in those discussions on this weekend in dealing with some of those who would persuade us to sign the agreement as is, and that there is no other way. Let it be said that at least for my part in those discussions, the only people who were saying, any resolution is impossible, were those who came to visit us.

We do not say that a resolution to the impasse, which is looming on this country, is impossible. We do not say that. We say, let us meet. We say, let us talk again. We say that it is not too late to take the initiative, to try and reconcile the differences which appear to divide us. The word "impossible"—the tenor of the debate being despair is brought to us. It does not come from us.

I hearken back and I use this opportunity, albeit perhaps with some liberty on this Bill, to talk about French language services in this province and to talk about the commitment that we in Manitoba have made on this process of reconciliation with French-speaking people in this province, who indeed were the cofounders of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am tired of being painted by those who come to this province, or those who speak across this country, as someone who does not respect the French-speaking people in this country—anything but.

I knocked on doors in campaigns in the 1970s and got bruised knuckles and hurt feelings from people who slammed them in my face time and time again. Why—because our Leader of the Day took a position on bilingualism which was not too popular in western Canada.

Let me tell you, I can recall growing up in a small town in Saskatchewan and having a Liberal sign in our front yard which was torn down every night. Mr. Trudeau was not a popular man. He was respected, but he was not popular. (interjection) Well, yes, my colleague says unlike Mr. Mulroney, he is actually neither.

In any event, to have people tell me that I do not accept and desire the presence of French-speaking people in this country as a founding nation is a great insult to me and I believe to many, many Manitobans and western Canadians and Canadians in fact from Newfoundland now and New Brunswick and all over this country who have concerns about the Meech Lake Accord. We fought that battle and we fought a battle against great odds in this part of the country.

Mr. Speaker, we are now saying that vision of a nation we had, which was to protect the French fact, which was to deal with the two founding nations in a responsible way in a way that would keep Quebec within Confederation; that vision is being desecrated by Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Bourassa and those who would have us ascribe to the theory of two nations.

I can only repeat the statement which I believe binds certainly this caucus in the Legislature and I believe

many if not most Canadians who do not want to see the Meech Lake Accord go through as it stands, and that is this country is more than the sum of its parts. Truly we must recognize that, we must recognize that we need a coast to coast to coast Constitution in this country, which allows us to grow, develop, prosper and live together in harmony. The Meech Lake Accord does anything but.

Let us not take a quick fix for long-term pain, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Meech Lake Accord proponents offer us. They say it has got problems; we acknowledge it has serious problems, but we must sign it because we can do no better. I am not saying that. I think we can do better. Our Party thinks we can do better. I believe every Party in this Legislature thinks we can do better.

The people who are saying, we can do no better, we will never be able to revisit this magic moment of unanimity, who are those people, Mr. Speaker? Those are the people who would blackmail us into signing a document that we know is bad. Why, because we have to, they tell us. That reason is not good enough. I challenge those who say that they love this country, and that they want this country desperately to stay together. I challenge them to sit down, take the initiative, and let us work on a better deal. That has not happened. I greatly fear that it will not happen, given the present tenor of the Prime Minister's comments which are still largely threats. That is greatly disappointing to me.

* (1450)

I do not pretend that I would ever be a great fan of Mr. Mulroney. I certainly did not vote for him. I certainly will not in the next election, should he choose to run. Regardless of what political stripe he carries, he is the Prime Minister of this country, and I think that beyond being a Liberal, a Progressive Conservative or a New Democrat, the Prime Minister has a role to play and he has a role to play for all Canadians of all political stripes from all provinces. I do not see that being done. I think that truly saddens, not Liberals or New Democrats only, I think it saddens Conservatives, certainly in this province.

Obviously, the people across the way are disappointed, they made that clear. As well Conservatives from around this nation who see a vision of the country coming to the fore through the Prime Minister's actions, which does not coincide with theirs, and which they frankly feel it will lead to the demise of this country as we know it, a country that pioneered transfer payments.

There is no other country on earth that has devised the system of transfer payments and equalization coast to coast like Canada has. We can be truly proud of that. It is something we have built through national institutions like the railway, like CBC, like the many national institutions which link us and provide for equalization. That is a fundamental principle that we are supposed to be built upon.

The theory behind the threats, the theory behind an accord which isolates one and places it above the other, the theory is fallacious. It is not something we should

ascribe to. We cannot ascribe to it. We are being asked to take a short-term solution in the Meech Lake Accord to a present problem in Quebec, a present sense that these are necessary or there is going to be worse things down the future without considering the long-term loss, the long-term pain.

The message is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not, we will be nation wreckers. That is what they say. I went to school in the East for six years and heard that as we went through the French debate in this province. I am hearing it again and I am sick and tired of it. I heard it on the weekend and I became absolutely nauseous as I heard people tell us, in particular in this Party, who fought that fight during the '70s for bilingualism and minority rights, tell us that we do not accept obviously the need to accommodate French-speaking people in this country.

I know the Minister of Finance—in many respects the comments I am making, I believe in the present state of this Legislature are non-partisan, because we all had those meetings last weekend and we all agree that on this issue we cannot be blackmailed into signing an agreement which is fundamentally bad, both in the short-term and the long-term.

I believe that the reaction we are seeing in Ontario and now in Manitoba, outright discrimination against French-speaking people, I believe that those reactions are directly linked to the inaction of the Prime Minister. He is the one who will be held accountable for those decisions and for those reactions throughout this country and it deeply saddens me.

Let me go on to say that I believe this Bill shows us to have, in good faith, complied with the obligations laid upon us by the Supreme Court of Canada and by our Constitution. That is not something we can say about the Premier of Quebec, that he complied in good faith with the requirements set upon him by the Supreme Court of Canada. Patently he did not.

It is therefore with great pride that I look to this document as another in the line of accommodations which we are obliged—but speaking for myself, I am also very, very pleased to have complied with. I think it is essential in this province that we set an example for the rest of the country. This piece of legislation helps us on that road. The support of the Society Franco-Manitoban for our position on Meech Lake I believe strengthens our moral ground on this issue of Meech Lake.

As we go through the coming months let us not forget that we cannot allow the tyranny of the majority to rule in a democracy such as Canada. If we ascribe to the preservation of minority rights we must stand up, and as has been quoted many, many times, Mr. Speaker, all that it takes for wrong principles to prevail is for good people to remain silent. Let us not remain silent, let us take our case to the people of Manitoba. I believe our case is correct and will win the day. I believe it will win the day in every province, except perhaps Quebec. Even in Quebec I believe that there are those who see that it is essential to maintain a balance in this country between the English and the French while also accommodating those other linguistic groups and

cultural minorities which come into our fabric, enjoying the multicultural heritage which we have in this country.

Mr. Speaker, with that, let me say that I look forward to this particular Bill going forward as another in that series of Bills which we can look to with some pride in this province as meeting our commitments set upon us by the Supreme Court of Canada, not an easy struggle that we went through to get there, but we made it. We are working on the solution today. As we go to the Supreme Court again to learn what else we may have to translate, I believe it is extremely important, regardless of what the decisions are, to treat this debate for the seriousness that it has and to deal with the tensions and problems in this country in good faith and with a willingness to accommodate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Mr. McCrae: I would advise the House that I would propose this Bill be added to the list of Bills to be considered in the Law Amendments Committee on Thursday evening at 8 p.m. in Room 254.

Mr. Speaker: Agreeable? (Agreed) I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 100—THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation supplémentaire de crédits, the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) has 10 minutes remaining. Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Indeed it gives me pleasure to stand up here today to comment on Bill No. 100. In particular, what I would like to concentrate my speech on is what has occurred in the last couple of days in regard to Bill No. 42.

* (1500)

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 42 could have saved this province a lot of money in the long run and in the short run. This is the connection I feel that makes it very relevant to this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday during Question Period, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) stood up in this Chamber and made a commitment to withdraw Bill 42. Previously we had been suggesting both publicly, to the media, that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) was wanting Bill 42 to be proceeded with, that in fact it was the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues who were wanting Bill 42 to be stopped in its tracks.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we go back to September of last year, or actually we can go all the way back to

shortly after the last provincial election in the summer of '88, when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) stated at that time, and it was quoted in the Free Press, that the First Minister of the province was going to be putting any legislation regarding landlord and tenant affairs onto the back burner. The day after that occurred the official Opposition, the Liberal Party, came out very strong on the Government, condemning it for not taking faster action—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would remind the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) that the question before the House is Bill No. 100. The purpose of Bill 100 is to provide the following: supplementary funding to Agriculture; Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs; Natural Resources; Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures; Environmental Innovation Fund. This is what is set out in the schedule to the Bill, and therefore these are the areas on which debate should be focussed.

I would like to remind the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to keep his remarks relevant to that question. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, as you pointed out, it refers to also co-ops. Co-ops would have been affected by this particular legislation. This legislation does have an effect on the revenues and expenditures of this Government. Because the Bill has been halted in its tracks, I would suggest to you that in fact the relevancy regarding my comments on this Bill are in fact in order.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) suggests or would like to attempt at being Speaker also. The Minister of Finance should be well aware that I have already commented on Bill No. 99. This is a very recent -(interjection)- The Minister of Finance says that I have used my chance. I would beg to differ. I would suggest to him that this is an appropriate time to debate it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have reminded the Honourable Member for Inkster the purport of Bill No. 100, and I would ask the Honourable Member just to keep his remarks relevant to that question, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, let us bring it around in terms of what this Government is planning. We have seen phase 1. Now we are starting to see Phase 2, and what does phase 2 include? Phase 2 includes what the Premier (Mr. Filmon), what the First Minister, yesterday made a commitment to in this Chamber. Part of phase 2 which does affect this budget is that legislation, much-needed legislation, is and has been put on a screaming halt by this particular Government.

I would ask or would want to know why the Premier has seen fit to include this in his so-called phase 2 or hidden agenda? We have been very consistent in terms of what has been going on with this Government on a wide variety of different Bills that have implications into the budget, whether it is the co-op portion of the supplementary information or whatever it might be. Bill No. 42 does have an effect on co-op housing, and co-op housing is affected by this particular Bill.

We have suggested to the Government that we would be happy, more than happy, to co-operate in any manner possible in order to see this Bill proceeded with. The response that we have been given by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) has been somewhat positive. The problem has been from the Minister of Housing's Cabinet colleagues and mainly, I would suggest, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). It can be routed back to the summer of '88, when he made the comments that Bill No. 42 was in fact a low priority for this Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that the Minister pointed out when he had introduced in the news conference regarding this Bill. I want to go over some of it. It is included in his own press release. He commented that the legislation streamlines the process providing one comprehensive authority, the Residential Tenancy Commission, to handle disputes which are currently heard through a number of jurisdictions. That is a fair assessment in fact of what the Bill was attempting at doing. The cost ramifications and the monies that could have been saved, the whole question of backlogs and question of time and waiting lists and so forth could have been cut down dramatically. As it stands right now, it is extremely confusing for tenants and landlords in terms of the proper process that needs to be followed.

The Minister commented that disputes will initially go through a Residential Tenancy Branch of Manitoba Housing, where officers will investigate and attempt to mediate, or failing that will make an order. Again, what we are seeing here is a commitment from the Government to actually put some teeth in the legislation. Had the legislation been allowed to proceed, we would have had some teeth within the department.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will remind the Honourable Member for Inkster, and I will remind him for the last time, to keep his remarks relevant to the question before the House. I have told the Honourable Member for Inkster that Bill No. 42 has absolutely nothing to do with Bill—excuse me—that Bill No. 42 has absolutely nothing to do with Bill No. 100. The purpose of Bill No. 100 is to provide the following: supplementary funding to Agriculture for the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation and the education tax reduction programs for farmers; Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs; Natural Resources regional services; Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures; the Environmental Innovations Fund.

This is what is set out in the schedule to Bill No. 100, and I would ask the Honourable Member for Inkster, for the last time, to keep his remarks relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. Lamoureux: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will adhere to what your ruling is regarding this, even though I am very concerned about the Government and the direction that they are taking the province when it comes to our tenants.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on into education and to the remarks that the Member for Burrows (Mr. Chornopyski) had made yesterday in regard to the funding and the policy decisions and directions that

are taken by this Government, even though they do not like to admit to setting the policy, that in fact they prefer to suggest that it is not the Public Finance Board, but rather it is the school boards that make the policy decisions.

