



First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

37 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXVII No. 16 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, AUGUST 12, 1988.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIBERAL
ANGUS, John	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BURRELL, Parker	Swan River	PC
CARR, James	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CHARLES, Gwen	Selkirk	LIBERAL
CHEEMA, Gulzar	Kildonan	LIBERAL
CHORNOPYSKI, William	Burrows	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James Hon.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Emerson	PC
DRIEDGER, Herold, L.	Niakwa	LIBERAL
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIBERAL
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Laurie	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
EVANS, Leonard	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen Hon.	Virden	PC
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Ellice	LIBERAL
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HEMPHILL, Maureen	Logan	NDP
KOZAK, Richard, J.	Transcona	LIBERAL
LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.	Inkster	LIBERAL
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANDRAKE, Ed	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MCCRAE, James Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MINENKO, Mark	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
OLESON, Charlotte Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald Hon.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PATTERSON, Allan	Radisson	LIBERAL
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Rhineland	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles	Springfield	PC
ROSE, Bob	St. Vital	LIBERAL
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
TAYLOR, Harold	Wolseley	LIBERAL
URUSKI, Bill	Interlake	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
YEO, Iva	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, August 12, 1988.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I would like to present the petition of the Manitoba Motor League of Gimli, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act To Incorporate The Manitoba Motor League.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): I have the pleasure of tabling three reports in the House this morning: firstly, the Annual Report of the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation for 1986-1987; the Annual Report for the Legislative Library for 1986-1987, and the Annual Report for the Film Classification Board for 1986-1987.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Lotteries Foundation Needs Assessment Review Status

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): My question this morning is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation (Mrs. Mitchelson).

There has been some indication that this Minister is prepared to redirect lottery funding away from traditional recipients and towards the new groups and projects, yet a Needs Assessment Review is still under way. Can the Minister inform the House today just what is the status of the Needs Assessment Review?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister responsible for Lotteries): I thank the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) for that question.

The Needs Assessment was started under the previous administration and was put on hold during the election campaign. I asked the Needs Assessment, the consultants, to go ahead and finish with that report. I did meet with the consultants and the members of the umbrella groups who were part of the advisory committee just the beginning of this week.

There were some concerns with the draft report that was presented to the advisory committee, that the information that was in that draft report was not completely accurate and did not present the true facts that the members of the advisory committee had presented to the consultants. So I have directed the consultants to meet again with those umbrella groups and make sure that we have full and factual information in that report before it becomes a final report.

Mrs. Carstairs: My question is to the same Minister.

Can the Minister inform the House which groups she distributed this interim report or draft report to? Is she also prepared to provide the Members of this House with copies of the draft report since it has now gone outside of her department?

* (1005)

Mrs. Mitchelson: I would like to inform the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) what the process is normally. This is a draft report, and obviously the facts that are in that report are not reflective of what the advisory committee has discussed with the consultants. They are going to go back to the advisory committee, to the umbrella groups, and it was the umbrella groups that are distributing Lotteries monies that were presented with the draft report. They have been part of the advisory committee since the beginning of the Needs Assessment. Those are the people who are going to have to ensure that the facts are there and correct.

I think it would serve no purpose for anyone outside of that advisory committee to have a draft report that does not have full and factual information. Until we have all of the facts, it is not a final report.

Mrs. Carstairs: I am pleased to hear that it is indeed not a final report, particularly in light that the Minister seems to have some genuine concerns that it was not factual in its entire content. I would ask the Minister, therefore: Why does her department and why does her Government as a whole seem to be making decisions about changing funding allocations, libraries and hospitals, for example, before this study has been completed?

Mrs. Mitchelson: This Government has never indicated exactly what changes, if any, there are going to be made in Lotteries distribution until we get the final report of the Needs Assessment.

The general public out there indicated in several different polls that have been done—and in a poll I did in my constituency—that they would like to see Lotteries revenues generated towards health care. That seems to be the No. 1 priority out there in the community, in the general public, and that is what the people of Manitoba are looking toward. We will assess the needs report, the report of the Needs Assessment, when it is in its final stage and we will make our decisions accordingly.

Mrs. Carstairs: My question again to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson).

We have seen budgetary lines changed with regard to her department on libraries. We have seen budgetary lines changed on health with regard to Lotteries. Why are those decisions being made before this study has been completed?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think I indicated in my answers yesterday that the Provincial Auditor had some concern that salaries for the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation and other operating administrative costs were being funded out of Lotteries. He could not get a handle on what was happening, and the people of Manitoba and this Legislature did not know what was happening in the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

A better method to handle it was to move all of salaries into appropriation for the department and move programming grants into Lotteries. It was a matter of putting operating grants, operating funding, into appropriation and that is what has happened as a result.

Tabling Report Request

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a supplementary question to the Minister.

We do not disagree that Lotteries revenues have been mixed and intermixed and intermeshed with Culture, Heritage and Recreation, but this Minister has made a decision to spend \$1 million out of Lotteries revenues on libraries without the Needs Assessment. When will we get the Needs Assessment Review study tabled in this House?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): When we have the final report, not a draft report, we will be tabling it in the Legislature.

* (1010)

Mrs. Carstairs: With a final question to the Minister, what urgency has this Minister placed upon the university, and Coopers and Lybrand who are preparing the study, to get this tabled as soon as possible?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, I met with them at the beginning of this week. There were concerns expressed by the umbrella groups. I have instructed the consultants to go back and meet with the advisory group, with the umbrella organizations, get the facts and present them to me.

Department Ministers Clerical Staff Intimidation

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

I would ask the First Minister to inform Manitobans, and indeed this House, whether it is appropriate behaviour for Ministers of the Crown to engage in discussions with employees in the departments, dealing with issues like we are going to give you the pink slip or there are going to be some firings? Is that acceptable and appropriate behaviour?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) continues to scrape into situations about staffing. He tries to raise fear among employees. He takes entirely the different position that he took when he was the Leader of the Manitoba

Government Employees' Association, at which time he accused the former NDP administration of politics in the way they dealt with their civil servants. He criticized them for the moves they made for hacking and slashing and making political decisions. Those are the kinds of things that caused disruption in the Civil Service.

We are interested in establishing a good relationship with our civil servants. We are not, in any way, interested in making threats or doing things to try and disrupt the good relationship that we are building.

Mr. Doer: My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Is it appropriate for his Ministers to engage in flippant conversation with long-term clerical and other employees in particular departments about pink slips and firings? Is it appropriate behaviour?

Mr. Filmon: This is what the Leader of the New Democratic Party said on March 8, 1983: "NDP tactics anger union. MGEA says politics decided the way layoffs were handled." Here is what the then-president of the MGEA, now the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) said: "There is a real sense of unfairness now—it is white-wine socialism. The senior executive positions in the Government have increased 22 percent since the NDP took over. Meanwhile, it is reducing line-department positions that service the public." That is the kind of political way they dealt with the Civil Service. That is the unfair way in which they dealt with the civil servants. It created fear and concern in civil servants.

Just earlier this week, I spoke to a member of the Civil Service who said to me that you people are doing a very professional, objective job. He said that the only fear in the Civil Service is in the mind of the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I meant everything I said then. I find it not inconsistent whatsoever to ask this Premier (Mr. Filmon) whether he is going to be accountable as Premier, not give me the old newspaper clippings, whether he finds it acceptable that his Minister of Labour and Environment (Mr. Connerly) walks around departments and employees, long-term clerical workers, and jokes about firings and pink slips in a continuous manner.

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

Hon. Edward Connerly (Minister of Labour): That is not true. That is not factual, that is a lie.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Connerly) used unparliamentary language. Would you kindly withdraw?

* (1015)

Mr. Connerly: Obviously you cannot use the word "lie." It is unfortunate that the Leader of the N.D. Party (Mr. Doer) could not be factual in his information.

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

Mr. Doer: We have had it confirmed on a number of occasions. They obviously—people are not going to put in writing what the Minister—we have had it confirmed on a number of occasions, we have had it confirmed on five different occasions.

My final question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). There is a meeting called with long-term clerical workers in the Department of Labour and Environment to deal with career options. We are not aware of what the final results of that meeting will be, but I would ask the First Minister to ensure that any decisions that will be made in that department will be made on the basis of merit, not on the basis of any other flippant predictions.

Mr. Filmon: I will give the Leader of the N.D. Party my total and complete assurance on that.

Mental Health Facilities Jurisdictional Disputes

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): My question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). The Health Minister has waxed eloquent for quite a while now about the new directions which his Government is about to assume in the area of mental health care. I believe it is time that we get some better answers.

The Selkirk Mental Health Centre has been told to maintain a 7 percent staff year vacancy rate. I ask the Minister of Health why, when he says he will address the needs of the mentally ill in Manitoba, does he allow that vacancy rate to be maintained?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): There is no 7 percent vacancy rate at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre.

Mrs. Charles: You should ask some of his members of the area, of the mental health area. This is not a laughing matter, sir.

In May of this year we had a suicide day in Manitoba, and on September 1, the nursing classes will begin at the Selkirk Mental Health Hospital. How does this Minister expect the school to be able to work when it has only filled five out of the nine teaching positions?

Mr. Orchard: No one takes issues of mental health care flippantly in this province, and that is why I would remind the Honourable Member before she comes to this House with accusations of 7 percent vacancy rates, she check her facts.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Member for Selkirk, with a final supplementary.

