

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 28, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Industrial Relations.

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

Your committee met on Thursday, June 22, 1989 at 8 p.m., and Tuesday, June 27, 1989 at 10 a.m., in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred.

Your committee heard representations on Bill No. 3—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, as follows:

Mr. Sheldon Pinx, Manitoba Bar Association
Mr. Harvey Pollock, Citizens Against Impaired Driving
Mr. Meyer Cosman, Private Citizen
Mr. John Campbell, Winnipeg Police Association

Written Submission: Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

Your committee has considered Bill No. 3—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new subsection 242.1(3) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 8 of Bill 3 be struck out and the following be substituted:

Storage of impounded vehicle

242.1(3) A motor vehicle seized, impounded and taken under this section shall be stored where the peace officer directs, and all costs and charges prescribed by regulation for the transportation, towing, care, storage, disposition and other related charges respecting the motor vehicle, all costs and charges on account of administration prescribed by regulation to be paid to the Minister of Finance upon the release of an impounded motor vehicle and for searches, registrations and other charges under The Personal Property Security Act reasonably necessary for a performance by the garage keeper of his or her obligations are a lien on the motor vehicle and the lien may be enforced in the manner provided in The Garage Keepers Act."

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new subsection 242.1 to The Highway Traffic Act, as set out in section 8 of Bill No. 3, be amended:

- (a) in subsection (4) by striking out " , other than an owner who is charged in connection with the seizure and impoundment of the motor vehicle,";
- (b) in subsection (4) by adding "designated by The Chief Judge of the Provincial Court of Manitoba for the hearing of such applications" after "justice";
- (c) in subsection (5) by adding "by an owner other than an owner who is charged in connection with the seizure and impoundment of the motor vehicle" after "(4)";
- (d) by adding the following after subsection (5):

"Issue to be determined

242.1(6) Where, after considering an application under subsection (4) by an owner who is charged in connection with the seizure and impoundment of the motor vehicle, the justice is satisfied that the owner, before he or she drove the motor vehicle, had no reason to believe that his or her licence or permit was suspended, that he or she was disqualified from holding a driver's licence or was prohibited from driving a motor vehicle and that the owner had at the time of the seizure and impoundment complied with subsection 27(5), the justice shall

- (a) revoke the order of impoundment;
- (b) subject to the lien described in subsection (3), direct that a peace officer order the garage keeper to return the motor vehicle to the owner or to a person authorized by the owner; and
- (c) direct that the fee paid by the applicant be refunded.";
- (e) by renumbering subsections (6) to (11) as (7) to (12);
- (f) by deleting "(5) and (6)" in subsection (7), now renumbered as subsection (8), and substituting "(5), (6), and (7)".

MOTION

THAT the proposed new subsection 263.1(1) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 9 of Bill No. 3 be amended by striking out everything before clause (c) and substituting the following:

"Notice and order of suspension

263.1(1) Where

- (a) a peace officer
- (i) by reason of an analysis of the breath or blood of a person, has reason to believe that the person has consumed alcohol in

such a quantity that the concentration thereof in his or her blood exceeds 80 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood contrary to section 253(b) of The Criminal Code, or

(ii) has reason to believe that a person while having alcohol in his or her body failed or refused to comply with a demand made on that person to supply a sample of his or her breath or blood under section 254 of The Criminal Code, and

(b) the occurrence is in relation to the operation of or having care and control of a motor vehicle as defined in this Act,

the peace officer on behalf of the registrar shall"

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new subsection 263.1(1) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 9 of Bill No. 3 be amended

(a) by striking out "or on the expiry date of the licence or permit seized by the officer, whichever is the earlier" in subclause (c)(ii);

(b) by striking out "(d)(ii)" in clause (d) and substituting "(c)(i)"; and

(c) by striking out "or on the expiry date of the licence or permit, whichever is the earlier" in clause (e).

MOTION

THAT the proposed new subsection 242.1(1) as set out in section 8 of Bill No. 3 be amended by striking out "225" and substituting "225(1)".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new subsection 263.1(3) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 9 of Bill No. 3 be amended

(a) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (c);

(b) by striking out the period at the end of clause (d) and substituting "; and"; and

(c) by adding the following after clause (d):

"(e) a copy of any certificate of analysis under section 258 of The Criminal Code with respect to the person described in subsection (1)."

MOTION

THAT the proposed new subsections 263.1(5) and (6) to The Highway Traffic Act be struck out and subsections 263.1(7) to 263.1(9) as set out in section 9 of Bill No. 3 be renumbered as subsections 263.1(5) to 263.1(7) respectively.

MOTION

THAT the proposed new subsection 263.2(1) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 9 of Bill No.

3 be amended by adding "under section 263.1" after "disqualification".

MOTION

THAT the proposed new clause 263.2(6)(c) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 9 of Bill No. 3 be struck out and the following substituted:

"(c) a copy of any certificate of analysis under section 258 of the Criminal Code without proof of the identity and official character of the person appearing to have signed the certificate or that the copy is a true copy; and"

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new clause 263.2(7)(b) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 9 of Bill No. 3, be amended by adding "or care and control" after "operation".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new section 263.2 of The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 9 of Bill No. 3 be amended

(a) by adding the following after the proposed new subsection 263.2(7):

Time of hearing

263.2(8) The registrar shall

(a) where no oral hearing is requested, consider the application within 15 days of compliance with clauses 263.2(1)(a), (b) and (d); and

(b) where an oral hearing is requested, hold the hearing within 30 days of compliance with subsection 263.2(1),

but failure of the registrar to consider the application or hold the hearing within the required time does not affect the jurisdiction of the registrar to consider or hear the application or to make a decision with respect to it.;

(b) by renumbering subsections 263.2(8) to (11) as 263.2(9) to (12).

MOTION (Subamendment):

THAT the proposed new subsection 263.2(8) be amended by striking out "15" in clause (a) and substituting "10", and by striking out "30" in clause (b) and substituting "20".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new subsection 263.2(11), now renumbered as subsection (12), be amended by striking out "provided to the appellant or, if he or she is not present, a copy shall be" and adding "within 7 days of the date the application was considered or the hearing was held by the registrar" after "sent".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new subsection 273(1) as set out in section 10 of Bill No. 3, be amended by striking out

"the person's" and substituting "a person's" and by striking out "the person" wherever it occurs and substituting "a person".

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new subsection 273(3) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 10 of Bill No. 3, be amended by striking out everything after "maintained by the registrar" and substituting "and when sent to the person in that manner there shall be a rebuttable presumption that the notice was received by that person."

MOTION:

THAT the proposed new clause 319(1)(uuu) to The Highway Traffic Act as set out in section 14 of Bill No. 3, be struck out and the following substituted:

"(uuu) prescribing for the purposes of subsection 242.1(3) the costs and charges payable on account of the towing, transportation, care, storage, disposition and other related matters and the costs and charges on account of administration to be paid to the Minister of Finance upon the release of an impounded motor vehicle or the manner in which those costs or charges are to be determined and the persons who are authorized to receive the costs and charges on behalf of the Minister of Finance;"

MOTION:

THAT subsection 16(2) of Bill No. 3 be amended by adding "1," after "sections".

Prior to the passing of Bill No. 3, your committee adopted the motion that Legislative Counsel be authorized to re-number the Bill and to make any changes to cross references necessary to insert in the Bill in proper sequence the amendments made in your committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted, H. Pankratz, Chairman, June 27, 1989.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I am pleased to be able to table the Annual Report of the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund Board.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a ministerial statement. I have copies for the House. Unfortunately, I only have five or six copies. I apologize to Members of the House. I do not have 13. If that is a matter, then I would ask

that we revert back to it later on after I have had an opportunity—whatever the wish is of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the 1989 Lieutenant Governor's Medal for Public Administration in Manitoba has been awarded. The award recognizes outstanding performance in public sector management. The 1989 recipient is Charles Curtis, Deputy Minister of Finance.

I would like to advise the House that the actual awards ceremony will be made on Thursday, September 21, at 11:30 a.m. and a reception in the Manitoba Room. All Members of the House will be receiving an invitation from the Lieutenant Governor and the Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am just going to read a very small portion of some of the information that I have handed to Members opposite, and just try to highlight the career summary and the contributions to the Province of Manitoba from Mr. Curtis.

* (1335)

Born and educated in Manitoba, Charles Curtis earned his Chartered Accountancy degree in 1955. For the next 12 years, he was employed by the Taxation Division, Department of National Revenue, in a series of positions involving increasing responsibilities. In 1967, Mr. Curtis joined the Manitoba Treasury Department as Assistant Deputy Minister and held that position until '76 when he was appointed Deputy Minister of Finance. He is currently the longest serving Deputy Minister in the Government of Manitoba.

Since joining the Manitoba Civil Service, Mr. Curtis has served six Premiers and nine Ministers of Finance. In every case and without compromising his own high principles, Mr. Curtis' effort and dedication have earned him the full confidence and high regard of each of the Governments involved. As a result, he has been able to provide invaluable continuity in the public service and consistently high-quality advice to a series of Cabinets. Mr. Curtis has been chosen by a succession of Manitoba Governments to take on some of the most difficult assignments, including important transitional work between administrations. In every case, he has carried out his duties with sound judgment and unquestioned integrity.

In addition to serving as Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Curtis has also served the Government of Manitoba from time to time as Acting Clerk of the Executive Council, Secretary of the Treasury Board, Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, CEO of the Manitoba Energy Authority, Acting head of MTX, and a member of the Investment Committee of the Civil Service Superannuation Fund, the Teachers' Retirement Fund and the Workers Compensation.

I will not read the countless other pages of achievements and contributions that Mr. Curtis has made to the province and to the country as a whole, but nevertheless I am sure all Members of the House will join me in congratulating Charlie Curtis in the prestigious award granted to him and announced today.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) for

bringing this forward in this way, because I think all Members of the House would like to add their congratulations to those of the Minister of Finance. Mr. Curtis has served this province extremely well and is extremely well-known across the country as a very competent and talented civil servant.

The fact that he has served so many different Governments over these many years is, I think, evidence of the fact that he does take his duties most professionally and he does conduct them with the highest of ethics and standards. I think it is very appropriate that he has received this medal, and I think all Members of this House will indeed join in congratulating him today.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): We would certainly like to add our words of congratulations to Charles Curtis on the awarding of the Vanier Medal. We of course have worked with Mr. Curtis in a number of different capacities over the years. He has been a person, as is described in the paper that has been circulated, with high integrity, high competence, great honesty and great credibility in this province.

It has meant Governments with different philosophies have come and gone, but the people of Manitoba have been well-served. The numbers and the figures so important in dealing with financial matters were always to be trusted through the stewardship of Mr. Curtis as the Deputy Minister.

He has been given very difficult assignments by various Governments in transition. He has also been given some hot potatoes between various Governments, when Hydro was under considerable scrutiny in the late '70s, MTX in the '80s. Mr. Curtis was handed the hot potato, and it has meant that we could disagree on the philosophical and policy issues, but on the competence and administration we knew Manitobans were well-served.

I have always trusted the advice of Mr. Curtis, and I often feel that the public service in this province has an exemplary example of the kind of person who we, I think, all revere in terms of their responsibilities. I am often very worried too, Mr. Speaker, that we may be overworking Mr. Curtis' credibility.

I watch him come in with his briefcase and how many portfolios he has stuck in that briefcase from the various hot potatoes he has to handle, I do not know, in any given day. I know it is a lot bigger than it was before. They have a lot more files than before, but we would certainly like to add our words of congratulations to Mr. Curtis, a fine person and a dedicated public employee of the Province of Manitoba. Thank you.

* (1340)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have from the Robertson School, nine Grades 3 and 4 students under the direction of Carol Klem. This

school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows (Mr. Chornopyski).

Also this afternoon from the St. Alphonsus School, we have thirty Grade 5 students under the direction of Sheila Lawrence. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

CFB Portage la Prairie Western Premiers' Conference

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). I believe that all Manitobans, but particularly the people of Portage la Prairie, were dismayed to learn that their Premier (Mr. Filmon) has agreed not to get into, in his words, "fedbashing" at the Western Premiers' Conference over the closure of their military base. That the First Minister would not consider the loss of 800 jobs and \$30 million in revenues important enough to place on the agenda at the Premiers' Conference is completely unacceptable. This is not a question of fedbashing. This is a question of standing up for Manitoba. On Monday, in putting forward his agenda to the conference, the Premier stated, "The military base closures are at the top of our list of concerns." He roars like a lion in Manitoba but he sure turns into a pussycat when he gets to Alberta.

My question is, why has his Premier not seized this opportunity to get a joint statement from the four western Premiers telling the Prime Minister that the closure of military bases in Canada is not acceptable and is another example of the federal Government's failure to address the issue of regional economic development?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): This Government and our Premier have made our views known very strongly regarding CFB Portage. There is no question about where we stand in relationship to the loss of those jobs and the ones at Kapyong Barracks but, Mr. Speaker, at the Western Premiers' Conference, while I was not a fly on the wall as neither was the Leader of the Opposition, you can rest assured that Manitoba's case was being put forward strongly.

Mrs. Carstairs: This is a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) himself said this morning on radio that he was not prepared to push his colleagues to make that kind of a joint statement. Will the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) immediately contact the Premier of this province and demand that he fulfill his commitment which the Premier made before he left for that meeting that he would work towards getting a joint statement from the western Premiers on this critical issue to Portage la Prairie?

Mr. Cummings: You can rest assured, as I said a moment ago, about the concern that our Premier took

to the conference regarding that situation, but the Leader of the Opposition forgot to quote the rest of what the Premier said in that particular interview, which was that the other three provinces either had a neutral or a positive effect. The situation was that we have an agreement now among the western provinces to stop being predatory on each other, which is also important on keeping jobs in this province.

Closure

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to have the Deputy Premier explain to this House if it is acceptable to their Government that troops be moved out of Manitoba and put in provinces like Alberta, and if that is acceptable to this ministry of this Government?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, we have very strongly stated our case. Our case was taken to Ottawa, it was taken to the Western Premiers' Conference, and we are looking after the interests of those people in Portage.

Mrs. Carstairs: It still has not been taken to the Prime Minister, because he cannot get in to see him.

An Honourable Member: Can you see John Turner?

Mrs. Carstairs: Yes, I did, as a matter of fact.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1345)

Assistant Deputy Minister Termination

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Several weeks ago, all Leaders in this House attended a panel set up by Manitoba Women in Government. At this meeting the Premier, I think with great sincerity, spoke about the need of professionalism in the Civil Service, the need for performance evaluation. He also recognized that political appointments should be restricted to political staff, boards and commissions, and at the Deputy Minister level. In light of that, can the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) tell the House today why the Associate Deputy Minister of Education Finance was fired today without a single performance evaluation conducted which indicated negative performance?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) that the Department of Education and Training does not have an Associate Deputy Minister. We have an Assistant Deputy Minister, and I think that is the position she is referring to.

As a result of the amalgamation of the Finance and Administration of post-secondary and schools into one

division, I am happy to say that we have decided to hire Miss Denise Lovatt because of her training experience that she has with regard to financial matters. We are confident that she will be able to handle the affairs of the restructured division of my department very well and very capably.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain to this House why the one performance evaluation done by the Deputy Minister, Glenn Nicholls, was a positive performance evaluation and why, after a positive performance evaluation, this individual was fired by this Minister?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, our responsibility as Government is to make sure that we have the best possible people in the most important positions that we have available to us.

When this department was reorganized and when we have assumed the responsibilities of training within our department, certainly that has created some additional administrative responsibilities. In that light, Mr. Speaker, we have decided that we needed the kind of person who we found in Miss Denise Lovatt to handle the affairs and the leadership of that particular division.

Civil Servants Performance Evaluation

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier, civil servants of this province deserve to be treated with equity and with dignity. What guarantees do we have from this Government, after the statements made by their Premier, that performance evaluations will be performed on each Member of the Civil Service Commission, and that and that alone will be used as the basis for promotion and demotion?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I take some umbrage at the question of competence when we have appointed a lady from Treasury Board to this position and her competence is beyond question, in my opinion. She has gone forward to fill a position that is needed.

She prefaced her question, Mr. Speaker, by talking about what the Premier (Mr. Filmon) had said in reference to women in the work force. Obviously, the employee who has been removed feels dissatisfied with having been removed, because this Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) is dissatisfied with that. But, frankly, we are putting people forward who we believe can do the job most competently, and that is why we made that appointment.

Critical Home Repair Program Elimination

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). We have seen over the past little while a Government and a Minister that is fixated on selling Government land to private sector land developers.

* (1350)

At the same time as the Government was congratulating itself on its land deals with Ladco and College Green, the Fort Osborne Barracks, it was much more silently eliminating the Critical Home Repair Program, a program that for the 1986-87 fiscal year received nearly 15,000 applications from low-income homeowners and seniors. Can the Minister now confirm that his Government has cut off this program to low-income families, to working families and to seniors, and they will no longer be able to repair their homes under the Critical Home Repair Program?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, we have not closed off and the Member, during the process, will see that we reviewed, we looked at all applications. We are still going through the applications and we are doing it on an emergency basis. That is what we will carry on doing in our department.

Mr. Cowan: If the Minister would call his own department and ask them to send out a Critical Home Repair Program application, he will find that he will be told that the Critical Home Repair Program was cut off in March of this year.

Now, I would ask the Minister again, can he confirm, given the information by his own department, that program has been cut off since March of this year, that his Government has had another attack on working poor, working families, low-income and middle-income families and pensioners through their elimination of this very important program, the Critical Home Repair Program?

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, we have looked and we did look at applications up to the time of what the Member has suggested. We did proceed under our Critical Home Program. The Member at the time of Estimates will be allowed to go through the different programs when we review them at Estimates time.

Mr. Cowan: I can see why the Government did not want to announce this on or before Seniors Day. I cannot see why now when they are caught with the elimination of a very important social housing program that they will not have the courage to stand on their feet and say yes, we eliminated that program. It is no longer available to low-income families, working families and pensioners.

Co-operative Housing Groups Funding

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): My question to the Minister is, can he also confirm that there has been no indication given by his department to the many non-profit and co-operative housing groups that have been waiting for approval since last October for their projects with respect to projects for this year, and that because of that lack of direction, lack of contact, and lack of approval, many of those projects are now at risk, which would further reduce this province's social housing stock?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): The Member from across the way is trying to confuse the

issue. Since April 1, the Critical Home Program has received 88 new applications under that program. To date, I agree these applications have not been acknowledged. However, up until April 1 of '88, we have proceeded and carried out all these programs.

Mr. Cowan: I do not know how many ways he has to try to answer the question and let us know what is happening without coming out and saying yes, there is no longer any Critical Home Repair Program, and that will have a profoundly negative effect on low-income families, working families and seniors in this province.