Mr. Speaker, we have had examples in which we have seen the Member for Burrows comment on a situation in his own riding, in which a school was shut down. This school was decidedly shut down by the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) through the Public Finance Board, at which time the school board themselves had decided that that was in fact a high priority in terms of its policy. They had submitted their five-year capital, their letter of intent, and so forth to the Minister. Yet, the Public Finance Board is the one that gives the money to ensure that the construction of this school could go ahead, thereby denying the funds to the board, cancelling any construction of that school.

The supplementary information, or Bill 100—the Minister looks somewhat confused and wonders why I am commenting on this. If we look at the supplementary Bill 100, you will see under Agriculture 10. Education Tax Reduction Program for Farmers. Does he not feel that is going to have an impact on the taxes in the City of Winnipeg, on the property taxes or taxes of this nature?

An Honourable Member: What are you talking about? Do you know what you are talking about? If you are just filibustering, sit down and pass the Bill, you do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the education is a priority. I take it very seriously. Obviously the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) does not. If he feels that I am not being relevant to the Bill, I would be more than happy to see him rise to his feet and say so. I believe that it is being relevant to the Bill, because we are talking about the financing of schools in the Province of Manitoba.—(interjection)—

* (1510)

The Minister of Finance is being awfully picky. If the Minister of Finance does not feel that what I am talking about is serious enough then he can feel free to leave the Chamber. He does not have to stay in here to listen to what I have to say. I am trying to say to the Minister of Finance that education is a very high concern and a high priority to myself and to the Liberal Party, and the ways and means of raising and spending the funds do give me a great deal of concern. If we look at Winnipeg No. 1, and—

POINT OF ORDER

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

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, given the fact that you have admonished the Member now on three occasions, and given the fact that he has tremendous leeway within the items presented within Bill 100, and given the fact that the

Member cannot seem to address one item here, I sense he is abusing the Rules and he is abusing your order to him. I suggest that he either find something that he can address within Schedule A, Bill 100, or else he sit down and he let somebody else speak to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point raised by the Honourable Acting Government House Leader, the Honourable Minister is quite correct. I have supplied the Honourable Member for Inkster with Schedule A, which points out exactly what the purpose of Bill 100 is. So I would ask the Honourable Member to keep his remarks relevant to those said departments in that Bill.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, Bill 100 does have an effect—or if we take a look at the forest fires in the Province of Manitoba, we will find that in fact many of the forests over the spring period were burned and consumed.

The Government has brought forward a Bill. I had perceived in speaking to this Bill as an issue in which I could raise several points that I personally feel are relevant. If the Government does not feel it is relevant, it is tough luck—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I am sure that the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) would not wish to reflect upon a decision of the Chair.—(interjection)—

Order, please. I will ask the Honourable Member for Inkster to keep his remarks relevant to the Bill and to put his remarks through the Chair. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, what type of impact will the forest fires have on the northern Manitobans and in fact Manitobans throughout the province? If we take a look at what has happened this year in terms of the number of trees that were burned and how those trees are going to be replaced and what the federal Government has given to the province in order to ensure that the forest fire problem was addressed, it is something that I am somewhat concerned about. We do not have the Government bringing forward, telling and ensuring us that something has been done to ensure that the forest industry in the Province of Manitoba will not suffer—or suffer minimally as a result of what happened over the summertime.

The environmental initiatives fund is something else that I have a great concern for. This particular fund, if we take a look at what my colleague from Springfield (Mr. Roch) introduced during Private Members' hour I believe it goes a long way in terms of a progressive step towards cleaning up our environment and adding to a fund as a solution to a serious problem in terms of having a clean environment. All of us can attest to the problems of litter and what the major component of that litter actually comes from.

During a northern tour that we had taken previously, January of last year, we found that there was a high concern with a number of containers that were dumped,

that were in the ditches and so forth in the north end of the province. That same argument can be brought forward not only up north, but also in the south end of the province and our urban centres and the City of Winnipeg.

Any step such as the one that the Member for Springfield has brought in and introduced into this Chamber should be proceeded with. I have to ask the question why this Government is so reluctant to tackle this particular Bill, why they do not feel it appropriate that a Bill of this nature will add to the Environmental Innovations Fund.

This is, as I pointed out, a very progressive step, a step in the right direction, that the Member for Springfield has brought forward, and I believe that this Government has not given it fair treatment, that this Government has not been standing up and putting their comments on the record. We have to wonder why not. Why is this Government not proceeding with progressive legislation that will enhance our environment at the same time, have a dramatic effect on the cleanliness of our rural areas, of the City of Winnipeg, in fact of all of our urban areas.

I am sure all of us have walked through parks or have driven down the highways, and we have seen what I am referring to. You see empty tin cans. If you have a deposit of sorts on it, you will find that there will be incentive for other organizations, voluntary organizations and so forth, to bring forward and collect these empty containers and so forth. That is one idea.

We can move on in terms of the whole question of recycling and what good a Bill such as the Member for Springfield's (Mr. Roch) would do for recycling in the Province of Manitoba. We can look at other options. If we look at the tire situation that has been going on in Ontario, and in search of solutions that can ensure that hazardous situations such as what we saw in Ontario are in fact limited to the largest degree as possible.

In watching The Journal, I saw an interview in which the president of a cement plant came up with a solution. I would have to ask if the Government, if this Government—we have tire dumps, we have thousands and thousands of tires piled together in one spot. What is this Government doing to ensure that the same type of a situation does not occur here?

* (1520)

We can look at what is not taking place from this Government or what this Government is not doing in terms of bold initiatives to ensure that hazardous situations, whether it is tire dumping, whether it is waste of some sort, whether it is the recycling of containers and so forth could do for the Province of Manitoba. One has to ask, what is this Government going to do with the fund, as the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) has pointed out.

Mr. Speaker, this fund could go a long way, or as the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) says, begin the process, because I guess we would require a considerable amount more to go a long way, but it is

a step, albeit somewhat small, but it is a step in which we can see the Government taking some action. What we really need to see is what type of action is the Government going to take. We have not seen that. We have not seen the Government issuing any types of Government policy, direction towards a much cleaner environment.

The Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) has often stood up to put forward questions and try to get the Government on record in terms of where they are going, what the Government is doing about our environment, to get some type of an idea of what they would do with the fund, but to no success. The Government time after time has kept their agenda to themselves. They have not been telling us what direction that they would like to go. They have not been telling us what phase 2 is all about. Is there some direction in phase 2 that maybe we should be aware of? The letter that was sent out from this Government attempting to raise funds, I believe really sets out what this Government is really up to.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from that letter. It goes, without a clear majority, the next and more difficult phase of the PC program to restore a much needed pro-business environment in Manitoba cannot be effectively implemented.

(Mrs. Gwen Charles, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Madam Acting Speaker, why is it when they send material out to Conservatives, out to their supporters, that they talk about a hidden agenda. Why is this Government not being honest and truthful with Manitobans in telling Manitobans what phase 2 is all about, what the hidden agenda is all about? Does the hidden agenda include the amendments such as the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) is proposing with his Bill regarding beverage containers? We do not know. The reason why we do not know is because the Government has no intention whatsoever to tell us what they would like to see, what direction they would like to go. I think that is a mistake. They were in Opposition for six of the last 20 years—I guess it would closer to 14-15 years of the last 20 years. I have to ask, what did they do while they were in Opposition? I am sure that they did not do anything. Did they caucus? Did they decide any policy? Did they know what they would do if they were ever given the opportunity to govern? I do not think so.

I do not think that the current Government had any idea on where they were going to go if they were ever given a Government, put into Government. They have shown this in their budgets. If you take a look at their first budget, it is virtually, from what we have been told and from what we understand, the same as the previous budget.

An Honourable Member: You voted against tax reductions. Anybody that would vote against tax reductions—

Mr. Lamoureux: And the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) says we voted against the tax breaks. That is not the case. The Minister should be well aware

that the Bill came in the Chamber and he can look up in votes and proceedings and find out exactly what we did do.

The Ministers seem to be convinced that what in fact we did was vote against tax breaks. Well I would suggest to them that if they read about the tax Bill and read about the votes, that they will find that that was not in fact the case. I can say that we did vote against the slush fund. It would have been nice if we would have not seen the slush fund, if we would have seen more money of what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) borrowed put into some of these funds.

If they felt that they had to borrow money, why did the Government not go ahead and increase an innovations fund to our environment? If they believed that the environment, if they are so serious about the environment, if they are so serious about Agriculture, and Co-operative and Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and Natural Resources, why did they not allocate more money there if they were going to be borrowing the money anyway? Why did they not do that?

You know, I am going to tell you why. The Government did not want to show a decline. The last thing they wanted to show was a surplus, because it was not the proper timing. So what did this Government do in its place? They borrowed \$150 million and they say we needed to borrow that \$150 million.

Well, Madam Acting Speaker, they did not need to borrow the money in order to fool Manitobans, because Manitobans are not going to be fooled. Manitobans know what reality is all about and they know that when you set aside a slush fund when you had an opportunity to take more bolder moves, to take new initiatives, to work towards our environment and so forth, why did they not do it? Those are the questions that are going to be put into the minds of many Manitobans. When they had an opportunity to do something other than create a slush fund, why did they not do it? Why did they feel it was their mandate to borrow money in order to create a fund? That is what I believe the hidden agenda is a part of. Phase 2, I believe, has nothing in terms of an Environmental Innovation Fund. It has nothing regarding our natural resources in agriculture as the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) has pointed out time after time as to how much of this budget is actually allocated out to agriculture. This is from a Government that represents how many rural ridings?

I think, Madam Acting Speaker, if we look at the record and we look at who is asking what questions and we go through the Estimates, you will find that it is the official Opposition that is more concerned about the rural area than the Government. It shows because the Government has the opportunity to do something about it, but they are not. When they had an opportunity, what did they choose to do? They chose, instead of showing a surplus or reallocating monies out, if they felt they had to borrow money, they could have reallocated, but instead of doing that they created a Tory slush fund to use at an ad hoc basis when they felt that they can use it to prop up this Government. Then to try and appease us, the Government said, well, we will only access it once a year.

Madam Acting Speaker, if the Government had not spent or decided to use or create that slush fund, they could have redirected some of that money into what we have before us today, but they did not choose to do that. I think that was a mistake. We have many initiatives that can be taken to improve our environment, to ensure that our farmers are protected against crop failures, to ensure that other things that are being taken care, to ensure that the forests in the North are being protected. That was an option that this Government had. That was an option that this Government gives thumbs down to, and they try to justify their thumbs down by saying, we need this fund in order to be able to guarantee stability in the long term for the province.

* (1530)

Madam Acting Speaker, I do not buy that argument. My colleagues do not buy that argument. The third Party in this Chamber buys the argument, but I do not believe Manitobans will buy that argument either. There are things that can be taken. I would encourage that his Government take a very serious look at some of the initiatives that we are proposing. If the Government does not know what they want to do, then listen to what we are having to do. The Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) has pointed out that they adopted our accountability policy when it comes to private school funding. Why do other Ministers not take the lead that the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) has given and start adopting some more of our policies? If they cannot generate, if they cannot create initiatives that are going to benefit the Province of Manitoba, then why do they not use some of the initiatives that we are willing to offer.

The Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) has offered a very legitimate initiative, an initiative that I believe the Member would not feel insulted if the Government took him up on it, an initiative that the Member for Springfield, I am sure, would be more than happy for this Government to take and embrace and actually proceed with it.

There are other things that can be done. If we take a look at other initiatives in regard to our environment—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): The Honourable Minister of Finance, on a point of order.

Mr. Manness: I just wanted to rise on a point of order and, say as a Member that has been in this House now for almost nine years, compliment the Member in some respect that he has been able to use up 40 minutes. But let me also say that in all that time I have never heard a more pathetic speech, and I have never heard a greater flaunting of a Speaker's ruling in all the time I have been here.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): The Honourable Minister does not have a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): Order, please. The Member for Inkster.