Mrs. Charles: Considering that this school is not going to have the proper teaching positions filled, how can this Selkirk Psychiatric Nursing School pass accreditation this fall, or is the Minister considering alternative forms of education?

Mr. Orchard: I can simply assure my honourable friend that the teaching program for the registered psychiatric nurses will continue as it has in the past at Selkirk. This fall's graduating class will be enrolled and will be taught in Selkirk.

Mental Health Care Jurisdictional Disputes

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): My question is for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

Individual Manitobans and their families are experiencing unnecessary delays in obtaining much needed health and social services. This results in part, by the confusion of jurisdiction for the care of the elderly in the community who may have mental health complications. Could the Minister inform this House what strategies he has initiated to resolve the long-standing disputes over this jurisdiction, which is really creating a new kind of systemic discrimination against the elderly who may have mental health difficulties?

* (1020)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): I am very pleased to address this issue with my honourable friend, the former employee of Winnipeg Regional Services Delivery, who knows full well the kind of chaos that was created when the former administration, some year-and-a-half or two years ago, and I believe, unbeknownst to the then current Minister of Health, that the Winnipeg Region would be divided into three regions to serve the people of the City of Winnipeg. I criticized that chaos, when I was the Opposition Health critic, severely.

That problem of service delivery in coordination still exists and I simply tell my honourable friend that it is being currently investigated, which she is well aware of. We are determining as to whether there is a need for three regions in Winnipeg or whether the people of the City of Winnipeg can be better served with one single region, one administration, one coordination to avoid the duplication, the overlap and people falling between the cracks in service delivery in the City of Winnipeg.

That study is ongoing and the results of it will be known in the near future, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, hopefully before Estimates are debated in this House. I welcome the opportunity to debate the Regional Service Delivery in the City of Winnipeg because I know my honourable friend, having experience in the chaos created by that creation of three regions, might offer some positive contribution to that debate.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I would love to offer positive comment to that debate. However, my question is not related to the three regions and to the disputes. What my question is, whether it is one region or whether it is three regions, is the fact that when referrals come in to regional offices, there is jurisdictional disputes between who provides service, Mental Health or Home Care, and the directorates have not gotten their act together to resolve this. It has been a long-standing dispute for the last six or seven years. Could the Minister tell this House what strategies he has initiated to resolve those jurisdictional disputes?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I just want to reinforce for the people of Manitoba the answer in the question. The answer in the question was for six or seven years

this problem has been going on because mental health services have not been coordinated in this province, from an institutional base—Brandon, Selkirk and even Mental Health Centre; from a community hospital base, be it Grace, be it Seven Oaks, be it Misericordia, be it Victoria; or from direct departmental provision of services through Regional Services. That coordination is direly needed, is part of the review that is ongoing in the organization of Winnipeg Region, as well as our regions outside the City of Winnipeg. We are very hopeful that under the reorganization of delivery of mental health that is currently being discussed within the department, that we offer those kinds of positive change of direction and delivery of mental health which has suffered so dramatically under six to seven years of neglect by the previous administration.

Ms. Gray: We appreciate the Minister's concern regarding the service delivery. Could this Minister tell us then, on the interim, what specific direction has this Minister given his staff in regional offices so that when referrals are made today and tomorrow and next week, there are not unnecessary delays because of this jurisdictional dispute? What specific directions today are given to staff?

Mr. Orchard: First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask the coordinators and directors of Regional Services if those kinds of disputes, in fact, are causing difficulties, because to date no one in my department has brought this problem to the attention of senior management.

Now, if my honourable friend has that kind of information from senior staff, I would urge her to pass it through the regional director in Winnipeg, onto the department so that we can address that issue because it has not been raised directly with myself or senior staff in the department.

* (1025)

Hazardous Waste - Flin Flon Analysis Report Request

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, this morning I heard news reports which I believe were initiated by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery), with respect to analysis of material that was to be processed in Flin Flon.

My question is to the Minister of Environment. Some two weeks ago, he indicated that he was going to table an analysis of both the Palo Alto material, as well as an analysis of the material coming from Dow Corning which had been shipped to Flin Flon for processing. In addition, he had been asked to table a legal opinion as to whether the processing of ore was in terms of the new environment the same as processing waste from the United States? Will he table those opinions? Does he have them? Does he have any intention of informing this House of those facts when he has undertaken to do so?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health): First of all, we have

to understand, in of the whole process of what we were doing and have to do is to ensure the safety of the worker primarily, firstly, and then to ensure that the environment is protected. That took place. There was no problem with the product that went up there.

It is unfortunate—and we have seen today—we saw when this initiative was first brought to this House, non-factual information in an attempt to smear, to create scare tactics, and whatever. We reacted responsibly. We put a stop use on the Dow Corning material. They try to call it Dow Chemical because chemical has a greater fear tactic. It was Dow Corning, Mr. Speaker. I said that we would get the analysis of the Palo Alto, and it will be available. I told him, and he knows, and I said it in this House, the Dow Corning material cannot be released because of patent rights—will not be released, but will be analyzed by our people.

Just yesterday, there was a meeting in Flin Flon which okayed the use of the material. The departments went over it, it is absolutely safe. The company says it is safe, they signed the agreement. The union looked at it and signed the agreement. The working group looked at it and signed the agreement. There was the whole program. If Pinocchio had told that story he would have a three-foot nose today.

Mr. Storie: The problem with this Minister is that either he does not know the facts, or he ignores them on a continual basis. Mr. Speaker, he continues to use language that is perplexing.

My question is to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery). If there in fact is no problem with the material that is shipped either from Palo Alto or from Dow Corning, why will the Minister not table that result or share it with me or my colleagues on a confidential basis so that we can assure ourselves that is the case? I know for a fact that both of those materials contain dangerous substances including arsenic and cadmium. The Minister of Environment would have us believe that if this processing was occurring in Portage la Prairie and adding to an already dangerous environmental—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Storie: —concern, that he would do nothing. Mr. Speaker, my question is where are the results? - (Interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Connery: It is somewhat ironical that the Member gets up and asks for the results of the analysis.

On August 2, a letter was addressed to me by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). He says as MLA for Flin Flon, I am once again offering to make available to you, on a confidential basis, an analysis of chemical waste from Dow which was recently processed at the mine. Mr. Speaker, he already has the analysis, what is he concerned about? Why does he not release it? The one as he knows, because of patent rights, we have agreed with Hudson Bay because they were requested that they not be made public. I am not afraid to show it to the Member for Flin Flon, but he already

has an analysis of it. There is cadmium, there is arsenic in those chemicals in very trace amounts, very small amounts. Every day, arsenic is used in all of those plants. Cadmium is produced at Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting. If we eliminated the use of arsenic in those plants, we would shut down the North. Is that what the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) wants?

The Minister of Mines who was responsible, when he was in power, to allow military batteries to be processed at the plant, to allow a load of material from Calgon, circuit boards which made employees sick. Mr. Speaker, while there was a deputy in place—the Leader of the Opposition says the problem we were having was when we did not have a deputy. There was a deputy in place when all that material came in. It was under the Minister of Mines who allowed it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1030)

Environment Act Legal Opinion Invocation

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my further question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery).

He fails to understand that we are adding an instrumental problem to an already difficult circumstance in Flin Flon. The processing of ore—I have asked him several times whether he has a legal opinion, on the basis of the new Environment Act, whether processing ore is the same as processing waste.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Honourable Member place his question.

Mr. Storie: I have a legal opinion which says that a new licence is required for the processing of waste in Flin Flon.

Will the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) enforce the Environment Act, which it is his obligation to do, and protect the environment and the people of Flin Flon?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health): Mr. Speaker, I have had intensive consultations with my department. We have also gone to the Attorney-General's legal department. The gentleman's name is Stu Pierce. He is in the department, and he came back and he gave me an oral report. He said if you want it in writing, he would provide it for us in writing. If the Member wants it in writing, we have no objection. We will give it to him in writing.

The licence is for emissions, not for input into the plant.—(Interjection)—It is Clean Environment. It is for the emissions, for the water emissions, for the hard

material emissions and for the emissions through the air. There is no change in the emissions because of the use of this chemical.

The legal people are absolutely positive that we are doing everything that is legal. We are doing what is safe for the workers. It is safe environmentally. It is creating jobs for the people in Flin Flon, and we need jobs.—(Interjection)—Mr. Speaker, how many times is he going to stand up there and say I am lying. After all, this—

Some Honourable Members: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. Connery: When we can we believe the word . . .

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, I will quit using the word "lying" because it is unparliamentary, when the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) tells the truth.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) knows that is unparliamentary. Now would the Honourable Member for Flin Flon kindly withdraw, unequivocally withdraw.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Storie: On more than one occasion, I have indicated to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) that I know that HBM&S has indicated that there is no additional employment because of the processing of this waste. It is incorrect rather than lying, if I can use that word. It is incorrect.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is Friday again, but I think all Honourable Members should remember that as many of us sometimes do get into a little bit of strong language, I think that if we are asked to withdraw our withdrawals should be somewhat like the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock). They should be large and liberal.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae). Beauchesne 325 says exactly that. Would the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) kindly withdraw his statements.