Non-Profit Housing Application Processing

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is with respect to another program which is being stalled by his Government and that is the Non-Profit Housing Program. Can he confirm that notices of approvals, which should have gone out last fall for applications that were made in October, have not yet been answered by his department and that delay, that stalling, while they are playing around with the land developers, is creating hardship in the social housing program area? We will have less social housing programs this year because of that stalling?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): First of all, let not the Member try to tell this House that they were not involved in land development business in Meadows West. The only trouble is, under his particular Government, the Meadows West was not too successful. However, under ours, we will be successful. He also fails to mention that under the Peat Marwick Report that it suggested that we do proceed with selling off land or going into joint ventures.- (Interjection)- It has been suggested.

He also has not mentioned in regard to the non-profit -(Interjection)- The Member across the way knows that we will be announcing all our projects and it will be done, I would say, within 30 days, and there is no way that we have cut back in our housing programs for '89.

* (1355)

Political Appointments Department of Education

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the education community is pleading for some actual decisions to be made. Instead what do we have, boards, committees, advisory bodies formed. In the month of June alone, this Minister, the Minister of inaction, has created four such committees. One member appointed yesterday to the advisory group to study community colleges, one Bob James, private consultant, was also listed as the recipient of two untendered contracts from the Department of Education in December 1988 and January 1989.

My question to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) is, is the plan of this Government, and

specifically this Minister, to continue increasing the bureaucracy and providing a forum for political appointments?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I would like the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) to identify what political appointment she is referring to that has come into my department because I am not aware of a political appointment within my department.

Mrs. Yeo: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the one individual who was a recipient of untendered contracts.

Illiteracy Task Force Recommendations

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Yesterday, the chairperson of the task force to study illiteracy, when asked what new issues were raised at the hearings, stated that the Inner City and the northern Native community has a high concentration of illiteracy. My question to the Minister is, was it necessary to spend \$300,000 of the taxpayers' money to reach such conclusions?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to respond to that question because I think if the Member for Sturgeon Creek or her Leader would take 10 minutes to look at the recommendations that have been made by an independent task force, they would see that in fact Manitobans did want the review. They did want the task force. They have been able to speak to the issues of illiteracy in this province. There are 28 recommendations here that will be acted on immediately. We have increased the budget by threefold for literacy in Manitoba. I am very proud of the work that was done by this independent task force and I am very proud of the monies that we have been able to allocate to helping learners in this province.

Special Needs Children Literacy Program Funding

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): These recommendations are very similar to recommendations that were made some months ago. Why is this Minister denying increased funding for the special needs of Inner City students, the highest concentration of students with challenging needs in the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, we are devoting some \$929,000 to literacy this year. Besides that, I have to inform the Member for Sturgeon Creek that beyond the grants that Winnipeg School Division No. 1 received on a per student basis, special needs, upgrading of facilities to accommodate special needs students, Winnipeg School Division also receives over \$6 million extra in special grants to look after the needs of specially handicapped or special needs students within that division.

Mr. Speaker, we do address the needs of special needs students. We have been very generous to school divisions across this province and will continue to be in education matters.

Manitoba Telephone System Fax Machine Sales

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, Crown corporations must have an arm's length relationship with Government. However, Government must also establish certain philosophical directions. This Government, while in Opposition, clearly stated that they did not want MTS in direct competition or conflict with small business in items such as computers.

My question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). Will the Deputy Premier tell this House why, with this philosophical direction, MTS has decided to directly compete with small business in Manitoba with respect to the sale of fax machines?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the issue of competition is the question that was addressed by the chairman of the board of MTS, indicated that they would be meeting with their competitors to make sure that they were not providing unfair competition. I can tell you, as well, that as Government we will be watching closely to make sure that our Crowns do not create unfair competition for businesses.

* (1400)

Competition

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, MTS has maintained that it is necessary for each phone line to have one telephone supplied by them. To the Deputy Premier, given the fact that they are competing with small business but will not also allow small business to compete with them, when will this Government eliminate this provision so that all are on the same level playing field?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, is the Member for Springfield advocating that MTS now relinquish its responsibility as a Crown monopoly in this province? Is that what he is suggesting?

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is asking questions. I hope he gets used to that role because he will be back in that role pretty soon. He mentioned new, unfair competition, but you are not paying up. You are just paying lip-service again.

Fax Machine Sales

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) is, has the Minister any information as to what effect MTS' entry into the fax business will have on small businesses selling and leasing fax machines in this province? That is, how many will be forced out of business or how many will be forced to drop fax machines and their product lines because of the unfair competition of this Government?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Member for

Springfield that no notice of unfair competition has been filed with my office. Nothing has been brought to my attention with regard to any unfair competition by Manitoba Telephone System. If they are calling the Member for Springfield, perhaps he should refer them to my office and we can do something about it.

AIDS Reporting Confidentiality Breach

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Second Opposition Party (Mr. Doer) raised a very serious issue about confidentiality of the AIDS reporting system in Manitoba. I would like to provide information, and I beg indulgence of the House because I may take an extra minute in terms of the answer -(Interjection)- If my honourable friends in the Opposition do not want the answer, I will be prepared to give it in the hall to the media if that would be more suitable to them, but I think they raised it in all seriousness.

Mr. Speaker, I reviewed the document in question and sought advice as to whether the guidelines for reporting had been in any way violated in terms of the confidentiality of the individuals testing positive for the HIV virus. I am assured that there is no breach of confidentiality in terms of the information that was presented in the document. There was no professional or occupational information as part of that report coming from Cadham Lab. The lack of breach of confidentiality is concurred in by professionals, and any knowledge or identification of the name to any of the individuals so described could only be achieved by someone with inside knowledge, in other words, part of the testing system from the physician standpoint. I am confident and I can reassure Manitobans that the report as presented has not breached confidentiality. I want Manitobans not to be concerned about the taking of blood tests—

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

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

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

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I want to believe that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) did not deliberately mislead this House in his answer. For that reason, I am standing on a point of order to advise him of information which came to me just following my question to him. I hope by doing so I offer him an opportunity to correct the record and any misinformation that was put on the record by himself.

An Honourable Member: Shame.

Mr. Cowan: No, I do not believe it was intentionally. Mr. Speaker, after having asked my question, staff called his Deputy Minister's office—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The point of order?

Mr. Cowan: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is I believe that the House has been misled. I do not want to believe that was done intentionally. I believe that I have a responsibility as a Member of this House to ensure that if it comes to my knowledge that there may have been an inadvertent misleading of the House that the Minister who misled the House has an opportunity to correct the record before it goes any further. I just want to inform the Minister as to the information which came to me from his office so that he can correct the record with respect to the question.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Housing, on the same point of order.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I answered that under those applications, that we are carrying them through under emergency circumstances to the Emergency House Repair Program. I mentioned emergency in my remarks to him and I mentioned that we have not completely closed down -(Interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ducharme: We are still answering those under the Emergency Housing Program -(Interjection)-

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

Mr. Ducharme: I said that, and you will check the record tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ducharme: I did say the Emergency Program.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). There was no point of order. It seems a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer)—oh, the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), on a point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) knows full well that he should not, under our rules, stand in this House during Question Period on a point of order and get into a debate on a matter of interest to himself.

My complaint under this point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that under the guise of a point of order, the rules have been abused by the Honourable Member knowingly in this particular matter. This is not a proper way to handle a disagreement with the Minister, and the Honourable Member for Churchill knows that. I would ask your Honour to remind him of that.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae). As I stated earlier, there was no point of order, but I would like to

thank the Honourable Member for advising all Honourable Members of that. There was no point of order.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Member for Churchill—

Mr. Cowan: On a new point of order—

Mr. Speaker: —on a new point of order.

Mr. Cowan: The Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) rose and put certain imputations of motive on the record. I want it to be clear, Mr. Speaker, that there is an obligation and responsibility on the part of all Members of this Assembly to call to the attention of the Assembly when they believe misinformation has been provided to the House.

I want to assure the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) and the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), yourself and all Members of the Chamber that I rose on that point of order because I care about the following of the Rules of this House. It was done to provide an opportunity to the Minister to correct the record—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan). If such was the case, I believe there was not a point of order, but I had given the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) the opportunity for the clarification. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order. Therefore, I have recognized the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), and I thank you for his answer today. I would note that there are other people who disagree with his interpretation. I heard Mr. Glen Murray this morning on the radio with a different interpretation of those guidelines.

My question deals with the preciseness of his answers recently, and the fact that he was very precise on three questions yesterday dealing with the pay equity issue—the \$2.3 million. I am glad to see that the Minister of Health will be precise from now on in terms of the financial matters in his department.

Health Care Underspending

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) now confirm to the people of Manitoba that his department, including the Health Services Commission, has underspent at least \$21 million and included in that is at least \$4.5 million in the Home Care Program of Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the preciseness of the answer that I gave on the pay equity issue is required because we have been

negotiating for the last seven months unsuccessfully, and we have not been negotiating—I rephrase that. The negotiations have been going on between management and the unions for the last several months for the implementation of pay equity.

The resolution has not been achieved, yet we are required to meet the legislation as we have agreed to retroactively. Money has been set aside to do that, contrary to the information that my honourable friend from the New Democrats was trying to put on the record.

* (1410)

Home Care Program Underspending

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my specific question to the Minister is, has his department, including the Health Services Commission, underspent by \$21 million, and has that, as part of that underspending, been at least \$4.5 million in the Home Care Program? A question I have asked this Minister on previous occasions—he runs back to the House with many other answers—could he please tell the people of Manitoba today in terms of the accuracy of the information we have?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, there will be complete, full details of the spending in the Department of Health when those numbers are completed and they are published in the fourth quarterly report. That is the process.

I have never indicated to my honourable friend that the department has not underspent in some areas of the departmental budget. That is not unusual. That has even happened from time to time during the NDP years. That information will be made available when complete. I will be fully prepared to share that with my honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Doer), who is so wanting that kind of information.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, my final question to the Minister is, in light of the fact that we know he has underspent in his department by \$4.5 million at least, in the Home Care Program last year, can he explain to Mrs. Weisman, a 92-year-old lady who was cut off home care, why the people of the North End and other areas of the city are being cut off home care, so this Minister can save money in his Budget at the expense of the seniors of this province in terms of the quality of service it is supposed to provide.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I suppose when you are in the New Democratic Party and you have not a new issue, you must bring up ones from six months ago.

I want to tell my honourable friend, and I will repeat for him because I know that he does not want to believe this, even the Members of the Official Opposition have indicated that there has been no change in the policy in the Home Care Program. There has been no change in the enforcement of the policy. My honourable friend of the New Democratic Party fails to admit that more

dollars have been spent on home care this year than last year, that individuals have received more service this year than last year. The policy is not changed one iota.

Tourism Action Plan Endorsement

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst). I have just read the recently printed document in the Community Tourism Action Plan which does come out of the Minister's department. My question to the Minister is, has he read this document? Does he endorse its content?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) would like to table the document so I can see exactly what she is speaking about, I would be prepared to comment.

Ms. Gray: I would assume a document which comes out of the Minister's department he would be aware of.

Gender-Neutral Language

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): A supplementary for the same Minister, this document which is to be widely circulated is a blatant example of female stereotyping. It says it is the men who do the business, the men who spend the money, and the women who wait on them. Does the Minister support this poorly written document which stereotypes women and fails to use gender-neutral language?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): First of all, my department produces hundreds of documents on an annual basis. Because the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) stands up and holds a book in the air and says this is from my department, I do not know for sure what it is, what it says or anything else, but if she tables the document, I will respond to her questions.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I do not care whether 1,000 documents come out of the Minister's department, but none of them should stereotype females, and none of them should have language that is not gender neutral.

Government Documents Gender-Neutral Language

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): My final supplementary is for the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Hammond). There obviously is no policy with this Government which ensures that unacceptable language and unacceptable material which goes out through the Government uses gender-neutral language, and that there is no stereotyping of females. Can the Minister responsible for the Status of Women today commit to establish some clear policy direction with the Government and with her colleagues which will ensure

that gender-neutral language is utilized, and that unacceptable material such as what has been printed in this document does not occur in the future?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): I thank the Member for that question. That was one of the recommendations that came out of the Women's Initiative. We are actively looking at Government, at everything that comes out of Government to make sure that it is gender neutral. If something has inadvertently slipped through, by all means we will look at it and make every effort to change it.

Transportation Industry Layoffs

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) whether he had been consulted on some major cuts that were taking place in flight services in this province. The Minister did not know anything about it. Last month when we asked about 3,395 layoffs at CN that were going to take place across Canada, the Minister did not know anything about those layoffs, even though he had met with the senior vice-president for CN only two weeks before.

I ask this Minister today whether he can indicate whether he now has received definitive information on the extent of those layoffs for this province and whether in fact he has raised his disapproval with the way that his office has been by-passed on this serious issue facing Manitoba?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to indicate that the questions the Member has been raising, most of them have been federal issues. I have indicated many times in this House that I have raised my concerns with the federal Department of Transportation about anything that affects the transportation industry in Manitoba in terms of jobs, whether it is CN, VIA Rail, whether it is the flight service out of Dauphin. These are concerns. I have concerns for Manitobans just like he does. Any time there is an issue that comes forward, I have been trying to raise the concerns with the federal department.

Mr. Plohman: It is not tolerable to Manitobans for him to dismiss these serious issues as strictly federal issues. They affect Manitoba and particularly rural communities in Manitoba. In view of the fact that 98 of 200 jobs in maintenance will be eliminated in the Hudson Bay area north of Dauphin, can this Minister indicate whether he has asked his First Minister, the Premier of this province (Mr. Filmon), to raise the issue of layoffs, CN layoffs, with the western Premiers at that conference to protest in the strongest terms to the Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. Albert Driedger: I can only indicate that our Premier is out there raising the concerns of Manitobans together with the western Premiers on many issues. Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure the Member for Dauphin

at this time exactly all the items that are on the agenda, but I know that the Premier is out there representing the concerns of Manitobans in the best way possible.

Mr. Plohman: This Minister did not even ensure that the serious issue was on the agenda of the Western Premiers' Conference. He does not even know if it is on. I ask whether the Acting Minister of Rural Development can tell this House what steps he is putting in place to mitigate against the effects of 98 layoffs in small communities in Benito, Birch River, Grandview, Mafeking, Minitonas, Roblin, Pine River, Sifton in my area of the province? What actions is he taking to offset those cuts to my rural areas of this province?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I will take that under advisement for the Minister.

Non-Profit Housing Proposal Calls

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): This Government has showed time after time that they have no commitment to non-profit housing. I have pointed out that in the past on the grants and subsidies where we saw a cutback of 9.7 percent, Mr. Speaker.

My question is in regard to the proposal call put forward on the housing co-op for non-profit organizations in September of last year. I have talked with co-op consultants, and I am more than happy to give the consultant's name to the Minister upon request. He has informed me that there has been a lack of approval of unit allocations. Will the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) tell me if the Minister is going to be supplying a new proposal call for this fiscal year, and how many approvals has he put through for the previous or the past fiscal year?

* (1420)

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, first of all when the Member talked about grants and subsidies, let him not mislead the House in suggesting when he is comparing actuals to budget items. What is shown in this year's Estimates is the actuals. When subsidies requests come forward, then they are dealt with, but you always refer to actual.

The other question that he has, as I mentioned, to the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), we will make an announcement of all our allotments. I can assure the Member across the way there has been no cutback on the allotments for 1989.

Mr. Lamoureux: To the Minister of Housing, I have been accurate. There is a 9.7 percent cut in the housing grants and subsidy portion of your budget. You are the one who made the budget. Of all the people, sir, you should be the one that knows that you have a cut there.

My question is regarding housing co-ops. CMHC, through the index-link mortgage, has cut back from 1987, 174 units to '88, 154 units.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

Mr. McCrae: I do not know what the Honourable Member had for breakfast this morning but would he get on with his question.

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

CMHC Subsidy Cuts

Mr. Speaker: Would the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) kindly put his question. Order, please; order, please. Would the Honourable Member for Inkster kindly put his question now, please.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): It is a very serious issue. The housing co-ops are being penalized in the Province of Manitoba. This year in '89, only 70 units have been allocated.

My question to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) is, has he been informed or has he been keeping up to date in terms of the cutbacks that CMHC has been providing or giving the Province of Manitoba? If so, what is he doing about it?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the Member gets up and talks about subsidies, etc. He not only realizes that on the subsidy section some of these programs were ceased in the last couple of years, and what you are doing is you are picking up the difference in mortgage funding, the differentials in mortgages, and all this would be dealt with at Estimates time. To get up in this House and explain a program in a couple of sentences, a program affecting in the vicinity of approximately 56,000 households, to explain in one sentence is ridiculous. The process is at Estimates time.

Funding

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Maybe at this point, given the 9.7 percent cutback according to his budget, will the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) assure this Chamber that will not affect the housing co-op programs that are in his department, the 9.7 percent cutback?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Again, we are fulfilling co-op obligations during the course of the year, and we are announcing our housing programs. As I mentioned to the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), we will be announcing the allotment of all our units in a very short time.

Non-Profit Housing Proposal Calls

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): The Minister has shown in his answers today that he does not understand his own department. He does not understand or at least

he does not want to acknowledge when his department eliminates a very important social housing program. He has just indicated that he does not understand how allocations are dealt with by his department. There is a proposal call in October, and normally within six to eight weeks those proposal calls are approved.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Honourable Member kindly put his question now? Time is very scarce.

Mr. Cowan: I am trying to be helpful to the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

They are approved in November so that groups can start land assembling construction. Why has the Government, at this late day, put so many social housing programs at risk, including co-op housing, including seniors non-profit housing, because they have not come back in response to those proposal calls that were made in good faith in October?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): We are responding to all proposal calls. I would like to maybe mention to the Member, I would like to know what kind of proposal call he had for Aspen Park.

Mr. Speaker: Time for oral questions has expired.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mrs. Carstairs: We frequently hear of marriages of the mind. There is a certain envy which surrounds all of in this room when we learned today that a wedding will take place on Saturday. This wedding will take place between a member of the press gallery and a cameraman, albeit from a different station. Now can you imagine how all of us would like to have our own cameraman, or maybe we would all like to have our own specifically assigned press officer? In this particular case, with Debbie McKenzie's and Lars Sharp's wedding on Saturday, we will indeed have that wonderful marriage of the mind in which the cameraman and the reporter tie the knot and make for that perfect marriage in the TV world.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave for a non-political statement?

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

Mr. Doer: Being a recent expert in this fine tradition, I would like to pass on our congratulations as well on

behalf of the New Democratic Party to the two. I have never seen blushes before from either of them that we see today. I look forward to our media baseball game where we will return the victories that we are so in need as MLAs in the future. Thank you.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Could I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I join with all my colleagues in the House in expressing best wishes to the bride and groom on the occasion of their wedding. I know Debbie McKenzie from my early days as an upstart alderman on Brandon City Council. I just want to associate myself and my colleagues with the remarks of other Honourable Members today.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Mr. Speaker: I have several Rulings for the House.