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Acting Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) obviously has not heard his own speeches, or has he read his own speeches? If he wants to talk about pathetic speeches, I would suggest to him and his colleagues that you read the remarks that you have put on Bill No. 4, if you want to talk about pathetic. If you do not have the courage to take initiatives as Government to ensure that we have a cleaner environment or to ensure that the farmers of this province can sleep better, then that is your problem, Mr. Minister.

In conclusion, Madam Acting Speaker, I would hope that this Government would treat issues of the province in a much more serious manner and take a deep, long look at themselves in terms of what they have actually accomplished while being in Government. It has not been much. They have shown that they have been able to do some things as a result of good luck, but we have not seen any signs whatsoever that this Government is able to do things with good management. We look forward to the day of seeing hopefully that this Government will be able to get its act together. On that note, thank you.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Madam Acting Speaker, I indeed welcome the opportunity to put my few words on the record with respect to this legislation as well. This is a follow-up from yesterday when we were talking about billions of dollars being allocated. This Bill only asks for some \$69.25 million. Indeed I think we can all agree that the vast majority of Manitobans in their lives will never see even a small fraction of that never mind that full amount.

So it is a serious piece of legislation before us, touching on several departments in this Government. For example, it touches on the Department of Natural Resources. I see the Minister taking an interest in my comments today on this aspect. I know that for the period of time pursuant to this legislation we have before us we had one of the greatest tragedies we have ever witnessed in the Province of Manitoba, a fire, a fire that swept many parts of this fair province of ours causing vast destruction to our natural heritage, to the personal property of many Manitobans.

It was indeed an occasion, a very sad occasion, that we had to watch repeatedly night after night for a number of weeks and months of the danger posed to life and limb, the danger posed to personal property, indeed the courage of the people who faced and fought these fires on our behalf and tried to restrict them, and all because, if I recall correctly, someone felt I guess that they were playing a prank and decided to light some of these fires.

I would like to ask, by leave of the House if I may, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) some questions about the allocation of \$49 million to his Regional Services section. If the House were to grant me leave I would like to pursue some questions, if the

Minister would be interested in responding to these questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): Is there leave of the House for the Minister to respond to some questions by the Member for Seven Oaks? Is there leave? I am sorry, there is no leave for the Member.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Madam Acting Speaker, on a point of order. If the Member wants to read questions into the record, the appropriate way for the Minister to answer in terms of debate would be in closing debate. That would be possible. I do not believe it is really a precedent we want to set of having questions during time for the debate stage on Bills.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): I thank the Member for his comments. The Member for Seven Oaks would continue on.

Mr. Minenko: On the same point of order to a certain degree, Madam Acting Speaker, if the Minister is certainly prepared to answer any questions, I am not sure why—

* (1540)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): Excuse me, there is no point of order. If the Member for Seven Oaks wishes to continue on—the Minister of Natural Resources, on a point of order.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): I just want to put it on the record that as an apostle of open Government I am always more than willing to answer questions legitimately put to me with respect to the expenditures of public funds. However, I do have to acknowledge that the House Leader from the New Democrats (Mr. Ashton) is correct. I thought we were in committee stage of the Bill—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): Excuse me, there is no point of order from the Minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Charles): Would the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) continue on with his comments on the Bill, please.

Mr. Minenko: Madam Acting Speaker, then I will perhaps take a later opportunity of discussing some of these matters. I am sure the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) will perhaps ask the Minister some questions at another time.

Indeed, Madam Acting Speaker, we were quite concerned when we saw the smoke, the fire, the hundreds and thousands of people fleeing the fire that affected such large portions of our fair province. It was quite concerning to all of us, because it is very much a part of our heritage. I certainly hope the Minister and

his various departments affected will indeed take on an aggressive policy of replanting and reforestation.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

When I was somewhat younger, Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity of participating in some planting of seedlings, and I know I have oftentimes read of—I am not sure whether it is federal or provincial programs that provide seedlings to various groups to participate in reseeding reforestation programs in various parts of the province. Indeed it would certainly contribute, and I can reflect on a small portion of this province that a number of the organizations in which I participated and was a member of, inherited from a gentleman, and this was one of the things that we indeed considered, and certainly if we would have indeed completed a project some 10 years ago, there would indeed be a healthy forest in the area that could be used and expanded on for recreational purposes and many other purposes.

When we look to this \$49 million expenditure, as I understand it, it is indeed directed toward expenditures arising as a result of the fire of last year. Indeed I think we need to congratulate the many people from the Emergency Measures Organization, of which the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) is the Minister responsible I understand, for their concerted effort in working together with volunteers and others on location to ensure that it was not a bigger tragedy than it was and than it could have been.

When we look further to the Environmental Innovations Fund that is touched on in this legislation, it brings to mind some of the efforts of this Government in the whole area of environment. The Honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) has indeed done an admirable job bringing to the attention of this Minister and this Government many of the concerns expressed to us and through us to the Member for Wolseley about some of the matters including a matter, a very important issue today.

The Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) dealt with a number of issues touching on the environment and the impact on her constituents, some of the problems that we have.

In some recent additions of the Saturday Night magazine, there was a very interesting article about the environmental efforts being accomplished in Costa Rica, I believe it is, which is one of the few countries around the world that has taken on a seemingly aggressive environmental stand in dealing with reserves of property that they are setting aside and their management techniques. I would certainly recommend that as reading for Members of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, when we look to the Environmental Innovations Fund, I understand that this fund is based on the deposits that presumably are attached to the cost of some of the bottles that are made available for people to purchase various products through.

Last week when I was cooling my heels in Toronto waiting for a visa to go overseas, I had the opportunity of spending some time with people in Toronto and

looked at the extensive use of the whole Blue Box Program in Toronto, where it seemed every home, certainly the few that I saw out of the many of tens or hundreds of thousands of homes in Toronto, had a Blue Box on their veranda, had a Blue Box that they would take out to the corner for pick-up, indeed, the efforts that many communities, even in Manitoba, are taking with respect to the recycling of various products.

An interesting program aired a few short weeks ago. I think it was one of Connie Chung's series, on various issues that they want to report on. They spent part of one of their programs dealing with a modern-day archeologist, a modern day archeologist who spent some time going through refuse dumps and boring through them to see what impact any efforts in the last several years have had on the issues of recycling of paper, of plastics, many other things like this. We often hear that it is believed in the public domain that we have increasing problems with increasing use of disposable diapers, the increase in plastics in our society.

Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things that this archeologist pointed out who studies modern society pointed out that one of the biggest problems is not necessarily plastics or diapers but is continuing to be paper. Paper is continuing to be the biggest problem. Apparently, from his discoveries he was able to show that plastics, although they seem to be increasingly becoming more popular in use, that in actual volume of plastic there has been, I guess, over a 15-year period of time, only a 1 percent increase in the amount found in various waste disposal sites. They speculated that perhaps it was the type of plastics being used that perhaps they are thinner, they are more resilient. As a result, as a volume percentage, they are not as predominant as people believe.

* (1550)

Still the problem was paper. Certainly, many of us here in our communities think that paper is indeed biodegradable, that if you throw it away it will fall apart in five or 10 years or less or whatever period of time it may be. What this archeologist found was when he dug further and hit a layer that was about 1973, he pulled out a newspaper—

An Honourable Member: That was a good year.

Mr. Minenko: —a New York Times. I am not sure what the Minister is saying, it was a good year. It was the NDP Government I believe in power at that time.

An Honourable Member: I take that back.

Mr. Minenko: Okay, there we go, you set the record straight here. There was a Liberal Government in Ottawa which makes it a good year. What he found was a New York Times issue from 1973, and when he opened it the only paper of the thick New York Times, the only paper that was maybe starting to become a little degradable was the outside cover that was folded over. When he opened the paper up, all the inside leaves were indeed almost as clean and clear as your today's newspaper is.

He was saying that he was constantly finding as part of his boring expeditions through refuse piles, old telephone books, that people threw away thinking they were biodegradable and end up in a refuse pile, but the problem is, they get piled over with other refuse and dirt. They are not exposed to air or any of the other natural means by which they could become biodegradable. He said that this was certainly—that there was for a 15-year period of time an increase from 23 percent total volume, I think it was in the mid-20s to the mid-35 percent, as the total volume of refuse in a refuse pile of paper.

The problem is that we believe it is plastic, but it is really paper. This has to be addressed by Governments in Canada, because the amount of paper that we use—and we certainly see the amount of paper that we get every day and I am sure the Ministers get even more. There has to be some process put in place in order that we can recycle as much paper as is possible.

I certainly believe that as quickly as possible there should be instituted in all Government offices some recycling program. Now you can collect all that paper. I believe this is a problem that they had encountered in Ontario, although recently I read that they have been able to keep up to the volume of paper. Apparently there is a problem of when you bundle it all up, where do you take it? What do we do with all this potentially recyclable paper? This is an issue that has to be addressed. Is this Government looking at means of putting in place an industry that would indeed recycle not only paper but plastics?

Mr. Speaker, just an interesting side point on this matter. During one of my visits to one of the industries in Manitoba that deal with plastics and manufacture many plastic items for our market here in Manitoba, for the rest of the Canadian market, indeed export not only in North America but outside, any of the product they find defective they automatically recycle. They have a special chipping machine that reduces pieces of plastic that they have manufactured. An item that they found defective, they automatically rechip it and reuse it. It goes back from, say a shaft of a hockey stick that was found to be defective, it is thrown in, and ends up about the size of a pencil lead and about a quarter inch long. Then they put that back in the process, melt it down and manufacture something else. I am sure that we can find many companies in our province who have that sort of system in place.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we need to have certainly aggressive Government action and some sort of plan; a plan of action to not only encourage the collection of recyclable products, but also to be able to put into place industries that could recycle them so we do not have to ship our bottles, plastics or paper out of the province and then have them come back perhaps in the form of paper. This is a problem that has to be addressed as well, the whole issue of value added.

How many jobs are we losing from the manufacturing sectors in the province to the service sector, and what then is the average income of someone from the manufacturing sector and someone from the service sector? I think that certainly Manitoba has been a leader in many areas of interest, and perhaps this is another

area that we could perhaps do a little bit more than we are doing. Certainly the Environmental Innovations Fund is a beginning aspect to it, and I certainly would like to see the Government's plan of action in this area.

One of the other issues that has certainly been on the news and before us on a daily basis for the last few weeks is the whole issue of tire recycling and the incredibly hazardous and detrimental effects of a tire fire that we have seen over the last few weeks in Ontario.

What kind of impact has that had? I am sure it will take many months if not years to actually study what impact it will have on people, on livestock, on ground water, on the soil and so on. I would certainly hope that this Government, through the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures people, would indeed have an action plan. So should unfortunately something like that happen in our province, we would be able to react as quickly as we can to deal with that particular problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am aware that—and I hope the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) will be in the avant-garde, leading this Government on to prepare for these types of eventualities and to deal with these problems in an effective, concrete and creative manner. When we look at what can be done with tires, there is a very innovative couple of people in Winnipeg's north end, who have been taking and recycling tires. They apparently have a process in place where they take a tire, they cut it down, and make mats. They make those rubber mats that we often see in, perhaps, import from outside this province.

Here are a few folks, in a very innovative part of this province, the north end of Winnipeg, which I am sure we can all agree, Mr. Speaker, and especially out of the St. John's High School, as well as other schools in the area, of developing many innovative people and people who have had an impact on many lives in the arts, in medicine and law, and many other fields. Here is a small company that found a way, a useful way, in dealing with this problem of changing and recycling. So we see, we do not necessarily have to find a whole process of melting those tires down so that we can then use whatever the goop that results from that meltdown result comes from, but that they are changing the structure of a tire into a rubber place mat that can be used.

I am sure all Members have seen those rubber mats when you go into some place, so -(interjection)- Well, I see the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) understands exactly what I am addressing here. Here is another group of innovative Manitobans who have seen a problem and are trying to address it. This is the kind of entrepreneurial spirit that we need in this province. This is, when yesterday I asked questions of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and questions of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism about the Business Start Program that indeed I was very concerned that these programs were not—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Rural Development, on a point of order.