Mr. Storie: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I thought I had withdrawn it. I had indicated that I would change the word to incorrect information.

Mr. Speaker: I have asked the Honourable Member to withdraw.

Mr. Storie: If Parliamentary Rules require that I withdraw that word, Mr. Speaker, I will do so.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Honourable Member.

Assiniboine Street Closure

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My question is for the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Albert Driedger). Since Assiniboine Avenue has been closed to traffic, there has been a very serious repercussion in the neighbourhood. Response time for emergency vehicles has increased by two minutes and these are critical seconds in life-threatening situations. Businesses and residents have complained because of difficult and confusing access, and street life at night has moved to the residential area east of this building.

My question for the Minister is this: Did the Minister consult city politicians, residents and business people in the area before the decision to close the street was made?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Government Services): I might thank the Member for the question. First of all, I would like to indicate that there is no permanent closure of the street. There has been consultation with the City of Winnipeg and jointly the decision was made to close the street on a temporary basis, to see what effect the traffic would have on Broadway. After a period of time—and I would like to indicate at this time that by the middle of September that survey will be completed and the street will be opened going west to east on Assiniboine Avenue, as a one way, and all this is done to get information to see, in terms of working for a proposed extension of the park and clean-up of the riverbank. Before any decision is going to be made on a permanent basis, consultation will be done with all the people involved.

Mr. Carr: A supplementary question to the same Minister. I gather by his answer that no consultation was made with the residents and with the shopkeepers in the area. He mentioned city officials, but he did not mention city politicians with whom there was no consultation.

My question to the Minister is this: Will he open Assiniboine Avenue today to restore some calm and order to the neighbourhood around this building?

Mr. Albert Driedger: No permanent decision has been made, but I have already had a delegation in to see me who have expressed their concerns, and I made the commitment to them that before any final decision will be made that consultation will take place with all the people involved, including the city councillors, including the city officials. We have been consulting and will be consulting further before any permanent decision is made.

Mr. Carr: A final supplementary to the same Minister. While this Government is measuring traffic flows, a neighbourhood has been severely affected, and the everyday lives of people is the question here. I would like to know from the Minister when he intends to inform residents and shop owners in the area, what the long-term plan is, and how soon can they expect him to reach out, as an open Government has promised to reach out, in time to save this neighbourhood?

Mr. Albert Driedger: Before we can go forward with any proposal, we have to know the impact that the traffic has when we make this kind of a change. Incidentally, I would like to indicate that that street, from Kennedy to Osborne, belongs to the Legislative Building, to the property here. But it is not done in an arrogant way. We have consulted with the city officials and we will again, as I indicated. I have asked them because of the delegations that came to see me, instead of having the survey done till the end of September, we will do it to the middle of September, and then we will create a one way going the other way and do a survey that way. Once we know what the impact of traffic is, then we will develop the plan and come forward with it. This has been done in consultation with the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) as well.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can see it heading for the bush.

* (1040)

Affirmative Action Position Coordinator Reinstatement

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): My question is to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery).

Yesterday, the Minister of Labour confirmed that this Government is not replacing the Affirmative Action coordinator's position, turning back the clock on affirmative action to the Sterling Lyon era when very little, if any, progress was made in terms of affirmative action. The Minister has subsequently stated that he will review the progress of the program over the next year and may actually replace the coordinator's position if there is no progress in terms of affirmative action.

My question to the Minister is: What goals has the Minister set for that year? What exact goals, in terms of hirings for Native people, visible minorities, women and the handicapped, has the Minister set to analyze whether this program is working?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Labour): The discussion was—and he was here yesterday. The Member was here yesterday when we talked about affirmative action. When they say targets, no, I do not really like targets. I will tell you what. When you set targets, when you get to that target, do you quit hiring in the affirmative action? No, not on this side of the House, we will not. We are going to expand affirmative action. Our office has just hired an individual who was part of the affirmative action target group, and I am very proud of that, and we will continue it.

But the position was there initially to coordinate it, to get it working. Mr. Hart, the commissioner, believes fully—and he has written to me on it—that by putting the responsibility now within the various departments,

it will be more effective and will do more for affirmative action this way.

Mr. Ashton: The Minister has confirmed that he has no targets. He is talking about going back to a system that did not work previously. Will the Minister not waste a year for the women, for the visible minorities, for the Native people and the handicapped citizens of our province? Will he now reinstate in the Civil Service Department that position to ensure the affirmative action does not waste a year?

Mr. Connery: I guess proof of the pudding is in the eating. Of course, we will know down the line.

We are looking at methods and means of improving the affirmative action process. We think this is the means of improving that action. We are very concerned that this target group, make sure that they have a proper place in this province, that they have a fair share of the income and a fair share of everything else that goes on. I am not going to bend to the scare tactics of the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), because all they want to do is create a misconception. Targets means, when you have reached the goal, you quit. I refuse to quit because there is a target set. We have talked about that with our departments. We will do the best we can.

Mr. Ashton: I have a further question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery).

Just a few months ago, the Minister announced cutoff of funding to the Labour Education Centre, citing fiscal problems with the Government as the reason. In view of the fact that this week's Budget indicated there was \$150 million in unanticipated extra revenue and in view of the fact that there are more than \$40 million in tax breaks to business, will the Minister now either reinstate funding to the Labour Education Centre or indicate at least that the real reason the funding was cut was because of the anti-worker and anti-labour bias of this Government?

Mr. Connery: It must be Friday, and the loonies are coming out.

There is no way. This department is very concerned. We will do our best in all areas. We are not turning our back on women. We can look at programs. The things that we inherited from this previous Government, I will tell you, were a detriment to the women of this province. We can look at an apprenticeship program that is in disarray, chaos. We will work in all of these areas to ensure that everyone in this province has a better go than what they have had. The loss, the reason that we had to prioritize our spending was because of the waste of the money of the previous Government.

Termite Infestation Relief Youville Street

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): My question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme).

I am sure the Minister is aware that the Youville Street area in St. Boniface is experiencing a potentially

devastating termite problem, and I am sure the Minister is concerned that urgent action is needed to swiftly eradicate the problem for the many homeowners in the area. My question is: Can the Minister tell this House what he is prepared to do to help the people of St. Boniface and eliminate this infestation?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): First of all, I appreciate the concerns of the Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry). Our Government expressed the same concerns and has the same concerns.

On March 2, 1988, the Council approved a motion that called for city-province joint use. Because of the election in March, this was not dealt with. However, an official delegation further requested this Government on June 27, again the city renewed its request. We have looked into the particular request and, in the meantime, the city on its own merits has allocated \$50,000 for soil sterilization for these particular 15 homes.

Termite Infestation Relief Control Strategies

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): A supplementary to the same Minister, the Ontario Government spends \$0.5 million per year on termite control. By acting now, Manitoba can halt the spread of termites in Winnipeg. What action is his department taking to remedy this most serious problem before it spreads out of control?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question and to sum up the question, after studying with the city stats and studying the Ontario position, I, as Minister, have recently submitted a proposal to the Mayor and the City of Winnipeg and am hoping to solve the situation and get that answer back soon. They are required to consider our proposal before they meet or by the time they meet in September. As the Member is aware, the committees are not meeting. I am hoping for the city to consider this proposal so that the action could be done right away.

Mr. Gaudry: A supplementary and final to the same Minister: Have you offered financial support?

Mr. Ducharme: Yes.

Hazardous Waste - Fliin Flon

Mr. Jerry Storie (Fliin Flon): A further question to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery).

On August 2, the Minister of the Environment, in answer to a question on whether HBM&S was required to license the processing of this waste, replied: ". . . nothing in a licence required for input."

The Minister of Environment was referring to the licence that is provided under the Clean Environment Commission. My question was with respect to The Environment Act which was proclaimed on April 1 of this year. It is clear that licence for developments are

required for Class 2 developments, and I want to read for the House what "development" means in terms of this particular Act. It means: ". . . any project, industry, operation or activity, or any alteration, or expansion of any project, industry, operation or activity, which causes or is likely to cause the emission or discharge of any pollutant into the environment."

Mr. Speaker, could he table an opinion in this House which indicates that HBM&S is allowed to process waste under the terms of the new Environment Act.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment): I will answer the question again, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, I have had discussions with our staff and I think it is Section 17. If I am not mistaken, I think he is referring to it. Anyway, I have read that particular section very carefully myself. I have talked to our staff and we got a legal opinion. I told him that, if he wanted a written legal opinion of Mr. Pierce, I will be very pleased to table that report in this House.

* (1050)

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the cooperation of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery), and I would ask only—to the Minister of the Environment—if he is going to table a legal opinion, will he also table the questions which were asked of legal counsel, and will he ensure that the opinion is given on the Environment Act and not on a licence which was issued by the Clean Environment Commission? Will he undertake to ask to table the questions that are asked of legal counsel?