On Tuesday, June 20, the Deputy Speaker took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) respecting comments made by the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) while speaking on a grievance.

I have read Hansard and have carefully examined the remarks of the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

In my opinion, they did not constitute a breach of the rules or customary practices of this House. The Honourable Minister therefore had no point of order.

Another ruling for the House.

On Thursday, June 22, I took under advisement an alleged matter of privilege raised by the Honourable Minister responsible for The Workers Compensation Act (Mr. Connery) relating to statements made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) on June 20.

* (1430)

I have read the remarks of the Honourable Member for Selkirk and of the Honourable Minister and the letter from the Ombudsman tabled by the Honourable Minister. I listened carefully to the advice of other Honourable Members. I have also reviewed previous Manitoba Speaker's Rulings and the usual authorities to which we refer in these matters.

Beauchesne Citation 31(1) states that "A dispute arising between two Members as to allegations of facts does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege." Maingot points out that "A dispute between two Members about questions of fact said in debate does not constitute a valid question of privilege, because it is a matter of debate."

Beauchesne Citation 494 states in part that "... statements by Members respecting themselves and particularly within their own knowledge must be accepted." The same citation also points out that "on

rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident."

The Honourable Minister in his remarks did not indicate in what manner his privileges or the privileges of the House, in his view, had been breached. The privileges of the Legislature collectively and of Members individually are those rights without which they could not discharge their parliamentary functions.

In my opinion, what occurred was a dispute over the facts and the Honourable Minister has failed to establish a prima facie matter of privilege. Therefore, I must rule that this issue is not in order as a matter of privilege.

I have another one.

On Friday, June 23, I took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) respecting the words, "We have all noted with interest that there have been changes to the Public Utility Board, I presume so it is easier for ICG to get their rate applications through," spoken by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

I have reviewed the context in which these words were used. I have also listened carefully to the advice of Honourable Members.

As Honourable Members know, I am of the opinion that this is a place in which there is bound to be controversy and in which unkind words and phrases will be used from time to time.

In this case, however, I believe the Honourable Member for Flin Flon has exceeded the limits we should set for ourselves by casting doubt on the impartiality and honesty of the Public Utilities Board.—(Interjection)—Order, please.

I am, therefore, ruling that the words spoken by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon were unparliamentary and I am asking him to withdraw them.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Yes, Mr. Speaker, having read your ruling, I certainly had no intention of casting any aspersion on the honesty and integrity of the Public Utilities Board, and I withdraw unconditionally.

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

This will be the last one. It is unfortunate that we have already distributed this ruling. I see that the Honourable Member for Flin Flon has somewhat moved his place.

The Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) rose on a matter of privilege on Friday, June 23, respecting questions asked the previous day by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. After receiving the advice of Honourable Members, for which I thank them, I took the matter under advisement.

In his remarks the Honourable Minister stated that "... the Member for Flin Flon has erred and violated the Rules of this House in not having accurate information." The Honourable Minister was, I believe, referring to the requirements of Beauchesne Citation

362 in the Fifth Edition, that, "It is the Member's duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings it to the attention of the House." This citation refers particularly to the placing of written allegations before the House and then asking Ministers to confirm or deny them. In any event, such a matter would be a matter of order, not privilege, as it has to do with the rules and practices of the House, rather than the privileges of Members and of the House.

In his remarks, the Honourable Minister referred to an allegation by the Member for Flin Flon, "... that changes in air ambulance services practices may have contributed to the death of at least one northern Manitoba patient." I have reviewed the questions asked on June 22 by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) and did not find this allegation in the questions or the preambles. Such an allegation, however, was attributed to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in an article which appeared in the Winnipeg Sun on June 23. Beauchesne Citation 31(3) advises that statements made outside the House by a Member may not be used as the basis for a question of privilege.

This matter appears, in my opinion, to be a dispute over the facts. As many previous Manitoba Speakers have ruled, a dispute over the facts does not fulfill the conditions of privilege. This view is supported by Beauchesne Citation 31(1) and by Maingot.

The Honourable Minister, in my view, has failed to establish a prima facie case of privilege and the question is therefore out of order as a matter of privilege.

I would like to thank all Honourable Members for their indulgence.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Bills in the following order—before I give you the list, I should tell my counterpart, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock), that initially we had discussed placing Bill No. 30 first on the list, but I think Bill 30 will have to be the subject of a discussion between himself and myself, so that if it would be all right with the Opposition House Leader we could begin with Bill 29, Bill 3, Bill 27, and Bill 6. The Honourable Member and I will discuss Bill 30 in the meantime and I will give you, Mr. Speaker, an update on our discussion on Bill 30. So Bill 29, Bill 3, Bill 27 and Bill 6, and I would ask both the House Leaders if that list in that order is satisfactory? (Agreed)

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 29—THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation anticipée de crédits, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for the Interlake (Mr. Uruski), who has 11 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, as we all are very aware in this House, we will be celebrating the summer season in an appropriate manner, I hope, and I will take this time to wish each and every one of you a very safe and happy summer and hope that we all can get the needed rest that I think we well deserve. Certainly those in Government positions, I appreciate, are probably that much more in need of it. At least certainly we see the mistakes coming out so we realize that it is just tiredness I am sure.

However, in Selkirk and district, we are particularly fond of the summer season because of the great tourist industry that it brings to our area. Just the day before yesterday, I was speaking to several outfitters and they were urging me to keep talking to the Government and encouraging them to recognize Selkirk as perhaps one of the centre attractions in the world for sports fishing.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Eight percent of the provincial sports fishing comes from

Mrs. Charles: The Minister for Natural Resources seems very aware, and I will look forward to further discussions with him on the topic as to what we can look forward to for support of the sports fishing in our area. We feel very strongly in our district about the potential for tourism in our district. We have the Lower Fort Garry, as is well known, just outside our district. In the Member for Lakeside's (Mr. Enns) district is Oak Hammock Marsh. We have River Road, which is a well-known tourist attraction with Captain Kennedy House and the old St. Andrews Church.

The district is a growing, prospering tourist area. Yet, because of the attraction that we have for world-class sports fishing and for other tourist potential, we still hesitate to sell our district to the potential we can because of the quality of water which we find running by our town and our homes along the Red River. Continually, we have written in the newspapers and other articles how wonderful the Red River is. We praise its beauty. The City of Winnipeg's advertising certainly points out the quality of the city has because of the Red River and the Assiniboine River coming together at this wonderful point in the country. However, we cannot be proud of our Red River because of the quality of water which exists within it.

* (1440)

As much as I support and will fully support the need for a clean drinking water source for the City of Winnipeg, and that Shoal Lake should have all preservation taken to enhance and continue its supply of clean water without being treated, I do think it is very strange that in one part we can talk about the need for Shoal Lake to remain clean, and then to have the city which receives that clean water expel that same water into the Red River in a quality that is not suitable under anybody's standards.

I recognize, as everyone in this House does, that it is not going to be an overnight solution to the clean-up of the Red River. I am very fearful that we are not hearing enough discussion taking place in this House

upon what to do with the Red River, how to co-operate with the federal Government to getting the funds that will be necessary for cleaning up the Red River. I am eagerly waiting to hear the results that we are promised with the discussions between the City of Winnipeg and this Government.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

We need a plan of action of how we are going to approach the clean-up of the Red River. Unless that is taken, I do not believe any Manitoban can hold their head high and claim that we have a province to be proud of. The Red River is an historical river. It is one, if anyone knows of the Province of Manitoba, they will recognize secondly in their mind, I am sure, the Red River. It is known in song, it is known in stories and is certainly well documented in history of what that means to us. I feel that by desecrating our natural history, that being the river, that we are making a statement to Manitoba and to our country about our commitment to our province. I urge every Member here to support all efforts because I think it will take a whole House effort in order to have this problem dealt with.

I also have been hearing from sports fishermen this spring and have received pictures of fish that are suffering from some malaise. It does not seem to be a cancer, it certainly is not eels, and no one really knows right now what is causing these contusions on the fish. They are, from time to time, reaching up to about four to six inches wide and going down right to the bone, and yet no one has an answer for what is causing the illness in these fish. I am fearful that we will continually see such occurrences happen if we do not put our directions and our priorities in environment, and just in tourism in our belief in the province towards our Red River, and make sure that we have a quality and quantity of water in that river of which we can be proud.

We certainly are well-known for commercial fishing in this province. As much as commercial fishing is an active industry of which we all support and would like to see ongoing enhancement, we have to recognize that along the same income, from what I can gather, we are gaining from our sports industry as well, that more trophy fish are taken out of the Lockport area than almost anywhere in the world in certain species of fish.

Yet, last fall, when the federal Government was dumping tailings from the bottom of the river, we had fish disappearing and they did not bite for several weeks, I understand. The Red River Advisory Group has met with the federal Government and with the Department of Natural Resources, and they are co-operating at looking at what is the best they can do for the river. It was also very obvious at that meeting that the study of the Red River, as to the fishing industry, has only occurred in the last year and a half. In the history of the river with our settlement along it, that is a very extremely short time frame.

So I urge this Government, in setting priorities in tourism, in environment and for direction of pride in our province, that they do not overlook the river indeed at our doorstep of this House, that if they are to say

that we have a proud future, then we have to make sure we are doing the best to make us proud of what we do.

Further to our district, we are very pleased and proud to have the announcement of a Dow Corning Plant coming into the East Selkirk area. We hope that it will come under close environment scrutiny and will pass it.

I am extremely proud of the residents in the area who have founded a committee in order to make themselves aware of the problems that may occur with the plant, that they will have the opportunity to make good representation at the environment hearings. I hope that they will, if necessary, fight any environmental concerns to the very end, but at the same time if they have those questions answered, will support the industry to the fullest extent that they can as well.

We in the Selkirk district have to be in competition with 60 percent of the population of the province literally an hour or less away from us. It makes industry in Selkirk a very difficult and challenging job. Although I think with the vision for the future we can look at the City of Winnipeg as a market area rather than a draw, I look forward to this Government supporting initiatives that will give Selkirk the ammunition it needs to stand on its own, to be a prospering community.

We look forward to a final decision and a positive decision on the Selkirk Landing Project. As I understand, although initial decisions were not positive, perhaps there is some reflection upon the needs of Selkirk and perhaps we will see, I think, a wise decision come from this Government when they give the province support for its rural development in the Town of Selkirk.

Although each and every one of us is a unique person and comes from a unique part of the province and we each are very proud of what that may be, I will continually say that Selkirk is in a special circumstance, being the only town within that bedroom/commuter shed area of the City of Winnipeg and yet being beyond free shipping costs or within a toll-free zone.

We have to compete with the City of Winnipeg and yet we do not have the market tools to do that. So in some special arguments, I think we can say that Selkirk needs a particular boost from time to time to make sure that we can do all we can to be part of Manitoba and to be part of a growing rural population instead of a receding rural population.

Having represented a rural municipality on the Association for Urban Municipalities in Manitoba, I have had the pleasure and opportunity to meet with many elected officials from the villages, towns and cities in the province. We all feel, of the Perimeter Highway, that there is a continuing attitude that if you are not within the city you do not exist, and I appreciate that this Government makes some service to rural development and understand that there is some awareness because of the make-up of the electorate being shown here in this House by the Government.

I do not know that those words and actions are getting out to the people because they keep asking me, so what is going to be happening out there? I urge this

Government if they have plans that they should soon let the rural areas know what they are because I think that, although this year we are finally having rain, they still are questioning because of the closeness of last year's drought to their heart and their pocketbooks, what their future may be when their children are looking at the tough times they have just gone through and saying that they too are going to leave their home farms or their home towns or they too are going to leave their cities for the larger centres in Manitoba and other provinces.

* (1450)

I am particularly concerned with this Government over its attitude of wanting to take away support for volunteerism in Manitoba, in particular within the multiculturalism department and the cultural department. No other agency has been singled out as much as the Manitoba Intercultural Council, and I am sure it has occurred, or I hope it has occurred because of poor representation to the Minister and not by the Minister's attitude herself.

I would hope that the Minister will be able to sit down with perhaps myself and the critic for the NDP and discuss where we are going and the multiculturalism group. None of us want to see any minority, any person who is new to our country and struggling to become an equal citizen, none of us want to see them without the best opportunity.

I invite the Minister over the summer to ask myself or any representation on our side of the House, or within the other third Party, that we could sit down and talk this out of where we are going and not make it confrontational, but get together recognizing that this House has a situation which I fully support, of an Opposition that is there to oppose and a Government that is there to make decisions. I think that from time to time we can put that aside and say we have done what we are here to do as to the show-and-tell situation. Let us get to work. That is what the people really want to have is some work done.

I will tell the Minister here today that I will give her full support in any move we can make to come to a solution to this crevice we have made in our thoughts right now. I think we want to reach the same goal, and we are having disputes of how to get there. Perhaps there are some areas that we could come to some agreements and some discussion, perhaps a fuller disclosure of what the policy of the Government is, and how they are going to get there would help us understand why decisions are being made.

At the time being, we do wonder how some of these decisions have been made. As I said just earlier that I suspect some bad directions were given the Minister and understanding that she is willing to stand as the leader of her department, as she well should, that on second thought there could be maybe some discussion made as to how to smooth some things over that are taking place and with full agreement so that we start the new year, of which I always think September, particularly as a mother seeing the kids go off to school. It seems like a new year in September, and maybe we

can start off that season on a ground where we can work together in a supportive manner with our multicultural community.

I have been privileged in my life to have through my household many members of the multicultural community, as I have spoken before. We had extreme pleasure at having a dear, what I came to regard as a son from Vietnam early in the 1980s. I learned so much from him. I believe it was a year and a half ago when I saw one of the films on Vietnam, I believe it was Full Metal Jacket, that I finally realized what one part of his terror was, this little boy from Vietnam.

In his broken English, he would tell me of people who would go in the ground and turn white. It did not dawn on me what that was all about until I saw this film where they had the bodies in the pits, and they were throwing lime over them. Then I realized why the terror was in his voice, what he had seen, what he had lived with. They bring that to our country. Can you imagine how they must feel to come here and be free, and how they must not know how to be free because they have never been that way?

This young lad would tell us of how his mother snuck him on the boat and claimed that this family that brought him over, allowed them to claim him as their son. She gave up her son in his name as well as his body in order that he may be free. I do not want to play politics with people who have gone through all that, nor does anyone else. They have a terror and a background in refugees that we will never know, and I hope that none of us shall ever know, nor shall our children, nor shall anyone's children know that terror.

People coming to our country cannot find it easy to settle in because of the language barriers and because of their cultures and traditions. We certainly have questions, even how we have treated our original peoples. We must do all to make everybody free.

I would also, at this point, want to bring in a discussion on the fact that none of us wants to talk about but must be talked about, I believe, in our schools. We are now finishing off, I hope, the end of the long inquiry into the aboriginal justice. We are hearing testimony that points out troubles in communities that do exist and attitudes that do exist that we must work towards resolving.

Education is the only way to break barriers that keep us apart. I would hope that grants can be directed towards the Department of Education that will develop books that are non-stereotyping, whether in abilities, in sex or in race, that we develop programs within our education system for the educators as well as those being educated, that is, our school children, that will teach an understanding of traditions.

We as human beings hate change and we hate not knowing or understanding. We obviously will always shun away from the unknown. I think many people are judged because they are different, not because people hate the person but because they hate the unknown. I hope within our school system, within this century even, that we can create an understanding and a knowledge for our youth, and that they as parents, as

politicians and as leaders in this world will come to teach the rest of us, as generations go by, a sense of understanding community that this world so desperately needs.

I also am the critic for the Department of Natural Resources and continually look at that as a very expansive portfolio. I am dismayed to see we are reducing support for silviculture industry in the Province of Manitoba, that the parks are not going to be as fully funded as before. I am already hearing of cuts that are taking place.

As much as within the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation we deal with culture, I think we also have to see our parklands as essential culture as well, totally different, but in as many areas the same, and that we learn, we appreciate, and we enjoy. That indeed is culture.

Our parklands, as we will be enjoying them this summer I hope for all us, are very precious to us, and we need a clear-cut policy as to whether these are a recreational place or indeed a preservation of our environment. Perhaps there should be some distinction between types and styles of parklands, designating in a fuller extent which can be which. I recognize that there are wilderness parks, but I think even within parklands we can enjoy the environment that each creates.

Even as crowded and as populated as Grand Beach is, we can also designate and appreciate what the sandy beach land is and how it developed. I do not think we are taking as much credit to the area as we could, and we are not appreciating the areas as we could if we developed a firm policy over what parkland and recreation land is all about.

That ties closely in again with recreation. I was sorry to see that Budget decreased as well to some degree, because I think in this world if we are to become healthier, we all have to have a sense of recreation somewhere in our life, nowhere perhaps more importantly than in our senior years for recreation to our seniors who have in some cases more time, although in my experience usually the more senior you get, the busier you get. I often hear of those who retire having no time whatsoever, and I think we all appreciate what our seniors are bringing to our life.

Then again, I have the opportunity, as many of the Members have when we go door to door during election campaigns, of meeting our seniors. That is the most fun of all. It is most difficult to turn down a lot of the hospitality they offer you, but you become quickly aware of how lonely so many of them are, that they want you at the door just so they can speak to you, they can invite you in and encourage you perhaps to stay for a cup of tea or coffee. I appreciate that they have a lot still to offer, that these are not their sunset years, these are their productive years. We should take and make use of those years and not waste them, and I think we should encourage their lifestyle through recreation.

* (1500)

I think there are many ways we are not being inventive enough to keep our seniors active and participating.

Let us face it, if we see them out there doing the job, I think we are quickly shamed into following them along and would encourage recreation to take a top priority. As I have read and I assume it is somewhat factual, three-quarters of our diseases, our health problems, are caused by lifestyle, and only about a quarter are caused by physiological diseases. So if we are to save in the long run our health budget, then we better keep us fit and healthy, both in mind, body and soul, I would hope. If that takes a few dollars output at the beginning, I think it will be well worth it in the long run. We must look towards that aim and look forward to seeing some direction by this Government into the health of recreation in our province.

I cannot, as I think almost every speech I have given, overlook the need for increased telephone service for our rural areas. My Selkirk riding, and I do not know how many ridings in this House, have definitely a halfway point in the riding, neighbours having to phone each other long distance. Recognizing that every schedule will have to have a line is understandable, but we also need to recognize that there are some natural service areas that should have a common calling district. I look forward to having a new plan developed, as I hear is being considered, for service calling areas within the province, and hope that the Town of Selkirk will become recognized in its natural service area so that neighbours do not have to call long distance. Perhaps we can look forward to having Selkirk being able to phone to the City of Winnipeg, its natural market area, without the added expense.