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): I would like to bring to the attention of the Member speaking that the subject that he is addressing has already been addressed a number of years ago. The industries that he is talking about and recommending to the House—

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

Mr. Minenko: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the Minister's comments, because indeed these are the kind of people that we need to encourage, and provide a market and a system so that we can use what we have seemingly discarded in another way.

How many other products would certainly fit into that particular genre, into that aspect of, and could be addressed in the same way? This was—and that I was remarking before the Minister's comments, which he knew full well was not necessarily a point of order, but again I thank him for his advice—was the whole problem with the Business Start Program, where successful program is being operated and run in Ontario, yet it is taking some 10 months to get this program off the ground.

* (1600)

I have had indeed, Mr. Speaker, many calls from people who have said, Mark, I called the first week in January and asked when the application forms would be ready. They said, in two weeks. I called in two weeks and a couple of days, asked the same question; they told me, call in another two weeks. They gave them another three weeks. They figured, okay well just in case, we will give them that extra week. They called again and they find that again we did not have those applications for them.

I think it needs repeating to this Government, because obviously they have not taken any action. When it took so many months to introduce the legislation, get this business program into place, what was going on? Were they caught in that rut that Jean Chretien mentioned a few short weeks ago when he was in Winnipeg, about a car spinning their wheels, going forward, going back, going forward, going back; presumably after a period of time the car will rock itself out of the rut.

Has this Government gone that far? Have they gotten themselves out of that rut? I would suggest and submit that the Government, with respect to these programs that many entrepreneurs are looking for and waiting for, have not gotten themselves out of their rut. You sometimes have to wonder why, when they talked about management and how good managers they would be. This was just one small aspect of seeing the meaning of this Government's program.

When we look to this legislation we have before us, which is granting the Government over \$69 million to do exactly that, we see that it covers a number of various important aspects for Manitobans. Again I

Wednesday, March 7, 1990

certainly call on the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) to get into place, let us see what they are going to be doing with this Environmental Innovations Fund. Let us see some concrete actions, because again people are indeed waiting for this important program to be put into place.

In conclusion, I would like to say that although many things have appeared before us on paper, in black and white, I think we have to look a little further and Manitobans have to look a little deeper as to what exactly, what kind of Government we are indeed facing here. Will they indeed put something down on paper and let it tail off and simply let it blow away in the wind, or as that tumbleweed that many poets and many writers wrote about in English literature and Ukrainian literature, just blow away across the fields?

I would certainly ask the Government and suggest to the Government that they begin taking aggressive action to implement many of the programs that Manitobans have been looking forward to, that Manitobans need, and are being delayed. I certainly hope that when this phase 2 of their program, that is sometimes referred to as the hidden agenda, that they indeed reveal that as soon as possible so that Manitobans have an opportunity to reflect and deal with that.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): I just want to put a few comments on the record regarding Bill No. 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Act. I notice that the Government tends to be somewhat concerned about adhering to relevance here, but I think there is an opportunity to make a few comments as it relates to agriculture in this particular set of supplementary appropriations.

I notice that the first one off the top is the requirement of a million dollars for the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation. I have mentioned before that I do have some concerns as it relates to the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation. We are now in the midst of what appears to be a decision being made federally where the Crop Insurance Corporation will be required to cover 25 percent of the total cost of crop insurance in this province.

This is a deviation from what we were looking at before, because it used to be that the federal Government paid 50 percent of the premiums, the farmers paid 50 percent of the premium, and the provincial share was simply covering the cost of administration. Now we have moved into a situation where the province is going to have to cover a full 25 percent of the cost including the administration and the premium. The farmer is still going to have to cover his 50 percent and the federal Government will cover the remaining 25 percent, so we once again are faced with the offloading that is typical of what the federal Government has been doing to Manitoba and to the other western provinces in the last couple of budgets.

I also think that it is important to look at some other aspects of the Crop Insurance Corporation, and that relates primarily to the necessity of trying to give better coverage as we move into what I think is essential, and

that is a move towards crop diversification. At the present time, as I have indicated before, I think the crop insurance coverage that is available for the so-called traditional crops is reasonably good, but when we move into some of the more specialized crops I think there is a need for far more thought into the type of coverage that is required and the monitoring that is necessary in order to provide the type of reimbursement for crop loss that is necessary.

What the Crop Insurance Corporation is facing in many cases is a lack of adequate data or a data base in order to be able to calculate the type of reimbursement that is required. In other words, they just do not have the historical background to be able to make the decisions as to the level of support that is required. In addition to that, of course, a lot more work needs to be done on a couple of the other side issues within the Crop Insurance Corporation, particularly the Livestock Feed Security Program which has been called upon very extensively in the last couple of years because of the drought.

Looking at the situation in southern Manitoba at the present time, one has to assume that there is going to be tremendous call on the Livestock Feed Security component of the Crop Insurance Program again. Regardless of what happens in the short term, we are certainly going to be faced with very poor pastures and in all probability relatively low forage yields in 1990, because being perennial crops in many cases that have suffered severe drought for two or three consecutive years, it does not matter even if it starts to snow or rain immediately, the damage has already been done to many of those forage crops. They are going to have to have almost a miracle in order for those to revert back to what might be regarded as average or typical production in 1990.

Therefore, I am pleased to see that there is additional support coming into crop insurance, but I am a little surprised at the amount, because I doubt very much whether that sort of an infusion will be adequate. Now I realize that we are looking at the '89-90 year as opposed to the upcoming one, but I would suspect that perhaps there needs to be some serious thought given to the appropriation that is necessary for crop insurance in the upcoming year as well as looking at the inadequacies of the past.

The Crop Insurance Corporation certainly also needs a lot of promotion, because another area of concern, Mr. Speaker, is that while the federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Mazankowski, is setting up task forces of all types. One of those task forces is to look at the so-called safety nets, but those safety nets that he is looking at certainly will not be in place for the fall of 1990. Therefore, I think it is essential that promotion be conducted by the Manitoba Crop Insurance, by the various organizations that speak for agriculture.

I think for all of us who think that we have a reasonable understanding of the agricultural economy in this province, it is imperative that we do our part in promoting crop insurance as one of the only reliable safety nets that will be in place for the upcoming crop year. Here again I would think that this million dollars that is identified within the Supplementary Appropriation

probably is going to be very quickly utilized in terms of satisfying the outstanding accounts that they are obviously looking at now, and the necessity of providing the type of promotion, perhaps the additional staff that is going to be required to handle the level of business that I would assume would take place this coming spring, and therefore one finds it very difficult to be critical of this additional expenditure specifically for the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation.

Some other areas under Agriculture that I think should be looked at, and I am a little concerned that they are not being adequately addressed in this appropriation, and that is the whole issue of the ERDA agreements. The ERDA agreements, of course, have for the most part already expired.

* (1610)

I am going to speak specifically of the one that is the Agri-Food subagreement which amounted to \$38.5 million which expired as of the 31st of March 1989. Current operations under that Agri-Food Agreement are on the basis of money that was not spent during the five-year period, and all expenditures under the Agri-Food Agreement will terminate as of the 31st of December of this year. There is no indication anywhere that I have seen of any likelihood of an Agri-Food ERDA Agreement being signed between this Government and the federal Government beginning in 1990 or even early in 1991.

I would think that some of the projects that have been entertained under that Agri-Food ERDA Agreement are the type of things that we cannot afford to see disappear. I speak specifically of one that I have a very close association with and one that I understand very well, and that is the Varietal Testing Program that has been conducted in this province many years. I cannot even recollect when it first started, but it is a Varietal Testing Program that has gone on in this province since almost the inception of agriculture. It is the Varietal Testing Program that is required in order to make the recommendations that go out in the field crop recommendation booklet every spring to farmers.

I want to impress upon Members opposite who are concerned with the agricultural economy of this province, that testing program is in its final year. I would like to make that point clear to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) because I am not sure that he is familiar with this, but that program is conducted at some 19 locations in this province, tests all of the cereals, oil seeds and special crops. That program, unless there is new funding found for it, is in its final year, so that in 1991 those tests will not be conducted. It is conceivable, unless something is done, that in the year 1992 the field crop recommendation booklets would not be provided through the Queen's Printer because they would have no data to base the recommendations on.

So while I have some reluctance to speak at length on this, because I am intimately involved in that particular program, I think it is imperative that this be brought to the attention of the Government so they take a look at how they are going to deal with that.

In part of that program as well is a forage testing program which is conducted at St. Claude and at Arborg. That is the same program, and it is in its final year of testing as well.

A third component deals with the horticultural crops, and likewise it is in its final year.

So this is an area that I think is urgent. I am disappointed that it is not identified in the appropriations, because I think it is certainly one of those that should have been on a high priority list in order to guarantee this continuity.

I would hope that there are negotiations going on toward that end, but at the moment it would appear that the traditional ERDAs, which are now coming through the Western Diversification Fund, are not addressing that particular issue. For some reason, which I cannot comprehend, agriculture does not seem to be high on the priority list as far as replacements of the ERDA programs which have either lapsed or are in the near future going to elapse.

The appropriations indicate \$700,000 for the Education Tax Reduction Program, and of course with the changes that have been made in the Assessment Act this would be the last time I assume that this type of an expenditure would be identified because it would be handled in a different manner.

I also have some concerns when I look down the list here and see the large amount of money that is in the supplementary appropriation for the Regional Services under Natural Resources. I have to assume that a lot of that is attributed to the forest fires.

Here again I would hope that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) is looking at a situation where we can in fact meet what he has identified as his aim and his objective in terms of reforestation. It would seem to me that this reforestation program is one that should be looked at as another means of diversification within this province.

For many years, we have relied very heavily on the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act facility out of Indian Head to provide these seedlings for many of the shelter belts and the programs in this province.

I know that we do have the nursery at Hadashville, but I think it is time that we looked at a much more ambitious program as far as the establishment of farms and facilities specifically for the production of seedlings that would be available not only for reforestation but for shelter belts and for wood lots. I think there is lots of room for one to allow your imagination to spread a little bit here in thinking of terms of how a much more greater expansion in the production of silviculture in this province could be supported. I think that it is a growth area. It is one that I think we should be looking at very, very seriously.

I am pleased to note that in some of the discussions and some of the information that is coming out under the \$11.6 million that has been identified for soil and water conservation that projects such as shelter belts and so on are being considered, but at the same time I think there is room for considerable expansion in that area.

Moving on to the area of flood control and emergency expenditures, I am a little surprised, Mr. Speaker, that we are not seeing further requirements for the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) and the Water Services Board. Once again, while I would hope it is not necessary to repeat this, I think we have to start becoming very, very concerned with the water situation in southern Manitoba for the spring of 1990.

It is a beautiful day out there today. The forecast for the next few days again is beautiful, but unfortunately that is not the type of weather we need at this time. I would be far happier if we had a forecast that was indicating that we were going to have a repeat of the storm that I think took place on March 5 and March 6 a few years ago.—(interjection)— My colleague from the Interlake says, rain. I am not sure that I would like to see a lot of rain in March. I think a good snow at this time with lots of rain in April and May and on into the growing season would be ideal. While we hope for the best, I think we have to plan for the worst. I would anticipate and hope that there are serious plans going on through the Water Services Branch in co-operation with PFRA, looking at all possible measures in order to overcome what might be a very serious situation as far as water services and water supplies are concerned in southern Manitoba in 1990. At the moment, south of Highway No. 1 it looks as though we are in for a very serious potential drought situation again.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I feel that one cannot argue too strenuously with the requirement for some of these supplementary appropriations here. Obviously the one relating to the forest fires, which is the biggest one, one can only hope that we are not faced with something similar to that again. I think one has to hope that we are not only looking at what might be referred to as the emergency measures that can be taken on when the catastrophe occurs, but also looking at the preventative measures, and in this case the measures that are required to provide the type of reclamation that will hopefully reverse the situation and bring us back to a situation where we are not looking at the devastation that has occurred this past year indefinitely, in other words, try to recoup as fast as we can by reforestation and by hoping that we can turn this into an opportunity in terms of expanding the silviculture in this province, looking at the expansion of nurseries and moving towards greater reforestation, hopefully bringing into being some of these facilities in areas where labour is—because it could be a relatively labour-intensive type of thing, and hopefully it could move into the areas where we are suffering from extensive unemployment.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to make a few comments on Bill No. 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Bill.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I rise this afternoon to speak on Bill No. 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1989. What was that grumble I heard off the front bench about I was the only one pleased about my standing here? My goodness, yes, I heard the comment from the Honourable Highways Minister (Mr. Albert Driedger).

