

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 26 March, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for this year, '87-88, of the Department of Health, the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 28 students of Grade 8 from Hedges School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Rykiss and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MPIC - list of shredded documents

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I understand from reviewing some information that presumably was provided with respect to the shredded boxes of documents from the Minister responsible for MPIC's office that there is a listing available of those documents that were contained in the boxes when they were turned over to the Archives. I wonder if the Minister can confirm whether or not there is that list available, and if so, if he can provide us with a copy of that list.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. As the member knows, while there is a list available, those are ministerial files and those ministerial files are not available for perusal and not available for review

until a certain time period has expired, and this case is no different.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister can indicate what is the time period that must expire in order to receive a copy of that list.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: All files from a Minister, no matter what period whether it was pre-1981 or pre-Freedom-of-Information legislation, are covered by the 30-year regulation unless a Minister has given special instructions or directions for other usage.

MR. G. FILMON: I'm wondering how it is then that a newspaper article appears to be quoting from the list. Where would that information have been obtained?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, I will be happy to table the list that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to as soon as I find it. It's a list that would be available for the public because it simply lists the files that are stored in the Archives.

MPIC - tabling of reports to the Board

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my further question to the Minister responsible for MPIC is: When will he be tabling those reports, that list of approximately 20 reports to the board, that were made pursuant to the minutes that we were given to read?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. That list is currently being prepared, and I believe all that is left to be done is to thoroughly review those submissions to ensure there is no matter of corporate confidentiality that would be found within those documents.

MPIC - availability of Provincial Auditor's Report

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, just one further question to the Minister responsible for MPIC.

When does he anticipate that the Provincial Auditor's investigation and report into MPIC's reinsurance activities will be available?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The request that went to the Provincial Auditor asked him to work as quickly as possible on that report. I

have not received any indication from him as to when he would be in a position to provide a report.

Springhill Farms Employees Union - petition

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

Today the Minister will have received a copy of a petition, also received by myself, the First Minister, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the Honourable Member for Gladstone, a petition from the Springhill Farms Employees Union signed by 106 of the employees at that hog killing plant at Neepawa. I understand there are 150 employees there.

The petition questions the methods used by another union, the United Food and Commercial Workers Union. The petition claims that employees at the plant were intimidated and misled by the UFCW, and they asked the Minister to intervene and to ensure that 82 percent of the workers who favour the Springhill Farms Employees Union, they asked the Minister to intervene on their behalf to be sure that they are given the opportunity to vote on the matter of certification.

Will the Minister intervene on their behalf?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I haven't seen the petition the honourable member refers to. It may have been received by my office. I have been away from the office part of the morning. It could well be it's been received by my office and I haven't seen it. But even if I had seen it, this Minister does not believe it's the role of the Minister of Labour to intervene in the collective bargaining process unless there's a breakdown of the system.

We have a collective bargaining process in Manitoba where workers are entitled to organize and apply to the Manitoba Labour Board for certification. Providing that the workers have satisfied the requirements of the legislation, then the board will process that application and certification will follow or will be denied in accordance with The Labour Relations Act.

This Minister should not interfere in that process and no member of this House should seek to interfere with that process.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, on a new question: Is it the policy of this government that in a particular plant, the wishes of 82 percent of the employees there should be ignored because of what is contained in The Manitoba Labour Relations Act?

And will the Minister refer The Manitoba Labour Relations Act to the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations of this House so that the matters contained in The Labour Relations Act may be reviewed by the members of this Legislature and by workers and by employers and by union leaders across this province so that we can get to the bottom of this and make laws that are fair to all Manitobans?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, it is clear from where the honourable member is coming.

He believes that the best way would be to have workers at the mercy of employers. Basically, the honourable member doesn't believe that workers should be entitled to organize, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I would ask that the Minister withdraw any comments that he's just made that would impugn any motives, on my part, other than motives on behalf of workers in this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, it is clearly my perception of the line of questions that the Honourable Member for Brandon West has been putting, that he feels that the best way in society would be to allow the workers to have to accept the dictates of employers in this province.

Madam Speaker, we have a system of law in place, a system of regulation in place that is virtually identical throughout Canada, virtually identical, that provides for free collective bargaining and a process for adjudicating the rights and issues that arise between employee groups and employers, and Legislative Assemblies are not the forum in which to take sides in that process.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, with a final question, the Minister, in his answer, wishes to impugn my motives and to suggest that this member speaks for the employers of this province.

When I accepted the duty of Labour critic, I agreed to speak on behalf of workers of this province; unlike the Minister of Labour who tends to want to speak for his union boss friends.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I have a question and I'm about to put it.

The Springhill Farms Employees Union is not a wealthy and powerful union like the United Food and Commercial Workers of Manitoba.

Will this Minister not do something to prevent workers from being manipulated and intimidated by these rich and powerful unions in this province?

HON. A. MACKLING: Really, Madam Speaker, I shouldn't dignify that question with an answer.

However, I do want to put on record the fact that in this province we have a labour relations climate that is second to none. We have an excellent record in respect to days lost; we have an excellent record in respect to employment; we have an excellent labour relations climate, and we'll maintain that climate despite the efforts of the Honourable Member for Brandon West and his colleagues.

Flood conditions update

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is - I don't know which Minister would be prepared to answer this - but I wonder if we could have an update on the flood conditions in the Province of Manitoba and what time that decision was made or the statement was made.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we had information released last week which indicated that there were no major concerns with respect to flooding except for some low-lying areas along the Red River, and this would not change except with some dramatic changes in the weather.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister then.

It is my understanding that there's been some concern expressed about serious flooding in the Red River Valley. Is the Minister saying that there is no concern at the present time?

MR. A. BROWN: You're not up to date, Len.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I was saying that on the basis of the last information that was provided to me as a Minister, there were no major concerns. I will take that question as notice and I will update the House.

Child Abuse Registry - regulations

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

During the fall of 1986 she received a report regarding the Child Abuse Registry. Will the Minister be introducing new regulations regarding this registry within the next few weeks, and will the new regulations contain an independent review and appeal procedure?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the report has been circulating to groups that have indicated an interest. We have received quite a few submissions, comments. They are being compiled and within a few weeks we will be bringing forward the final regulations. But there is still time and I encourage members opposite to peruse that report and to submit their recommendations on it.

The appeal process that was outlined in the report, I think, did outline an appeal process. It did involve the committee that, sort of provincial child abuse

committee, a multi-disciplinary committee, as to the first stage of an appeal. But if members opposite have other ideas as to how that can best be done, we would welcome their input. I have had some suggestion that it would be valuable to have a lay person on that committee, and that certainly is an interesting possibility.

Child Abuse Registry - removal of names

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary question to the same Minister.

Will both non-proven sexual and physical abusers' names be removed from the list?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I can only assume that the Member for River Heights has seen the report and the recommendations. Assuming that, she will know what their recommendation is: that physical abusers, only those who are confirmed, be retained on the list, and that only strongly suspected sexual abusers, strongly suspected by two-thirds of the multi-disciplinary committee, also be retained.

Again, they give the rationale as relating to the great difficulty of achieving a courtroom decision but often we run into the situation where all the legal people and the professional people involved are of the same opinion, that there is a very strong probability that there was difficulty, but for technical reasons there was not a conviction.

And again, we are mindful of the balance between the civil rights of the adult person and the need to protect the child. Again, I invite all members of the Opposition to peruse that report and to submit to me their suggestions because we have not yet come to a final determination.

Child Abuse Registry - release of names to employers

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: With a final supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

Will employers under the new regulations be given access to information only on proven abusers, thereby protecting the names of both victims and suspected but not proven abusers?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, again as I've said, there is not a determination as to the final regulation as yet. The member knows what was recommended by the committee that studied the issue for two years. She should know that there was no suggestion of victims' names being in any way accessible to potential employers. The suggestion of access for employers, only where employment in a special trust relationship with children is involved, would have access after receiving the permission of an employee applicant. So, again, I urge the member to peruse that report and to submit to me her recommendations for how to handle the issues.

Budget - health care facilities - increased payroll tax and hydro

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health, Madam Speaker.

Many hospitals in the Province of Manitoba are experiencing substantial deficits from this current operating year that will end in about five days' time. My question to the Minister of Health is: In the Budget allocation from Estimates for the upcoming fiscal year, does that Budget provide sufficient monies to those hospitals to provide for the .75 percent increase in the payroll tax that those hospitals will be paying?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, that question was asked of me a few days ago and, at the time, my answer was that there was discussion taking place with individual hospitals. When a final decision is reached, an announcement will be made.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, as well in the Budget, the 4.7 percent increase in hydro rates was announced, one-time forever. Madam Speaker, that makes the hydro rate increase 10 percent to those same hospital institutions this year.

My question to the Minister is: Does the Budget allocation allow for that increase in hydro costs to those same health care facilities, including personal care homes?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, the same answer, there are discussions taking place with the hospitals and, until that is clarified, it would serve no good purpose to give a partial answer at this time.