I also have to comment on the fact that the taxation on our telephone bills is not acceptable to rural people. I expect rural Members across the way recognize that as well, that to be taxed upon a tax over a service that is readily available to Winnipeggers, those inside the Perimeter Highway, creates that extra conviction of rural Manitobans that they are indeed a different set of Manitobans, that they do not have quite the same rights and privileges as those within the Perimeter Highway.

Of all cases I deal with most often within my office in Selkirk, which services the district, is the weekly and daily inundation of people with problems with Workers Compensation. I have, almost in every aspect of inquiry, had comments made by those at the other line saying things have gotten worse in Workers Compensation and not better. We were assured that April 1 would bring a new telephone system on, and yet I am still being told by claimants that they are being put on hold. Several weeks ago now, one of my claimants from the Dugald area, as a matter of fact, said he waited on hold for an hour at Workers Compensation until he finally gave up—an hour waiting on hold for Workers Compensation. I hope that was an 800 number, that he was not paying the long-distance claim.

I have to wonder about the efficiency of the organization when they on one hand can say they are clearing up the telephone problem and then put somebody on hold for an hour. I think each and every one of us can recognize for a few minutes someone may be left unknown on a telephone line from time to time—but an hour? Does not anybody ever walk by that phone and see the blinking going, as happens?

Although we have a complaints department known as the Ombudsman's Office within Workers Compensation, it is not given an 800 number. So rural Manitobans will have to pay to lay a complaint against one of their files whereas Winnipeggers, of course, can phone directly. I hope that is an easy enough problem to be dealt with, that this Government can look at that immediately.

I am shocked and dismayed over the fact that we are told by members who are known within the Workers Compensation organization and affiliates that there are 120 files they cannot get to for appeals. Now, although we have three new members on the Appeal Board, we continually understand, through discussions with the appeal process adjudicators and so forth, that these Appeal Boards do not meet on any given basis, that decisions are not made with any given time frame. It is continually an ad hoc situation with no one seeming to be in charge, and have been asked by certain people to shake up the Minister so that he will stop saying everything is getting better when it is not.

We do not expect, nor have we expected, an overnight solution to this problem because indeed it was in a frightful mess, but it is not getting better. If the Minister would acknowledge it, we would be glad to sit down and say what type of complaints we are getting and where we could suggest some solutions to be put. It is not acceptable to have people go on welfare when they are rightly due their process and rightly due their cheque from Workers Compensation. I have had people on welfare who have been accepted for a claim, who have been told they were going to get their money, but because the cheque does not come, and does not come, and does not come, they have to go on welfare. When those are townspeople in this Town of Selkirk, we, the citizens of Selkirk end up paying for 60 percent of their welfare costs as taxpayers.

Now I am not against paying their welfare costs because in these particular cases, they are well needed. These people need this money just to eat to survive. On the other hand, if I am paying it just because somebody has got a fouled-up department, I object to it because many of those taxpayers, unlike myself, cannot afford to pay their taxes very easily. They are scraping, they are working hard to pay their taxes every year. When we waste that money, when we put it into a system that is being neglected, not by the people claiming but by the Government producing the problem, then I think we all have a problem.

I would really like to be able to sit down as I have with other Ministers and discuss the problem. I see the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), we had a good discussion over abuse shelters. I think I helped, I hope, put some ideas into the Minister of what the problems were. We are glad to see similar solutions coming out to support them, and that is what we all can do in this House. I certainly, as well as anyone else, recognize the process here but I also appreciate co-operation. It has to go both ways, it cannot just come one way.

I would hope that each of us will be able to take a rest, get back together and do what we have to do in the question-and-answer forum that we have, or as people point out it is more questions, no answers. That is why it is called Question Period.

We do what we have to do to maintain the democracy we have to support our question, and the ability to stand up and ask a question and expect an answer or expect accountability. That is a system that no other people are as privileged as we to have, but at the same time to make a minority Government work we have to have co-operation. I, personally, will do all I can, and I think some Ministers here will support that I will work with Ministers where possible. If we are not getting co-operation both ways, it quickly falls apart.

So I look forward to September, coming back. It will happen to be the day after my son's birthday, so I will maybe be exhausted again after having a seven-year-old birthday party. I look forward to coming back. I see the mothers over there are nodding, oh, yes, seven-year-old boys, that looks fun, eh! I look forward to coming back as much as I look forward to a summer of a little bit of the pressure coming off because I think there are a lot of areas that we can improve. I hope that a little bit better co-operation is taken in all Houses here, so that we serve those that we are elected to serve to the best of our abilities. I will take this opportunity once again to wish you well for the summer, good health and let us all come back with lots of tan and big smiles come September. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

* (1510)

Mr. Ed Mandrake (Assiniboia): The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) is asking me whether or not he should leave, and I beg of him, please stay.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): I might have to get up again.

Mr. Mandrake: That is right. First of all, it brings me great pleasure to talk to this Bill, the Interim Supply Bill. I would like to, on behalf of my critic's area—first of all, let us start off on the high road and compliment the Minister on this newsletter I received today regarding the half a million dollars in Rural Bridge Program. I think it is high time coming. I think our rural areas deserve all of the assistance that we can provide them with. They have long been neglected in our highway construction budget. A particular project such as this certainly does now give the rural people the impression that we as Government, and I use that plurally, do believe that rural Manitoba certainly deserves some recognition.

The one thing that I would like to retract, and that is a compliment which I paid to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) regarding speech disorders. I was very, very happy that he had placed two additional speech therapists on board at the Health Sciences Centre but unfortunately, in reading through Hansard on June 15, our critic found out through the Minister that there are 300 children waiting for speech therapy—300 children.

An Honourable Member: That is not possible.

Mr. Mandrake: Well, this is what the Minister said, and he apologized for it.

Some Honourable Member: No, no.

Mr. Mandrake: No? Yes, he did. Read your Hansard, Mr. Finance Minister, read your Hansard. Of course, you do not know how to read, so again I will have to interpret it for you.

Mr. Acting Speaker, our children

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Acting Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mark Minenko): The Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), on a point of order.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Speaker, I have to rise on a point of order and ask the Member whether or not I heard myself correctly. I think he indicated that I could not read or something, and I must have been wrong when I heard that. I am not the world's best reader, I admit, but I can read.

The Acting Speaker (Mark Minenko): A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Mandrake: If I said anything wrong to the Minister of Finance, I dearly do apologize.

Mr. Acting Speaker, our children are our most valuable resource, and particularly our children who have a speech problem. They should be attended to. I would hope that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) would look at that kind of list of children waiting for speech therapy and possibly try to alleviate that.

During my speech to the Budget, I asked the Minister about \$6.8 million, and this is what he quoted on record: "The \$6.8 million that supposedly were savings because of the contracts coming in lower, if we look at what he says, we do not know where it is." Well, if you will look at the left side of page 93, on the left side, the top line, \$94,316,500 was expended last year. Then, of course, during Estimates, Mr. Acting Speaker, we found out where this \$6.8 million is.

All I am trying to say is that let us not leave things like that on record that give the critics the wrong impression. This Minister, this department, total revenue for last year was \$346,046,200.00. What does the budget give? A little bit over \$200 million. Is that an injustice? I say it is. Here our revenues are \$346 million and all we can get into this budget is \$200-and-some-odd million dollars.

Now, when they were in Opposition, they were very adamant about dedicated funding. Now they are in power. What action are they going to take with regard to dedicated funding? I would certainly love to see the policy with regard to that particular area. I have yet to see it. One year has gone by and nothing has ever developed. We will be watching with great anticipation to see what they are going to do about that particular area.

Mr. Acting Speaker, as the critic for Highways, I have spent a lot of hours in reviewing the annual report and some of the glaring things that have come to my attention. In particular, that is bicycle safety. Bicycle safety is very important, because a good portion of the

people who ride on bicycles are children. I would like to at this time just draw the attention of the Government, maybe they have seen it, maybe they have not, but I will bring it to their attention.

There is an article on TV called Bicycle Safety sponsored by I think it was Petro-Canada, if I am not badly mistaken. I think they said something about Bill, I only wish Bill—this little child who got injured in a bicycle accident—they say it is unfortunate that he was not taught how to ride the bike or was not taught the safety rules of bicycling. An only child supposedly was lost.

Now, that hit very dear to home. It is not that I have any young children—my daughter is married off—but all the children in my community, all the children in Manitoba as far as I am concerned are my children. If we lose one, that is one too many because of our neglect to implement and educate the young children as to what bicycle is and bicycle safety.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I have looked at the statistics again, as provided in the annual report which the Minister has provided me, and there is an increase in bicycle accidents. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has set up what he calls a Fiscal Stabilization Fund with \$200 million in it. I would ask him why he could not possibly let go of some of that money so we can use part of that money as an educational program for bicycle safety in our province.

* (1520)

The implementation of a suggestion—implementation, I do not care how you do it—of at least wearing helmets for people who are driving bikes is very, very important. If we could only just maybe take one initiative, that initiative, and prevent any more accidents, or accidents to escalate in the next year, I am quite confident everybody in this House would be very, very pleased with the initiatives of the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger).

Mr. Acting Speaker, in the annual report, again I was taken aback because our accident ratios in this province are climbing. I will give you an example: 1986-87, rear-end collisions were 743; this year, they are 779. I do not know why, I do not understand why it could be, but when you drive down Portage Avenue it is quite obvious. I mean, no longer are we maintaining any kind of distance between vehicles. We are sitting right almost on the other person's rear bumper. Something has got to be done. The accidents are just constantly escalating and escalating. We are not seeing any action being taken.

An Honourable Member: Do you have any statistics to back that statement?

Mr. Mandrake: The Minister asks whether or not I have any statistics. Please, come over here and I will give them to you.

An Honourable Member: No, I am over here.

Mr. Mandrake: No, you asked for them. I will give them to you. I will gladly provide you with them.

An Honourable Member: Put up or shut up.

Mr. Mandrake: Thank you very much, Harry. The people across the road are thinking they are going to upset me but forget it. I have dealt with you people like that back in the '50s, so it does not bother me one little bit. Believe me, no, it is true. You know, I served twelve-and-a-half years in the military, and I have had people like that before try to disrupt me and be very agitating. Unfortunately, I could not be as dictatorial as I was in the services. I understand where you people are coming from. Unfortunately, you just do not want to hear the truth, and that is why you are trying to distract things.

We have seen in the past several months CN layoffs, cuts, possible cuts in VIA Rail. Everything is going on. We are losing jobs, jobs and more jobs. We are not saying that the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) is responsible for CN Rail, but at least the thing he could do is lobby, the least he could do is lobby with great determination.

An Honourable Member: They are lobbying.

Mr. Mandrake: The Members across, they are saying they are lobbying but still we are losing those jobs. That must be a very good job of lobbying. Wake up and smell the roses, because it is just not happening, wake up.

Mr. Acting Speaker, CN layoffs, as an example, and this is the area that I am very much concerned with—CN layoffs, 40 people—CN layoffs, age 40 and over, which was just announced here a little while ago. Under five years, there are two people; between five to nine years, there are three; there are 19 people between 10 and 15 years.

The reason why I bring that up is, who is going to hire these people at age 40 and over? Who is going to retrain them? Who is going to hire them? In towns such as Sifton, Thicket Portage, Wabowden—the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) is laughing at that, I do not think that is funny—Pine River, Ilford, Gilbert. These are very, very small villages where these people come from. What are we going to do for job retraining for these people? What initiatives has the Minister taken on that particular issue, nothing? I have not heard anything. If he has taken any initiatives, come forward and tell us. We will gladly offer him praise if he has taken that initiative.

Mr. Acting Speaker, VIA Rail announced that they would be building a maintenance shop in Fort Rouge. My only question is, now with the talks that have been going on in Ottawa with Mr. Lawless, who is now the Chairperson for VIA Rail, what is going to happen to VIA Rail, but more importantly so is what is going to happen to that maintenance plant here in our province? Dimes to doughnuts we are going to lose it. I have a gut feeling we are going to lose it, and that would be very, very detrimental. That is very, very, very bad.

We have other issues that I would like to address today. One of them of course is I am going to just quote a few things here. I am just following the example of the Premier of the Province (Mr. Filmon). He makes

remarks about saving clippings. Well, I do the same thing so that I can always remind the Honourable Members from the Government that you are not the only one who picks up clippings and they reminds you of some of the things that have been said in the past.

Mr. Acting Speaker, June 15 in the Winnipeg Free Press, we were advised that an 80-year-old lady from San Diego, California was pronounced dead on arrival at the Morris General Hospital due to a car accident north of Letellier on Highway 75. This highway did not even get a mention in the Budget Speech, did not even get one mention in the Budget Speech. Why? Why do they not take greater care and understanding of what is happening? Here is what a little child says, a 12-year-old son, dubs Highway 75 as the highway to heaven. That is a 12-year-old child, that is her perception of Highway 75. I strongly suggest to the Members here to please speak to the Minister and take a more positive—or somehow let us get cracking on that highway whereby we do not lose not one child or not one other human being on that highway.

* (1530)

Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister had before him a multitude of resolutions proposed to him by the tourism industry. These were not costly items, they were relatively negligible in respect to dollars. This one for example is to make sure that the entire province be reintroduced to the map, and that includes the North and Churchill.

Here is another one, again from the tourism industry. Be it resolved that PTH 11, from Junction 44 to 11 to Grand Beach, and PTH 59, Grand Beach to 44 be designated as a La Verendrye Trail and appropriate signs installed. How much was that going to take to do something like that?

An Honourable Member: Thousands and thousands.

Mr. Mandrake: The Honourable Member says thousands and thousands of dollars. You were a critic for Highways, you should know how much a sign costs. It is not going to be no thousands and thousands of dollars, so do not give me the gears. Would you like me to put some quotes on the record which you said when you were in Opposition? I will.

I mean, it is all well and good to have fun, but let us show something positive.

Here be it another resolution. The maps should be identified with our parklands regions and historical places with little asterisks beside the appropriate area. Again, it does not take very much money to do something like that, but yet it gives the opportunity for the tourist to identify these areas and go and see our beautiful province.

I would like to go now to one particular area that I just came back from last weekend. Again, I am going to compliment the Minister. I will give him a compliment. He is setting up a truck stop on the corner of 10 and 16. I think that is an appropriate thing to do—it is. One thing that worries me, we are going to have a great influx of vehicles in that corner. We are going to

have increased traffic in that corner. Would he undertake today, not today, but would he undertake within a very short period of time, after the erection of that rest stop, to put lights on that corner whereby then you can control the traffic flow coming onto Highway No. 10 and going up North? It has been proven that there have been some serious accidents in that area. If we increase the traffic in that area, we just might get more accidents back. I do not think that would be an appropriate thing to do. Let us put a safety infrastructure there whereby we could eliminate any accidents that could happen.

We have been in the process of Estimates. I must admit that the Minister was very, very, knowledgeable. He provided answers to the both critics with speed and in great detail and I appreciate that. As long as we have that type of dialogue, I am quite confident that everything will go fine.

The one thing that I would like to put on record is that I raised a question of affirmative action in the Highways and Transportation Estimates. I was asking as to what affirmative action is there, for example, the Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy Minister, etc., etc. This was the reply which I got back from him, which I got a little bit ticked off with, and I am going to read it for the record. I do not know what raised the question because I do not have any ladies here. I do not think that we have some on staff who are in managerial positions. I found that a little bit offensive.—(Interjection)—I will just go back for a second.

He went on to say that the present staff that he has on hand have been with this Government, and previous Governments, and they are very capable people. I would never ever question that. All I am asking is that if one of them was to retire tomorrow morning, would he, if given the opportunity to replace that man with a visible minority, or a lady, would he undertake, providing they meet the qualifications—I mean, you are not going to just put a person in there because you have to meet certain criteria in affirmative action. I do not agree with that but if they meet all the qualifications, would he do that?

Mr. Albert Driedger: Yes, I can go along with that.

Mr. Mandrake: Thank you very much. I am very, very happy that you will.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I have brought a particular issue to the Minister's attention about truckers carrying dangerous commodities. They have to be identified on the front of the vehicle and at the rear of the vehicle. Last weekend, I went past a transport which was pulling a Rocky Mountain Trailer, and that one had the appropriate sign identifying it. It was carrying inflammable goods or whatever the case may be. I passed this truck and not one little sign on the front of the truck, not one. It is my understanding that it must be on the front of the vehicle and at the rear. If I am wrong, I am sure the Minister will correct me.

* (1540)

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): . . . on the sides as well.

Mr. Mandrake: The Member for Portage (Mr. Connery) says it is on the side too. I am not so much concerned about the side but I am very much concerned about the front of the vehicle. The side of course, I think he did have one on the side, so I am not going to make any remarks about that.

The other point, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that I raised the issue of Highway 75. I still, even until today, am very confused, amazed and totally appalled in the way which we are constructing our highways today. No. 1 Highway which has a minimum of a hundred feet in-between, we are chewing up so much good agricultural land to build a highway. It is beyond me, it is beyond my comprehension why we need this kind of a distance in between the highways. We have to mow that, we have to plant it, why not bring it closer together?

I mean, the Autobahn in Germany which has unlimited miles per hour, if your vehicle can go 150 miles an hour, you can do so in the left-hand lane, no problem. All there is between those is a steel girder. Cannot we take some of that knowledge from Germany and say, what is it you guys are doing that maybe we could implement here in Manitoba?

Mr. Acting Speaker, to chew up that beautiful agricultural land for our highways and leaving so much land in between our highways is simply appalling. I cannot understand the reasoning behind it. When I asked the Minister that particular question, he says it has been done for the past years and years and I have to rely upon my engineers, so therefore that is the way it is going to stay.

I am sorry, I do not go by the old philosophy of what has been happening in the past, I am going to be willing to live with it, maybe I can change.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Harold Gilleshammer, in the Chair.)

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Are you going to move all the highways?

Mr. Mandrake: The Member for Gladstone asks me whether or not I would move all the highways. She obviously does not understand what I am trying to say, and I am not going to repeat it. I will let you read it in Hansard, the Honourable Minister.

To use up such an enormous amount of good agricultural land, Mr. Acting Speaker, for the construction of our highways is beyond anybody's comprehension. I do not understand that.

As I said before, the Autobahn—I mean, land in Germany is very, very precious. If you have one acre of land in Germany, you are a rich person—one acre of land. Here, we just use it all up for no reason whatsoever. At least, I have not received a conclusive good reply as to why we are doing it.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

Mr. Acting Speaker, we do not even have to go to continental Europe for that. All we have to do is just go down south into the United States. The distance in between the highways is maximum 30 feet, maximum.

Why can we not just change? How much time do I have left?

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member will have six minutes remaining.

Mr. Mandrake: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Boy, time flies when you are having fun.