Mr. Speaker, here we are almost at the end of the fiscal year having a debate like this. Does that not say

something for the fiscal mismanagement of the Government of this province by the provincial Tories? If this Government had called the House back in Session when it should have in mid-March last year, we would have been up front with this stuff and it would have been done by early fall. There is part of the problem.

* (1620)

They did not have their legislative agenda together in 1989, Mr. Speaker. That is why we had the delay on this Bill and that is why we are speaking on it here in March of 1990 in the last month of the fiscal year. This is really something. Why is it that the Conservatives could not call the House together when it was offered as a convenient time that it could have been by the Opposition Parties? Early mid-March was quite reasonable in 1989, but instead, because their direction was not set, because their legislative agenda was not prepared, we did not come together until the third week of May and then we had a mini-Session of only six weeks and we barely started the Estimates process leading to this very Act before us today.

That says there was no push on by this Government. This Government was prepared to look at interim spending approvals instead of having a normal approval process of budgets, Estimates, concurrence and the like. That says that, I think, they were not fast off the mark. I do not think they knew where they were going, and it seems crazy that we have approved virtually all the budget in an interim fashion.

We have before us here today some very interesting items, Agriculture; Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs; Natural Resources; Flight Control and Emergency Expenditures; and oh, yes, the Environmental Innovations Fund, that fund that was set up out of the last throne speech of which we see nothing happening. We are all paying into that fund, I must say. We are getting very little benefit, and the little benefit we have, the stories I hear is that we will see monies going not to innovations but to the same sort of solutions, the old tried and true solutions for the environment as opposed to trying anything new. I cannot for the life of me understand why that fund, sitting at a half million dollars, other than for the few cases that I have mentioned or the few sorts of things I mentioned, has not had expenditures taken out of it. Have we got another slush fund being built up here? Albeit it is a small one, but is it another slush fund? Why have no expenditures come forward?

My goodness, we have the Manitoba Environmental Network who has not received any funding from the Minister of the Environment. He suggested, when pressed three times on the matter, that he was instead going to see if there could be some contracting grants developed for the network, and that is not what they asked for. They asked for base funding. He suggested that this would be quite an adequate solution. He said so in fact in a couple of public speaking meetings. When I went back to the Manitoba Environmental Network and asked them, well, did you put in for some contract work to get some money from the Government? They said, no, we never even introduced the subject, let alone made an application. I said, well, is that not interesting?

I guess that puts meat to the fact that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) has not been able to obtain grants from his Cabinet colleagues because when a grant over \$5,000 in a department has to go before a committee of Cabinet it would appear that the Environment Minister and the Deputy Premier of this province does not have enough clout and cannot get the \$38,000 to \$43,000 that has been talked about to keep the Manitoba Environmental Network afloat. I might add, the Manitoba Environmental Network is the umbrella group of the nearly 100 environmental organizations that exist within this province. They have a very serious funding situation to the point they are either going to cut back drastically on their operations and go back to operating out of somebody's home on an extra phone line, or even potentially cease operations as a recognized entity in its entirety.

This is the same Minister that is involved in the round table nationally, in the round table provincially, who is the Deputy Premier and who cannot get any base funding established for this organization. I think the Environmental Innovations Fund would be a source to tap for that group. I think it would be rather innovative, quite frankly, of the Government to say, well, we will not take it out of normal funding sources, we will take it out of this new fund, a fund built up by the way by you and I paying a little surcharge on our purchases of alcohol. - (interjection)- What was that I just heard from the rear bench there? Was that the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns)?

In any case, I will continue. I think the Manitoba Environmental Network deserves that sort of consideration and should be considered for funding from the Environmental Innovations Fund, but I think quite frankly, after the sort of comments I heard from our Environment Minister during the Estimates process when questioned on his philosophy and his understanding of and toward the environment, I was rather taken aback to find out that the Member for Ste. Rose considers or views the environmental movement in a very, very cynical fashion. In fact, he had some rather unkind words that he put on the record about the environmental movement and some of the people involved in it and the fact that they were not sincerely concerned with the environment and they were there to make money off of the environment, and that was really their motivation.

I do not think that speaks very well for the chief environmental officer of Manitoba, but given the fiasco we have just seen where almost a million litres of raw sewage has been pumped into the Assiniboine in a low flow ice-covered time, and that is said to be the answer, why did you not look at other solutions? Well, that is the way we have done it before and it was too costly to collect this sewage and then transport it to three miles away to two possible locations where it could have been dumped in Charleswood. You know in passing in the hall, the Deputy Minister of Environment when confronted, I said, this is a crazy solution you people have here, and all I got was a shrug of the shoulders and the comment, well, at least the Government Services Department made application this time before they dumped the sewage. Well, that sort of lackadaisical, cavalier, insensitive attitude towards the environment

is what is going to cost this Government and cost it severely at the polls.

I am hoping we are going to finally see some direction, some guidelines on how the Environmental Innovations Fund is to be spent. It is certainly not a case that we do not need some incentives for people to become more environmentally sensitive and to look after the environment. There are many ideas out there that need to be developed, that need to be applied and used in Manitoba. I think this is a great opportunity to take and use that money, but why is it sitting there? Why has it not been consumed?

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it has not been consumed because this Government is holding it in reserve for a bag of sweeteners for use in the next provincial election, and instead of the money consumed in this fiscal year when it should, we will see it in an impending election. Then there will all of a sudden be the untying of the purse strings on the Environmental Innovations Fund, and that is when the money will come forward. Meanwhile, they are going to let groups like the Manitoba Environmental Network starve. Well, that is not satisfactory.

We have before us also appropriations of some \$17,400,000 for the flood control and emergency expenditures organization. I am very pleased to see that. I am going to be looking forward, however, for the post facto evaluation of how the emergency measures were carried out in the time of our forest fires, Mr. Speaker, because I for one have a lot of questions of how Manitoba conducted itself during that serious emergency. I have questions as to why did it take three weeks to get equipment, materials and aircraft from other provinces when the National Co-ordinating Centre for Forest Fire Control is right here in Winnipeg? Why did it take three weeks to get those aircraft here when those aircraft were not being used in those other provinces?

We have had a lot of slapping of back and self-congratulatory messages from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Albert Driedger) and others on the Government benches. I would suggest there is all together too much self-satisfaction by that Government on how they handled that emergency.

There was little listening to local Governments, people that have had experience in dealing with forest fire contacts in local areas, whether it was in small towns in the North or whether it was on Indian reserves. I think in both cases there was an opportunity to do some listening and do some learning from those local officials and local firefighters on how best to handle the situation. What we saw instead was a very tightly knit centralized control with little local sensitivity and little reaction to the needs in those areas.

We had the case where the Government was very proud of having saved homes from burning and I think that was good, but after days and days when the homes were no longer in danger, why were those forest firefighting forces not put into the breach to try and save some of the forest itself, which was needed quite frankly as a home for the fur-bearing animals that

Wednesday, March 7, 1990

trappers require, that allowed the fire to continue burning and to damage the water resources in the area and that burnt commercially viable forest that was available for harvesting.

I think there are a lot of questions out there and I for one would not be one that would be offering congratulations until we see a thorough review of how that emergency was handled and it is put forward for public scrutiny and pulled apart and come up to a final conclusion as just how well was the forest fire situation handled in Manitoba in 1989. I do not think it will come out as all plaudits.

* (1630)

We see here as well, an item also from Natural Resources which is the regional services aspect of that department, I would say a very old and established department and a department that probably should have a very thorough review of how it is organized, structured, how it carries out its mandate. I would suggest that it is more than timely to consider using some of the expenditures in this area for a review of the roles, objectives, policies and standards of that organization to see if Natural Resources really is delivering the service that it should be to the people of Manitoba, given the mandate that we all think it has.

I think it is time for a review, and when organizations as old and as established as Natural Resources do not get periodic reviews you end up with a lot of lethargy, you end up with a lot of programs in place that have not been modernized, you end up with people not performing in the way that they should. I see nothing in this budget in line items anywhere that indicates an effort on the part of this Government to make Government more modern, to make Government more efficient.

It was underlined, I might add to the Chamber, only last night, when we were reviewing Bill 61 which is one of the City of Winnipeg amendment Acts, and in it we were talking about the city auditor. All throughout it all it talked about was the financial auditing which is obviously something that has to be done and done well. But I can recall some 15 months back the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), when we dealt with the first of the City of Winnipeg amendment Acts, said that he would be bringing forward in a later statute, a total reinforcement of the city auditor's role. I looked as hard as I could and I could not find anything in there that would really say they were looking at that broader, broader view of the city auditor's thing.

I think it is really significant because we have a parallel here between nothing happening in Natural Resources, or any of the other departments, and we see the same thing in the review of the legislation governing our largest urban centre.

I talked about the thing as not whether you are getting the best bang for your buck, but are the policies and standards of the organization being followed? Are the civil servants doing what it is that they are mandated to do? Are they doing it in the most efficient way possible?

In most large public service organizations, operational auditing is as important as financial auditing. We do

not see that in The City of Winnipeg Act amendments, and we certainly do not see it here in any of the line items of any of these departments saying there is a Government initiative to try and make this public service a modern, efficient, and effective public service. What we have here is that same lack of direction, that same lack of understanding about what modern public administration is in fact.

I think the Conservatives are wearing out their trousers on the seat because that is what they are flying by is the seat of those trousers, and they do not have a direction as to where they are really going.

We have also a small \$650,000 item for the Corporate Affairs unit of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It sort of gives opportunity to mention the fact that we have a Bill, Bill 64 unfair Business Practices Act, of which there are some very serious questions as to whether the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) should ever have presented that Bill.

We have the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and we have the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, we have private individuals, we have had all sorts of people running small and large companies in this province saying, what the heck is going on in Bill 64? Why are you bringing forward draconian legislation of this nature? Yes, deal with unfair business practices, but why are you doing this? I for one do not know why they are doing it at all.

I guess it says, the point that I made a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, the fact of not having an adequate legislative agenda. This provincial Government loves to say what good managers they are and how well they look after the funds of this province. I would have to say, balderdash. That is not the case at all. We have seen that they do not know what public administration is. They do not know what it is to run a modern Government. They do not know how to set direction from on high to make sure that it is carried out. They do not know how to make their administration more efficient so that they have more dollars to stretch to carry out other programs that do have to be carried out.

They also do not know how to set priorities. They do not know how to rank order things. Priority setting almost seems to be not in their vocabulary, not in their vocabulary.- (interjection)- I am hearing a little bit of noise from the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), and I guess maybe we are hitting a few raw nerves here. It is causing a few rumbles here. It is causing a few rumbles on the Government benches, but that is quite all right, it might stir them into a little action. For goodness sakes, we certainly need it. I have never, ever seen a Government that is just NATO oriented, that is, no action, talk only, as this one.

An Honourable Member: Never.

Mr. Taylor: Never.

An Honourable Member: And you have been around a long time.

Mr. Taylor: That is right. In any case I will continue.

We have seen no innovation in Consumer Affairs from this administration. We have seen even less in Corporate Affairs, Mr. Speaker. When it comes to Corporate Affairs this Government is so laissez-faire that it is absolutely pathetic.

It seems to be that everybody including businessmen will be so thankful that there is a Conservative administration in place that great and wondrous things will begin to happen on their own. Well I hate to tell you, the real world does not operate like that. Not everybody is so thankful that there is a Conservative administration in place.