Hospital - closure of beds to control deficit

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that Brandon General Hospital, when faced with budgetary constraints now being faced by a number of City of Winnipeg hospitals, is the Minister willing to accept as government policy the closure of anywhere from 8 percent to 10 percent of the active treatment beds in Winnipeg hospitals, as he accepted with Brandon General Hospital as a method of controlling their deficit faced with a 10 percent increase in hydro rates and a 50 percent increase in payroll tax by this government?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, it's obvious that the honourable member would like to start discussing my Estimates at this time. There's nothing I'd like better than this, but this is hardly the place. I do not think that we are going to restrain ourself to the kind of answer that he wants, this yes and no business. He knows absolutely why. A full explanation of where we feel we should be going will be given during my Estimates, I can assure you of that.

The Manitoba Labour Relations Act - protection from intimidation

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour, and it's prompted by the questions from the Member for Brandon West.

Mr. Minister, the labour legislation in our province, how does it protect anyone who is intimidated either by the employer or by the employees or union? Madam Speaker, I'm asking the Minister: What protection do the laws of this province give to any intimidation effort by a union or by an employer in an attempt for a decertification process?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, The Labour Relations Act clearly provides protection for the workers and for anyone involved in the collective bargaining process. If anyone feels that their rights have been in any way interfered with, there is a process pursuant to The Labour Relations Act for which they can have their rights adjudicated.

Budget - accounting practices

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance in his Budget Address the other night indicated a year-end forecast of a deficit of \$415 million, and he arrived at that number through a deduction of a \$30 million figure that he called a year-end saving.

My question to the Minister of Finance, Madam Speaker, given the fact that for five years this government has not come anywhere close to its expenditures' forecast; and given that within this present year expenditures have gone beyond forecast by the level of \$69 million, can the Minister tell me the rationale for introducing this new type of accounting technique within his Budget?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

First, some of the comments behind the question are incorrect. The Government has in some years been very close, in fact, some years under its projections in terms of what the year-end deficit would be. We're certainly not as far out as what a former member of this House called the fiscally irresponsible position of the Government of Saskatchewan where they were out some hundreds of percent, not a matter of a couple of percent.

But in terms of the specific question, we are taking a lead in that area from other governments in Canada; the Ontario Government, the Federal Government put the same kind of assumptions in their Budget documents in terms of anticipated year-end savings, and it's been in essence a practice that's gone on in this Province of Manitoba.

In fact, I think the first time it's appeared on the books of the Province was Budget documents, quarterly reports brought down by a member of the Conservative Party when it was in government. I think it was Mr.

Craik who was the first one who used the anticipated year-end savings in a quarterly report. They have appeared in quarterly reports for a number of years now and we've merely incorporated them into the actual Budget presentation.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, can the Minister indicate then why that explanation was not given within his Address and, furthermore, is he saying that there was in past years a figure, whether it was \$30 million or whatsoever, that was broken out in various departments that represented the saving in other departments which was not in any way exhibited within the departmental Estimates?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: This is the first time that it's appeared in the Budget at the start of the year. It has appeared in the quarterly reports - if the member would look through them - in every one back to the quarterly reports put out by the previous government when they were in office.

There is an anticipated year-end savings that has appeared for many years. What we've done is merely reflected that accounting practice not only in the quarterly report, but in the annual Budget that comes out.

As I indicated, it's put in a way that is exactly the same actually as the Government of Ontario in the way that they portray that in their books. It's done in a similar fashion to that done by the Federal Government. The reason that we didn't provide more detailed explanation in the Budget document itself is obvious. I don't know if we want to have that document go into such great detail, but it was listed in there and explained and I've provided the member with the additional information that he is inquiring about in regard to that item.

Estimates - breakdown of revenue

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary but a new question.

Given the fact that later on this afternoon we will probably be debating Interim Supply, I'm wondering if the Minister can provide the members of this House with a detailed breakdown of the other revenue figures - and I'm specifically referring to fees - through the various departments of government, so that members opposite may have an opportunity to determine how it is the government is able to increase those fees, as on an aggregate fashion, at the rate of 11.5 percent. Will the Minister undertake to provide that information to members of the House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There are specific errors. We will attempt to provide that answer. As the member knows, Interim Supply is dealing with the spending of the funds on behalf of the government. It does not deal with the revenue Estimates that are also before the House.

First Ministers' Conference on Aboriginal Rights - Premier delayed

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yesterday many members of this House, and I'm sure many Native people across Manitoba, were concerned over the fact that the First Minister and the Minister of Native Affairs were delayed in their departure to the Conference on Aboriginal Rights by the unnecessary delay on the vote on the Budget by the members of the Opposition.

I would like to ask the Deputy Premier whether the delay led to the First Minister missing the important first meeting yesterday between the Prime Minister and Premiers at this very important conference?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.

That question is not within the administrative competence of the government.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, I'm asking the Deputy Premier if the Premier - and she's the delegate of the Premier in the Chamber - was able to attend a meeting which was definitely within the administrative competence of the Premier, a First Ministers' meeting on the aboriginal rights. If you prefer me to restate it

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Could I please hear the question?

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, my particular concern, and I'm asking the Deputy Premier on this, is whether she will make members of the Native organizations at the conference aware of why the Premier was delayed and make Native people in this province aware of the fact that it was because of the actions of members opposite that the Premier was delayed in attending a very important meeting? - (Interjection)-

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, it's with great regret that I have to report that the delay in the vote yesterday did mean that the Premier and his party were unable to attend the very important pre-conference meeting that took place in Ottawa last night. Since this is the most important conference affecting Native rights to have taken place probably in the history of Canada, it is most regrettable that that delay occurred, Madam Speaker.

Lotteries - age restriction for entry to casinos

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister in charge of Lotteries.

A constituent of mine called to inform me that his 16-year-old son was admitted to the last operation of the casinos at the Convention Centre. He was a high-school student, age 16, and held a part-time job. He was admitted and lost a fair amount of money.

My question to the Minister is, is there an age restriction on those who can enter and play in the casinos?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Lotteries.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I'd like to thank the member opposite for that question.

We certainly do attempt to put in place procedures to ensure that under-aged young people are not allowed into casinos. I will certainly check into this particular instance and into our procedures to ensure that we are able to determine effectively those who are under age and ensure that they are not allowed into the casino.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, is there a policy now in place to either question, or at least check and prevent young people, who are under age, from entering onto the premises and participating in the gaming process?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, yes, there is a policy in place. I will check into the exact way in which that policy is implemented and report back to the member.

MR. C. BIRT: I thank the Minister.

To help her check it out, one further point of information. This young individual used one piece of false identification and was admitted. I'm wondering, when the Minister is checking out to see if some procedure can be established where more than one piece, or some further way of checking on that person's identification, because not only did the student get into the place but also several other friends. Apparently they all used one piece of identification and obviously that procedure is not sufficient to prohibit young people from getting in and gambling.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, with those comments from the member opposite, I'm not sure I understand his first two comments since he was perfectly aware that there was a procedure in place and that we were checking for underaged young people. Obviously, it's not going to be always possible to deal with situations where false identification is used. We will certainly check into the situation and ensure that the most fail-safe system is put in place.

Seagram's Distillery at Gimli - closure of bottling plant

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

On this side of the House, we've argued long and hard that the payroll tax is a real disincentive to

businesses in Manitoba and that it will cost many, many jobs to the Province of Manitoba. The payroll tax, Madam Speaker, in this Budget was raised 50 percent.

This comes to my attention, and I hope I'm wrong, Madam Speaker, but I was told that the bottling part of the Seagram's Distillery at Gimli was closing or is closed. Can the Minister tell us if he had discussions with this Seagram's plant?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. E. CONNERY: Would the Minister take it upon himself, Madam Speaker, to investigate why this bottling plant is closing down or has closed, and at what loss of the jobs to a small town, the Town of Gimli? This is a very important part of their economic life and they cannot afford to lose those jobs. Would the Minister take it upon himself to investigate the situation?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, I'm always prepared to talk with anybody about jobs in Manitoba, but there's a lot of nonsense in the discussions we just heard from the member opposite with respect to the health and education levy; one example being, for instance, the CF-18 went to a city which has a similar levy - about 3.25 percent as opposed to 2.25 in Manitoba - because of a very specific decision by the Federal Government. The Federal Government decided that, if Oerlikon moved to Montreal, they would get a major procurement contract, regardless of the fact that in Montreal they would pay about 3.25 percent as opposed to 2.25 percent for the health and education levy in Manitoba.

If you look at Toronto, where employers are now paying in the range of \$644 a year for the medical premiums of their employees and more than 70 percent of the companies there are paying that for their employees, you will find that that is a larger payment by employers in Ontario than they have to pay in Manitoba, and the fact of the matter is that they're

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Swamp fever - mandatory testing

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture.