Mr. Speaker, in my summation, I must admit that the position which I hold as a critic for Highways and Transportation has been, to say the least, very enjoyable. We can have our little jokes across the path here, and we can all have our little digs and whatever we want to do, but it has been a great learning experience, an extremely good learning experience, particularly for myself.

I pride myself in listening to people. The Honourable Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) possesses so many years of parliamentary experience. The Honourable Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), another Honourable Member who possesses an enormous amount of years of experience. I will listen to those people; I will listen to all the people. I will listen to all people if I can learn one thing, and I am quite confident that I will, because that is my character.

Mr. Speaker, in summation, I would like to ask—again in my budget I had addressed this issue, but I will bring it up again. The old story goes, repetition, repetition, repetition. The \$8 million that this Government is expecting to receive as a tax on gas, and \$14.4 million for a full year, would this Government promise us that this money would be placed in a fund, some sort of fund that cannot be used for anything else, anything else, except for construction of highways, and not Repap roads?

That is all I ask from the Honourable Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger). To the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), and I am quite confident that he will undertake my suggestion, and possibly look at this idea.

This year, they are expected to raise \$14 million on the dreaded cigarettes. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any qualms about paying that extra cent, none whatsoever. Fourteen million dollars are going to come into the Party (sic) coffers. I presume it is going to go into capital revenue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us take that money and put it towards the education of our youth to make sure that they stop smoking. I know how you feel about it, and you know my feelings about smoking. I do not think to spend money in trying to educate us or the people who do smoke is a waste of money. But let us do it for our children, because again those are the ones that need our help.

Mr. Speaker, if they could offer me that assurance, I would be greatly appreciative.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise on this Bill and speak today

to Honourable Members. I want to address some overall concerns in the two departments for which I hold the critic portfolio for the Official Opposition, being Labour and the ministry of Justice. I am going to refer back to some of the statements that were made in this Speech from the Throne which we recently had from this Government. I am also going to talk about what I perceive to be the needs of those departments that are crying out for attention, for more attention, and I might add more imaginative, hopefully more productive solutions, than we have seen from this Government so far.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start then by saying in my opinion the Government produced what might be called a "blue-sky Budget," which masked what I know and what I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows and what all Manitobans know to be a different story. That was admittedly, on the part of the Finance Minister, because of extremely high revenues in the mining industry through the international prices of metals due to the tax grab that was made by the New Democrats a couple of years ago. Due to generous equalization payments from the federal Government due to the poor performance of the Manitoba economy, we were what might be called blessed by extremely high revenues.

* (1550)

Now it is important to remember that those revenues come from the taxpayers of this province and this country, corporate and private taxpayers. So when we see an abundance of money, it is not that we can pat ourselves on the back because that money comes through taxation. That money comes from the people and, if we can give it back, we should give it back. Some was given back, that is true, but this Government quite shamelessly decided to set up a slush fund, and I do not have any hesitation in using that term. Regardless of the attempted explanations given by the Minister of Justice, I do not have any problem calling it that because I know that is what it is. I have lots of friends, I am pleased to say, who are Tories and I say, yes, the Minister, he set up a slush fund. That really bothers me, and they say, yes, that is what it is. There is no hesitation in admitting that. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), I am sure, has heard that perhaps in private from his own colleagues, the colleagues that rimmed the room when he read his speech. They all went out, they were not fooled, they know what he has been doing and there was no two ways about it. They understood.

I do not have any hesitation in calling it a slush fund. That is what it is. It is pure politics and it is bad management; it is very bad management. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says, wait until the Provincial Auditor. I do not have any hesitation in saying that I am sure the Provincial Auditor will see through this. I am also sure that the people of Manitoba will see through it. The fact is the Auditor gives us advice, but the ultimate judge of this will be the people of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba agree with us. They know what this is. The fact is, far from good management, this Government has represented bad management again and again and again.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many areas which my colleagues have touched on with respect to the financial

incompetence of this Government. As I said, I am going to concentrate on the two that I know best, the two that I have the critic portfolio for.

I want to talk first about Labour. It is the newest portfolio for me and I have greatly enjoyed getting to know this department in my critic role. I knew something about Labour because I had been involved in labour relations and in the labour field as a practising lawyer and indeed as an articling student. So I think I knew something, although I am the first to admit and I know the Minister feels the same way, there is lots to learn. This is a department whose real importance is yet coming. The fact is that the Department of Labour has played a vital role in this province. But I am telling you it is going to become increasingly and increasingly important in this province as we see labour issues, as a result of the Free Trade Agreement, have their true impact on this province.

The fact is that what was a great disappointment to me was that the Government said in their Speech from the Throne. This is the statement: "My Government also plans to expand provincial measures to help Manitoba workers adapt to changing job and skill requirements"—very nice sentence, very nice sentence. When I heard the Lieutenant-Governor say that, I thought, by golly, here is something that is good.

The fact is they are recognizing that free trade is having an adverse effect on this province and it is going to get worse, and they need something to deal with it. I thought, is that not wonderful, they are going to admit that free trade is going to have a problem and they are going to come to grips with it. They are not going to hide and put their head in the sand. They are going to realize that this rationalization of North America is going to have an incredibly detrimental effect on this province.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

It already has, as we see the process of rationalization which we have recently seen enter the field of occupational, workplace health and safety, bizarre as that sounds, that seems to be the philosophy of the Tories in our nation at present, including the Tories in Manitoba. I heard the Lieutenant-Governor say that and I thought is that not great? Then, lo and behold, came down the Budget and instead of coming through on that commitment, in the Labour Adjustment Branch of the Department of Labour, we saw a total increase in expenditure of \$60,600, \$60,000 to come through on my Government plans to expand provincial measures to help Manitoba workers adapt to changing job and skill requirements.

Mr. Acting Speaker, that is an absolute insult to the people of this province who are struggling with the changing economy as a result of the Free Trade Agreement, who are struggling to feed families, to pay mortgages, and to keep good jobs in this province. We have seen again, and again, and again, the loss of jobs in this province and they are not transient jobs. They are not jobs that are minimum wage. Those jobs are necessary and the more jobs the better. The fact is the jobs we are losing are jobs in the manufacturing sector that are jobs that pay well, that support families,

that pay mortgages, that allow people to live the lives that they want to live in the Province of Manitoba. It is what keeps them here.

Mr. Acting Speaker, it is, I repeat, an insult to those people and to the people in this province, who will increasingly face pressure in the particular industries that they work as we, as a province, attempt to come to grips with the blight of the Free Trade Agreement and the rationalization which is flowing from that agreement.

Mrs. Oleson: Blight.

Mr. Edwards: I hear the Minister of Family Services saying blight, as if it is not a blight. I ask her to ask the people who have lost their jobs in this province in the last year, as a direct result of economic shifts in this continent, as a result of the Free Trade Agreement leading up to it and since it, and I ask her to tell those people that it is not a blight on their lives, that they do not have a job, and that they may have to move or they have to take a job at half the wage. The fact is we are seeing, in this continental economy which is developing, Canada is at the losing end of the stick. I will tell you one of the provinces that will be losing more than anyone else will be the Province of Manitoba. That side of the House does not know the full effect of this agreement. They have no idea and they have put their heads in the sand.

Mr. Acting Speaker, as I look through the further figures which came out on the budget from the Department of Labour, I see that we have general Administration, Executive Support to the Minister, that is up 13.6 percent but no, Labour Adjustment that is only up 6.5 percent, half—got to take it up 13.6 percent for the Minister's executive support, but not good enough—

Mr. Manness: Spend, spend, spend.

Mr. Edwards: The Minister of Finance says spend, spend, spend. Mr. Acting Speaker, what I am saying here is their priorities are all wrong. That is the fact. They prefer to see a 13.6 percent increase in Executive Support for the Minister and only a 6.5 percent increase for labour adjustment.

Why did they not put in their Speech from the Throne, we commit ourselves to more executive support for Ministers? Why did they not say that? Why were they not honest and open enough to say that? No, Sir, they give the big line. What is behind the big line—absolutely zero, absolutely zero.

Mr. Manness: It is global for the department.

* (1600)

Mr. Edwards: The Minister of Finance says "global for the department." Let us see what they did to the department? Yes sir, they gave some money to the department. Where did it go, executive support for the Minister, salaries, administration.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this department, I predict as time goes on, will become an even more important

department than it has. The Labour Adjustment Branch will have to be reckoned with as an important tool in dealing with the real effects of the Free Trade Agreement. We cannot bury our heads in the sand. We must come up with imaginative solutions. I am the first to admit, we lost that election in November, we lost. The Free Trade Agreement became a reality. That is true, but I am not one to sit around and say that we have to just cry the blues over that forever. We have got to move forward, we have got to come to grips with the reality of what has been wrought in Ottawa, between Ottawa and Washington, and to do that we need serious consideration and imaginative thought and a commitment to the workers of this province, because we want this province to grow and we want this province to prosper. The fact is the people are increasingly realizing Tory times are tough times and, with two Tory Governments, it is doubly tough.

Mr. Manness: It was pretty easy in Liberal days. All they did was borrow.

An Honourable Member: And spend, spend, spend.

Mr. Edwards: The Minister says it was pretty easy in Liberal days, all they did was borrow and spend. I will tell you, you point to a Government to me that made more promises than the federal Tories did in November. Oh, we will get child care in there and let us do this and that and the other thing. Let us just give it all away, province after province after province, the Tories, hippity-hop, hippity-hop, all across the country. Mr. Mulroney, glad handing here, glad handing there. Boy, Michael Wilson must have just been biting his tongue. Where was Michael Wilson? Where was Michael Wilson when Mr. Mulroney was saying, billions for child care, yes siree, we believe in universal child care, that is right, billions. Michael Wilson, he must have been away that day. He did not hear that one, because five months later he stands up in the House and says, oh, sorry about that, sorry, I know you may have voted for us because of that, but hey, another election is four years away and I am sorry you are going to have to take the hit.

The deficit, oh, yes sir, the deficit is terrible. Frankly, Mr. Acting Speaker, it is bad, the deficit is bad, but the deficit was not created between November and June of 1989, no sir, the deficit was not created in six months. The fact is that the Government in Ottawa went to the people of this country in November and deceived them outright, and turned their backs on those people and on the programs they promised and they outright bought votes and then turned their backs on those people.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): No provincial issues.

Mr. Edwards: The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) says, no provincial issues. I do not want to say that he was not here for the last 20 minutes of my speech. I do not want to say that and I will not say that, but the fact is the record will show I have lots of provincial issues to talk about. I am making the very real and very appropriate link between the two Ministers of

Finance in this province and this country, and the fact that they are out to deceive the people with fancy tricks, fancy promises, but the fact is they are bad managers and they are getting increasingly bad.

I have confidence that the people will see through that and they already do. As I have told the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), I have not talked to anybody, I have not talked to one person. As I said, I do not choose my friends according to politics. I have lots of friends who are Tories. My Tory friends, they say to me, Paul, hey, we know what that was about, we know what it is about, they are putting it away, it is a rainy day fund. Who writes the cheque? The Premier writes the cheque. We know what it is about. It is \$200 million to throw around when you feel like it when you need a few votes.

This Government simply does not give the people credit, I will tell you, because they see right through this thing called the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. It is not—

An Honourable Member: It is an illusion.

Mr. Edwards: That is right, the Budget Stabilization Fund in B.C., well BS Fund within two days is what that one was called, and this is the same thing. This Government was smart enough not to get BS in there because they would have turned on them, but it is the same idea, and it is exactly the same scam on the people of this province.

Mr. Acting Speaker, let me touch on some of the justice issues. I was very pleased to see that overall—9.69 percent increase to court services—this was a needed increase. In addition to that, we saw in the Justice Department a \$568,000 increase, primarily made up of salaries for Crown prosecutors. That is good.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) says we are going to clear the court backlog. By the end of the year, it is going to be three months, and power to it. I frankly think that would be wonderful. I think if that could be achieved, we would all agree that is a very, very important thing to tackle in the justice system.

The fact is that again this Minister sent out a press release when he announced his plans and said, no, I am not going to throw money at this. I am going to solve it without spending money. Yes siree, I am a magician. I am going to solve this without spending money. Well, just a few weeks later, here we go, \$500,000 more for Crown prosecutors and \$275,000 more for provincial judges. Well, I mean, let us face it. That money may be necessary to solve the court backlog, but let us not deceive the people. You cannot tell the people one thing and then do another, and bury it in the budget and just hope that nobody picks it up because the fact is the figures speak for themselves. The fact is that to solve the court backlog problem does require, in part, greater funding for our court services.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I have a few other comments about some of the figures that came out of the budget documents in the Justice field. Civil legal services went down 2.48 percent. I am not sure why that was. I will have to explore that at Estimates and I hope that I will

get an answer. I am not sure what the rationale for that is. The Law Reform Commission went up a total of 1.32 percent, \$4,700, and that is on a budget of roughly \$359,000.00. So the Law Reform Commission, again, is not getting very much funding, and that is a shame. I know they have other sources of funding. I look forward to hearing from them and maybe hearing from the Minister as to why that is. He may have a very good explanation. Perhaps other funders of the Law Reform Commission have raised their donations, I do not know, but the fact is that appears to be a very, very small figure.

Constitutional Law grant, down 14.52 percent. Well, that may have been a mistake because I think there is a few constitutional cases coming down the pipe, and we have seen this Government take the attitude that we will see you in court. They took that with MARL on the prayer issue. I fear that in rejecting the very, very reasonable amendments which I put forward at the committee stage yesterday on the drinking and driving Bill, they may be in for a rougher ride than they would have been had they accepted them. Yet they have cut the funding for the Constitutional Branch by 14.5 percent, and I am not sure what that reflects. It is an extremely important time for the Constitutional Law Branch in this country and in this province. The fact is that it is the single biggest issue in the law and has been for some time.

The stabilizing of Charter interpretation and the realizing of what the courts see our new Charter document to mean is the largest task of the Supreme Court of Canada today. It is the largest task, I would submit, of practising constitutional lawyers, and being a constitutional lawyer with the province or with the federal Government has great advantages because of that. It is an interesting time to be involved in constitutional law in this country.

* (1610)

Let me just digress and speak very briefly on the drinking and driving legislation that we passed through committee yesterday. The PCCF coalition was firmly enforced, or NDPC, whichever way you want to put it, throughout most of those committee hearings. I had reporters come up to me afterwards and say, gee, why did your amendments not pass? They made so much sense. Well, I submit, that is what an objective onlooker thought. The fact is I was doing everything in my power to convince mostly the NDP, because you know, the Government, it is their Bill, they are going to defend it, you can expect that, but the fact is I was doing everything in my power to impress upon the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer), his colleague, Ms. Hemphill, the MLA for Logan, that we needed protections for this piece of legislation as it is going to wind its way through the court system.

I deeply, deeply hope that this piece of legislation withstands the inevitable constitutional challenge it will face. I am going to go on record, and I have again and again and again to say that I hope this piece of legislation passes muster. I have fears. I have expressed those fears.

I attempted to translate those fears into what I felt were very reasonable amendments to this Bill, which

did not have any impact on the deterrent effect of the pre-trial suspension or the impoundment. What it was, I believed, and I believed that any onlookers there in the hearings would agree, were the minimal protections for people faced with those types of incidents. I believe that those protections will be seen to be missing in the legislation when this piece of legislation goes to court, but I deeply hope that it passes muster. I do have those fears. I have made those fears known, and I guess we are all going to have to just sit back and see how it goes.

I am telling you that I firmly believe it is the role of a Minister of Justice to recognize that there is a need to protect the innocent. There is a need to be tough on crime and tough on criminals, and no one disputes that. The fact is you can be tough on a criminal when you know he or she is a criminal. The question is what do you have to do to prove that he or she has broken the law. That is the issue. That is what we have gone to wars for in this country. That is what we have spent 400 years developing. That is why this is not China; that is why this is not Panama. In this country, you are innocent until proven guilty. That is the fact, and that is what Ministers of Justice and Solicitors General and Attorneys General have had to protect for decades, for centuries.

There is no question that there are thousands of innocent victims of drinking and driving throughout this nation, throughout this continent, and we should lead the way in dealing with that. They are innocent victims and they need to be protected. We must also protect those who are innocent and who are charged or who are penalized by policemen, by registrars of the Motor Vehicle Branch, or by courts. We must protect the innocent. We must allow them the reasonable opportunity to prove their innocence. If we lose that, we have lost it all. The credibility of the system goes down the tubes, because this is not a nation that believes that you are guilty until proven innocent. That is the way they do it in many other countries in this world and, I might add, we express shock and horror over their actions.

We distinguish ourselves. We say we are different. The fact is we have to protect that difference, and it is the Minister of Justice's job to remember that, because the people will always want to lynch the criminal. That is a very natural feeling. The public needs to see justice done and done quickly, and punishment meted out harshly. They need to see that, but if you lose the ability to prove your innocence, you have lost everything.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we also saw a 12.47 percent increase in provincial police expenditures under the Law Enforcement Branch, and I welcome that. We are seeing the federal Government desert the RCMP and the funding for provincial policing, and that will have a grave consequence on the Province of Manitoba. I am sure that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) and Mr. Hill, his assistant in this area, are working hard on this issue. I think we are going to increasingly see the federal Government pull back from financing and provincial policing. That is extremely of great concern.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I am very watchful of that.

Mr. Edwards: Yes. The Minister of Justice says he is being very watchful and I congratulate him on that because he has to be. The federal Government, I think, in their last Budget showed that they were decreasing, they were looking to pass more onto the province, and I know that is their plan heading into the 1990s.

I know that we have other particular problems in this province with provincial policing, in particular, the shared funding problem between municipalities and rural urban municipalities. I was pleased to attend a conference out at Brandon—a workshop, a think tank—put on by the rural urban municipalities and heard some of their thoughts, and some of them made very persuasive, very interesting arguments. I have also met with members of the rural municipalities, and they also have made some good points. I think it is a tough issue. I do not envy someone having to deal with that issue.

An Honourable Member: Extremely serious matter.

Mr. Edwards: It is a tough issue and it is a serious issue. I know there was a report which was being worked on, and some kind of a solution was going to be worked on in co-operation with the Department of Municipal Affairs. I look forward to seeing what that solution might be, and any recommendations will be seriously considered by this side of the House.

Mr. Acting Speaker, how much further time do I have?

Mr. Connery: When are you going to start giving your speech?

Mr. Acting Speaker (Mark Minenko): The Honourable Member, I believe, has approximately 13 minutes.