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Mr. Connery: . . . any answers to these questions?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Connery: The questions to the legal people were naturally by telephone, but they were to ask whether we were contravening the licence and if, under The Clean Environment Act, it was illegal.—(Interjection)—Mr. Speaker, if you would ask them to be quiet so they could hear the answer, that we did, when all of those particular questions were raised, to make sure that what was going on was in a proper vein. If there was any thought that there was anything unsafe, if the people of Flin Flon were concerned, there has been absolutely no concern raised with this office from the people of Flin Flon. There has been no concern raised to me by the unions. I, in Opposition, went to the unions to ask them to make sure that they were happy with what was happening and there were no concerns. If there was need for a clean environment hearing I would have no worries about calling it, but I am not going to call for a hearing to waste the money if it is not required, just to satisfy the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to ask leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

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

Mr. Minenko: This weekend thousands of Manitobans of Ukrainian heritage are joining thousands of other Ukrainian Canadians in Toronto and Hamilton, Ontario, to commemorate the 1,000 anniversary of Christianity in the Ukraine, the Millennium. Earlier this year Ukrainian choirs from Manitoba joined with many others from around the world to commemorate the same event in Rome. These are but two of the hundreds of international, national and local events which are being sponsored by Ukrainians around the world to commemorate in a special way an important event in the history of a nation, a people. With this Act in 988 and the prayers, a new era began in the history of a nation.

When the ruler, Vladimir the Great, adopted the Christian religion for his Kievan State, he chose to strengthen cultural, economic and religious ties with the rest of Europe. By accepting baptism from the Byzantine Greeks, the Kievan State could also draw upon this civilization for its literature, philosophy, art and architecture and yet developed these in its distinctive own Ukrainian style. The adoption of Christianity led to a cultural explosion of creativity and beauty. This creativity and beauty continues to today even though Ukrainians have suffered under the yoke of many conquerors.

The visible flame of Christianity may have at times flickered, yet never died. When Ukrainians were invited to settle in Canada almost 100 years ago, they brought with them not only a desire to succeed and prosper but also their faith. Within a short time priests came to minister to their spiritual needs of these new settlers. Churches were built, parishes organized, and schools established. The traditions, the culture, the architecture, is evident today in the everyday life of Manitobans. Religion plays an important role in the life of most people. The role of religion in the Ukrainian family and community life is most important.

As Ukrainians enter the second Millennium, I would ask all Members of the Manitoba Legislature to join with me in acknowledging this historic event and congratulating the many thousands of Ukrainian Canadians who have devoted many hours to prepare for this event of religious and historic significance.

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to ask leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

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

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with my dear friend, the

Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) to congratulate and to extend best wishes to our citizens of Ukrainian descent, who this weekend will be celebrating the Millennium of Christianity in the Ukraine. This indeed is a very important event in the lives of the Ukrainian people in Canada and, indeed, around the world. Over 1,000 years, Christianity has played a major role in the lives of the Ukrainian people. In fact the church and Christianity can be said to be the heart and the soul of the Ukrainian people.

For people of Ukrainian descent in our province, who have been in our province for some hundred years now, this event is one in which it is extremely important. For hundreds and thousands of these individuals, this year will be marked with celebrations, with dinners, and with masses. In my own constituency, the Ukrainian churches have been celebrating now for the last several months with masses and with dinners. Members on this side of the House certainly join with our friends across the way in extending congratulations and best wishes to the Ukrainian community on this very important event. Thank you.

The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

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

Mr. Plohman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join with my colleagues, the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), and the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in recognizing this important milestone, the Millennium which is a celebration of 1,000 years of Christianity in the Ukraine. It is something that we do not often have an opportunity to acknowledge and recognize and to celebrate, the millennium of anything. This is truly an important Millennium; 1,000 years of Christianity for the Ukrainian people throughout the world.

Dauphin, my constituency, is particularly relevant in this issue, because over the last number of years Canada's National Ukrainian Festival has been celebrated in Dauphin. The 23rd festival was celebrated just two weeks ago. At that time, the Millennium was the theme of that festival, and people from around the world recognized that celebration right here in our own province. Of course, on the Sunday of the festival, I was able to participate at the Cross of Freedom, which is an historic site just 15 miles from Dauphin, where the first Ukrainian mass was held in Canada. That is truly a historic site, and I was able to share with the people there, the Ukrainian people and many others, the important event in celebration of the Millennium.

I think that we should all acknowledge for people in Manitoba, Ukrainians in Manitoba, the important contribution that they have made to our society, to the Canadian society generally, and the importance of religion in their lives. It has been the force that has driven their society, and of course has done much for our culture, the development of cultural celebration in

this province. I want to join with the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), and the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), as I said earlier, in recognizing this truly important event for Ukrainians throughout the world and particularly in our province and in our country.

ORDERS OF THE DAY BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) who has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity because, as you know, the Budget affects Flin Flon as well as every other community.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says there was not one question asked on the Budget. I certainly did ask some questions in my speech, and I ask another: is there any additional money to support the environment?

I had asked questions of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) earlier and have to say that I am not satisfied with the answers given to this House by the Minister of Environment.

Mr. Speaker, I said in a preamble to a question that the Minister of Environment has not—and does not appear ready to—take environmental issues seriously. We have a new Environment Act in the Province of Manitoba which was proclaimed on April 1. The intent of that Act was to protect the environment, not only from the processing and the handling of dangerous materials in the province as they pre-existed but to protect Manitobans from the prospect of having additional processing of waste, the additional operations in the province, which stood either in the short-term or the long-term to jeopardize the health of Manitoba workers, the health of families in Manitoban, or the environment. It is a serious undertaking.

The new Environment Act, which was proclaimed April 1, makes it very clear that any operation, pre-existing operation, in the Province of Manitoba which alters its operation is required to obtain a new licence under the Environment Act. Section 11.1 of the new Environment Act says, no person shall construct, alter—and that is the key word—alter, operate or set into operations any cost to development unless the person first files a proposal in writing with the department and obtains a valid and subsisting licence from the director for the development. I believe and have legal opinion which confirms that the processing of waste in Flin Flon is in terms of legislation a new development. It is a new development.

The first shipment of waste from Dow Corning arrived after the introduction, the proclamation of this Act; and, therefore, the terms of this Act have to be enforced to protect not only Flin Flon but also other communities who may, by virtue of circumstance of the operations in that community, be it a foundry or some other process, at some time be faced with the same dilemma.

I do not seem to be able to convince the Minister of Environment that we understand the risk, that the people in Flin Flon, the people working for HBM&S, the company, the surrounding communities, understand that there is an inherent risk in processing ore. It is a dangerous operation and its by-products include heavy metal particles and chemicals which are dangerous to human beings and to the environment. That is true. We live with that risk, we understand it.

The new Environment Act, and I believe common sense, dictates that the Province of Manitoba and this Government take seriously the long-term risk of additional environmental hazards being introduced to our environment.

We have an Act which requires companies such as HBM&S to apply to develop proposals which are submitted to the Department of Environment for approval if a new process or an alteration of an old process is about to add additional burden on the environment. The Minister of Environment has confirmed that there are trace elements in the waste from Dow Corning and from Palo Alto which are harmful to the environment and harmful to human health.

* (1100)

I take great offence at the Minister of Environment suggesting that somehow this is a political ploy. The fact of the matter is that this province needs a policy for the introduction—the transportation of waste into this province and the handling of that waste in this province. We have the vehicle to make sure that policy is enforceable. We have the vehicle to make sure that policy is enforceable. We have an Environment Act which foresaw the possibility of waste being transported and processed in Manitoba. Flin Flon is the tip of the iceberg and this issue goes far beyond the question of how dangerous that new material is to the environment. The fact of the matter is that there is an additional risk. It is an incremental risk that, before we accept, we should seriously understand. We should know the implications and my feeling is—and I believe the feeling of many people in Flin Flon and probably across the province—that the people who are to be affected, and that includes the workers at HBM&S and the people who live in Flin Flon, deserve the opportunity to understand what this new process means to the environment and to the health of workers and have the right to make public comment on that by virtue of having hearings through the Clean Environment Commission.

The Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) stood all too quickly to announce publicly the Clean Environment Commission would be holding hearings in Brandon with respect to the odour that was coming from the Burns Plant. We are not talking about odour in this instance. We are talking about substances, although they may be at small levels that are known carcinogens, that are known to have harmful effects to both the environment and human beings.

It is not good enough for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) to ignore the real obligation that they have to protect Manitoba interests, not only

in Flin Flon, but across the province, to start to be able to implement The Environment Act. We need a system whereby waste material, regardless of how hazardous it is—and this waste is hazardous, perhaps it is not as hazardous as a carload of PCBs but there are hazardous elements in it and we have to be concerned about its shipment to Manitoba and to Canada. The Minister of Environment has done nothing, absolutely nothing to assure the people of Flin Flon or this House that the department is a) prepared to deal with the analysis that is required of material coming in; or b) to deal with the requirements under the new Environment Act that companies be licensed to process waste.

The fact of the matter is that this Minister (Mr. Connery) has relied on a licence which was issued to HBM&S under The Clean Environment Act, the old Clean Environment Act, and has not, in my opinion, taken seriously the requirement that he turn to the new Clean Environment Act and follow its principles, and follow its statutory and regulatory requirements. And that is his obligation.

I want to put on the record as well that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) has an unbecoming tendency to put on the record statements which are clearly not factual. The Minister of Environment said on August 2, apart from many other silly things, I have talked to the labour union people in Flin Flon and they are not concerned. The labour union people refused to handle the waste that came to Flin Flon. Now if that is not an indication of concern, I do not know what is.