About a week ago, I drew to the Minister's attention the growing concern of horse owners throughout the Province of Manitoba with the very serious problem of swamp fever. More and more horses are being destroyed or having to be destroyed because of this highly infectious disease. I asked the Minister at that time whether or not he would use his good offices to do what I believe most horse owners would like, that

is to have a mandatory testing program carried out in this province; and hopefully, with a compensation support program attached to that. Has he made any representations to Agriculture Canada to attempt to get that program under way before the mosquito and insect season is really upon us?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, it appears that honourable members on the other side, their priority in agriculture is not the incomes of farmers, and while I don't discount the difficulty that certain horse owners have in respect to the disease, I want to tell my honourable friend that I asked our veterinary services people immediately upon - in fact, about a week before the member raised the question, that I wanted a full report. And on the discussions that they've had with the federal people, I will try and have the details of those discussions for him very shortly, but I do know that our people have been in constant contact both with the federal people and with veterinarians in the field.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, just briefly, on a point of order.

Madam Speaker, you sometimes ask why we on this side get exercised. We don't really need that kind of smart-alecky innuendo direction made. I have a constituent who lost 12 mares, 12 pregnant mares. I have neighbours who lost two or three of their pet riding horses.

Now I know that isn't the most urgent, pressing problem in agriculture today, but it happens to be of concern to anybody who's lost a horse or is about to lose a horse. This Minister can do a little better than give me a smart-alecky reply. I asked him politely a week ago, would he use his good offices and get off trying to score little Brownie points, politically, and do something, in this case for, the horse owners of the Province of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on the point of order.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I want to indicate to my honourable friend that if they talk about Brownie points, they wanted a debate on agriculture and then they adjourned this House and didn't want the debate on agriculture. We offered the debate. Now they're saying that they want some action.

Madam Speaker, it is a federal responsibility, but not only discounting that it is a federal responsibility, our veterinarians have been involved in this situation, Madam Speaker, and I've undertaken to provide that information to my . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Is the Honourable Minister addressing the point of order or the issue?

Order please. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order, nor is it a point of order to insist on an answer from a Minister or the content of the answer.

Lotteries - grant cutbacks

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation.

Madam Speaker, on March 17, the Minister wrote to umbrella groups under the agreement and advised them that to achieve the objective of spending surplus lottery money on maintaining essential social services, particularly in the health care field, that they would adjust the funding agreements and mechanisms with each umbrella group effective April 1, 1987.

Can the Minister advise to what extent these umbrella groups are going to be cut back on April 1, 1987?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I will refer the Member for Charleswood to page 16 of the Budget, since it's obvious that he has not read the Budget Address, where it states that in keeping with our priorities, an estimated \$7 million of surplus lottery revenue will be targeted for health care for Manitobans. In light of rapid growth in lottery revenue of over 200 percent since 1983-84, this will be accomplished without any reductions in support to current recipients by using surplus lottery revenue.

MR. J. ERNST: Can the Minister then advise the House, Madam Speaker, what adjusted funding mechanisms, as of April 1, 1987, will mean to those umbrella groups, if it isn't a cutback or a reduction or a control of their lottery revenues?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I will be discussing and negotiating with each of the six umbrella groups and each of the six special agreements groups this coming Monday and Tuesday. We will be engaged in a dialogue around the current distribution system. We will be consulting on the question of a needs assessment for the lottery distribution system and arriving at, I am sure, acceptable arrangements on all sides.

Lotteries - casino experiment

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, I have a new question to the same Minister.

Several weeks ago I wrote the Minister with regard to the effects of the casino experiment that took place recently, and the effects that removal of Casino Days, normally allocated to certain umbrella groups, financial implications that it would have on their particular revenue flow.

I understand that the Minister has responded with regard to that matter and has indicated that the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation would grant a loan, as it were, to one particular umbrella group at interest, Madam Speaker, yet on the other hand has already reached a cash settlement agreement with two other umbrella groups. Can the Minister advise why one umbrella group is being treated differently from another umbrella group under this situation?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I'll certainly look into this matter and get the details for the Member for Charleswood, but I can indicate that, with each of the groups involved or for each of the group that was impacted by the pilot project, a mutually satisfactory arrangement was arrived at and, in all cases, it was based on an average of earnings from previous Casino Days or previous arrangements with the Lotteries Foundation. I have heard no complaints and, in fact, a great deal of satisfaction from this settlement.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I'd like to begin by moving two motions which show up on the Order Paper in respect to the Rules and the appointment of the Deputy Chair of Committees.

I would move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Labour:

WHEREAS interim Rules provisions in force throughout the last Session limited speeches in Private Members' Hour to fifteen minutes and limited debate on a Private Members' Resolution to three hours; and WHEREAS it is desirable to bring these provisions into force permanently.

NOW THEREFORE I MOVE that the Rules of the House be amended by reinstating permanently those Rules which were in effect on a trial basis during Session 1986-87, namely:

- (a) that the Rules of the House be amended by adding the following new Rule immediately after Rule 22:

"Time limit on debate

22.1(1) The total time allowed for the consideration of any Private Members' Resolution and any amendment thereto shall not exceed three hours.

Termination of debate

(2) When the time allowed by sub-rule (1) has expired, the Speaker shall terminate debate on the item being considered."

- (b) That present sub-rule 33(3) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(3) Notwithstanding sub-rules (1) and (2), speeches during the Private Members' Hour or during debate on a private members' order called by the Government pursuant to sub-rule 20(2) shall be limited to fifteen minutes."

MOTION presented and carried.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Clarence Baker, Esq., Member for the Electoral Division of Lac

du Bonnet, be Deputy Chair of the Committees of the Whole House.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, would you please call Bill No. 8?

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 8 - THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside who has 27 minutes remaining.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I had concluded my comments with respect to Bill 8 on the last occasion when the adjournment hour arose.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs to close debate.

HON. G. DOER: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to thank all members for the debate that took place on Bill 8. I think many of the comments that were made are very useful comments. I think the meeting that took place, also, in conjunction with discussions with members opposite, with the officials from the Department of Municipal Affairs, dealing with the whole issue of assessment and assessment reform, I believe was very useful for certainly myself.

I've had briefings before, but, Madam Speaker, it was useful to have the concerns from all constituencies of Manitoba represented by the questions that were asked of the officials taking part in this very, very difficult issue of getting Manitoba's assessment and assessment reform up to current market values and implementing many of the concepts and many of the principles that were articulated in the Weir Report and adopted by members of this House.

I would just like to also say briefly, Madam Speaker, that the bills we have passed in the last period of time last year and are proposing this year are interim bills. They are all scheduled in such a way that the principles articulated in Weir and the Assessment Reform Committee of Manitoba can be implemented as soon as the computer can get all the property in the computer and we can deal on a province-wide basis with many of the issues that are contained in assessment reform, such as classification, and deal with some other issues that certainly became apparent with our briefing, Madam Speaker, and that is the issue of have the values of land in rural Manitoba gone down so far and the values of land gone up so high in Winnipeg that there has been an inequity there.

Madam Speaker, this bill provides an appeal process of 105 days for this 1987 year, a unique circumstance,

we believe, and provides enabling legislation for phasing in. We believe it's a logical bill for dealing with the problems confronting us in a unique way in this reassessment process in the city, but I do appreciate all the concerns from all the members representing constituencies on this problem because it is a province-wide issue notwithstanding the fact we're dealing with a specific court order.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY BILL NO. 9 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1987

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The Committee of Supply will come to order now to consider the following resolution:

RESOLVED that a sum not exceeding \$750,307,040, being 20 percent of the total amount to be voted as set out in the Main Estimates, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988.

Does the Minister of Finance have an opening statement?

Does any critic from the Opposition want to say something on this resolution?

The resolution has been passed.

Is it the will of the committee that I report the resolution to the Speaker? (Agreed)
Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply adopted a certain resolution, reported same, and asked leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, that Madam Speaker

do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Ways and Means will now come to order to consider the following resolution:

RESOLVED that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenditures of the public service, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988, the sum of \$750,307,040, being 20 percent of the total amount to be voted as set out in the Main Estimates, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Does the Minister of Finance have an opening statement?

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I simply, at this stage of the proceedings, and in consultation with the Government House Leader, wish to table for the record of the House a letter between the Government House Leader and myself whereby we have had some discussions with respect to the granting of Interim Supply, which as we all know must be passed before the end of the month.

In view of the schedule of the government, with respect to the Throne Speech and then the Budget Speech, we agreed that Interim Supply would be passed by tomorrow and the details are set out in this letter, but it was also agreed that the amount we are dealing with is only approximately two-and-a-half months of supply. So that the Government House Leader has agreed to introduce the legislation required for any further Interim Supply for the present Session, previous to the end of the first week in June; that is, June 5, 1987, and that legislation in the required accompanying motions thereafter will be considered until it passes, so that members of the Opposition will have from the first week in June to approximately June 15, when Interim Supply will be required, to give full discussion and debate till it passes Interim Supply. But we are agreeing at this stage, in view of the fact that Interim Supply has to be passed, that this resolution and the accompanying bills will be passed before the end of the Session tomorrow morning.