Mr. Edwards: Thirteen minutes. The Minister for the Workers Compensation Board (Mr. Connery) says, when am I going to start my speech? Well, my speech has been going on for some time. He must have been working on other things, although I wish he would work harder. That is another issue that comes up again, again and again. It is a great sorrow to me, and I think to many Members in our caucus, that the Workers Compensation Board simply has not been turned around. We had hoped, and I know that he had hoped, for a lot greater success with the Workers Compensation Board, but the fact is it has not happened. That is the bare fact. I get calls almost on a daily basis. I do not think there is one person in my constituency who is on Workers Compensation who has not called me. The fact is it is mass frustration and anxiety when these people go to deal with the Workers Compensation Board.

I am not sure what the overall solution is, but the fact is this Minister had better get to work in getting the Workers Compensation Board back on track and being user friendly, because there is serious discontent with the functioning of that board. The real tragedy in all this is people who have problems with the Workers Compensation Board, they call us second. They have always tried. They have tried, and tried, and tried, and they have been bounced six or seven places. They have been told, oh, we will pull your file and we will get back

to you, and then they do not get back to them. They have been told, oh, there will be a decision in a month. Instead, it is a year.

The fact is there are just massive problems with the Workers Compensation Board and in how they deal with the public. There has to be a concentrated effort to deal with the public because the Workers Compensation Board deals with people. Those people need to be served well. The Minister of Justice knows that they need to be served well in the justice system. It is just the same in the Workers Compensation system.

The fact is Workers Compensation is a deal. It is a deal that was struck decades ago where workers said, they gave up their rights to sue their employer and in return they get guaranteed compensation. The spirit of that deal was that the compensation would be effective and would be sufficient. It is a sacred trust that was developed through the catalyst of a Workers Compensation Board for workers to be provided for in the event that they suffer injury in the workplace.

Going along tandem with that was the idea that employers had to provide safe workplaces. That is an area that of late in our province has been extremely topical—workers' safety. The whole of North America, probably the world, is going one way on workers' safety, this Government is going the other way—sad but true. The fact is we are learning every day about the adverse effect of certain chemicals in the workplace. Environmental issues are very topical because we are learning what these things can do to us, and we are learning the effects of cancer and how rampant it is in our society as a disease, as a tragic fatal disease, yet we are in this province moving backwards on the regulation of cancer-causing materials.

* (1620)

We are undercutting the hard-won rights of workers, rights that were won over decades of struggling with Governments to get legislation in place, which effectively imposed responsibilities on the employer to work in co-operation with workers, to put into place standards for Workplace Health and Safety and responsibilities on employers to bring forward information about hazardous materials and hazardous chemicals, and do something about it.

The fact is, this Government has presided over a decrease in those standards which was brought in, in just a ridiculous fashion. They solicited under time pressure from the Chamber of Commerce an opinion on this matter. The Chamber of Commerce, to its credit, wrote back and said, yes we want this done, what the Government ultimately did. They also said, but we regret we did not have enough time to really look at this thoroughly. I do not know, the Minister just did not read that paragraph, just bought the whole thing lock, stock and barrel and put it into law.

They did not just stop at reducing the actual threshold levels, they did not stop at that, no, sir. They brought an adverse impact on the plans that would be developed between workers and employers. Workers and employers are no longer concerned about the lowest detectable level, no, that is not their mandate under

the statute. Mr. Acting Speaker, that is a great shame because I submit, and I think all Manitobans agree except people on the opposite side that a committee between workers and management that is looking at hazardous things in the workplace, should look at hazardous things in the workplace at the lowest detectable level.

They should be concerned about anything that is there that is potentially cancer-causing. That is not even the regulation, that is not even the point at which the employer has to get rid of it. That is just the mandate of the committee and this Government has said, no, that is not your concern anymore. Your concern is this level, a level that is being sued on in the United States of America, a level that comes from the United States of America, and that people down there are extremely upset about and have taken the authorities to court over. Did this Minister know that? No. Did she know that there were experts all across the United States who had said that these standards were far too high, that they represented industry norms rather than safe health standards? No, she did not know that, she had not checked.

The Premier had to step into the breach as things got really bad. Yes, he had to step in and, unfortunately, had to usurp the authority of his new Minister and say, look, we will rethink it. We applaud that, I am glad they are going to rethink it. They better revoke it because the fact is it is a very bad regulation, doing harm in this province today.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to say that we, on this side of the House, have expressed again and again and again in this House, but also in our caucus meetings it comes up very often, the tragedy of job losses in this province. I have touched on it before in my speech, but I want to touch on it again. The fact is we need—

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Tory times are tough times.

Mr. Edwards: I hear the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and I appreciate his support, he is saying Tory times are tough times, but I wish he had the strength of his convictions. I wish to heavens that the Leader of the third Party would put his money where his mouth is because he says Tory times are tough times. He says they deserted the North. He says they desert workers, he says they desert seniors. After 39 minutes out of 40, he stands up and he says, but they are not that bad.

The Leader of the third Party and everyone else in that third Party, quite frankly, stood up for 39 out of 40 minutes and just said all of the things that we had said: the North, seniors, labour, all of these issues, very important, cannot believe what the Government says, Speech from the Throne does not cover the areas that we want it to cover, Government is bad. Then they got to the famous, said 12 times, "but," but we are going to prop up this Government because it is the politics of desperation in that Party. The Leader of the third Party knows full well that he knew I was going to vote on that Budget down when he was in Brandon for his weekend with his compatriots. He did not even

have to see that Budget to know how he was going to vote. The fact is everybody knew how he was going to vote, including him.

Mr. Doer: St. James is a target seat.

Mr. Edwards: The Leader of the third Party (Mr. Doer) says St. James is a target seat. You know what? They held that seat last time, and it was a target seat, so I am not too worried. Mr. Mackling represented that seat for many years and quite frankly had a lot of support in that community. I think there are a lot of people who would have voted for him personally.

The fact is, he did not run. The other fact is, they just could not bring themselves to vote for the NDP anymore. I will tell you -(Interjection)- well, the Member says, do not get too cocky. I am not cocky; I am not cocky at all. I look forward to a hard fight. Mr. MacDonald, Al MacDonald, who ran against me for the NDP, we got along famously. We had a very, very good, clean campaign. I look forward to that the next time. I believe in democracy; the people should decide. The fact is, the people are going to decide on this Budget. I can tell you I think they are going to decide in our favour because the fact is it just does not address the problems that this province is facing.

Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): It is a pleasure that I stand here today and speak on the Interim Supply Bill. Mr. Acting Speaker, there could be many, many departments that I speak of in the time that I have allotted to me, but I would like to begin by putting some comments on the record in regard to the Department of Health.

We know that in Manitoba today, and in fact across Canada, we have a crisis in our health care system. We know that this crisis has been a long time coming, and that it is not something that has mushroomed and happened over the past year, over the one year that this particular Government has been in power. We do know as well that the steps that have not been put in place by this Government have escalated some of the concerns in the health care system. What is more disturbing is that it is the five years down the road, 10 years down the road and 20 years down the road that we will really see the devastating results of non-action and dollars not put into true prevention and promotion programs.

It is very, very difficult for any Government to really put some resources into the area of prevention and promotion. There was some of it that was done by the former NDP administration. There were a few strides made, but there really has never been in this province a true sense of direction in terms of prevention and promotion.

As one person, and as many philosophers and people who study the health care system has said, it is very difficult for politicians to want to put dollars into the health care system in the areas of prevention because they do not see the results immediately, which means the voters do not see the results, which means you do

not get your picture on the front page of the newspaper to say, oh, look at all these dollars that have been put into prevention and promotion, and look at the results that we are going to benefit as Manitobans 10, 15, 20 years down the road.

It does not sell newspapers and it does not necessarily sell votes in the minds of some politicians. It is time that a Government decide to do something different and actually decide to truly look at all areas, not just within the Department of Health, but look within the Government, look outside of the Government into private industry, and work towards developing solutions which can really make a change 15 and 20 years down the road in terms of the cost of our health care system.

We know that Manitobans in general are not a very healthy group of people. We continue to see waiting lists for heart surgery. We continue to see people going into hospitals because of complications as a result of diabetes. We continue to see tests for individuals, continued tests because of high cholesterol, high blood pressure because of stress levels. All the indicators are there that we are a society that does not take care of ourselves.

* (1630)

We have to have a Government that is willing to actually put dollars into the health care system where they really believe that prevention programs and promotion programs are essential to Manitobans. That starts with school children; it starts with young families; it starts with private industry. It starts with the Civil Service and people in Government practicing what they preach.

We have a Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) who has talked about partnership with private industry in regard to health promotion and prevention. We have a Minister who talks about environmental workplace and what is important in the workplace. Yet we have seen no action from this Government in regard to really assessing the workplace within the Government system and really looking at their own backyard to see whether environmental factors are causing low productivity, high absenteeism and, in fact, a lot of people missing work due to poor health. Some of that poor health relates directly to the job.

I am sure if you looked at the Department of Health in particular and some of the other departments, you would find a high absenteeism rate. A lot of civil servants have stressful jobs. A lot of civil servants do not get enough exercise because of the nature of their long hours of work, and a lot of civil servants do not often times live a healthy lifestyle for a variety of reasons.

I think it is important that a Government begin to deal with some of these issues in terms of health prevention. When we look at the budget that this Government has proposed in the area of Health, we see very little resources which have been put towards the actual people who can go out and best deliver the programs to people in the community, whether it be to private industry, whether it be to community groups, whether it be to women's groups, whether it be to school children. We do not see the resources in this budget.

Who best can do that job? Public Health nurses within the department and also home economists. Basically those two professionals are the ones who are out at the community level, whether it be in rural Manitoba, northern Manitoba or in the City of Winnipeg, and they are the ones who are best able to deliver health promotion programs. There are no resources that have been allocated so that there are those individuals who are available to go out and deliver that program, or to act as resource people or consultants to teachers and to community group leaders who then can deliver that message to their people.

We see some increases in the Health budget to some of the directorates and we think, yes, it is important that Program and Planning be an important part of the Health budget. It is important that some resources be there, but directorates do not deliver services and do not deliver programs. It is the people at the field level, at the grass-roots level who do that job, and there are no increases in those staff at all. Even last year when we had this Government present their Budget, they talked about all the resources that would be going into the education of AIDS in the community. Yet the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) himself admitted that those six SYs that would be utilized were all redirected SYs from other places. Two of those SYs came from Dental Health. So we see a taking away of Peter to give to Paul. In essence, we take away from Dental Health, which is also an important program in terms of health promotion and disease prevention, to give to another program. So we have not really increased resources, we have merely shifted them around.

Within the Department of Health and the Health budget, the Minister made a great announcement about the Women's Health Directorate. I have no difficulty at all in saying that I was on the record and our Party was on the record in saying that, yes, women's health issues are very, very important and need to have a higher profile within the province, but to establish a separate Women's Health Directorate with no thought or planning of what they will be about, will only serve to further fragment services within the department, increase the lack of co-ordination, and we will spend a lot of money on hiring individuals who will not be able to adequately do the job because of their lack of a clear mandate.

So we have this announcement by the Government about this Women's Health Directorate and all the fanfare that went with it, and then we look at the main Estimates of the department and nowhere is it listed that there is a Women's Health Directorate. I personally was pleased in some sense to think, okay, this Government has paid attention to what we had to say. They are not going to establish a specific directorate. Perhaps they are going to amalgamate or incorporate another directorate to increase their responsibilities. Perhaps they are going to look at the Maternal and Child Health Directorate or the Health Promotion Directorate, or maybe there is going to be an increase in the mandate of the Women's Health Directorate under the Status of Women portfolio, but as we look through the Main Estimates we see there are very few increases in dollars and resources in those particular directorates.

Where is the Women's Health Directorate and, moreover, where is the initiative on the part of this

Government to really look at women's health issues? Yes, there needs to be an emphasis on women's health issues, but there has to be co-ordination and planning that takes place.

We deal with women's health issues through the Status of Women, Women's Directorate. They have been very much in the forefront in terms of dealing with reproductive technologies and the impacts and the implications that has on women and families in Manitoba. They have been very instrumental in looking at the whole area of midwifery and looking at other health issues which affect women. We applaud the Women's Health Directorate for that, but what actually is their mandate or authority in regard to other directorates in the Department of Health?

We also have a directorate that is Maternal and Child Health. The rumour has it that they are going to change the name of that particular directorate from Maternal and Child Health to something like Women and Child Health. You can change the name of a directorate, but that does not necessarily mean you are going to change the focus of that particular directorate. There has to be some actions and resources that go with that directorate as well. Yes, that directorate deals with young families and deals with women, but nowhere in that particular directorate has there been any particular emphasis on women's health issues.

We have a Mental Health Directorate and a Mental Health Division as well, and again there has been some interest in that particular directorate to specifically look at women's mental health issues. I think that is important. We are glad to see that the directorate is doing that, but where is the co-ordination in all this? Where is someone assuming some sense of co-ordination and saying to the people of Manitoba and to women of Manitoba, yes, this is important and all these pieces within all these directorates do a little bit in relation to women's health issues, but we are going to make it a priority, and here is how we are going to do it, here are the specific objectives and the mandate and how we are going to reorganize the department? We have not seen anything forthcoming from this Government in that area to date.

We also had an announcement from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) about Mental Health Advisory Committees. The announcement was made in Dauphin. There are certainly a lot of announcements being made in Dauphin, Manitoba these days in regard to Government initiatives. We are pleased to see that in fact some of those initiatives are in rural Manitoba and in communities such as Dauphin.

We have seen established a Mental Health Advisory Committee. Now, this is not a new idea. I know the Minister of Health likes to think that this is a brand new idea and he has invented the wheel himself, but about four years ago the former administration—and I must give some credit to them—were actually looking at establishing a very similar type of advisory group. In fact, there was actually a call that went out from the senior management in the department to the middle managers in the Civil Service that said please submit names to us of individuals who are in your respective communities, who you feel would be interested in sitting

on Mental Health Advisory Committees at a community level and who have some expertise in the area. Unfortunately, that idea never did get off the ground with the previous administration and it was left in a vacuum.

We have now seen the idea revived by this particular Government, and there is some merit to that particular idea. I would, however, like to caution the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and his staff to ensure there are safeguards that are put in place so that the Mental Health Advisory Groups that are being established do not go the way of some of the advisory groups, which were established under the Welcome Home Project through the previous administration.

* (1640)

Unfortunately, we saw some good ideas, some great ideas as a matter of fact, but very little planning and implementation that went along with it. As the Minister is working with his senior staff and looking at the mental health advisory committees, I would suggest to him that he clearly define to the advisory groups what it is their mandate is going to be.

We have a Health Advisory Network at a provincial level as well. One of the mandates of that particular group has also been to look at mental health issues. What is the relationship between the Health Advisory Network, their subcommittee on mental health, the mental Health Programs Branch and the mental health advisory groups which would be established in the community?

The Minister of Health, what can he tell community groups, particularly in Dauphin, as to what their role is going to be? Will that advisory committee simply advise on existing programs and services in the areas of mental health? Will that committee be asked to initiate program suggestions and service ideas which reflect the particular needs of the community of Dauphin and the surrounding area? Will there be resources, i.e., dollars and staff available should there be an idea, a proposal which the Dauphin group would like to put forth to the Government? Will they be allowed to submit those types of proposals? Will there be dollars available? What if the Mental Health Advisory Network does not like the ideas that the Dauphin Mental Health Advisory Group put forth? Who has the final say? Can a grass-roots advisory group go ahead and do something unique and specific in their community, or does it have to be sanctioned by the main mental health advisory subcommittee through the main health advisory network?

Again these are all very specific questions. These are all questions which need answers before the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and his Government goes too far in the planning. I hope that he is able to learn from the experiences of the past administration, who again had a good idea when it came to community grass-roots participation for looking at services to the mentally handicapped, but when it came to implementation they were sorely lacking in what they were able to do.

One of the other areas that I think should be looked at in the Department of Health—and it is very, very

difficult to do oftentimes, and in fact it takes some initiative and some motivation on the part of staff and other community groups—is the whole idea of establishing interagency community councils throughout the Province of Manitoba.

It is even easier to do within the City of Winnipeg, and certainly some of the communities in Winnipeg have gone ahead and developed interagency councils where you have child welfare organizations, you have child guidance clinics, the school system, the churches, self-help groups, the Department of Health, the Department of Family Services staff, a number of groups and agencies, a number of professionals who meet as a group, who have a structured organization and who attempt to work together as a group of people who serve a particular community, a particular area or particular geographical area. They seek to look for new and innovative solutions to the limited resources and to the service needs in the community.

I would like to see some encouragement from the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), and from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and from the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) in regard to looking at these interagency councils, because I think where you can use dollars or resources efficiently is when you have different groups, organizations and professionals who get together and use their talents, their expertise and sometimes their limited resources, a few dollars from the Child and Family Services Agencies, some volunteer staff resources from the public health nurses, some expertise from the school division, where you use those resources collectively in order to deliver some programs and to develop other programs.

There have been some very good examples in the City of Winnipeg. The Inner City Interagency Council which has been active for many, many years has certainly addressed some issues in the Inner City. We have a Northeast Interagency Council as well which has also developed some programs. I think it is something which the Government, particularly in those three departments, could be looking at. It is the whole area of community development and how do you utilize your resources appropriately in the community.

Certainly this could be looked at in rural Manitoba and in northern Manitoba as well. Although the geography can be a difficulty, you still can have groups of professionals and community organizations who get together and who can look at the specific needs of the community and develop resources along that line.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

We see, when we look at this Government's record and we look at the dollars and where they are allocated, a whopping increase, and I use that term sarcastically in the Seniors Directorate. Actually, I am not quite sure we can technically call the Seniors Directorate a directorate. Usually you have an executive director, some staff and resources that you can apply to that directorate. I think we may have one person at this point, or two people who are in that particular directorate. Usually again, a directorate is there to provide a specific function under a certain framework on a provincial basis, and in this case it is looking at

the issues related to seniors. It is there to provide some content to a program. It is there to evaluate existing programs. It may be there to advocate and may be there to look at service gaps and needs on a provincial level. This is what you oftentimes see a directorate do.

Now, we have not seen anything enunciated in last year's Estimates, or we have not seen anything enunciated with the Seniors Directorate—we are on the second Minister at this point—that would indicate that it is a truly functioning directorate.

We have had some help, I would imagine the Government has had some help, from the gerontology division within the Department of Health, because there are some experts actually who are renowned internationally in terms of their working with the seniors and their working with the aged.

What we are concerned about with the Seniors Directorate is again there is no sense of direction from this Government as to what the issues are with seniors and what they plan to do. We must get five to 10 phone calls a month from seniors, in our constituencies, who have a particular issue, and that is non-profit services in the community that are available to do yard work and to do exterior house maintenance for seniors.