I want to tell the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) that I have not had one call from citizens in Flin Flon, ordinary citizens, who oppose my concern over handling the U.S. waste in Flin Flon. Every single person to whom I have spoken who is a member of the general public has opposed this and said "Why are we doing this? We do not need to do this." I am not even opposed to doing it necessarily, but I believe that HBM&S is required to get a licence.

I believe we should understand what the content of that material is. I believe the working people have a right to know what the material is, and I believe the public in general deserve to know what additional burden this material may have for the environment and the health of their families and their loved ones. That is a simple request. Let us find out the facts. This Minister treats this in a flippant way, with incorrect information, incorrect assumptions about what is going on in Flin Flon.

The Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) also said on Friday, July 29, "But our Workplace Safety and Health people are on-site in Flin Flon on a continuous basis." That was also incorrect. He says, "As you know, . . . there are monitoring systems within all plants to ensure that the threshold values are within proper levels." That is not accurate.

The Minister said that we understand all of the dangers inherent in this material. We have an analysis of what the material contains. It contains toxic elements. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) should also know that clinical studies done with respect to the dust from sewage—sludge—is also dangerous, in and of

itself, to workers. What precautions has the Minister taken with respect to handling? He dismisses the fact that there are toxic elements in this material. He dismisses the fact that there have to be procedures for handling it. The Minister of Environment does not take his role as the First Minister of Environment in this province. It is not acceptable, either to myself or to my constituents, and I do not believe, to the people of Manitoba. Our environment is too important to be treated in such a flippant, indiscriminate manner.

The fact of the matter is that this processing of waste from the United States is, in all likelihood, only the tip of the iceberg. We have no way of knowing whether there are not already jurisdictions in the United States who have found that they can ship material to Manitoba to foundries, whether they are in Winkler or Winnipeg or wherever, for processing. We need to get a handle on that new, in some respects, problem—an increasing problem as jurisdictions become more leery of processing waste of one kind and another.

The response of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Conner) is not good enough. It is not good enough to say that I, as the Member for Flin Flon, am fearmongering—I am not. I am not necessarily opposed to the processing of waste, but I say that we should not do it through the back door. We should not do it in violation of the Environment Act. We should not do it without the consultation and the knowledge of the people who work with that material, who handle it, and the people's lives who may be affected if we are wrong about how it should be handled or how it should be processed.

This is a serious matter and I am hoping yet that the Minister of Environment will understand that and take some precautions and perhaps become a little more sensitive to his real responsibilities as Minister of the Environment, because at this point he has not shown any willingness to take his responsibilities seriously and he has left himself seriously impaired as Minister of Environment. It is clear that his ability, his sincerity, when it comes to environmental questions, has to be under question.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity. I am sure we will have other opportunities to discuss the environment and the importance of spending more money on it and protecting it.

Mr. William Chornopyski (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure to observe your performance in this House for the past several weeks, and as I expected, the right man has been elected to this high office. You have displayed fair and sound judgment when you conduct orders to this Legislative Assembly. I want to add my congratulations to the many that you have already received on your appointment.

* (1110)

It gives me great pleasure to congratulate my friend and colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) on his appointment as Deputy Speaker and I want to congratulate the Premier (Mr. Filmon) for two good choices. I want to also extend congratulations to

all the Members that were elected to serve their constituents and for that matter all of Manitoba.

I want to thank the people of Burrows constituency for their support in this April 26 election. I would like to tell you what my concerns and priorities are in Burrows constituency. But first let me just give you a little bit of background—my own background, that is. I rather feel a kinship to many Members of this House and the reason is I was also born on the farm. I have a farm background. I am very proud of that. I spent the first 18 years of my life on my parents' farm at Sundown, Manitoba.

I learned about the three "R's" early in my life. As someone has already mentioned: rocks, roots and a rough life. Of course, there was a simple explanation for this rough life. There was a Conservative Government in power at the time. We did, however, have some modern conveniences. We had central heat; for example, a box stove in the centre of the house and if you dropped a few pieces of wood there every hour, you had heat. We also had running water. You took a pail, ran to the well and it depended on how cold it was how fast you ran. We had no problem with power interruptions. You filled the lamp with coal oil and you had light.

But in all seriousness, it truly was a hard life. I recall my brother and I would have to cut a cord of wood every day after school and then the next day haul it to town with a team of horses—an 18-mile round-trip for 75 cents, while a bag of flour was \$5.00. So you can see that it truly was difficult to survive.

After serving in the Armed Forces, I made Winnipeg my home and I acquired a wife, a home in the North End—where else?—the heart of the city, and eventually four children. Elsie and I are now blessed with five grandchildren.

I want to issue two challenges to the Members of this House. If any one here thinks that they had more humble beginnings than I did or smarter or better-looking grandchildren, I would like to meet them privately outside this House and talk about it.

When my service to the Queen and country was over, I was employed with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the running trades which of course led me into union work and eventually into politics. It was a natural move for me to be associated with the NDP. I, like many thousands of Manitobans, believed and supported the former Premier, Ed Schreyer.

In 1974, I was elected to city council and I served there for 12 years representing Mynarski Ward, which is situated in Burrows constituency. Again, it was a natural progression for me to run provincially.

In 1965, after terminating my employment with the Canadian Pacific Railway, like my colleague and friend, the Member for St. Norbert, I went into the sales field and eventually into business for myself. At the same time, I never did forget about the farm.

So I went back to school, acquired a Farm Management certificate, a Business Administration certificate, and I thought I was well-equipped to go

back to the farm. But it was not until 30 years later that I did, in fact, start farming again. I did not go back to the farm but I did start farming again and I am still doing it, but I am in specialized farming called "seed production."

Mr. Speaker, it is only 85 miles from Sundown to this Chamber but it has been a long hard journey to get here. But now that I am here I am anxious to make a positive contribution.

I would like to speak a little bit about Burrows constituency, and as I said a while ago better known as the North End, and to many, the heart of the city. This is home for people with many ethnic backgrounds. Historically, the area was predominantly Polish, Jewish, Ukrainian and German. However, with the influx of people from other countries, there are today many with Asian backgrounds and a fairly large Native community. We have a mosaic of colour and culture that perhaps does not exist in any part of the City of Winnipeg, the only place that I know of where one can still enter a shop and be served in 10 or 12 different languages.

Mr. Speaker, Burrows constituency is not without problems. Ninety-five percent of our Native community is unemployed. The people are frustrated to the point that they turned to alcohol. A recent report by the Police Department in the Free Press said that of the 500 calls they received over the long weekend, 75 percent of those calls were from the core area. Burrows constituency is situated in the core area.

It became very evident during the election campaign while knocking on doors that something was very different from the last time I knocked on the same doors, and that was very simply the amount of security systems that have been installed, and almost every household has a guard dog. Thirty percent of the people in Burrows are senior citizens and, of course, they are easy prey for those who want to take advantage of them and there are many of those.

* (1120)

Mr. Speaker, necessary steps need to be taken immediately by the Attorney-General's Department to assist the City of Winnipeg police so that 24-hour foot patrols and store-front police stations be implemented for the area. If anyone has any doubts about what I am saying, try walking through that area with a six-pack.

Unemployment and crime go hand-in-hand, and Burrows constituency has more than its share of both. There has to be a better way to deal with this ever existing problem of unemployment, crime, alcoholism, family break-up, and most important, abuse of children and our seniors. These problems are running rampant in Burrows and they must be addressed now.

I want to make a brief statement regarding The City of Winnipeg Act. The Honourable Minister responsible has publicly stated that he will introduce an amendment to The City of Winnipeg Act to reduce the size of city councillors from 29 to 23. I am firmly opposed to this reduction, especially the reduction in the core area where the workload, because of the problems previously

mentioned, is the heaviest. A reduction of two councillors as proposed in the inner city would further reduce the response time from councillors to citizens. I urge the Minister to give this matter further consideration.

The Honourable Minister knows that prior to amalgamation in 1971-72, Winnipeg was surrounded by 13 municipalities which meant that there were 13 councils, 13 mayors, and 13 of everything else. In total, there were well over 100 councillors serving less people than we have today. Amalgamation, however, reduced that number to 50 councillors. In 1977, a further reduction took place to 29 councillors, while the population has increased and the city has grown in size.

There were no other changes made to this unique unity form of Government. Many statistics have been quoted by the media and other people that have been grossly misleading when comparing the City of Winnipeg to other cities. A classic example is comparing Winnipeg Council to that of Toronto, which is most frequently used.

Toronto is made up of five boroughs; each with its own council and mayor. North York, for example, has a population of 551,000 with 33 elected people. Somehow, every time they use an example, that magic number of 14 is always used, and I do not know where it came from, but it is not correct.

However, should the Minister decide to go ahead with the reduction as proposed, I would offer him one suggestion. I suggest that the boundaries of the city wards be redrawn so that all councillors have a share of the inner city and its many problems. This would be fair and it would certainly remove the ever existing parochialism.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to represent Burrows constituency in this House. I dedicate myself to making a positive and worthwhile contribution, and I want to work with every Member of this House in the spirit of cooperation. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): Let me begin today by offering my sincere congratulations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) for the leadership that he has displayed in the Budget that he brought down. I believe that the Budget brought in will steer a path for Manitoba which will lead to better things to come in the future.