So perhaps I could simply table this as a record of the agreement between the Government House Leader and myself, which has been discussed and agreed to by the Member for River Heights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I can confirm what has been stated by the Opposition House Leader and also indicate my appreciation for the assistance that he has provided on behalf of his caucus and his critic in order to ensure that the necessary bills will be passed in order to continue with the necessary payments of government for salaries and for other suppliers and individuals at the beginning of the new fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to just spend a few minutes in this point of the Interim Supply procedure. Mr. Chairman, although I've never spoken on this particular point before, I think it's incumbent that I rise and do so.

You may remember earlier on this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a specific question dealing with whether or not he would provide for this House a copy of all the increases in fees through all the various departments of government. You may remember also, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister said, well, really, Interim Supply is dealing with spending and really that's a revenue question. As if to say, Mr. Chairman, that it's not important that it be considered.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at your list of procedures, we are in now No. 5, which is a Committee of Ways and Means. Sometime ago, Mr. Chairman, when the people, whoever it was, our former parliamentarians who came up with a process of debating money matters, suggested that if you were ever to discuss the expenditures of money in any supply fashion that surely there had to be an equal opportunity or an opportunity to discuss the raising of the ways and the means, to have in place the funds to support the expenditures in question.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise only to point to the Minister of Finance that even though we are debating an Interim Supply Bill, that the longstanding tradition of all Houses of Parliament is to provide an opportunity, an opportunity to discuss amongst legislators how it is that we are going to tax ourselves, either in the form of fees or in taxes to raise the necessary funds to support that expenditure.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's why I rise and I suppose before I complete my opportunity to debate within this portion, I will leave the question hanging for the Minister of Finance to address and ask him again whether it is his intention to lay before the members of this House a complete breakdown of all the fees through all the various departments.

Mr. Chairman, lest I remind you, and I know you've gone through this revenue booklet in detail, I know you have. One would see from page 2 to page 6 - and Mr. Chairman, there only are nine pages - but pages 2 through 6 represent all the revenues in the forms of fees, in the forms of - well, they use the word "sundry" - in the forms of fines, in the forms of land title fees, in the forms of program costs and certificates and so on and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, that represents this year an accumulated figure of \$345 million, an increase of \$30 million, an increase of 11.3 percent over the year previous.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it's incumbent upon the government, as quickly as possible and hopefully within the next half hour or so, to lay before us greater detail associated with revenues brought forward in the form of fees. Again, Mr. Chairman, as people would realize a whole two-thirds of the revenue forecast figures are directed towards that area of government revenue collection.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As always, we will attempt to answer as many questions that members opposite will raise. But I would just point out a couple of points in response to what the Member for Morris has indicated.

Yes, we are in Ways and Means; and Ways and Means Committee is established to look at the raising of revenues in certain cases under certain bills; revenue bills do get referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, but the specific resolution that's before us is very clear. It states that we are dealing with a resolution to providing the Supply granted to Her Majesty for certain expenditures. We're dealing with the expenditure side of the operation in terms of the resolution that's before us.

We will be pleased if the member has specific requests for information on specific fees to attempt to answer them. Not all of the fee decisions are available. Many of them have been decided previously, and have been reported in the normal fashion as fees are decided. The member knows that fees in many cases are determined by regulations pursuant to certain acts of this Legislature. The member will also be aware that many of the fee increases that manifest themselves in the revenue Estimates that are detailed in the booklet on revenue have already been filed in the normal fashion. If the member has specific questions we can answer them.

As an example, if there are increases in here regarding the Department of Community Services for Vital Statistics, those fee increases were announced previously and gazetted, what have you, in the normal fashion. I don't have that detail here; I don't have the time to start going through and providing that information on fees previously. I can indicate that the increased revenue in that area is a result of previous fee decisions.

The same is true with respect to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. There are fee increases related to the operations of the Securities and Real Estate Board. Those fees are as a result of decisions that were taken previously, gazetted and announced with respect to increases in various transactions as they relate to the Public Securities Commission, fees for securities, fees for real estate. So those have already been announced and I don't have the details here. I don't know if the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has those details. I'm sure he will attempt to provide it if the member doesn't have a copy of that news release or that information as it was filed at the time of those increases.

So we will attempt to answer the questions even though that is not the specific reference of this resolution or this subsequent bill that will be before us as we get further into our procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: I accept basically everything the Minister says; however, I point out to him that, because such a large portion of revenue is starting to come forward via fees and that the government is beginning to use them as a major tax source, because indeed the rates of revenue increases are much higher than the rate of expenditures, I would recommend to the Minister that he put out a listing, indeed on a yearly basis, and if that should accompany the Budget, that would be fine.

Mr. Chairman, I looked in the back of one of the Decter Reports and, of course, there were all the fees laid out before me.

A MEMBER: Pages and pages of them.

MR. C. MANNES: Pages and pages of them, that's right. So maybe it isn't necessary to put out 1,000 documents with them. It seems to me that they must be collected somewhere. In a statistical fashion, they must be collected somewhere.

I also realize that regulations will come into place and may outdate some of those figures in a quick fashion, but I found that a very useful piece of information because, for once, I've seen where all the fees of government totalling \$350 million had been collated under one cover. I see some benefit in that. I see some benefit in Manitobans knowing that there is one source to which they can go and find those figures.

My strong recommendation to the Minister of Finance for his consideration is that, another year, he provide just a simple update of those series of pages, because then indeed all of us can do a better job. We can do a better job preparing for Estimates and, indeed, we can do a better job of indicating to our constituents who constantly call us, Mr. Chairman, who do not have access to the regulations as printed within the Gazette, who do not have access to other areas, but who in many cases call those of us who represent them and ask us those questions. I think that, if members had that on file with all the other tax information that the Minister provides, bases the taxes in place and all other provincial jurisdictions, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a beneficial document.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: It's an excellent idea. I'll review it with staff of the department and see if we can't provide that kind of document on a timely basis. I don't know if it can actually be a document that will be filed as part of the actual Budget or something subsequent during the year, because some of those fee increases take place at various times. But I think that we could look at what the most appropriate time in the fiscal year is and have that kind of updating in one comprehensive document. I think it's an excellent idea. I'll pursue it and report back, probably not during this point in time, but hopefully by the time we review the Estimates of the Department of Finance. I could probably give you a definitive answer by then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it then the will of the committee to adopt this resolution? If the committee has agreed, resolution is adopted.

Shall the committee rise?

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Ways and Means adopted a certain resolution, reported same and asked leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. E. KOSTYRA introduced, by leave, Bill No. 9, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1987.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 9 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1987

HON. E. KOSTYRA presented, by leave, Bill No. 9, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1987, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I did provide to the Opposition Finance critic a copy of my speaking notes providing for information regarding the various aspects of Bill No. 9. Basically it does do what the Opposition House Leader indicated in terms of providing 20 percent of the amount to be voted of the main appropriation excluding statutory items to be voted to provide enough Supply to approximately the middle of June.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I've only got a couple of minutes that I want to bring something to the attention of the House under this particular aspect of the Interim Supply. On Wednesday, March 25, I had the opportunity of voting against the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance to approve, in general, the budgetary policy of the government.

I just want everybody in this House to know that I was elected to represent my constituency and the people that voted for me, Madam Speaker. I felt that I had the opportunity of voting against that Budget. I supported the amendment that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had proposed, and I was prepared to vote against that amendment. In so doing, the criticism, the discriminatory remarks, that were made

by the government because I took the opportunity to stand up and vote against this Budget, because it was the policy that I felt that my constituency wanted, the discriminatory remarks that were made, particularly by the Minister of Native Affairs who made a remark where he blasted the Tories for their insensitivity to Native issues, that is absolutely wrong, Madam Speaker. There is no insensitivity on my part towards Native affairs. No remarks, and keep your God damn mouth shut while I'm talking!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's my business. I'm here to

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Would the Honourable Member for Niakwa please come to order?

I was listening to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Niakwa. In those remarks he used some profanity that I would hope he would withdraw before we continue with the other remarks that he is making.

Could the honourable member please withdraw those remarks?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Madam Speaker, I didn't have on the hearing piece, and I didn't hear what remarks you had made concerning my remarks. Would you repeat them, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Certainly. I distinctly heard while the Honourable Member for Niakwa was making his case his useage of a couple of words of profanity. Would he please withdraw those remarks, so that we can continue hearing the case that he was making?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Madam Speaker, it's an unnatural way for me to act. I guess I get a little worked up, and I must apologize for making these remarks that were unparliamentary.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. A. KOVNATS: And I do apologize.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa may continue.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Madam Speaker, I am here to represent my people, and my people wanted me to vote against the Budget of the New Democratic Party Government that was proposed by the Minister of Finance. In so doing and in following the rules, I wanted to take my place here and vote against it. To be criticized in the discriminatory manner in which I was criticized just leaves me beyond words, Madam Speaker.