Many seniors are fairly independent in their homes, but they do find that the exterior heavy housework, the painting of and the renovating of houses, the maintenance, and the yard work is too much for them. There are very few resources that are available currently for seniors. Some of the non-profit seniors councils have started to look at that particular type of work. There is a group in the North End that is now looking at yard maintenance for a very reasonable cost. The City of Winnipeg has developed a program for seniors, but that program is wrought with a lot of problems. It is only as good as the number of people who are on social assistance who volunteer to do the work. Oftentimes those numbers fluctuate greatly, so that it is not a dependable service. It is very frustrating for any individual. For a senior who cannot physically go out and cut the grass and fix their fence, they call the Community Home Service and they are told that they have to wait four or five weeks.

These are some of the issues that the Seniors Directorate could be looking at. They need to be looking at the real issues that are facing seniors in Manitoba.

Again, in the Health Department, we saw no increase in resources for support services to seniors. So that means we have one to two staffpeople in the City of Winnipeg who are there to attempt to work with community groups and agencies, Kinsmen Groups, non-profit housing groups, etc., in an attempt to develop resources, whether they be congregate meal programs, whether they be recreational opportunities, whether they be shopping, whether they be non-profit cleaning services. Two staff cannot possibly do that.

* (1650)

It is unfortunate that we do not have those resources that are allocated because it is very cost efficient to have non-profit community groups who do provide that

kind of service, rather than the Government directly providing that service. It is a very cost-efficient method of doing that. Oftentimes you can get more satisfaction, the clients do, from that type of a service than from Government services where there must be fairly specific rules and regulations that oftentimes cannot meet the flexible needs that are required of the senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I could speak for a couple of days on the Department of Health, but before I move on to some other issues, I want to comment on the Home Care Program.

I found it interesting that we do see an increase in one particular line of the Home Care Program and that is Home Care Assistance. Now, that line specifically refers to services or dollars that are paid out to VON services, Home Care Attendant services, Home Support services, Orderly services, LPN services, etc. That line refers to direct services, and the cost of those direct services, whether it be mileage and salaries paid to those individuals who do provide a service than to the aged and infirm and the handicapped people and people basically who are eligible and are on the Home Care Program.

Now one of the problems, and one of the problems identified in the Price Waterhouse Report was that we were not properly case managing these situations in the community because of the paperwork and the workload and the fact that we were not computerized as a Home Care Program.

So what do we see? We see a Minister of Health a year later who has resource co-ordinators and basically it is their job to match home care attendants and orderlies and send them out to the people's homes. We have them sitting at their desks with a computer beside them and the computers are non-functional. The system is not working so they are still forced to match the individuals on a manual basis. They are forced to do all the work manually, and they are using many, many person hours by not being able to utilize the computers that are there.— (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Tory side of the House, as usual, is making fun of the word "manually" and asking me if it is gender neutral.

First of all, I would question whether in fact anyone on the front bench of that Government even has a clue as to what gender neutral is. When you look at the whole area of behavioural change and when you read the various people who have written about, how do you change behaviour in society and how do you change behaviour with a group of people, the first step always is awareness, and unfortunately the Government has not quite reached that first step yet, of awareness.

In regard to the Home Care Program, what has concerned me is that we have all these resources being thrown in to the direct services, but yet there are no accompanying resources to go into staff positions, even if they are on a term basis so that those individuals, those case co-ordinators and resource co-ordinators, can more effectively manage the services that they have. The point of the Home Care Program is that you have individuals who go out and make an assessment in a home who determine what the services should be on

a short term, perhaps three months. Perhaps an individual needs a VON nurse and needs a bath once a week or needs a dressing changed twice a week on a short-term basis.

* (1700)

The difficulty with the program is that those same case co-ordinators never get out three months later, do not even get out six months later to see the client, to meet with the client, to reassess the family situation, and in many cases those services could possibly be withdrawn or reduced. That has always been the intent of the Home Care Program but it has never been able to be put into practice or reality because of the lack of case co-ordinators and resource co-ordinators that are available. That problem was identified in the Price Waterhouse Report. When you look at the Home Care Program and when you see where the dollars have been allocated, more into VON, more into LPN, and again the whole area of the VON services was questioned, you do not see where any of those recommendations have been followed through in the budget.

So we have concerns as to what this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is doing in regard to the Continuing Care Program, which certainly spends very many millions of dollars as part of the Health budget in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of seniors and I have spoken of the Health Department. Certainly we could talk about the budget and how it does not address the issues of the inner city, the issues of poverty, how there is no sense of direction. There is not even an indication from this Government of the real needs facing people who are impoverished, and that could be the subject of an entirely new speech and information. So thank you very much for allowing me to put these comments on the record.

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), that debate on this Bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Oleson for Mitchelson.

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 the following decisions taken with respect to Bill No. 30, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act, referral to and consideration in Committee of the Whole House, report thereon by the Committee of the Whole House, and presentation to

the House and debate on the motion that the said Bill be now read a third time and be passed, be declared procedural nullities by this House; and that the said Bill be now referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments to consider and report of the Bill for third reading, and that this motion not be regarded as a precedent of this House.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that by leave—is there leave?—there is leave, that the following decisions taken with respect to Bill No. 30, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act, referral to and consideration in Committee of the Whole House, report thereon by the Committee of the Whole House, and presentation to the House and debate on the motion that the said Bill be now read a third time and be passed, be declared procedural nullities by this House; and that the said Bill be now referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments to consider and report of the Bill for third reading, and that this motion not be regarded as a precedent of this House.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, this motion arises as a result of the movement of Bill 30 through the House yesterday, one step beyond the step agreed by the House Leaders of the Parties. I can express my regret for any inconvenience this has caused anyone. It is simply out of my zeal, as any Government House Leader would want to do, to get Bills passed and in this case, of course, to get on with the protection of children under The Child and Family Services Act, but I do ask for the support of Honourable Members so that I can announce that this committee will be meeting later on today.

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

The question before the House is all which was proposed by the Honourable Government House Leader. Is that agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Röch), that the composition of Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Osborne (Mr. Alcock) for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus); Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) for St. James (Mr. Edwards); and Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor).

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will sit this evening at 8 p.m. in Room 255 to consider Bill 30. Tomorrow, Thursday, the 29th of June, as worked out between House Leaders, will be the last day of this part of the Legislature's sitting. The hours of sitting tomorrow, by agreement, by leave, will be 10 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

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

The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Hour.

Mr. McCrae: The Parties in this House have worked out an arrangement whereby we can deal with all manner of matters today during the Private Members' Hour. Leave will be required to alter the normal order of business for Private Members' Hour, but I believe I am correct if I say that it has been agreed that the first item would be Resolution No. 42, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger), followed by way of orders of business by Bill 13, standing in the name of the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). After her contribution, the next item would be Bill 21, I think it is standing in my name, but at that time I would allow the matter to be taken up by the Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery).

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

RES. NO. 42—RECOGNITION OF THE ABORIGINAL PEOPLES' RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger), Resolution No. 42, Recognition of the Aboriginal Peoples' Right of Self-Government. The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) that

WHEREAS Canada's aboriginal peoples seek a constitutional amendment which will recognize their right of self-government; and

WHEREAS all Parties in this Legislature support, in principle, the aboriginal right of self-government; and

WHEREAS consideration of any amendments to the Constitution of Canada recognizing the aboriginal right of self-government should be considered as a priority item on the country's constitutional agenda.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Government of Manitoba to immediately enter into substantive discussions with the federal Government, other provincial Governments and with representatives of the aboriginal people of Canada to formulate and draft an agreement in principle, and present this agreement to provincial Legislatures and the Parliament of Canada; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Assembly further urge that consistent with the recommendations of the 1987 Joint Parliamentary Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Constitutional Amendment, a meeting of First Ministers and aboriginal representatives take place no later than April 17, 1990.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Herold Driedger: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to actually be able to speak to this resolution. The need for it essentially comes out of the fact that in March of 1987, the aboriginal people did enter into a First Ministers' Conference to determine the right of self-government, to determine the terms of self-government, and out of this particular constitutional conference many principles had been agreed upon.

A short month after this, the Meech Lake Accord was talked about by the same First Ministers, and it came about that due to this Meech Lake Accord taking precedence insofar that some of the terms and conditions of the accord tended to, in many parts of the country, cause consternation that the Constitution was not being amended in a way satisfactory to all people, and particularly to the aboriginal people.

For instance, the "distinct society" clause of the Meech Lake Accord was questioned by the aboriginal people. The unanimity clause on the Senate reform was also questioned by the aboriginal people. Even the agreement that fisheries would be on the constitutional agenda disturbed the aboriginal people. They felt that suddenly as they saw the constitutional energies of the country being diverted to the Meech Lake process, they saw that very substantive movement on their important issues were suddenly placed, to their mind, on the constitutional back burner. In the interim, they have seen much to-do in the country, in the land, with respect to constitutional concerns, particularly with respect to the Meech Lake Accord.

* (1710)

In all this, although I am sure negotiations have been continuing in one respect or another at different levels by aboriginal peoples with the federal Government, by some aboriginal groups with provincial Governments, but essentially this not taking any kind of priority item, the aboriginal people came to this House, they came to me to introduce this resolution in order to facilitate some degree of urgency to their legitimate concerns. Legitimate because if the Meech Lake process is permitted to continue as it now is, we have here in this province an all-Party task force coming up with a position that shall reflect the Manitoba position, and this particular agreement may or may not be accepted by the whole country.

If this particular process continues, the legitimate concerns of the aboriginal people may again be taken care of insofar that some accommodation may be made so that they can continue to negotiate their way towards the right of self-government. On the other hand, the process may also fail in coming to some sort of agreement. Once again, the Native people will feel that they again have been placed into a constitutional never-never land, because while they were making great strides, great process, the interim period, the players who were at the original table will have probably changed their mind because of a hardening of their positions with what happened over the Meech Lake Accord. This will then call for re-education once again on the part of all people to take into account the legitimate concerns and aims of the aboriginal people.

The aboriginal people feel that we should not, at this point in time, put all our constitutional progress into the outcome of what happens in one basket and that is the Meech Lake Accord. The amendments that may be made to the Accord may be accepted, and we may end up having a document that all people can be quite happy with including the aboriginal people and then again this may not occur. These amendments may accommodate the concerns of all Canadians and this resolution that I am now raising in this House may not, at that point, then have been necessary. I think we have to take into account that this process may fail, and therefore we should be ready in order to allow the legitimate concerns of the aboriginal people to be advanced.

The first people of this country should not, once again, be placed on a constitutional back burner. The first people of this country should not, once again, feel that they are being placed in a constitutional never-never land. The aboriginal people felt themselves singularly excluded from the constitutional process following the First Ministers' Conference of the 1987 round on aboriginal affairs, but they should not feel themselves excluded now.

As I indicated earlier, I am certain there are discussions taking place at different levels now. I think if we, as a Legislature, come forward with a united stand a definitive statement by this House can lend weight to what should be a national will, to resolve these important issues leading to the constitutional recognition of the aboriginal peoples right of self-government.

With those few brief comments, Mr. Speaker, I will defer to another speaker.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would hope to be given leave to carry through until six o'clock. I have a considerable amount I want to say on this particular subject. I would have thought the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) would have wanted to take some opportunity, but if he is not prepared to comment I will try to keep my comments as brief as possible so in fact he can. I will reconsider that.

I think it is important that the new Members of this Legislative Assembly, in this House, have a little bit of an understanding as to some of the activities over the past years and the sincerity of the different Parties. I guess one wants to make sure that this is not an attempt to, in any way, play politics with our aboriginal peoples, that it is a sincere attempt to put forward the sincere feelings of the political Parties in this Assembly. I just want to make absolutely sure there is a sincerity built into this resolution that I would hope is there.

Let us deal, Mr. Speaker, with the 1987 Accord. I was fortunate enough to have been invited, with the First Minister of this province and his Attorney General and his Native Affairs Minister to Ottawa, to that meeting of which there was not the ability to accomplish the inclusion of the aboriginal rights in the Canadian Constitution. It was a situation that did not make a lot of people happy, but let me just make one comment.

I say this in support of the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) because I think it was extremely important that he was a part of it. He was a part of it but I am not so sure if the former Premier was as into it, or the former Attorney General was.

Maybe I have told this story to the House once before, but let me tell it to you again. First of all, the Premier left this Assembly to go to Ottawa in a major huff. He was very upset about some activities that had taken place and that he was delayed getting to this constitutional meeting. In fact, he even said to me as we were going to the plane, which the Prime Minister of Canada had sent to the airport to pick us up, that if I had not have been there on time that I would have been left at home because he had to get to this meeting.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we proceeded to go to Ottawa. We arrived at the Ottawa airport. The Premier of the province and the then Attorney General were in so much of a hurry to get to the meeting that they forgot their Native Affairs Minister. They left him carrying the luggage with me, and they proceeded to rush off to the meeting. That, I thought, was an insult. I seriously thought it was an insult to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs and really showed lack of sincerity for the whole issue in dealing with aboriginal people. That is true. Ask the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper). I am not putting anything on the record that is not true. It is an absolutely true story that I am telling.

I again want to conclude my comments in that regard by saying that when the then Minister and I got to the hotel where the conference was taking place, the First Minister of the province was not rushing to the meeting, but he had lots of time to stop and talk to the media. That was his main priority. The former Premier could not get to the meeting on aboriginal issues; he had to stop and have a big media blitz.

Mr. Speaker, it truly demonstrated the political posturing of the former Premier. I say it in support of and defence of the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).- (Interjection)- No, it is the truth. It is the absolute truth. It is the absolute truth. So it says what the former Premier, the Member for Selkirk thought about constitutional change for the aboriginal people and showed what the former Attorney General had as far as their sincerity and the aboriginal inclusion in our Constitution.

It was nothing but a lot of posturing, and I say it in support of the former Minister, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper). The sincerity of Howard Pawley and Roland Penner was nil when it came to the sincerity of dealing with our aboriginal people. It was evidenced by their actions. Their actions speak louder than their words. Mr. Speaker, I just thought it was important that the Members of the Legislature know clearly how the former administration thought about this issue. Not the Member for Rupertsland—he is very serious and sincere about this. I say this very honestly. I know he is, but I tell you the former Premier and the Attorney General lacked a lot of sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, let me say as well, and I am disappointed in the Liberal Critic in this regard, I am not so sure whether he in fact had made a presentation to the all-

Party committee on constitutional change that we have recently had. I am not sure what he has put forward to the task force, the all-Party task force. I am not sure what the Liberal Critic put forward. He may have included a resolution or he may have put something forward to the task force, and if he did not, I do not know why he did not. It would have been an important opportunity to do so.

* (1720)

I would hope that the task force would in fact be dealing with the question of aboriginal inclusion. I say that very sincerely for all Parties of the Assembly to be aware of.— (Interjection)— The Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) seems to have some kind of problem. He seems to have some kind of problem in this whole matter because for some reason he thinks that it is not fair for a Member to get up and speak their mind. It is okay for him to get up and speak his mind, but when it comes to someone else in telling the truth, he has a difficulty.— (Interjection)— No difficulty with the truth? Well, nothing should bother him. This speech should not bother him at all.— (Interjection)— Ask the Member for Rupertsland. Ask the Member for Rupertsland, who stood on the loading dock with me waiting for the second or the third taxi cab when the former Premier and the now head of the Law Society at the University took off in a whirlwind—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order. I do not suppose the Honourable Minister has to be reminded that he should preface through the Chair. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey).

Mr. Downey: I appreciate that direction and will make sure I will follow your guidance.

Dealing specifically with the resolution, Recognition of Aboriginal Peoples' Right of Self-Government, I think it is an important issue which we should be dealing with. I think we deal with it particularly, whereas Canada's aboriginal peoples seek a constitutional amendment which will recognize their right of self-government. Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty with that. Whereas all Parties in the Legislature support in principle the aboriginal right of self-government. That is a very all-encompassing comment and portion of it.

I think there still has to be both for the aboriginal peoples of this country, and for those that are not aboriginal peoples a far more refined and defined definition of what that whole expression means, because I am sure it means many different things to aboriginal peoples as it means to non-aboriginal peoples. I would support a further clarification as to what the full meaning of it is.

I would hope the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) as I would hope other speakers to this resolution would assist legislative Members in a clearer understanding as it could be attached to this whole question of aboriginal right of self-government—no problem in general principle. I think we, to some degree, we see within some of our communities, and we know that within the reserves we do have pretty much the operation of self-governments.

The whole question, is it self-government or is it an improvement on the current system or it is just too much Government? I say that and I have said it before in this Assembly, and the operations of the bureaucracy within Government, because I have seen many things that have been carried out by the Governments, who are supposed to be carrying out the best interests of our aboriginal peoples who have missed the target by miles.

So I say in this, I think it is an opportunity for us to further explore and everyone understand the whole question of aboriginal self-government. We go to the, therefore be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Government of Manitoba to immediately enter into substantive discussions with federal Government, other provincial Governments and with representatives of the aboriginal people of Canada to formulate and draft an agreement in principle and present this agreement in provincial Legislatures in the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would be more than pleased to wait for the all-Party task force to report as to what they have to say because this whole question, I would hope, would be again dealt with by the all-Party committee. Again, that could well be somewhat either a little advanced, this resolution could be a little advanced and/or be dealt with by that all-Party committee, and the resolution could have read that way, that the task force be specifically asked to deal with this subject, in view of the fact that we have a task force. We had many good presentations made by the aboriginal peoples of this province. Their ideas are certainly worthy of consideration, and it well may be an add-on to the work of the task force.

Again, I have no difficulty with it. In fact, that might speed up the process if the task force were to make recommendations on it. That might be helpful to the Member in a meaningful way. It may be helpful, I am sure, to the New Democratic Party to become aggressively involved through that mechanism.

In the conclusion, be it further resolved that the Assembly further urge that consistent with the recommendations of the 1987 Joint Parliamentary Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Constitutional Amendment, a meeting of First Ministers and aboriginal representatives take place no later than April 17, 1990. It is very difficult in the situation that we have, to really put a date on or to force any Government to deal with in this manner. I would hope that if there was a time could be set in which it should be dealt with, there could be a recommendation from the task force on it.

In general principle, we have no difficulty in supporting this in this resolution, no difficulty in general support of the resolution. However I would expect, and I say this very sincerely, that I would hope the task force would be able to show a little more aggressive and immediate action on it. I am surprised that there was not at least a comment made in the resolution as it relates to the task force.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on this resolution.

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to debate this issue. Of course, the Minister

of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) again is bellowing and yelling and blowing hot air, again without much substance. He was not really dealing on the whole issue of self-government.

I want to deal with the resolution where it says, "whereas Canada's aboriginal people seek a constitutional amendment which will recognize their right of self-government." If you read Section 35 of the Constitution Act of Canada, it says that existing aboriginal and Treaty rights are hereby recognized and affirmed. Section 35 already recognizes self-government, and that has been part of the problem, that many of the Premiers across this country, mostly Conservative Premiers, do not want to recognize, but within Section 35 the issue of self-government is already recognized.