I had hoped, given some of the lack of initiatives on the part of the previous administration in the area of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, in which we had a lot of speech making and rhetoric, that we would have by now, almost two years into their term, seen something come out of this Government in this general area. We have instead only seen a Bill, Bill 63, that has some problems, and Bill 64 which should not be before us. It does not show that a legislative agenda was available when the Government took over or we would not have seen such a very slow start.

In fact the legislation we saw in the fall of 1988 was almost totally housekeeping legislation that had no significant impact at all. It was not until the following fall, the fall of '89, when one saw anything at all coming forward. That does not say much for preparedness. It does not say much for preparedness at all. So it is with disappointment that I comment on this item from the Department of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The other items here I am sure have been spoken to. The Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation has been spoken to by our Agricultural Critic and ditto on the item of the Education Tax Reduction Program for farmers, a million dollars for the first one, and \$700,000 for the latter.

We are well aware that the crop insurance situation in this province is not what it should be, that the number of farmers buying into the crop insurance scheme is only a little over 50 percent I believe—some 53 percent I recall the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) mentioning one day in the House. That is a pretty low rate of participation for something that is as significant as crop insurance, particularly in a time of drought.

* (1640)

It would appear that saying is that there are a lot of farmers out there for some reason are taking enormous risk and are in the position of potentially, with another drought year staring us in the face, losing all. I find that very unfortunate. We see a Government here, going through the motions of governing but not showing the leadership that I think is required to make Manitoba a better place to live and to make Manitoba a leader in ideas in Government in Canada.

I do not think you have to re-invent the wheel. I do not think a small jurisdiction such as ours has to always be the one that would come up with the ideas. I think

there is nothing wrong with taking from other jurisdictions. In fact, I have advocated that many times.

We see neither the borrowing from other jurisdictions and the adapting to our context here and making better those ideas from elsewhere, and we do not see any new ideas coming up. All we see is a lot of talk. We hear the ads on the radio now prepared and paid for by the Conservative Party of Manitoba. I have to say, my gosh, what hogwash we are hearing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a strange situation when we are dealing with the end of the fiscal '89-90, which is March 31, '90, and here it is, the 7th of March, and we are still dealing with interim supply of one form or another in The Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1989, Bill 100. It really says this Government does not have the reins of power firmly in their hands.

That is unfortunate, but I think the Tories over the last two years have had a good try at it. I think possibly soon enough the public will be able to judge as to whether they are satisfied with the performance to date, if one judges by the performance of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) who sets a spectacle of bringing forward legislation totally inappropriate, ill-prepared, that quite frankly should never have seen the light of day until it was properly prepared. We see a Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) who creates a slush fund and then walks out of a standing committee of this House, which now is being dealt with at the Committee of Elections and Privileges. We have a Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) who is so soft on the environment that it is a joke. The NDP brought forward the new Environment Act for Manitoba, albeit with loopholes and albeit that it did not go far enough, but at least they had the political will to go that far.

This Minister takes that same Act, makes a couple of minor changes to it, does not plug the loopholes and does not enforce the provisions of the Act. We have seen that at the oil spill up at Conawapa. We have seen it with The Forks development right here in the City of Winnipeg, and then we see him operating within the law and making a very poor decision about allowing the dumping of almost a million litres of raw sewage into the Assiniboine River just last week. You look at that and you look at the other so-called Environment Acts that the Tories have brought forward, and you say what are they doing? I guess the answer is very, very little.

We see before us a litany of environmental projects that have not been handled well. We can talk about Island Falls up in the northwestern part of the province in which there is a lapsed water licence there, something that should be of concern to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) and the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey). What do they do about it? Nothing. They call a meeting. They do not ask Saskatchewan to get in line about the Island Falls dam 40 miles upstream. They just let it go on and on. They do not intervene with the federal Government and say if they are going to replace that Island Falls dam there better be a federal environmental assessment review process put in place. No, they do not do that.

They do not give us protection on Shoal Lake with the water supply of the City of Winnipeg. They come

up with a solution for a water supply problem in the Gladstone-Plumas area by saying this is the solution now, we will do the cost benefit analysis to justify it, instead of doing a cost benefit analysis of a range of solutions which would make some sense. That is the way we have the Tories operating, as lip-service environmentalists.

When they do apply, when they apply, and that is not very often, the environmental impact process, they do it not at the planning stage. They do not do that, no. They do it instead at the approval stage of the project when expectations have been raised, when the issues have become controversial and in which there is a big political price to be paid.

I think there is going to be a big political price to be paid, and there is going to be Tory blue blood on the ground when it is all over. People are not prepared to accept the flagrant and wanton destruction of their environment any longer. So it is with sadness that I see this sort of thing going on.

The fact of the matter is that we see this sort of dereliction of duty and lack of leadership in just about any one of the front bench or Cabinet Member positions if one cares to go into it in some detail. We have seen a case where the Natural Resources Minister and the Environment Minister previously were replaced because of the way they conducted themselves and the way that their portfolios were not looked after. That is sad for this province, very sad.

I am not sure that we are seeing much better action now other than possibly there are two possibly more skilled politicians occupying those portfolios, but I do not think the action is any greater. In fact, I would say it is just about the same old inaction that we have had for some time now.

We have had Manitoba raked over the coals by the federal Tories. We have seen cuts of bases. We have seen chopping back within the civilian departments of the federal Government. We have seen the ERDAs absolutely gutted. We have seen the Western Diversification Fund cease to be a granting program into becoming a loan program. We have seen transfer payments cut. Where does it all end?

The federal Tories are completely backing off on the federal presence in this province, a have-not province of Canada. I think that is absolutely unacceptable. Whether it is the issues that I have mentioned or the chopping back of activities at Churchill, the gross reduction in VIA Rail services and servicing in Manitoba, it does not matter what it is. It is one thing after another, and we do not see this Government jumping into the breach. We do not see it happening at all. Most unfortunate, most predictable, however, and it goes on and on.

We see one area of concern after another not being spoken to. We see the flip-flop on Meech Lake. We see the coziness with Saskatchewan on so many issues to the detriment of this province, the lack of action on the part of this province with Ontario.-(interjection)-

Well, I am pleased to see that the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) wants to see a little more fire and

brimstone in the speech here. I am not sure though that I would prefer to read from his bible so that I get worked up and give him that sort of a speech. I do not believe in quite the same bible, but it does not hurt having a little encouragement from the benches nearby.

Well, I think what we have had, Mr. Speaker, is we have had two old testaments, and it is the Liberals that are the new Party here in Manitoba, and I can see the -(interjection)- the New Democrats are still saying they are the new Party. They have been around I think 25 years, but the name "New" is not quite so new. In fact, I would suggest it is more than a little tarnished, but I would suggest they should try using some Silvo on it. I would not suggest to use Brasso because they have enough brass already. In any case, it is a situation where we have what is supposedly a new Party, actually a very old and tired Party, and I am glad that they are getting a rest, and they will have a chance to rejuvenate themselves and sometime come phoenix-like out of the flames, but hopefully that will not be for another couple of decades.

* (1650)

In any case, I think people are saying, we have given the New Democrats more than enough chance over this last couple of decades and there have been two chances for the Conservative Party in there as well. We have two old Parties here in this House, and we have the new, renewed and reliable and trustworthy Liberals that will offer a different sort of a choice to people. I think people made that choice in 1988, in April, and I think what you will see is that base of vote will stay there. I think people do want a different way of doing things, and -(interjection)- Well, we do not have to get them from within the family here, but in any case—

The polling has been done, Mr. Speaker, and done well. It seems to be accurate. It shows the trends and the trend is there. There was a sea change in the political life of Manitoba in spring of '88 and you could not help but feel that campaigning door to door as I did in that early spring of '88. People wanted a change, and they wanted a change for a good reason. I think it comes nigh to every political Party, a time to get out of power and to renew itself and to look back at what it did. It is just that it is the New Democrats' turn for that to happen. We understand, in the Liberals, that happens from time to time. We have been through the years in the wilderness and now it is the turn of the Liberals to come in and to offer some new ideas and some very new ways of doing things.

We have offered much to the people of Manitoba, and I think they have embraced it and they see a different way of doing things -(interjection)-

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

Mr. Manriess: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I apologize to the Member for rising at this point, but I am wondering, seeing that we are so close to going

into Private Members' hour, whether or not there might be a will of the House to waive Private Members' hour until 5:45, at which time we will go into Private Members' hour.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed upon that we will go into Private Members' hour at 5:45? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

Mr. Taylor: I should have given the high sign to your Honourable Finance Minister because in two minutes I was going to be wrapping up in any case.-(interjection)- My goodness, and there is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) saying, we are still waiting for some sense. Well, the people of Manitoba are waiting for some sense and they are waiting for some sense to come out of those Government benches over there, but I think it will be a very, very, very long wait, because all we are getting out of there is a different type of rhetoric than the rhetoric we had from the predecessor administration. That is unfortunate, but in any case, we will see passed soon Bill No. 100.

Here we go with getting near the end of the Estimates process and hopefully we will have it completed just before the end of the fiscal year. I think we can achieve that much. Instead of having it done in the first third of the fiscal year, as would be a normal process, and that is plenty of time to do it, we will instead have it done just before the end of the fiscal year when in fact virtually all or almost all of the money will have been spent.

I just say to the Conservatives, when they look at going into their third year, if they are going to go into their third year and not call a snap election, that they try and get their House in order and get their budget and financial approval process working as it should work in concert with how Government is set up to operate, and do not put off the way that they have in the past their budgetary process. Now if we end up coming back into the House after this Session ends, not until some time in September, then I would say to the Government and to the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) in particular, we will have the same thing happening again for fiscal'90-91 as this bollix that we have had for fiscal'89-90. I say that as a sincere concern and a sincere warning to the Government. Let us not have that happen again. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

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

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for Wednesday, March 7, 8 p.m., be amended as follows: The Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) for the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

I also move, seconded by the Member for Interlake, that the composition of the Standing Committee on

Private Bills be amended as follows: The Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) for the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak); the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) for the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

I further move that the composition of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, seconded by the Member for Concordia again, be amended as follows: The Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) for the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans); and the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) for the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

I further move, for Industrial Relations, Wednesday, March 7, 8 p.m., that the following changes be made, and that is seconded once again by the Member for Concordia: that the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) be substituted for the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), and the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) be substituted for the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? Is it left in somebody's name? The Honourable Member for the Interlake.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I thought I would place a number of comments with respect to Bill No. 100, The Supplementary Appropriations Act, and speak to some issues primarily as it relates to rural development, which includes Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environmental matters.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are quickly headed down a path in the agricultural community of some very, very serious times. The farm community is at the present time I think fairly patiently waiting for some action on behalf of the Province of Manitoba and its federal counterparts to give some indication to the farm community as to what kind of support they might expect in the next month or two.

(Mr. Parker Burrell, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Speaker, we have seen interest rates rise substantially since last spring, since a year ago. In fact mortgages have risen I guess one could say in the 12-13 percent range for five years and over. The Minister -(interjection)- FCC, yes. I am speaking of FCC hitting the 13 percent range and thereabouts.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the crucial signal here of course is short-term credit as it relates to operating credit for farmers to put their crops in. When you are looking at commercial rates probably running in the 14 percent to 15 percent range for operating credit, we now have farmers having lost the advantage at least on their crops in storage through the interest free cash advance program. That one measure could have, to some degree, offset some of the cash requirements of a portion of a farm community.

However, Sir, coupled with last year's drought, there are I am certain thousands of, and I say thousands of,

Wednesday, March 7, 1990

Manitoba farmers at this point in time having and receiving their notices from their financial institutions to prepare their cash flow projections for operating credit this year, and quite frankly I would think spending some sleepless nights wondering as to how they will in fact obtain and be able to finance the putting in of their crop this spring.

* (1700)

Mr. Acting Speaker, while there are musings—and I say musings because there has been no clear indication as yet as to what will occur in terms of the support, whether it be a drought program for the '89 year crop, or whether it be a special grains program in light of what is occurring on the world horizon with the U.S. subsidies and the European subsidies, the national Government is in fact indicating that there may be some support coming. The federal-provincial committees have now reported, or at least are in the process of reporting. There may be some support there.