In the paper, it says: "... a surprise vote was taken." Well I know that they're not responsible for the wordings in the paper, "a surprise vote." I think that it's a necessary thing, and it's not a surprise vote. The vote was to take place and it did take place under the

Rules of the House, and to be criticized for it? I'm not trying to make any political points, Madam Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Madam Speaker, I'm not trying to make any political points. I'm just trying to state facts because, when it comes to making political points for myself, I'm not trying to win my seat. I'm not worried about that. That's not what I'm here for. But I think it's got to be held in perspective, the false accusations, the feelings and the indignation that was shown because I took my time in voting, but all within the limits.

I now know that there was some discomfort on the part of the First Minister and the Minister of Native Affairs in going to a meeting in Ottawa. I really don't know the consequences, but to be accused of my insensitivity to Native issues - absolutely wrong, very frustrating, Madam Speaker. I have heard these accusations, not just from the Minister of Native Affairs and not just from the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, I also heard them from the Attorney-General. Madam Speaker, it's beyond belief.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

If other members of the Chamber would like to have a conversation, I'm sure they can find a mutually satisfactory place to carry that on. The Honourable Member for Niakwa has the floor.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I heard somewhat the same accusations from the Attorney-General when I returned to the House to vote. I heard the Government House Leader making somewhat the same accusations. When they make reference to the Conservative Opposition, Madam Speaker, I happen to be one of the Conservative Opposition. So when these accusations are made, they're levelled at me.

But I'm not demanding, I'm not even asking for an apology on these discriminatory remarks, Madam Speaker. I'm not one to carry a grudge. I'm not going to fight back in the same manner in which the government has fought. I would just like it to be on the records that I don't appreciate it.

I'm not one to sit in my chair and make remarks across to the government. I don't support that type of action in the House. I think, if you've got something to say, you get up in your place and you say it. I remember making an ungentlemanly remark to the member who asked the question that I thought was a set-up to try and embarrass me and my group more, when the Member for Thompson got up to ask a question concerning the vote and whether the Premier was able to get to Ottawa in time for an important meeting. I did make an ungentlemanly remark from my seat, which is absolutely not normal for me. Without anybody even knowing what the ungentlemanly remark was, I apologize for making it from my seat.

A MEMBER: He's not really a horse's ass, Abe.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I wasn't about to divulge it, whatever I had said. It was my business and my business only.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of presenting my case and making my remarks. I just want the people from the government to know how I feel. I've never been this worked up before, Madam Speaker, I've never been this worked up before, not because of the Budget. I had a chance to speak on the Budget yesterday and I spoke on it, and it was gone. You know, it's a fait accompli. I don't have that much opportunity to change things, because I am a member of the Opposition. But one day, Madam Speaker - it's not a threat - I'm going to work to see that the people who embarrassed me in this regard will not have the opportunity to embarrass me again. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

We're in Second Reading of Bill No. 9, and I'd like to make a few comments too with respect to activities of last evening. I can sense - I can share, I should say, the mood of utter frustration of the member, my colleague behind me, Madam Speaker, who rises in representation of his constituents and has to be berated, like indeed all of us were last night when we conducted our activities in the confines of the Rules of this House - within the confines of the Rules of this House!

Now, Madam Speaker, I'm not going to stand here and justify the actions that were taken last night.-(Interjection)- Well, the Member for The Pas says, I can't. Madam Speaker, let me tell you one thing. If the bells or the rules had allowed for 10 hours to let the bells ring before we had to come to vote on this Budget, Madam Speaker, if it had taken 10 days, if it had taken 100 days, it would have taken us that long to come in and vote on the Budget. We would have taken it to the limit that the rules provided.

Madam Speaker, we were voting on a Budget. Governments have fallen on Budgets, Madam Speaker. Indeed, this government was two votes away from falling on this Budget, Madam Speaker. So let's remember the issue; the issue was the Budget of the Province of Manitoba and the main purpose, the main reason that each and every one of us are representatives of anywhere from 14,000 to 20,000 Manitobans each, Madam Speaker. That's why we've been elected to this House. The tradition of Parliament, Madam Speaker, is such that our primal purpose for being here is, No. 1, to represent the taxpayer.

Madam Speaker, there can be no greater financial document before us than the Budget, the Budget that asked us to consider expenditures in the area of \$4.2 billion; that also asked us to consider, in principle, tax measures that are going to bring forward \$3.7 billion revenue, in principle two new tax measures including an attack on property. Yet, members opposite say that we're doing something wrong in the confines of the Rules when we allow the bells to ring for one hour.

Well, Madam Speaker, we totally reject that, and we totally reject the slurs of racism that came across the hall last night too, came across this Chamber, well

heard, well in the hearing of every member of this House. Those members should have been called to attention, Madam Speaker, but they weren't.

Madam Speaker, last night up till two or three days ago, we were led to believe the Premier wasn't even going to Ottawa, as of last night. He wasn't even going to go.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would remind the honourable member that the motion before the House is Second Reading on Bill No. 9. Our Rule 30 says that "Speeches shall be direct to the question under consideration . . ."

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Of course you're right, Madam Speaker. I accept your admonition.

Madam Speaker, we're discussing Bill No. 9, Interim Supply. Of course, a lot of that Interim Supply is directed towards the Budget, approximately 20 percent of the Estimates that have been laid down before us. Last night, Madam Speaker, we voted on that Budget and, also last night, members of this House decided for some political reason - we made our views known, Madam Speaker. We were protesting a terrible Budget, a devastating Budget, Madam Speaker. We were very open in what our reasons were for letting those bells ring for one hour. We didn't hide it, not at all, Madam Speaker.

The Minister of Mines and Energy says that we sneaked out. No, there's no such word as "snucc." If you look in Webster's, you'll never find such a word as "snucc." Anyway, Madam Speaker, we sneaked out, and we did so to give Manitobans an opportunity to do one of two things, first of all to look at their pay slips. We asked them, through that protest last night, to look at their pay slips and/or to look at their income tax forms.

Well, Madam Speaker, if we succeeded in causing 50 percent of tax-paying Manitobans, tax filers of this province to look at their personal income tax and to see what impact this new Budget, the new principles of taxation, the new measures of taxation will have upon their disposable income, then we were successful.

I don't apologize to members opposite. I certainly don't apologize to the Premier of this province who, instead of arriving in Ottawa, Madam Speaker, at roughly ten o'clock or a quarter after ten, Ottawa time, may have arrived at eleven o'clock, because nobody had shown me an agenda of the First Ministers' Conference where indeed the meeting was called to order at eight o'clock last night, or that the first item was dealt with at either ten o'clock or eleven o'clock last night, Ottawa time. And that's what the members opposite failed to acknowledge, Madam Speaker, when they went out of course to try and salvage something from last night, and the fact that we were putting through, with a very small margin of two votes in this House, a most disastrous Budget.

Madam Speaker, I come back specifically to Bill No. 9. As my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, has indicated, there is agreement between both sides. The government needs monies to operate into the next fiscal year. It's not our intention, in any fashion, to hold up the passage of this Interim Supply Bill, Madam Speaker.

We have a number of members on this side who want to ask specific questions of various Ministers, and I believe we have a number of members who would like to make general comments specific to areas within the Budget, within the areas of Estimates. Then we also have a few members, Madam Speaker, who did not have an opportunity to be part of the Budget Address or the Throne Speech Address who would also maybe like to make a few comments.

Madam Speaker, we have deliberately requested of the government that there not be a consideration beyond 20 percent of the total expenditures of government under the Interim Supply Bill No. 9, that we deal with roughly at this time a figure of \$750 million.

Madam Speaker, isn't it interesting that, in the period of 10 years, we are going to pass a bill allowing the government to spend .75 billion and we're going to do so in the space of about two or three hours of debating time. Madam Speaker, this .75 billion doesn't represent 25 percent of the total expenditures forecast of the government.

Isn't it interesting that in today's realities, when we have inflation at 4 percent, isn't it interesting when today we have revenue increases being outstripped by expenditure increases. Isn't it interesting, in these days when we have a general decline in the forecast of the economy nation-wide and indeed, Madam Speaker, a decline in the Manitoba economy - not significant. I'll say to the Minister of Finance and members opposite who, I know, are very proud of the economic statistics, the economic factors that allow the measurement of one province versus another, I acknowledge that some of those factors would allow members opposite to feel some satisfaction. But I say to you and to anyone who wants to listen that so many of those factors have been purchased through borrowings. They have been bought.