In the space of a very, very short time, the Minister of Finance was able to marshal unto himself a rather clear understanding of what goes on in the Department of Finance and in terms of what goes on in the Province of Manitoba. I must say, as an Opposition Finance spokesman and critic for the previous Ministers, the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness), who is our Minister of Finance now, learned a lot in that time and applied the knowledge that he gained, plus the realities that we face coming into office, applied them very, very well in the sense of bringing forward a Budget which has earned accolades from many, many groups in Manitoba's society, not to mention of course the

majority of the people of Manitoba who find that in the Budget presented the commitments made by the Progressive Conservative Party during the election campaign were carried forward. I must say, I am impressed by the speed with which the Minister was able to do that and the speed with which many of the commitments we have made, we have been able to act on. During the course of my remarks, Sir, I will draw attention to some of those commitments.

Soon after the delivery of the Budget by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), suggestions were made by various people, and most notably people in this House and the Opposition, that somehow the Budget brought down by the Minister of Finance was not very much different from the Budget defeated, the previous Budget by the New Democratic Party defeated earlier this year. Well, in my humble submission, Sir, nothing could be further from the truth. All Manitobans were very, very concerned during the election campaign and before that about the massive debt that the previous New Democratic Government was imposing on Manitobans, and the debt charges that arise therefrom. I think bringing a Budget down within three months of taking office, bringing in a Budget that brings in a deficit of \$196 million is a significant achievement.

A lot of Honourable Members and perhaps, to some extent, some news people as well refer to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) taking advantage of a windfall. I suggest that comments like that show very little respect for taxpayers right across this country. When we are talking about this so-called federal windfall and the taxes raised through taxation initiatives so-called by the previous New Democratic Government, we are talking about people's money. When we talk so flippantly about windfalls, I do not think we are showing very much respect for the people we represent, and the hard work that they do to raise the money to pay taxes to the provincial Government and the federal Government and Governments at all levels.

Right from the beginning of my political career, it has been my thought that I, too, have been a taxpayer and my neighbours are taxpayers and, as politicians, we need to show an awful lot more respect for the people we represent than we have tended to do in discussing matters relating to fiscal affairs and taxation. We are talking about people's money, so let us not be quite so flip when we talk about windfalls.

* (1130)

In addition to revenues being improved for the Government—we are given some flexibility that way—but the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has been able, in a real way, to make some tough decisions based on fairness and based on what could be seen and what is fair for all Manitobans.

I appreciate the Minister for avoiding the temptation of getting into long-winded rhetorical discussions in his Budget Speech. For the last two or three that I am aware of, to hide the weaknesses of Budgets brought in by the previous Government, the Budget Speeches have been couched in language which is nothing short of rhetoric.

This Budget was very straightforward. It was a no-nonsense Budget in the sense the Minister did not try to colour what we are trying to do with the use of fancy words and phrases, but he got straight to the point, stated what was bothering the people of this province, stated what commitments we had made, and then went on to state what we were going to do in terms of carrying out our personal commitments.

I am not the only person who makes the argument that the Budget that we have before us is quite different indeed from the previous Budget. Now the Brandon Sun which is my local newspaper, which has a history which is bound up with the history of the City of Brandon and which has served our city well for many, many years, has something to say about this Budget too. I must be candid and tell Honourable Members that the Brandon Sun is not always particularly kind to politicians of my particular persuasion, and then I can also say that they are not always unkind either. I can say they generally draw a pretty fair balance with which I do not think very many Members in this House who take the trouble to read the Brandon Sun will disagree. In fact, I highly recommend a reading of the Brandon Sun, especially for Members of the Liberal Party. They might be able to get their finger on the pulse just a little bit better of what goes on outside the City of Winnipeg.

According to the Brandon Sun's analysis of the Budget, the main change in the Budget Address is in the philosophy. The Conservative Budget of this summer has moved to change the focus of job creation in Manitoba from jobs generated through Government-funded initiatives to jobs generated by the private sector.

I think most Members in this House campaigned on that very issue, that a real job, the best jobs are those that are real jobs created by the private sector. We all know stories of jobs created through Government initiatives, which sometimes last merely long enough to allow a worker to amass enough weeks to qualify for unemployment insurance. It seems to me that is really a stopgap way of creating work or generating employment for unemployed people and people and their families who need the income that is generated from having a job.

I believe it is fair to say that the philosophy of most Honourable Members in this House represented by the Progressive Conservative Party and by the Liberal Party campaigned strenuously on something being done about the payroll tax, which is certainly seen by most Members in this House as a very bad tax in the sense that, if we are trying to create work for people, taxing those very jobs is hardly the way to go. So I think the Minister made a significant step in terms of the threshold related to the payroll tax and a step that in some people's opinions went beyond expectations. In some people's opinions of course, the opinions of the left wing of this Chamber, anything we do for business is wrong and any time we do something for business we are favouring business over the average Manitoban. I think the people spoke loudly and clearly about that issue on April 26 and said, "the payroll tax is wrong. We are going to vote for a Government that is going to get rid of that payroll tax."

I appreciate very much that our Minister moved, as he said he would move, on the payroll tax. Those who shortly after the election discovered certain information which came to light made the suggestion, "well a commitment is not really a commitment, we do not really have to move on that." If Honourable Members opposite had been around for the last five or six years while that tax month in and month out has been taken away from employers and indirectly from employees and potential employees. If they had been around they would not be so quick to suggest that a commitment so fundamental to the election be so quickly thrown away.

I believe that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has taken a very responsible position in sticking to his guns and moving on the payroll tax promise. I am frankly somewhat shocked that Honourable Members opposite would, so soon after taking their places in this House, be advocating that we give up on the idea, at least for now, of getting rid of the payroll tax. I thought that was a pretty fundamental campaign promise on their part and on our part. I am proud that the Minister of Finance moved so soon to do that.

I think it is pretty important to note that the promise to remove the payroll tax or to get started on that process was essentially what the Liberals promised to do during the campaign as well. I think the people of Manitoba are able to see through the position taken now that, oh, somehow it is not very important and we can put off doing that.

I really think that the Members of the Liberal Party are going to have to think that one through and be ready with a proper explanation for that kind of position when their constituents ask them about that, because let us remember, we are talking about jobs. It seems to me every election that I can remember jobs have been a very major issue. When we are talking about jobs and job creation, the payroll tax in Manitoba is central to that discussion. I am pleased that we have come through on our commitment.

The Brandon Sun suggests that the elimination of the payroll tax burden is an impressive accomplishment and that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) was not sure of the Liberal timetable for removal of the payroll tax.

We tend to see a little bit of this indecision every day on various issues. It is a little disturbing to a person like me who has tried to support policies consistently as we go along. The idea of changing one's mind all the time does leave in people's minds a sense of doubt as to whether those who do change their minds almost daily really know in which direction they are headed. It does create a little bit of a crisis of confidence for some people.

I am also pleased to note in the Budget that there is provision for small businesses, new small businesses to receive a tax holiday. I believe that will also go over very well in the sense that a strong message was needed, that there is a new order in Manitoba. We are no longer heading down the path of pure socialism, which has the tendency to leave generators of wealth and income and generators of employment, to leave

them somewhat despondent about the future prospects for our province. This is an exciting initiative in the sense that there is a message out there right away.

Manitoba is indeed a good place to come and combine that initiative with the commitment to remove the payroll tax, there is some reason for business decision makers to feel confident about the future and feel confident about the investments they make in our province. This is certainly a contrast from the kind of initiatives and policies that we experienced under the previous Government.

I guess what is really remarkable about the tax cuts that we are bringing forward is that all the while we are able to maintain our commitment to tax dollars being spent in the area of health care. I suppose if during the campaign there was a theme that was in addition to the payroll tax theme, among rank-and-file Manitobans at the doorsteps, it was what is going to happen to our health care system? How long can that system last with the pressures mounting the way they are? Governments have to be responsive to that concern. Medicare in Canada is here to stay. Manitobans and Canadians will not hear of a move away from our guaranteed Medicare system for everyone on an equal basis and our Government has accepted that without too much cajoling.

* (1140)

The fact is that health care is basic to being a Canadian. It is part of our way of life and it is a very important part. So to see 9.1 percent increase in health spending in Manitoba is encouraging indeed. For those who would suggest—as many of my New Democratic friends would do across this province—that the election of a Progressive Conservative Government could mean negative changes in our health care system. I think those who would make that suggestion should be a little more comfortable today and a little more comfortable since the introduction of the Minister's Budget.

As we have said all along, we are indeed committed to the provision of quality health care for Manitobans, and we are going to do the very best we can within the limits prescribed in the Budget, and those limits are indeed generous in terms of health care spending. That kind of spending in health care will also leave health care people and the politicians in the Government in a very flexible kind of position so that they will be able to be innovative and imaginative and able to bring forward programs which need to reflect a change in the direction that we are headed. We used to talk about health care reform in this House before a number of Honourable Members opposite arrived here, and I am sure they would have been interested in that debate because health care reform at the time I recall questioning the penultimate previous Minister of Health about closures of beds at the Brandon General Hospital and the answer I was getting was that this was sort of part of our health care reform package, so that health care reform came to mean bed cuts.

Another interesting expression they used to use and I commend the present Minister of Finance for his

candour—he calls a tax a tax. The previous New Democratic Government used to refer to taxes as revenue raising initiatives—a pretty fancy little expression. But I am telling you a tax is a tax is a tax and it hurts when it comes out of people's pockets. It comes out of their hard-earned dollars and the time they spend raising money for their families, I think of that. Then we tax that and then we have someone who comes along and calls it a revenue raising initiative. I must say I am a little insulted by the sleight of hand.