What will be crucial, Mr. Acting Speaker, for Manitoba farmers and Manitoba taxpayers is what is the cost? That will be the crucial determination, Sir, because if in fact Manitoba's share of any support program will move from what the Minister himself was snookered, and I use the word snookered, into last year—and I really feel for his position, because you have your own colleagues putting the screws to you, Mr. Acting Speaker, nationally. That makes it doubly frustrating. I am certain, for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay).

Yet, what I am hearing or at least seeing in the media, coming out of Saskatchewan we have the Premier of Saskatchewan probably heading for an election and announcing that they are coming up with a \$250 million fund for Agriculture. Then when you couple that to his other statements, saying that we are going to require a half a billion dollars to have our farm population put the crop in, one can only start measuring as to what the Premier of Saskatchewan is saying.

To me that spells a 50-50 proposition. That is the way it appears to be headed, because if Grant Devine is prepared to put up 50 percent of the money now, obviously, Glen Findlay and the Conservatives here really do not have too much say in this whole process unless they get together with Saskatchewan and Alberta, because Alberta will do whatever they want. They have in the past, and they will continue to do whatever they want. If they need \$50 million or \$100 million the money will be there in Alberta terms.

The real clinchers in this whole proposal, and the ally that I think from a taxpayer point of view in the Province of Manitoba, is the Premier of Saskatchewan. I for the life of me do not understand or at least cannot figure out how he is prepared, on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, to put up 50 percent of a half a billion dollar bill, which historically has been an expenditure that Ottawa should and has made in the past. That is where I cannot understand the politics of the situation, Sir.

On top of that, we have this Bill in front of us saying we need \$1.7 million for Agriculture, but we do not have any signals from the Government as to where the

\$31 million or \$30-odd million is for the 1988 drought program coming from. No one has explained—and the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) have not explained as to how that financing will occur and over what period of time. Is that the way you—do you back yourself into a corner and say, well we will use the \$200 million reserve that the province has in place and some of that money will be used to pay that?

Clearly, the signal in my mind is out there that Manitoba is going to be put in the position again of now moving from a 25 percent contribution in terms of farm support programs, now moving into a 50 percent contribution.

So I say, the offloading debate and the offloading issue, while it was clearly started under the Liberals and accelerated under the Conservatives, the provincial Conservatives here certainly have moved a long way down that slope as it relates to assistance to our farm community. I have to say it is not, in essence, at all of the making of the Government here, of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) here, not at all.

It is a dilemma that is faced and that he will face over the next coming months. I have a feeling that he is going to have to—if there is anything going to be significant, one has to look at more than just a drought program for '89. One has to look at a combination of factors of operating credit that has to be in place, and unless the Guaranteed Operating Credit Program, although the announcement has been made that it is being extended for a number of years, whether that will be sufficient, I am not certain. Given where interest rates are today, there is indeed a very serious financial situation facing Manitoba's farm community.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I urge this Minister to take heed of what is occurring out in the farm community at the present time. The silence in essence is as deafening, but there are some very, very serious signs out there that this spring is going to be a very tough period of time, notwithstanding the moisture or lack of it in several regions of our province.

So the Government certainly is not off the hook on this issue. It is not of their making, but clearly the moves that have been made by the U.S., by the Canadian Government to some extent, in terms of giving up two-priced wheat by undermining the underpinnings of orderly marketing through the Wheat Board, through the Free Trade Agreement, is placing a greater and greater uncertainty on the farm community as to what is actually occurring.

The farm community is getting more and more nervous as to wondering where the next shoe will fall? Is it going to be increased interest rates? Is it going to be a dismantling of some form of supply management? The studies that are going on with respect to transportation are all very unsettling I am certain for most farmers and I am sure even for politicians who are in places of decision-making are very unsettling. The moment that you try and make a move in this direction, something else comes rolling at you that either undoes or even is worse than undoing what you have tried to accomplish in plugging an area.

Clearly, Mr. Acting Speaker, the whole question of this crow offset—I mean, I can understand where the Government has attempted to argue for a level playing field. It has not occurred even though the Minister doth protest very much that he has attempted to create a level playing field. It has not occurred because Alberta will not allow it and neither will Quebec allow that level playing field to occur.

* (1710)

Alberta is intent and has to a large extent succeeded in buying itself a beef processing industry. They have put up, what is it, about \$25 million per plant in terms of the new Cargill plant in the southern part of Alberta, and it may be more in terms of its takeover of the old Swift plant in Edmonton.— (interjection)— Pardon me? Gainers, well, I call it the old Swift plant, it is the Gainers plant in Edmonton. I think the costs are probably \$50 million or more to those two plants.

They have, I think it is something like \$13 million or \$14 million of loan guarantees to Fletcher's in terms of hog processing in Red Deer, so that they are intent on having a foothold into that marketplace certainly is there.

When you look at the capacity for processing across western Canada, the Minister's own study here in Manitoba said we have overcapacity. We have overcapacity in hog processing right in this province; we have overcapacity in beef and yet we are all talking about saying we need more slaughtering capacity. It is just not in the cards, so what is the next step?

Can you imagine the Province of Manitoba trying to compete with, what is it, \$60 million to \$70 million of assistance, direct and indirect assistance to the processing operations of Cargill and Gainers in Alberta? Saskatchewan is trying to, but look at their deficit, just look at where their financial position has headed over the last number of years. It is scary, absolutely phenomenal.

When they took office there was a balanced budget in Saskatchewan. You have eight years of so-called Conservative good administration and the deficit has run right through the roof, Sir, run right through the roof.— (interjection)— I hear the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) saying a number of years of no rain.

There is no doubt that weather has played a very major part in where they are at, but offloading and shifting of costs, I venture to say to the Province of Manitoba in the last couple of years, has meant at least an additional requirement of between \$200 million and \$300 million to this province alone just in the last two years. It may even be more. I may be out on my figures because if you start looking at the ERDA Agreements, you start looking at agricultural financing, you start looking at a number of areas in health care and education in terms of cost-sharing, you will find that the burden and the shift of offloading by the federal Government onto have-not provinces has been escalating immensely.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

It has not stopped at the provincial Government. It has escalated for our Native peoples as well, Sir, that

offloading, this past budget. One really cannot understand, I cannot fathom, at the notion of the federal Government in capping funding to our Native brothers and sisters in this province in the area of education. If ever there was a time and an opportunity for our Native people to break what I would say is the welfare syndrome and give some opportunity or provide some opportunity to our Native peoples in this province, it is through education, through providing the opportunities for our citizens to go on beyond the elementary and high schooling that are in the reserve communities, go on into our community colleges and into our universities to make sure that our Native brothers and sisters can in fact eventually break out of the historic arm lock or historic strangle hold of welfare and life in subsistence.

I cannot understand, and I am certain that most Canadians cannot understand the situation, but even more so, it is so difficult to get that message across in that when there is this kind of offloading of expenditures from Ottawa onto the provinces, the pressure on provincial treasuries is all that more great in that to provide similar services for not equal but at taxation levels that are relatively similar across this country, provinces like Manitoba will have to tax at a far higher rate if they attempt to keep the services at a national level. It is very difficult to comprehend and to indicate the significance of such shifts as it relates to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the Maritimes.

I believe that the Government should be prepared to explain where it is going to come up with some of the additional funding. Spring will be upon us very soon. If we do not and the farm community does not have an indication of some clear financial support to them before the end of this month, I believe that we are into a very serious situation as to bankruptcies, as to financial foreclosures, as to the health of our farm sector. I expect that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) will want to provide some information when this Bill gets to committee as to where the money is going to come from for those other measures that are not in this additional supplementary supply Bill. Thank you, very much.

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, this matter will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger).

BILL NO. 99—THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 99, The Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation de crédits, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson), who has two minutes remaining. Stand.

Is there leave that this matter remaining standing? Agreed. The Honourable Government House Leader, what are your intentions?

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Well, I understand that there is going to be a little—do you have a speaker?

Wednesday, March 7, 1990

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Ellice, on Bill No. 99.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly am quite pleased to be able to put some comments on the record in regard to this Bill. We are nearing the end of the fiscal year within less than six weeks. It is very important I think at this time that we make some comments with respect to dollars and monies that have been spent or have not been spent within various departments and within various appropriations.

* (1720)

What comes to mind first, Mr. Speaker, of course when we look at this Bill is the whole area of Child and Family Services. We had yesterday a two-page news release from the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) who basically said nothing in two pages. I suppose we can give credit to some of her communications officers who managed to say in two pages basically no new information at all.

We heard the Minister say that she was prepared to cover the deficits of the agencies, which of course we already knew, given that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) had finally given that commitment approximately three weeks ago in the House. What is very interesting, what is noteworthy within that two-page press release, is not what is said, but what is in fact not said. We have an example of a Minister, and I refer to this example as we are dealing with this Bill, because this has certainly been an area of contention in this House, the whole area of how you provide social services in the community, legislated mandated social services as well as what is called more voluntary social services, such as in the area of prevention and preventative work with families.

It has caused a lot of debate in this House, and I feel that the Government in this particular instance has failed to provide leadership and to work in a reasonable, consultative way with the Child and Family Services agencies. Now we had the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) who today basically said that she had met with the Child and Family Services agencies six times. Meetings do not decisions make. That is three meetings a year with Child and Family Services agencies. Just because the Minister sits down and has a meeting does not mean that there are any concrete decisions or recommendations made and that in fact there is even any type of meaningful dialogue at all. I understand that in fact the Child and Family Services agencies are even more frustrated from these recent meetings with the Minister of Family Services than they have been in the past.

The Minister agreed to set up a joint committee of agency presidents, executive directors and her senior staff in her Department of Family Services to look at the funding formula mechanism. That particular committee was set up early in 1989 and probably before that, because in fact we had the first interim report which was delivered and written in February of 1988. That committee had been established, but we had a stalling of that committee where in fact there were no

meetings for a while, and we had Child and Family Services agencies who were coming to us and saying the Government no longer wishes to engage in this joint dialogue and to try to reach some type of common understanding. We have not heard anything about the meetings. Then we talked to the Minister of Family Services, and she agrees to resume the meetings. We are not quite sure where that communication breakdown did occur, but in fact those meetings then resumed.

Then we have a report in May of '89, another report from this joint committee, a very detailed report in regard to all aspects of funding as they affect the Child and Family Services agencies. In that report there was no mention at all that there was any dissension in terms of the issues which were presented in that particular report. There was no indication that there was a minority viewpoint from that report. We must assume, and it is a very detailed internal report, that in fact there was not agreement from all parties about the contents of that particular report.

That report is important because it was a step forward in joint discussions between at least the senior Government staff and the Child and Family Services agencies. That report had a very interesting conclusion in it, and that report said there was an agreement from the committee that one thing was for sure, and that is the Government should be prepared to either add to the base budget of the agencies at least that amount that they were in deficit the previous year. If they were not prepared to do that, then the Government would have to look at cutting services because those were the only two options as seen by that joint committee as to what should be done in regard to some of the funding concern in respect to the Child and Family Services agencies.

We have a joint committee which has basically looked at those two issues. Then we have a Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) who writes letters to the agencies and says, I want you to develop a balanced budget for us with no deficits, and I want you to ensure that as you develop that budget you are not looking at cutting services.

That is very difficult to do, Mr. Speaker, because the agencies are saying with the very small increases they have received, which is less than the rate of inflation, that by virtue of those small increases they would be forced to cut services, and yet the Minister is saying, no.

The Minister is giving a mixed message. Is she then saying that they are supporting the fact that these agencies are having deficits every year? The latest message we are getting from this Minister is that in fact they will cover the deficits from last year only when they receive from the Child and Family Services agencies a budget projection for 1990-91 which basically is looking at balancing the budget and that the agencies can show how they plan to get rid of that deficit.

That places the Child and Family Services agencies in a difficult position when they still do not know what their budgets are going to be for '90-91. We are at the

end of this fiscal year, and in fact the Government, particularly in the Department of Family Services and Health, those two departments being what I am more familiar with, are just now, those community agencies are just now, within the last few weeks, after Christmas, getting an indication from the Government as to exactly what their budgets are going to be. They are almost at the end of the fiscal year.