So when I say, when I indicate to the Minister of Finance and to members opposite that I am terribly concerned as to where this province is heading in a fiscal sense, I don't see how it is the Premier, the First Minister, can come forward and say that he expects that, if this happens and if something else happens, the Budget will be balanced in 1991. I say, they're playing politics; they're playing too much politics with the fiscal future of this province. Of course, over the next while, it'll be our goal to demand of the Minister of Finance a better accounting as to the future revenues that will be in place to allow the Premier to come forward and say that possibly the Budget will be balanced in 1991.

Madam Speaker, this Interim Supply Bill covers roughly a time of two months - pardon me - two-and-a-half months, till June 15. We fully expect to be, at that time, debating another Interim Supply Bill. We at that time will be interested or will have had the opportunity at least to have been able to have gone through a number of the departments of government, and we'll have a better opportunity to know specifically what plans the government has in place for the expenditure of many of the funds in question.

Madam Speaker, let me take this opportunity to say that we also notice yet another mention of the word, Manitoba Properties Inc. Although the Minister of Finance did not read his speaking notes into the record, I thank him for providing them to me at an earlier date. I indicate to all members of the House that again we

recognize the fact that Manitoba Properties Inc., that quick, slick, trick-of-hand brought forward by the former Minister of Finance, is still something that this present Minister cannot, in any way, cover over. He has to address it over and over again, as he did within his speaking notes on Bill No. 9.

Madam Speaker, he says this and I quote, and he talks about the additional amount of future commitment, authority. I think he's talking about loan authority, and he says: "The amount of future commitment authority has been slightly reduced in this Interim Supply Bill, relative to the previous year, from \$200 million to \$175 million for 1987-88." He goes on to say: "This is representative of the future commitment authority required in 1987-88 to provide for the financial obligations under the MPI Lease Agreements."

Madam Speaker, this province has sold off hundreds of millions of dollars of buildings - and I'm not going to move into it in great detail now - but every turn that this Minister of Finance makes, indeed every time that the Cabinet, I'm sure, wants to make another decision to spend money, they're hit face up with the fact that they made a decision a few years ago that represents a large incremental portion to the interest bill of this province.

So, Madam Speaker, with those few remarks, I look forward to moving into the Committee of the Whole when we can have a freer exchange.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cooperative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I did not intend to enter into the debate today and for that reason, Madam Speaker, will keep my comments short and brief, because I know there are many members who want to speak to the issues that have been identified already in the debate. But I could not sit in my seat and let go unchallenged or unanswered the comments by the Member for Niakwa and the Member for Morris in respect to what happened last evening.

It's interesting to watch them today try to extricate themselves from their embarrassment, because what happened last night is an embarrassment to them; it is an embarrassment to all Conservatives in this province. It is an embarrassment because of their actions for the people of this province. What they did last night, Madam Speaker - and I'm addressing the issues which you allowed them to address earlier in both remarks by the Member for Niakwa and the Member for Morris - was to prevent the Premier of this province from attending a historic meeting of all First Ministers to deal with issues that are of primary importance, not just to the aboriginal people in this province, but to all people in this province and all people in this country.

They now tell us that they didn't mean to do what it was they actually did. What do they say they intended to do? Well, now they tell us that they did mean to do what they intended to do . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

We now have in front of us Bill No. 9. I cautioned the Honourable Member for Morris to direct his remarks to Bill No. 9.

The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I believe I am in the finest position of this House addressing my comments to those provisions which are provided for in Bill No. 9.

Bill No. 9 is an omnibus bill and addresses all issues of concern to this House. The issue which I am addressing right now is one of concern to all members of this House and to all Manitobans. They said last night, Madam Speaker, that all they wanted to do was stop the Budget. That's what they told us and they're saying right from their seats, that's all they wanted to do to stop the Budget.

Well, let's look at how that argument unfolds. By the time they left this Chamber, there had already been a vote, a recorded vote, ayes and nays with members standing in their place and indicating how it was they were going to vote on the Budget which defeated their amendment. They knew they couldn't stop the Budget if they stayed out of here an hour, two hours, four hours, four days or four months. So, if they say they left this Chamber in order to stop the Budget - and that's what they just reconfirmed - what they are saying, Madam Speaker, rings somewhat hollow, because if they really wanted to attempt to do that, they should have left before the amendment vote was taken. They had already lost one vote five minutes before they left the Chamber. There was no reason at that time to ring the bells to stop the Budget.

They also said, Madam Speaker, by that action they wanted to highlight their opposition and their concerns and their questions - and let them stop me if I'm misconstruing anything they've said - about the Budget. The Member for Morris said there was no greater document before us, that they had to take that action. Madam Speaker, why didn't they ask one question during the question period on the Budget?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. J. COWAN: Why didn't they ask one question during the question period? The Hansard yesterday, and I'll read off the listing of the questions, Madam Speaker: Oral Questions; MPIC - submissions to the Board; Archives - signature on document; Archives - records on microfiche; MPIC - Minister's press conference.

Well, I'm sorry, the Member for River Heights asked a question on "Statutory debt payments - reduction of," in the Budget.

By the way, the Member for River Heights has very clearly indicated that she resents being lumped in with members of the Conservative Opposition. I can't blame her. When we do that, it is unfortunate as an oversight on our part and we will certainly try to correct that situation.

A question on "Treaty Land Entitlement" from the Member for Arthur.

Finally, we got around to farmers and agriculture. It seems that we're always getting around late in the question period to farmers and agriculture, but finally the Member for Virden got up and asked a question on deficiency payments.-(Interjection)- The Minister of Agriculture tells me that he suggested that farmers are

very pleased with the federal contributions to incomes for 1987, Madam Speaker.

That comment should be put in every rural newspaper in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, so that the people of those two provinces know full well what Conservative members believe in respect to those deficiency payments. They're suffering and they're suggesting over there that farmers should be pleased with what's happening to them.

Then there was a question on the "Yellowhead Route - federal funds." Then there was a question on "Highways - reduction in services." Then there was a question on "Anishinabe." Then there was a question on "Child Abuse Review Committee Report." Well, we came close to the Budget because someone asked about the payment for that report but it didn't reference a Budget. Then there was a question "The Manitoba Labour Relations Act - legislation." Then there was a question on "MLA's - intimidation of."

You know, they're embarrassed today because of what they did last night, and I would suggest they did what they did last night because they were embarrassed because they hadn't asked any questions in the question period on the Budget. If they had directed their attention to the Budget during the question period, they wouldn't have been so embarrassed that they had to pull that stunt last night which is so embarrassing them today.

So let's accept that they intended that they were attempting to draw attention to the Budget that they had failed to draw attention to for the last number of days. They blew it, Madam Speaker. They became so obsessed with what they believe to be scandal, and so obsessed with what they believe to be the foremost issue in Manitoba, that they put aside the concerns of farmers. They put aside the concerns of Manitobans over the Budget and they focused only on MPIC. Now, that's their right. That's their prerogative, that's their choice, and it's a choice they obviously made.

I believe it was a wrong choice. I believe the public would believe it was a wrong choice. But having made that choice and having had to suffer the embarrassment of making that choice, please don't have them then by some trick, some cute stunt - for whatever purpose it was intended - had the effect of not allowing Manitoba to be represented at a very historic meeting, because -(Interjection)- Well, the Member for Emerson says that, I believe he used the word "fiddlesticks" - I don't believe that's unparliamentary - and he said he knew he couldn't make it anyway.

Let me tell you what happened and let me ask the Member for Emerson to correct the record if I'm at all wrong in explaining the chronology of what happened. As soon as the bells started ringing, the Premier of this province went out of this Chamber to talk to the Leader of the Opposition who was just across the hall giving a press conference to tell him how important it was that he be at that meeting last evening where the First Ministers of this country were attempting to work out a consensus which would provide for a successful First Ministers' Conference, and he did that, Madam Speaker. -(Interjection)- Well, I think the Member for Charleswood said it started this morning - I want to get to that point - but let me finish.

I then followed, probably within 10 minutes of the bells ringing and talked to the Whip, the Member for Emerson directly, and I said we are concerned because

there is a plane waiting for the First Minister to get him to the meeting on time. The Whip told me everything was under control and not to be concerned. He agrees from his seat that's right. At that time, I had no indication that we were going to have to wait the hour nor did any members on this side have any indication. I'm not certain that the Member for Emerson knew. I don't know. But, what he told me was not to be concerned, everything was under control.

Then we waited and we waited and we waited and we waited. That inconvenience, Madam Speaker, did not bother us personally. It was not the matter that we waited in this Chamber for an hour for them to return. Those are the rules and we understand that. What agitated and bothered us on this side, and I believe what is now embarrassing members on that side, is that they made the people of Manitoba and the people of this country and the aboriginal people wait, wait, wait, wait, so that they could try to extricate themselves from their embarrassment of not having focused on the Budget during the Budget Debate. That's what is so agitating.

I remember the Minister of Northern Affairs, the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, the only, to my knowledge Treaty Indian Cabinet Minister in this country stand out in the hall last night and say to the press, we have waited for centuries for this meeting, and now because of the parliamentary games they're playing, we are losing our opportunity to be a part of that.