I might say that when we were debating the issue with the First Ministers across this country, many of the First Ministers did not even recognize that aboriginal people were here prior to their arrival. I find that astonishing, because in a sense that is a recognition of we were here first—First Nations we called ourselves as aboriginal people in this country. We also wanted to make the people understand that the whole issue, when we mention aboriginal self-government, that we were here since time immemorial, and we had our own system of Government. We developed our own social structures, political structures within the whole, what we call, Canada, now. I might advise the Members in this Chamber that we had aboriginal populations in this western hemisphere greater than the European population at one time.

We had massive political organizations in this country. If you look at the history of aboriginal people you will find that the Huron, the Iroquois confederacy formed political alliances, and there was trading going on since time immemorial, that we had a political system in this place. What we wanted was the Governments to recognize that we had self-government, not a forced or type of self-government, a recognition within the parliamentary system, and only to be recognized and only to be legally enforceable once parliament has passed it. I think that does injustice to the whole issue, the relationship that we have had with the rest of the country. So there is not a real understanding by both the Conservative Government and also the Liberal Party as to what we mean by self-government.

Self-government, we have always said, is already contained within Section 35 of the Constitution Act. As a matter of fact, in our presentation to the First Ministers' Conference, you would see the statement that we presented that says that the Indian people were here prior to the arrival of Europeans, and we had our own self-government and did our own business with this.

* (1730)

Also, just by the whole process of signing Treaties was a recognition that nations existed, and we made Treaties with the Canadian Government. In that sense, we do have a self-government, and the other is a recognition that the Royal Proclamation -(Interjection)-

Somebody says that I should praise the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey). I can mention to him that when he is dealing with Spence Lake and telling the people that he is giving them self-government, Metis self-government, he does not have that authority to say the people in Spence Lake will have Metis self-government. He only has authority to create northern affairs communities, and I think he is misleading the aboriginal people when he says that. He does not have any legal authority. I believe the aboriginal people want all political Parties to be sincere and also to support the issue of self-government, and eventually would want to be able to control their destiny.

I believe we have had opportunities and both the Liberal and also Conservative Prime Ministers to deal with this issue. I remember when I first got elected in 1981, the Queen was coming to Canada. I had a call from the Prime Minister's Office to attend the Repatriation Ceremony, the bringing home of our Constitution to Canada. I had a call from the Prime Minister's Office to attend a dinner, and plus the Queen. I declined to attend that function because I felt the Queen, as a representative, a symbolic representative of the country of Great Britain had not represented her people here in Canada who had signed Treaties with her. On that basis, I declined to attend the dinner at that time.

In terms of self-government, I think all the aboriginal people across this land would want people to understand what they mean by self-government, not necessarily that they would want to get all their land back, but rather to be part of the society to share the resources that have been exploited and also able to have a say in this country as to their own destiny. As you know, we have been experiencing, especially in the relationship we have had with the federal Government, that we are gradually shifting the responsibilities onto the provincial Governments. As a matter of fact, during the discussion, in a constitutional discussion we proposed wording in the agreement where the federal Government would have primary responsibility for aboriginal people across this country. We still do have outstanding issues that we have to deal with, in terms of the Treaties that we signed with the federal Government.

I am pleased to be able to say a few words on self-government on this issue and hope that all other people will support the First Nations of this country to achieve self-government, not for just political reasons and whatever, but for the aboriginal people of this country we call Canada. This resolution is the same resolution, I believe, that we passed a few years ago to be sent to Ottawa, to the other Legislatures, the resolution that I introduced here to support the aboriginal people. I have no problem in supporting this resolution to be sent to the other Legislative Assemblies and to further the aspirations of aboriginal people in this country.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I have a committee substitution, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), and the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcyia-Leis) for the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill).

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 13—THE MANITOBA INTERCULTURAL COUNCIL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: By leave, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), Bill No. 13, The Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil interculturel du Manitoba, and the motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) that the question be now put, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger). The Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) has advised me that he has concluded his remarks.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I rise, I suppose, to put several concerns and issues on the record. Also, I believe yesterday the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) wanted the question put on this Bill, and as Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation for this Government, I do want to indicate that our Government is not supportive of this Bill, this piece of legislation. There are several reasons. I would like to comment just briefly on some of them and start with a bit of history, Mr. Speaker, on where we were at when we took over as Government and I was appointed Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation and responsible for multiculturalism.

Mr. Speaker, we were faced with two ongoing reports that had been commissioned by the former administration, one of them being the Task Force Report on Multiculturalism, and the other one the Needs Assessment on Lotteries Distribution and Lotteries Funding to all communities. They were commissioned and, I believe, with certain purposes in mind by the former administration. What happened when we took over was that reports had to be completed and we, as a new Government, were faced with recommendations that were made in those reports and had to deal with those recommendations.

The Task Force Report on Multiculturalism, Mr. Speaker, travelled throughout the province and held public hearings and had input from a broad cross section of the multicultural community. I just want to quote from one of the recommendations from the task

force report, and I quote: "The task force heard numerous concerns in its public hearings about the fairness with which these latter grants are distributed to the various groups and organizations that request them. However, it is our belief that in order for justice to be done, it must be perceived to be as done.

"The Task Force is recommending a major overhaul in the grant distribution system. The creation of a Multicultural Grants Commission is recommended to accomplish two goals: firstly, to ensure the co-ordination of the granting process, by centralizing all sources of funding distinctly earmarked for multiculturalism, thereby facilitating the process of application for funding; secondly, by allowing an independent body, without official ties to any particular organization to make decisions based on need, merit and past performance." That is the end of that quote.

I wanted to read that into the record because although MIC did feel that they were doing quite a good job of distributing funds to the multicultural community, obviously there were some concerns or enough concerns raised by that community to, I guess, enable or have the task force choose to put a recommendation in their report that the funding be removed from MIC.

Mr. Speaker, also we had an ongoing needs assessment on Lotteries distribution and I would like to read into the record, too, the comments that were made as a result of that needs assessment and a recommendation to Government, and I quote: "Ethnocultural funding should be provided directly by the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation or by a Multicultural Grants Council. There is merit in the use of an external agency or council which would only make grants and would have no advocacy role." It goes on but I will end the quote there and just add a few of my own personal comments to that.

These reports, as I said, were commissioned by the former administration, it was not our Government. The recommendations that came forward were as a result of broad consultation throughout the community. So there obviously are some people out there, Mr. Speaker, who do feel there should be another mechanism for distributing grants to the multicultural community.

I suppose I could, at this point, indicate that some of the reasons why Cabinet made decisions to change and remove the funding role from MIC. Mr. Speaker, we found out as a result of the audit that was done at MIC last year that some of the monies that were to go directly to the communities through the Lotteries allocation were transferred over into ongoing operating and administration for MIC.

* (1740)

Mr. Speaker, the Lotteries funds that were allocated to go to the multicultural community should all be used for direct grants to those communities for community development, for whatever purposes they were approved for. There is a temptation when you have a group that is an advisory body and is being funded by a Government department. MIC this year will be receiving \$222,000 from the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation for administrative and

operating costs, and they receive around a million dollars to distribute to multicultural groups from Lotteries. Those funds should be separate and they should be earmarked. They are earmarked and should be used for those specific purposes.

I know that the temptation is there when you have a body that has two different and separate functions. The temptation is there possibly to take some of that Lotteries money that should be going to the communities and putting it into administrative costs. Last year, over \$20,000 was taken out of Lotteries and put into administration for MIC. That is \$20,000 that could have gone out to some multicultural group or multicultural organization to do some community development, to deal with some immigration and settlement problems that they had. Unfortunately, the temptation is there when there is one body that is performing two very different functions.

That is one of the reasons why we would like to have an independent body handing out Lotteries monies to the multicultural community, because that temptation will never be there. They will have a mandate to distribute Lotteries monies to the community. They will be held accountable, and held accountable right through the Estimates process in this Legislature as a result of the needs assessment changes, so that the Opposition can ask quite openly, honestly and freely what is happening with the grants to the multicultural communities, what are they going for. As Minister, I will have to answer those questions and will have to be completely accountable to the Opposition and to the members of the multicultural community for the decisions that are made by the new Multicultural Grants Advisory Council which we are in the process of setting up.

I do want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that David Langtry, who has been chosen as the Chair of that Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, is a very credible member of the community who, along with other members of that grants council, will come from a broad cross-section of the community that will operate independently of my Government department and advise myself, as Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, what grants should be allocated. I would have no reason to believe that there would be any changes in any of the recommendations that were made to Government on what grants should go out to the community.

As a matter of fact, when we met with MIC on Monday morning as a multicultural affairs committee of Cabinet, we discussed with MIC a transition team of members of MIC working together with members of my department and David Langtry as the new Chair to provide for a transition, so there would be no fear among the communities that there would be any lapse of funds, that all of the funds that were allocated by MIC until the end of August would flow through the new Multicultural Grants Council and would be honoured by that new council.

New criteria will not be set up until the next fiscal year, so the applications that are out there in the communities right now will be looked at and will be used until the end of this fiscal year, until the transition

can take place and in an orderly fashion. I must say that the meeting was a positive meeting with MIC and they are prepared to work very closely with us on the transition from the funding through MIC to the funding through the new Multicultural Grants Council.

Mr. Speaker, I know that members of MIC have been concerned. They have come to us as Government and have wanted to retain that role, but I do not believe that we as Government should put MIC in a position to be tempted to use that Lotteries money for reasons other than what it is supposed to be used for and that is for direct grants to the communities that they represent and that they advise Government on.

Mr. Speaker, MIC is an agency of Government, and as an agency of Government it should have a direct relationship with advising Government on issues that arise in the multicultural community. We have had some problems over the last year sort of getting roles and responsibilities straightened out. I do believe now that there is a sense that MIC wants to work co-operatively with Government to work towards implementing the new multicultural policy and a new multicultural Act.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation that is on the table right now for discussion in no way deals with the full impact of what should be under way and in process for the multicultural community. It is three specific issues that have been pulled out: one the funding, one the appointment of the Chair and one the hiring of their own executive secretary; three things that have been pulled out of an Act that is terribly flawed. We have an Act that has been put in place and has been working for five years that has many flaws and many problems. I have discussed with MIC, too, that there should be changes to that Act. We are committed to those changes, but we do not want an ad hoc bandaid approach by pulling out three very political issues in the MIC Act and wanting to amend the Act and just look at those three issues when there are many other issues that have to be discussed, looked at, implemented and changed as a result of a new multicultural policy that will be coming forward and a new multicultural Act.

So this really does not address the issue of problems in the multicultural community. It takes three specific issues and treats them in a way that really does not deal with the issues and the concerns that face the community. It is a matter of determining whether one body or another body that represents the multicultural community should be administering grants. It does not deal with addressing the problems of understanding and cross-cultural awareness and all of those things that should be going into a multicultural policy.-(Interjection)-

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) laughs, and I certainly do not profess to understand all aspects of the multicultural community, but I am attempting, and I would hope all Members of the House would attempt to learn and to understand more. I do not profess to be an expert, but I do profess to want to listen and to want to learn and want to understand and want to do some of the things that are right. We cannot accomplish everything overnight, but I do know that there are positive things that we can do.

There are ways and means that we are looking at working with MIC at the committee level so that the committees on MIC will be able to meet with the Ministers who are directly responsible for issues that pertain to those committees. We are over the next period of time going to be working towards that multicultural policy. We have the commitment of MIC to do that. When we have a multicultural policy in place we will be looking at changes to MIC's Act that will reflect all of the issues that should be addressed, not just the quick fix that the Liberals have introduced in this piece of legislation that really does not address the full implications of multiculturalism and multiculturalism in our Manitoba society. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

* (1750)

BILL NO. 21—THE UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT

Mr. Speaker: By leave, debate on second reading, Public Bill No. 21, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), The Unfair Business Practices Act; Loi sur les pratiques commerciales déloyales, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae).

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I see the Honourable Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) is seeking the floor at this time. I would ask that he be allowed to speak and that the matter remain in my name.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to have this remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Justice? (Agreed)

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to enter debate on Bill 21. In the Throne Speech it was indicated that we would as a Government be bringing forward consumer protection legislation, and I can indicate to the House that we are working towards that end. As everyone is well aware, there is a lot of work to developing legislation, so we are trying to ensure that when we do bring our legislation forward it has been properly vetted through the various groups to make sure that it is good legislation.

I do want to say to the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) that I appreciate the work he has done. He introduced Bills last year and he has reintroduced those Bills again this year. I think most of the legislation that the Member for Elmwood has introduced I have a lot of sympathy towards. I appreciate the fact he has been concerned enough, from the consumers' point of view, to introduce that legislation.

I am sure that we will see support from the Liberal side as far as consumer legislation goes and, when we do as a Government bring forward our legislation, I will have to take the opportunity to talk to the critic, along with the critic for the NDP, to ensure that we bring forward legislation that will have the support of all of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the problems that the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) has in bringing forward legislation and not having the staff at hand to help polish it and to maybe arrange—

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): He did a good job.

Mr. Connery: —for all of the meetings. Yes, as the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) says, he did a good job.

It does take a lot of consultation with all of the client groups, the consumer groups and those business groups that are affected by legislation to ensure that the consumers are protected and also that we do not do things that hinder good business, because after all it is in the interests of consumers that we do have good legislation that does not hinder their opportunities to do business and to buy goods and services.

I said I have met with the Consumers' Association to discuss legislation, and we have had three meetings already with them. I have met with business groups to discuss it. The one group that I have not yet met with, but we were attempting to make arrangements, are with the seniors. A lot of the legislation does impact on seniors, so we want to make sure that they have had an opportunity to have input into it.

It is understood that protection is required for all people, but there are certain groups that maybe require legislation a little bit more importantly than others, and there are some in our society who are vulnerable, possibly the young who have never been exposed to some of the high-pressure salesmanship that goes on, some of the less able, the seniors who are pressured and do not have that willpower to fight back. The idea of consumer protection is there.

Mr. Speaker, let it be put on the record that by far the vast majority of businesses are good businesses. The need for legislation only relates to a very, very small number of businesses that really are attempting to rip off the people, if you might want to say that, or just in some cases do not understand the need for certain legislation. We just do not want it to be considered that it is bad when you are in business and that we have to legislate against all business people. I respect most of the business people in this province, and I think most of them are doing good.

The Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) does point out that when it comes to the unfair business practices, a lot of other provinces do have legislation in place. I think he has listed some six provinces that have legislation in place. His indication was that maybe it is time Manitoba has similar legislation. Well, I can tell you that we are reviewing legislation. I think it is fair to say the legislation the Member introduced was legislation the department has been working on for

some years. In fact, I am told some of it goes back to the mid-'70s that they have been working on. The development of legislation in some senses takes a long period of time. In other cases it just takes the political will to bring it in.

I am pleased, with my new portfolio, to have that time to be able to meet with the groups and to develop what we consider to be good legislation. Mr. Speaker, I still believe that it is a money Bill in the sense that it will cost money to implement the Bill.

An Honourable Member: It is in order.

Mr. Connery: I know the Speaker ruled that it is in order, but it will cost money to advertise the Bill and to implement the Bill, so we recognize it as being that way.

Mr. Speaker, there are some concerns with the legislation that I have, by and large I accept it as being pretty reasonable legislation that I think we, as Government, are looking at into some of the things that we are looking to bring in. One of the areas that the legislation does not talk about is the grossly excessive pricing that some businesses have done. We see this in the area of home renovations where we see people taken by grossly overpriced things, or they are cheated out, or charged vastly excessive prices for the repairs done. That is a concern that I think we would like to look at.- (Interjection)- Hi, John, glad to see you are listening.

Mr. Speaker, in looking through the legislation, when we look at Section 3(1) of it where we think that if we were going to look at the grossly excessive prices, that is the area. Once again, this is where we see seniors where somebody drops in and says they need a renovation and convinces them to go into it, whether it be attic repairs or whatever.

A case that was brought to my attention which indicates the need for it is the squirt can salesman who says to somebody, let us check your attic. He goes up there with a little squirt can under their arm, and whoosh, and gets a bit of water on the insulation and convinces that person they need roof repairs, and really they do very little and they get away with it. That is the sort of thing that legislation needs to prevent, Mr. Speaker.

One of the areas that I did find a little bit of concern about, is in 5(1) of the legislation that the Member has put forth. It says, "where the department will maintain public records of all enforcement proceedings taken under this Act or the regulations." I think if a business is convicted, are we going to have them put on public display? I do not think that is in the best interest of business. If they have done something wrong under the legislation and they are convicted, they pay the price, fine or whatever. We have some concern of whether they should be put on public record. We have seen debates and other issues where we have had some of those same concerns that should people have their record made public.

Mr. Speaker, when we go in there is another area—maybe because the Bill is a little older that the Member

had. The level of fines, I think, if we are going to look at the level indicated in the Bill is \$2,500 for an individual or imprisonment up to six months, or in the case of a corporation, a fine of not more than \$25,000.00. In today's context, I think we need to review that. We have seen in The Environment Act where fines have been drastically increased because large corporations, a \$25,000 fine really is not a deterrent if it is of a significant nature. As in The Environment Act, it goes to \$1 million. I am sure that the Members opposite would support levels of penalties that would ensure that businesses would not take advantage.- (Interjection)- Teeth, as the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) says, and that is right. We have to have teeth if we are going to have legislation. There is no use having wishy-washy legislation.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation says that they will not apply to any transaction that is over \$100,000.00. Of course, this would eliminate transactions of real property, houses and that sort of thing. I think that maybe the Member might want to take a look at those sort of levels where in today's market, even for the average home, you are looking at levels in excess of \$100,000.00.

Mr. Speaker, the Member also has two other pieces of legislation that we will be discussing at another time, Bills Nos. 22 and 23. Once again, Bill 22 especially, is one that has a lot of merit. I have some concerns with Bill 23, where they are talking about the deposits. In that area, I think there are some concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to wrap up, to put on the record that our Government is actively pursuing consumer legislation. I can assure you that the legislation put forward by the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) will be looked at in the context that we think it is some pretty good legislation. We will review it to ensure that the better parts will be incorporated, and I say the better parts. I think most of those Bills are good.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we do get the opportunity in a Government, and obviously it will not be before the recess, but hopefully in the very near early part of the next Session we will have an opportunity to introduce what legislation we are prepared to bring forward. At that point, I will be discussing with the Members of the two Opposition Parties to solicit their support, maybe make some minor changes that may be required. If they can help us improve the legislation, I would entertain their suggestions along that line.

* (1800)

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say thank you for the opportunity to speak on Bill No. 21. I will have a little more to say when the opportunity arises to speak on Bills Nos. 22 and 23. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: By leave, it has been agreed upon this matter will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae).

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned. It stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning (Thursday). That has been agreed upon by leave.