But those days are over, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say. The New Democrats—I do not know if I have heard the Liberals opposite refer to the Budget as a right wing measure—certainly like to talk about it being a right wing measure because we kept a promise that we made some six years ago about the payroll tax. There is little else in that Budget that could possibly even suggest anyone making such comments. When we look at their health care spending being even more than the New Democrats had suggested bringing in, it kind of makes their comments ring somewhat hollow.

As one whose community depends to a very, very large extent upon agricultural activity and as one who recognizes as the Minister does that agriculture is in a difficult situation now and has been for some time, I must say that I am pleased to see the significant increase in agriculture spending in this Budget. I think it amounts to something around 50 percent which is very significant. The fact is our Government has been left in a flexible enough position that it could respond to the problems created for the farm community by the drought this year. I am very pleased to see the kind of commitment that we are getting from this side of the House. I think the fact that so many of our Members do represent rural and agricultural ridings is reflected very well in the Budget and for any urban Member, such as myself, to look askance at the type of commitment our Government has made to agriculture would indeed be reprehensible. I suggest to all Honourable Members, no matter from where they come, if we forget for a moment that agriculture is still the backbone of this province, if we ever forget that, we are in big, big trouble. We are already in enough trouble.

We see small communities in our province, the populations, they are shrinking. We see them moving to the big city and we cannot stop that. We cannot tell people where to live. We are not about to do that and no one would suggest doing that. But when that happens, not only do we create problems in rural communities, but we create significant problems in the city as well when we bring influxes of people here.

The Honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Alcock) raised today in Question Period some of the problems that we encounter in the big city. I do not think we can ever be flip or take these things in any way other than a very serious way.

The balance that we have in our province is something worth preserving. I am a little concerned about the way it is heading in terms of the population flows. Many granting formulas in rural Manitoba are based on population. If the population of a small community is shrinking, that does not mean you do not still have a water system. That does not mean you do not still have

a sewer system that has to be financed. Just because there are some fewer people there, those systems, those infrastructures have to remain in place and have to be kept up and maintained.

So I wish all Honourable Members would bear that in mind. I am not for a moment suggesting that any one has said that rural Manitoba is not important to this province. But I really ask Honourable Members to keep that in mind more often than they do and not to let it slip, because rural Manitoba is still the backbone of this province and has been very significant in the development of our province. It is what has brought our province to the greatness that it enjoys today. We have to protect what we have and preserve that.

Speaking of rural and non-Winnipeg Manitoba, I must say a personal thank you to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) for remembering the Brandon University Rural Development Institute. As Honourable Members know, Brandon University is located in Brandon West, my constituency, and it has been a matter of some pride to me to be able to represent Brandon University as part of Brandon West. So a commitment made previously is being carried forward.

Is this the kind of sameness in the previous Budget to this Budget? Is this the kind of similarity that Honourable Members, and notably the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), are criticizing? Is the Leader of the Opposition criticizing funding for the Brandon University Rural Development Institute? Because if she is, maybe she should say so. The people of Brandon would be very interested to hear that, or maybe she does support it. Maybe she does.—(Interjection)— It is interesting to note. I hear the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) saying, we like Brandon. I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. James that he and his colleagues would have done well to speak to their Leader during the election campaign when the Leader of the Opposition suggested that McKenzie Seeds be sold outright—end of ball game.

If any one has ever missed the point of the politics of the City of Brandon and the economic realities of the City of Brandon, it is the Leader of the Opposition. Then we had the spectre of seeing the two Liberal candidates in Brandon West and in Brandon East quickly hurrying to let the Leader of the Opposition know that she was definitely on the wrong track. Then a day or two later, we had a retraction and a change in the policy. I think this was pretty damaging, certainly to the Liberal candidate in Brandon East. In Brandon West, well, the spread was fairly significant there anyway, but I am telling you Brandon people are pretty upset about the comments of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to McKenzie Seeds. There was also another point respecting the City of Brandon. There is a point that is often made, and since becoming a Minister, I have made it repeatedly. It is not Winnipeg and it is not rural. Let us not forget. Let us not forget, we have an urban area in Brandon, in Thompson, in The Pas, in Portage, in Dauphin, and many significant communities in our province.

* (1150)

Well, I recall the election campaign and there was some polling done—I take it by the Liberal Party—

and one of the polls showed that the Liberals were gaining strength in Brandon and indeed they were. But the point is, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) went to the newspapers and said, "We are very pleased. We are doing very well in rural Manitoba. We are showing strength in Brandon East." What an insult to the people of Brandon East.

Let me suggest to Honourable Members opposite that before they put—how does it go? Better to say nothing and be thought a fool than to open ones mouth and remove all doubt. I would just like to remind Honourable Members about that when it comes to rural issues and Brandon issues and non-Winnipeg issues.

I am extremely pleased that provided for in the Budget is the reopening of the RCMP detachment in Reston. This has been a matter of some disturbance to the people in that area. The previous Government shut down the detachment, leaving people with no proper police protection for many, many miles. It was a wrong-handed move. It was a slap in the face to rural Manitoba. Rural Manitoba was accustomed to those types of slaps from the previous Government, but of course that problem was repaired on April 26 and we made commitments about our rural RCMP policing.

I am happy to say if Honourable Members would like to look again for another difference in this Budget as compared to the last one, you might check to see what the previous Government was doing with RCMP protection in Manitoba and look at what the new Government is doing in terms of cutbacks in services. I am very proud to be part of a Government that is going to restore to rural Manitoba RCMP protection.

I am happy also on behalf of the people of the Town of Minnedosa who are very relieved that the courthouse there will be repaired and used for the purpose for which it was intended. The way things were going it appeared the courthouse in Minnedosa might have soon had the same experience as the Land Titles Office, for example, in Boissevain, and other slaps to rural Manitoba. I am very pleased about that too.

The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) made a pretty good speech the other day, I must say. There were a couple of points that somewhat - (Interjection)- The Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Alcock) has almost a one-track mind. With the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, it is Meech Lake. With the Honourable Member for St. James, it is Land Titles. He made the point, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "The Land Titles Office problem in Winnipeg has been dealt with, in my view, by throwing money at it—uninformed, unimaginative, unwise." Well, let us talk about the wisdom of that statement when we compare it with a statement or question put by the Member for St. James in Question Period who suggested that some \$12 million of profits made by the Land Titles Office, and his words were "You should use every penny of it to solve the problems."

Which is it? Are we going to spend those millions of dollars, which is impossible to do, and solve the problem overnight? What is he suggesting? He is talking about throwing money and then he is talking about spending every penny of profit. Which is it? That does

leave one kind of wondering just which direction the Honourable Member is coming from. If we do not know where someone is coming from, it is even harder to decipher just where it is they are going to take us and that is a concern for me.

I appreciate the Honourable Member's comments about morale in the Attorney-General's Department. In fact, I suppose the first matter I had to deal with as Attorney-General of this province was a matter dumped on my plate by my predecessor when two days before leaving office he makes certain announcements with all the lights and bells of press releases and so on, making a mockery and a circus out of the justice system in this province. That took a fair amount of my time initially on my appointment—the ticket matter in the City of Winnipeg.

I do not think we could have done better than to obtain the services of former Chief Justice Archie Dewar to do the job. How that could have any other effect but to assist us in solving the problems that we have and improving morale among the people in the department, I do not know what else we could perceive from that. I do appreciate the Honourable Member's comments the other day when he discussed that. It is true, sometimes when a new Government takes over it does inherit some difficulties.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has suggested that we should never again refer to the previous Government and the difficulties that it left for us and the mess that it left for us. The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) talks about wait and see all the time. He does raise problems, as he should do as a responsible critic, but to suggest that we should never refer again to the record of the previous Government is somewhat unrealistic and smacks of some arrogance that is somewhat disturbing, not only to myself but to all Manitobans.

The Honourable Member referred to backlogs in our courts—very good point. He, like I, has identified a serious problem that we have in our court system. I identified that some time prior to the Honourable Member's coming along—it is not his fault when he came along, that is for sure. He is doing his job raising these issues with us.

Discussions—there are two main areas in our court system where there are significant backlogs. One is in my own City of Brandon. Very shortly after my appointment, meetings were already under way and discussions were being had, and decisions and new directions were being taken. That problem is being actively addressed. Similarly with the City of Winnipeg, my department, just in case it needed it, was made aware soon after my arrival of this particular problem, and so work is being done on that.

The Honourable Member raises issues occasionally. They are important issues and I view them with importance every time I am asked a question about the Remand Centre or about the Public Trustee or any area of corrections generally, any area under my responsibility. I take those questions very seriously and do my best to attempt to get the proper answers and take the proper action that is necessary. I, for one, am

a believer in the democratic process. I, for one, am a believer in the value of an effective Opposition. I, for one, am not so arrogant that I would suggest that I have all the answers. I never would do that. But I do say that we are taking some significant steps.

Where we are not doing that well enough, the Honourable Member's questions are very helpful—get us on the right track. That is what an Opposition is all about. In that sense, I am pleased with the Honourable Member. But there are times when I have a little problem with some of the information that he brings forward, lacking in accuracy as it does. It does create problems in the minds of the people out there about the nature and extent of some of the problems we have. But I can say that we are doing our very best and working very hard on some of the problems the Honourable Member raises.