That was in fact the effect. They say the meeting wasn't that important. -(Interjection)- Okay, I'm sorry. They're saying they didn't say that. I thought I heard them say -(Interjection)- they said the meeting just started today. Well, the Member for Sturgeon Creek says that's true, well then why did the Prime Minister, his leader, send a Challenger Jet to this province so that the First Minister of this province, our leader, and a man who has been very instrumental in the entire First Ministers' Conferences on Aboriginal Rights trying to bring justice to a situation that for far too long injustice has prevailed, why did they send that jet here? They sent the jet here because the Prime Minister of this country thought that the meeting was so important and the presence of Manitoba was so important that they would send a Challenger Jet here so that the very minute the vote was over, they could get on a plane and at least make the last hour of the meeting.

Because we had to sit and wait for 55 minutes while members opposite caucused or did whatever they did and then another five minutes while the Member for Emerson, the Whip, had a cigarette outside the Chamber -(Interjection)-

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I take exception to that.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, perhaps he didn't have a cigarette, but I will tell you, Madam Speaker, that the Member for Emerson when everyone else in this Chamber was in their seats was outside in that room right over there . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The honourable member well knows he is not to make reference to the absence or presence of members.

HON. J. COWAN: Well they yell over, Madam Speaker, that I'm a desperate man; if ever we saw a desperate

group of desperadoes who were caught in their own embarrassment. I retract that, Madam Speaker. I'm not certain whether it's parliamentary or unparliamentary but it's not even true. If ever we saw a group of desperate men and women though, we saw them last night when they played the stunt they felt they had to play.

Madam Speaker, the Premier did not make the meeting. I don't know what was said at that meeting, but I do know that Manitoba, who has been playing a key role in the aboriginal conferences, was not represented. It's not a matter of the Premier not being there; it's not a matter of the Minister of Native Affairs not being there; it's not a matter of the Member for Arthur not being there; it's a matter of the people of Manitoba were not represented in that room because they felt they had to let the bells ring the full hour to draw attention to a Budget that they had failed to draw attention to because they had been so obsessed with other matters for the last week that they had forgotten all about the fact that the Budget was before this House and an important issue to all Manitobans.

So, they say what they intended to do was draw attention to the Budget. I suggest there were better ways to do that. They say what they had intended to do was to stop the Budget if they could. I say that after the first vote they knew that was not possible so there must have been other reasons. They say, Madam Speaker, that they did not intend to stop the Premier of the province attending that meeting, but the fact is all they did - I don't believe they drew attention to the public; we know they didn't stop the Budget - all they did was prevent the Premier from attending the meeting. They knew that would happen. They cannot now stand and say it wasn't an important meeting, because if it wasn't an important meeting, their leader, the Prime Minister would not have sent that jet to rush the Premier of this province to that meeting so he could attend at least a part of it. That is regrettable.

I do not know if the First Ministers' Conference is going to succeed or fail. I hope it succeeds. But I do know the chances of that success have been significantly lessened because of the stunt they played last night. They will say it was just a supper meeting. As a matter of fact one of them from his seat earlier said it was just "din-din". That's how much they respected the process that was taking place, but the fact is when you have all the First Ministers around the table with the Prime Minister, at the request of the Prime Minister, without the glare of the cameras on, without reporters being there, so that they can attempt to work out a consensus that is in the best interests of not only the aboriginal people of this country but all people of this country and that conference takes place with one - and a key First Minister - being absent because of their actions, I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that they have done a disservice to all Manitoba, to all Canada, and that is why they stand up in such embarrassment today. Maybe it will not have all been for naught if a lesson is learned from it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No way.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, they say "no way." They say they won't learn a lesson from it. So perhaps it's not

even important that I share my thoughts with them but for others who are listening.

Madam Speaker, these opportunities, these historic occasions, these meetings of this significance come about so rarely that we have a responsibility, all of us have a responsibility, to ensure that the work that has taken place through those meetings is the most productive and positive work possible.

That responsibility was failed last evening by the members opposite when they so blatantly - and I won't use words that they were insensitive, I don't know that to be the case - prevented the vote from taking place. If they didn't know, they should have known full well the effect that would have on the First Ministers' Conference, Madam Speaker. It was shameful; it was unnecessary. I think that is why today we see the situation we have.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

First of all, I shouted from my seat at the Government House Leader that he was a desperate man and I want to justify my statements in that. One of the reasons obviously why the House Leader's been standing here lecturing us is because he has faulted in his operation in running of the business of this House, and that is where the problem stems from. That is where the problem stems from the day that we started coming into Session. He's goofed and he's goofed time and time again, Madam Speaker. I'll illustrate exactly what has happened.

From the time that you called the House back into Session, we had our Throne Speech; we had to have the Budget Debate; we had two days where basically there was very little going on. Their own members had to speak to bills because there was no business to do. But, Madam Speaker, what is most interesting, when he tries to lecture us about the shameful deed we did, well, that is our responsibility here in this House. The Member for Morris indicated exactly the reason we did that. But let's get down to the basics.

As Whip for the Opposition, I want to indicate a few points here, Madam Speaker. Whenever I've had a request, and this has been our working guidelines, and the government Whip knows whenever there's a federal-provincial arrangement and a request is made for a pair, they've always got a pair. Madam Speaker, why was there no request for pairing for the Premier, for the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, why was there no request? I would've granted it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, there we are, poor timing and planning on the House Leader's part. That is where the whole problem stems from, and that's why he gets up in this House and tries to lecture us. It's his own stupidity in this degree in terms of running the business of this House that it's happened.

Why, Madam Speaker, was there no request for pairing? I've honoured every one; I've never crossed anybody up and I would've done it again. Why? Why would the Premier not take and ask for a pair?

Madam Speaker, when he talks of being ashamed, he should be the one that's ashamed because of the way he's run the affairs here. Madam Speaker, initially it appeared that the Premier would not even go, or that he'd go on a commercial flight and he would have arrived late last night. The Federal Government said they would like to have the Premier there, so the Federal Government flies in a plane - to wait on the tarmac, whenever the Premier is ready - to fly him down.

But at the best of times, Madam Speaker, because there was no request for pairing, if he had left at quarter-after-six, he would not have made that meeting in time. He would not have made the meeting in time, when you consider the time it takes to drive from here to the airport. Even if you speeded, whatever the case may be, it takes a certain amount of time till it gets off, the time it flies, by the time he lands and takes a cab. Madam Speaker, just so we get the record straight, it takes you approximately close to 40-45 minutes to take a cab from the airport down to the -(Interjection)-15 minutes.

So, Madam Speaker, what the House Leader has been doing is distorting the facts here. He's distorting the facts because he himself is trying to absolve himself of the blame of the way he's conducting the business of this House.

I want to give you another illustration, Madam Speaker, of how poorly he runs this House. A bill was introduced, Bill No. 2, having to do with Daylight Saving Time, a government bill. Madam Speaker, through this malfunction of this House Leader, that bill can't be processed. It can't be processed. Again, a House Leader who has got his head in the sand, and then tries to get up, Madam Speaker, and tries to say that we don't know . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. J. COWAN: I wonder if the Member for Emerson would entertain a question.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: No, Madam Speaker.

He had his chance to make his points, and I'm going to take this chance to make mine. Never mind this business of questions.

Yes, for the first time, Madam Speaker, I always felt the Member for Churchill, as House Leader, has been pretty good in manipulating things in terms of the house business. He's managed to work that well in conjunction with our House Leader. They've done well. But he screwed up the business of the House from the day it opened, Madam Speaker, and that is why we have this problem. Then to try and justify it, he gets up and lectures this whole House because we let the bells ring for an hour, rules that he made. Madam Speaker, if we had wanted to, we could have rung the bells for an hour on the amendment and rung them for another hour on the Main Motion, so don't give us this business of stalling.

We knew the timetable as well as you did. What you're trying to do is take away from the impact that that

ringing of the bells had for one hour yesterday. Because it's hurt you people, it's drawn the attention like we intended it to do of a stupid Budget, a Budget that's going to hurt the people in Manitoba dramatically, and we've illustrated that by ringing the bells.

Then for that House Leader to get up and berate us here, and comes up with all kinds of marginal statements in terms of how we've been acting on the whole thing. It's your fault, Mr. House Leader, and you take the credit for it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines on Bill No. 9.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I join to speak on this bill, which pays for the Premier's attendance at the First Ministers' Conference, and I assume pays for the attendance of the Attorney-General, and pays for the attendance of the Minister of Native Affairs as part of a legitimate effort on the part of the Government, and I would believe possibly will pay some of the expenses involved by the Member for Arthur.

The interesting thing is that we started debate on this bill with the Opposition getting up and acting very sensitive. They were being terribly defensive. I could appreciate some aspects of the Member for Niakawa's comments, but when he went so far as to say that somehow we on this side had no reason to be very concerned, many of us were disgusted at what we considered to be the insensitivity of the Conservative caucus when they knew full well what was taking place.