If the Government can say that this is effective management, I would say that in fact it is not. I know we will hear from the benches of the Government where they will say, well, the Opposition kept us in Estimates too long. Balderdash, because we know very well, and it has happened in the past, that Governments are quite capable and are quite able and in fact will send out indications to agencies that this is your dollar amount that you are going to receive and will actually send out the cheques to those agencies when they have not even sat in Estimates and we have not even gone through a particular department.

For the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and some of his Ministers to attempt to use that argument, the public of Manitoba, the agencies, the Opposition, we know better, we will not be fooled, we know that is balderdash. We have a situation now where when we are at the end of a fiscal year and agencies are just receiving indications as to what their dollar amounts are, we have a Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) who is saying to the agencies, we will continue to review the funding formula mechanism.

Well, that continued review has been going on for two years with absolutely no conclusion how long will that review continue, another year, another two years, or will it continue until this Government feels that they can get a mandate so that they can disband the Child and Family Services agencies, which is what they really wanted to do anyway, because they want to centralize it all. They want to throw it back into Government's hands directly, because as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) himself has said, if we had accountants leading the Child and Family Services agencies instead of these social workers, we would not have this problem.

We know where the Government is coming from in regard to providing services to social services. We know that this Government has absolutely no idea, no concept, no understanding of the difficulties that agencies, agency staff and community boards face in terms of attempting to provide credible, quality child and family services to the people of their community. It is not an easy task; it is a very difficult one. I think a lot of credit has to go to the workers and to the staff and to the board, to the community board who volunteer their time in an attempt to make their community a better place to live.

I am very, very frustrated, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we have just received this announcement yesterday from the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), two pages of a lot of words which basically say nothing. The Minister responsible for Culture and Heritage says \$2 million is not nothing. We have a Government who sends out a press release and said, well, let us throw \$2 million into a special fund. On the other hand they say, but the Opposition believes in throwing money, and they will write a blank cheque. Figure that one out.

* (1730)

There seems to be somewhat of a contradiction, because it is this Government that has not dealt with the problem. They have said here is \$2 million for a special fund. They are trying to fool the public again, because we know very well and the child and family services agencies know very well that for those special needs children where the rates are above the approved amounts, there are provisions already where child and family services agencies can apply for extra dollars in special situations. To announce that there is \$2 million is somewhat bogus, because in fact provisions are already in place for those special circumstances.

What about the hundreds and thousands of children who need care who are below the special rates, who need up to \$81 a day? What about those children where the child and family services agencies are attempting to deliver a service for them? That has not been addressed. This Government has thrown \$2 million at a problem and has failed to deal with the major recommendations of their own report. I consider that ineffective management, the child and family services agencies feel it is ineffective management and they are not impressed with what they consider as lack of consultation and real decision-making on the part of the Minister of Family Services with support, of course, from a number of her colleagues.

As we look at this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we talk about Government efficiency, we talk about dollars being spent, we look at huge numbers, and we think about this Government who sometimes forgets about some of the small dollar amounts that could be put to good use in some of the preventative family programs. The two examples that come to mind are the parent-child centres in the inner city in the north end of Winnipeg, programs which are grassroots where there are community parents and professionals involved with developing and running parent-child centres where single mothers, where parents have an opportunity to take their children to a centre, to work with their children, to be involved in clothing lending, to be involved in toy lending, where parents have the opportunity to feel in a safe comfortable environment, to spend some quality time, some learning time with their children. It is not a lot of dollars, but those small amounts of dollars and support from the Government can go a long way to preventing some of our chronic problems that face the child and family services agencies.

If we could only see ourselves in terms of looking at dollars put into prevention as opposed to always throwing money at the problem after it is too late, if we could put some money up front to those families, to those community organizations, I would suggest to you in five, in 10 years, we would see some of the cost decreasing because we would have stronger communities. We would have a better community base of support services for families.

Look at the West Broadway Family Centre where we have examples of parents who use that centre for a respite opportunity so that an unemployed father can go out and try to look for a job in an afternoon, can

go for an interview, can ride the bus and go to various job locations and put in applications; where a single mother can leave her child for an afternoon because she is having difficulty coping, and she recognizes that in herself, and she needs that relief and that time by herself so that when she does then spend other time with her child she knows that she is not under as much stress and she knows that she can cope better. These are real issues that face real people in the city and all across our province. These are the real issues that the Tories fail to grasp when they are looking at what programs they will fund and what they will not.

We have a Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) who says we believe in families, because we changed the name of our department. We believe in accessibility, affordability and flexibility when we are dealing with child care. Is not a parent-child centre child care? Is not a family centre that deals with respite care for families not child care? Is not that the case? I would suggest to you that it is the case.

When we have the Minister stand up and say we believe in families, but we do not believe in this type of respite care, it is a contradiction. She has a very narrow view of what families and family care and child care can be.

We have to look at some of the creative ways that communities can deliver service to their own families within that community and meet their needs. All parents do not need or can afford or want their child in a child care setting on a regular basis. Some of these families, they need the worker down at the respite centre who can talk to them about some difficulties they are having with their child. They need to be able to leave that child in the respite care centre so they can have some quality time for themselves, or that they can have some time to go spend with a sick relative, or go looking for a job. These are very real needs; these are very important things.

This is what the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), I suggest, Mr. Speaker, has failed to do when she looks at what types of programs and services she will support and what she will not. We still have a parent-child centre who basically is no further ahead with information from the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) or the Minister of Family Services. They have had two years of going through a process of listening to Ministers and being told do X, Y and Z and then we will look at this. They do X, Y and Z and then they are told again, another do A, B and C, and the story goes on and on and yet they are no further ahead.

When we are talking about huge sums of money and when we are looking at the amount of money this Government is spending, it is important to ask the question, what criteria do you use when you are funding these various community organizations? We asked that question to the Minister of Family Services during the Estimates process, and she could not give us an answer. She really did not know. She cannot even go back to those agencies that she does not fund and say, well, we have decided to not fund you because you do not fit our criteria which are a, b, c and d, and you are not within our priority. She has not been able to even do that.

What type of management have we been able to find from this particular Government in the last two years when it really comes to that? They like to cry a lot about the expenses and the problems in the social services, but they themselves are not taking a leadership role. They are not being pro-active in terms of dealing with the many issues that are facing agencies and that would face any Minister who is given a Social Services portfolio. It takes leadership. It takes creativity. It takes open consultation with the community. It takes effective communication with the community. It takes honesty in dealing with the community.

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

Mr. McCrae: Matter of House Business disguised as a point of order. It has been agreed that we could now proceed to Private Members' hour.- (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. There was an agreement that at 5:45 we would go into Private Members' hour. Is it the will of the House to call it 5:45? Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS COMMITTEE CHANGE

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) with his committee change.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, if I can I indulge the House to make a correction to a committee change I made earlier. I had moved, by myself, seconded by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the Standing Committee on Private Bills be amended. It should read: the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis) for the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), the corrected form.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed? (Agreed) I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Thompson for that clarification.

Mr. Speaker: When Bill No. 99 is again before the House, the Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) will have 21 minutes remaining.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, Bill 56 will be before the Standing Committee on Law Amendments on Wednesday at 8 p.m. If necessary to complete consideration of Bill 56, that Bill would then be considered at the Law Amendments Committee's evening meeting on Thursday, at 8 p.m. So that Bill 56, if necessary, will be added to the list of Bills in Law Amendments for that evening meeting.

Wednesday, March 7, 1990

Mr. Speaker, I understand the Liberals are having a little get-together this weekend, and for the purposes of accommodating that little gathering, I believe there is a wish on the part of Honourable Members that this House not sit on Friday. Would you be so kind as by leave—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there agreement there for that the House will not sit on Friday? Agreed. Therefore, at 6 p.m., Thursday, the House will adjourn until—okay, the Honourable Government House Leader.

* (1740)

Mr. McCrae: While we are being so agreeable, I think we should let the staff and everyone know that there is also agreement that the House will not sit beyond 4:30 p.m. tomorrow so that Honourable Members can recognize International Women's Day.

Mr. Speaker: To recognize International Women's Day. Order, please. Is that agreeable that Thursday the House will adjourn at 4:30 to recognize International Women's Day? Agreed. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Mr. McCrae: By leave, would you call Bills 88 and 89?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for the House to bring forward Bill No. 88? Agreed.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Speaker: Before calling Bill No. 88, I would recognize the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) with his committee changes.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on committee changes:

I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), that the composition of Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus); Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) for Transcona (Mr. Kozak).

I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks that the composition of Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) for Radisson (Mr. Patterson).

I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks that the composition of Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources be amended as follows: Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) for Transcona (Mr. Kozak).

I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Private Bills be amended as follows: Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles); Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) for Burrows (Mr. Chornopyski).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 88—THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED PERSONS PARKING ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), Bill No. 88, The Physically Disabled Persons Parking Act; Loi sur les emplacements de stationnement réservés aux handicapés physiques, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger). Stand?

Is there leave that this matter remain standing? No? No leave granted. The Honourable Minister has lost his opportunity to speak on second reading of Bill No. 88. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), and he will be understanding if I stand in my place and deny leave for him to carry on, because he is supportive of the words that I am going to say to Honourable Members this afternoon, on his behalf and on my own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should begin by offering thanks to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) for bringing forward a matter of this nature, a matter of this importance to segments of our society who need to have their interests dealt with at the official level of Government and the Legislature. The people we are referring to are those who are physically disabled and those who want to remain mobile and get around our communities and around our province.

I think it behooves us as legislators to do what we can to assure smooth movement for those whose movement otherwise might not be so smooth, so that we think that issues relating to showing the courtesy that we ought to show for those who are not able to enjoy the mobility that we do. I think it is incumbent on us to be supportive of measures that in any way would alleviate circumstances and make life somewhat easier for people in those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us is something I have discussed with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko). I have told him that I agree with the principle behind this Bill. I think the principle is as I have stated in the early part of my comments. I have also stated to the Honourable Member that I would like to work with him in making a few minor changes to the Bill. I do not like to use the expression, to improve the Bill, because I think the Bill is a good Bill, but I do say that there are some changes that might make the enforcement of the Bill a little—something that authorities in this province could work with a little better.

There are certain responsibilities that the Government accepts when it accepts a Bill like this, and the Honourable Member I believe understands that. In the areas of certain enforcement aspects and certain technical aspects of the Bill, my department and I have looked it over and there are a few as I say minor details

Wednesday, March 7, 1990

that should be dealt with. I do not believe those details detract at all from what the Honourable Member is trying to achieve in this Bill.

I have some concerns, as has been expressed by others. I think the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), in another context, has expressed concerns in certain circumstances with minimum fines. I have no particular philosophical problem with minimum fines, depending what the minimum is. I look forward to discussion of what those sanctions should be and just how they are stated in the Bill.

If the Honourable Member is willing to consider amendments, which I understand he might be if they are reasonable, and I would certainly attempt to make all amendments reasonable and attempt not to do any violence to the principle of this Bill.

On that basis I would be happy to be able to discuss this Bill very soon in a committee. I understand if this Bill passes today it would stand referred, or I would announce its referral to the Standing Committee on Private Bills, which interestingly is having a meeting tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. I would indicate our support for this Bill and the fact that it would find its place on the list in that committee tomorrow morning.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

REPORT STAGE—PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 89—AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE UNITED HEALTH SERVICES CORPORATION

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 89, An Act to Amend An Act to Incorporate United Health Services Corporation; Loi

modifiant la Loi constituant la "United Health Services Corporation," standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz), the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill No. 89, An Act to Amend An Act to Incorporate United Health Services Corporation, reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 89—AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE UNITED HEALTH SERVICES CORPORATION

Bill No. 89, An Act to Amend An Act to Incorporate United Health Services Corporation; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant la "United Health Services Corporation," was, by leave, read a third time and passed.

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

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? Six o'clock. The hour being 6 p.m., this House now adjourns and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).