I am very pleased that in our Budget, which I said earlier was a no-nonsense Budget and a no-rhetoric Budget, about the fact that we kept our commitment about personal income tax increases. Now some Honourable Members opposite who made no commitments about personal income tax increases or decreases bug us today about the massive tax grab brought in in the previous 1987 Budget by the New Democrats. Not a peep from Honourable Members opposite during the election campaign about reducing the net income tax, not even the kind of commitments that we made, they made none. We made, at least the comments and the commitments as a priority item. The net income tax which we oppose and do not like would be very much on the chopping block, just as soon as we can get to that. Honourable Members opposite seem to say, the rules have all changed, the election is over now, to heck with what the people were told, do this, do that and the other thing. That is no way to run a province. It just cannot be done that way. Honourable Members opposite know it and yet they raise issues like that. That is their right to do that, I respect that. As far as how much sense it makes, we will leave that to the people to decide.

The fact is that Manitobans told us what kind of Budget they wanted. They told us that the payroll tax, its turn was now, its time had come, in fact it was overdue—Manitobans told us that. Manitobans told us that the deficit was too high, something had to be done about that. We did something about that so that it is pretty hard, may I suggest, to do anything but support the Budget that we have before us. The Budget is the very best Budget that was possible under the present circumstances in our province. So I certainly will be asking all Honourable Members to join with me in getting the job done in terms of support for the Budget and allowing the provisions in the Budget to take effect and to improve those areas of our public service in this province that need improvement.

I am a little disturbed by something else that the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) said in his speech. Maybe I should not respond so much to the Honourable Member because it may give him a false sense of credibility. What he has right now is something more than the delusions of just the adequacy that the previous Member for St. James had. He was,

I suppose, the one who had the biggest delusions of adequacy I have ever seen. The present Honourable Member for St. James' delusions go far beyond that, and sometimes they go beyond the reality that exists.

I was disturbed when I heard the Honourable Member refer to appointments made by our Government as a collection of hacks. I did find that disturbing in view of the discussion that went on a day or two previously between the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) and the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) of this province. The Leader of the Opposition quite rightly raised an issue over that and I certainly join with the First Minister in the comments that he made.

Let us remember when we refer, for instance to—let us talk about the former Attorney-General of this province, Gerry Mercier, to refer to that person in such an off-handed way and refer to him as a hack, I think does a disservice to Mr. Mercier, of course. It certainly does a disservice to Mr. Mercier's family, it does a disservice to anyone who has ever had the privilege and the honour of working with Mr. Mercier. I see the Leader of the Opposition shaking her head in disbelief—I do not blame her. To refer to appointments made by this Government as hacks really does a disservice to that person, and I could refer to any number of people who have been appointed and ask the Honourable Member opposite—(Interjection)—

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Would the Attorney-General entertain a question?

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): Yes, I would.

Mrs. Carstairs: I would like to ask the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) if he has any knowledge of any Member of the Liberal caucus making any comment about Mr. Gerry Mercier?

Mr. McCrae: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I did not suggest that the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) made a specific reference to one person. I did not do that, and he did not do that. The point is, to generalize in the way the Honourable Member did is to leave all of them in the same position that the Leader of the Opposition suggests a person close to her was left. That can have an effect, an unpleasant, an unfortunate effect. I can go through the list of people who have been appointed. I can ask, for instance, if the Honourable Member would like to be specific and name which one of the people who has been appointed is a hack. Perhaps the Honourable Member will address that someday.

* (1200)

But I think that he and his own Leader sort of get off of the same wavelength, when the Leader of the Opposition raises one day a very important point, a very valid point, and that is dealt with in the House, only to be followed a day or two later by her Justice critic with comments like that. I suggest it is shameful, and that the Leader of the Opposition might do well to have a little chat with that Honourable Member.

That being said, I mean no disrespect to the Honourable Member. I do ask the Honourable Member

to think over the language he uses in the House, both on his feet and from his seat, because there are times when language is used that can be hurtful and spiteful and can leave lasting marks on people. So I think we should all try to be a little kinder with each other and also with everyone else in this province.

I am very pleased to be part of a Government that is able to bring forward the kind of Budget that has been brought forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). I think it is eminently worthy of support, and I urge all Honourable Members to join with Honourable Members on this side of the House and support that Budget, and to get the job done for the people of Manitoba. Thank you.

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): I would like to say that it is my pleasure to be given the opportunity to respond to the Budget, but unfortunately my heart would not be in that statement. Some have said to me, you know, you have to learn to be angry when you ask your questions. Well yes, I am angry, but my main emotion is more one of sadness, one of extreme disappointment for myself, for those who provide education services, as well as those in receipt of the services, and most especially for the people of Manitoba.

Like my honourable colleague, the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), when he stated at the beginning of his response to the Budget that his speech would be very short, I will make that statement as well except that, unlike my honourable friend, it will be very short.

So for a moment, let me leave the 1988 Manitoba Budget aside and pay tribute if I may, to the former Member for Sturgeon Creek, Mr. J. Frank Johnston, one who served the constituency for 19 long years. He has certainly earned his current position of retirement, at least from the political arena.

If I may comment with regard to the Ministerial Statement concerning the accelerated remittance of school taxes, just to reiterate my support from a school division point to view to this step, if one were to speak from the viewpoint of the City Council perhaps or the municipalities, obviously the reaction might be quite different. However, it has for some time now seemed logical that those taxes collected specifically for educational purposes, school taxes, should in fact be provided directly to those entrusted with the responsibility of dealing with school divisions themselves.

Yes, there are a few proposals in the Budget that merit some support and encouragement but, in the area of education, I must admit that I was extremely disappointed. In the Throne Speech, education received but mere mention. In the Budget, similar glancing over of such a key department was so apparent. Are our children, our future not worthy of keeping up with at least the rate of inflation? The 3.3 percent over the last year will hardly address the multitude of key issues we need to address in the area of education. When the Party campaigned, we stated over and over and over again that education was one of our prime concerns. It still is, even more so.

The Task Force on Illiteracy was mentioned in the Throne Speech. It certainly is a problem of society that must be attacked with a vengeance. But \$300,000 for another task force? I say "another," because who knows how much the federal Government has spent and/or is spending on the Task Force on Illiteracy as proposed in the federal Progressive Conservative's Throne Speech in 1986.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

Like many others on this side of the House, I was of the impression that, when the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) of our province speaks, the Prime Minister listens. Does it also work the other way around? Could some of the results of the federal task force not be shared with this province? Will there not most assuredly be duplication of research? Three hundred thousand dollars, a strange figure to light upon considering that the previous Government felt that a total provincial High School Review could be adequately done with a mere \$25,000—strange indeed. What an outstanding response we can expect to hear, if and when we eventually see the report of the Task Force on Illiteracy.

In the area of Program Development Support Services, the meagre increase does mere lip service to the needs for these activities. As far as the Inner City Education Initiatives are concerned, the only increase in this area is with the salaries. Everything else remain the same.

Robert E. Lee said, "The education of man is never complete until he dies." Hutchins said: "The object of education is to prepare the young to educate themselves throughout their lives." If we believe these quotations, and I do, we like many others are concerned about the paltry increase in the area of post-secondary adult and continuing education. Again, the only increase there is for salaries.

Le Bureau de l'Education Francaise, in the area of curriculum development and implementation, has a significant decrease. Is this the way this Government addresses the needs of a bilingual country and province? -(Interjection)- That is a matter of opinion.

What of our universities, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Their needs are indeed extreme. It is my understanding that this Saturday an article is to be released stating a particular writer's rationale and position with regard to the five poorest university settings in our country. And oh, yes, I understand that Manitoba is to be stated as one of them. The catch-up that our universities are diligently striving to achieve makes them all extremely susceptible, all vulnerable to be on that hit list—how unfortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how sad.

My life's work and that of the majority of my past and present family has centered around the health care field. My older brother, Dr. Bill Hay, has practised psychiatry in Selkirk, in Winnipeg, and finally on the Hill and in private practice in Brandon. How appalling is the amount provided in this Budget for Mental Health Services, the very real need for more assistance for disturbed youths in the way of living accommodations, education, therapeutic services, psychological follow-up and on, and on, and on.

* (1210)

One thing that has disturbed me greatly in the last little while is the Members opposite in Question Period have consistently responded to questions from this side with suggestions to wait for the Estimates. Prior to that, answers centred around waiting for the Budget. I wonder aloud what recommendations they will have to put us off after the Estimates are complete? At any rate, I for one look forward to hearing some answers shortly.

Yes, the education Budget is up 3.3 percent, or so it stated in the Budget Speech, although we have been told that sometimes you cannot really bank on the figures. At \$792 million, I think that is the figure they actually mean, the Government has stated that with their good management, Manitobans can take heart from this Budget. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest to you

that it will be interesting indeed to learn whether in fact the majority of Manitobans—the average women and men—agree with that statement.

Thank you.

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Deputy Speaker, could the House agree to let the time stand at 12:30?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. Praznik: The debate would stand in my name then?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The debate will remain in the name of the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik). The hour being 12:30 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until Monday next at 1:30 p.m.