Some of the people on the other side have been Cabinet Ministers; some of them have attended First Ministers' Conferences; they know what takes place at these First Ministers' Conferences. They know that the dinner preceding the conference is very critical to the conference. - (Interjection)- The Member for Portage la Prairie knows nothing of this, he usually gets up, pipes up from his seat occasionally, not to clarify things. I would just ask him to take a little bit of time. If he wants to get up afterwards and speak on it, fine.

But there have been instances, and I've attended these things. He should go back and peddle his onions, I say, Madam Speaker. - (Interjection)- That's right, because we want to talk about the issue. I would appreciate talking about the issue because we have a grumpy person sitting there again, trying to interject as he usually does.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right, we usually get rotten remarks from you, that's why . . .

HON. W. PARASIUK: Pardon.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: We usually get rotten remarks from you.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Oh, well, that's . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Low-down, sleazy . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I've been speaking and we have this case of arrested adolescence on the other side, treating this like a sandbox . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Could honourable members, if they have any remarks to make, please rise to their feet and address their remarks through the Chair.

The Honourable Minister has the floor on Bill No. 9.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The point about it is that these meetings before the conference are critical. You start out by having a dinner and it is after the dinner that you have the real discussion' and the Prime Minister understood that. That's why he sent a plane here, waiting to pick up the Premier at about one-quarter to six to get the Premier there, so that they could all still meet for some period of time, because they knew that the Premier could have caught a plane at 7:15, but they wanted to give that extra hour, extra hour-and-one-quarter.

I think that was a good move on the part of the Prime Minister. It was a statesmanlike move. There's an attempt on the part of all Canadians to be statesmanlike on this particular issue, and the one group that wasn't statesmanlike last night was the Conservative caucus of the Province of Manitoba. They were the group in this entire country that were not statesmanlike on this.

A time when the country called for statesmanship, they were lacking, terribly lacking in that quality, and today they get up and wonder why we were sensitive about their terrible lack of sensitivity, their lack of statesmanship with respect to an issue that is an important issue. This is the last constitutional conference mandated by the last constitutional changes, and that's why people believe that this one can be a make or break conference. Manitoba's been in the leading position, has taken a leading position in these discussions. And now we have all the defensive comments coming from the other side - didn't ask for a pair . . .

A MEMBER: Didn't need one.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Didn't need a pair, everything was all arranged. The Premier could have had his voice heard last night. It probably could have been very critical - very critical to coming to a national consensus with respect to aboriginal self-government within the context of Canadian federation. This could have been a great moment for Canadian history. I hope it still is, but it certainly hasn't been added to or aided by the tactics of people on the other side. And the timing of the dinner meeting was established by the Prime Minister. He knew that this was going to be cutting corners very fine, and as a consequence, sent out a plane. A courteous matter, he did it courteously.

We assumed - possibly too much to assume - that Conservatives might have in fact acted - well, we won't assume that anymore; I wouldn't assume that. I would not assume that it would take a Conservative caucus one hour, having voted on this amendment, to go out and decide whether in fact they would vote against it or not. Not one new member attended between the first vote and the second vote.

The normal purpose of bells is to allow people to come in for the vote or to go off in caucus to determine whether in fact they will vote in one direction or another. They didn't need that. They didn't need that time. They

knew full well that they were pulling a cute stunt. A cute stunt that may be too clever by half and was too clever by more than half.

It's one that has embarrassed them, as the House Leader has indicated. It is one that I think will embarrass Manitobans as a whole, because they assume if people come here, they will debate the issues and if the Conservatives had such a grave concern about the Budget, why did they spend a whole week guttersniping on MPIC when they didn't spend the time focusing on the Budget?

I believe that a lot of their own constituents are wondering where the priorities of the Conservative Opposition lie. Do they lie with guttersniping or do they lie with the matters of agriculture? Do they lie with the matter of job creation? That's an interesting thing that you have to discuss with your own constituents and with your own backers. Because so much of what takes place in the House, Madam Speaker, both in the short Session we've had to date and last year's Session, has been geared to try to protect the backside of the Leader of the Opposition. That leadership review is taking place on April 18, and hopefully we might have some sanity after that; we may have some sanity.

But what's happened is that there's been precious little discussion of major issues, and as a consequence, they found themselves terribly embarrassed. They have made their position clear. They were not acting in protest.-(Interjection)- Fine. I might be mistaken on the date, if it's 11th, fine, but if that is the major difference that makes the Member for Sturgeon Creek happy, I'll say it's not the 18th, it's the 11th. Frankly, that doesn't change the line of argument.

But I want to come back to the Member of Niakwa. His words of protest, unfortunately in this particular instance, given the magnitude of the matter, given its severity, our scene is ringing somewhat hollow, even though I know that the Member for Niakwa is a sincere and honourable man. That's why we have that type of difference with respect to perception, but we, on this side, we're very disappointed and very disgusted at what took place last night because it was completely and totally unnecessary.

As I conclude, last night called for statesmanship and the Conservatives failed miserably.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the previous speaker stood up and he, in a roundabout way and in his usual manner, when he even dealt with you, just so that he could talk on what he wanted to speak about and we've been speaking it all day, he used some phony excuse about who was paying for the trip and who wasn't. That is the basic, sneaky, roundabout way that he usually does things when he presents himself to people.

I noticed that "Chip and Dale" are both laughing over there now. I can accept that. The only thing that I didn't know was that "Chip and Dale" had become rodents, but it's one of those things.

A MEMBER: Stay on the statesmanlike . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I was trying to, Madam Speaker, I was going to, but I also heard the sarcastic

remarks started by the Member for Transcona to the Member for Portage la Prairie. What he doesn't realize is that I can give and take it - I can take it too - but it usually starts from him and it has been that way for years in the House.

Madam Speaker, the only thing I would say is that when the House Leader got up and said that this was the most important meeting of the century, and then the Member for Transcona talked about the process of ministerial meetings or First Ministers' meetings, I would venture to say to those members on the side who are Ministers know full well that First Ministers' Conferences are set months ahead of time and the Premier of this province knew the date he had to attend that long before.

A couple of days ago, when he made the indication to Ottawa that he might not want to attend because he was in the Budget Debate and may not vote, so the Ottawa made it appropriate and sent an airplane to take him. The earliest he could have arrived in Ottawa is at least 9:15 to 9:30, even by Winnipeg time. In fact, he would be very fortunate to arrive there by that time, even flying on a government jet.

Madam Speaker, if it was the most important meeting of the century, I can assure you that he would have asked for a pair, if he thought it was more important than his Budget. If he'd have thought it was - of all of the things that we've heard this afternoon, I'm sure that a pair could have been arranged. In fact, it would have been arranged because we have not turned down any pairs to Ministers on government business on this side.

A MEMBER: That's not true.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I said we have not turned down any pairs to government Ministers who are going to Ministers' Conferences, if you wanted to have it clarified. Madam Speaker, I think there was one last year. Quite frankly, we happen to be in 1987, and that's what I was referring to.

Madam Speaker, I'd also like to say that if the member who was speaking for an hour yesterday, the Minister of Finance, who was quite concerned when my colleague got up to speak, because there had been some arrangement because he wanted to speak for an hour, the Minister of Finance. When a person stands up or a Minister stands up to close debate on his bill, nobody else can speak after that. He could have sat down any time -(Interjection)- and then the House Leader would stand up and say: "By leave, we have a vote." We would have a vote.

He could have sat down -(Interjection)- Oh, Madam Speaker, now it comes, now it comes; now we hear them. You see, they're cornered. They realize that it was in their hands and not in ours. It was in their hands; it was in their House Leader's hands to do anything he could to see that the First Minister got there. The First Minister did not get there, basically because this House Leader got himself so confused yesterday that it wasn't even funny.

Madam Speaker, when I made the comment about the House Leader being confused and he tried to say that I called Beauchesne a socialist document one day, what I was referring to, what he was doing in the House

was at least chapter 2 of his socialist document. The way it goes is the first thing he does is he usually stands up and says: "I appreciate the question, I'm glad you asked, and I'm certainly happy that the honourable members have an interest." Then he moves quite slowly and casually and very, very smoothly into always blaming the other person. He moves the blame around to the other person's side and then, Madam Speaker, when that fails, he then starts to go direct blame. He doesn't do it smoothly any more.

Yesterday at noon in the question period, he tried to create confusion, because that hadn't been working any more. Last night, he did the final thing in the instructions, was to get mad, etc., and that is when he lost his cool. He's regained it today to try and throw the blame on this side again and, quite frankly, I've been aware of the phony tactics he uses for a long time.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, the members on this side of the House do not apologize for the fact that this government, over the past few years or six years anyway, took the money out of the people's pockets of the Province of Manitoba, like walking to a bridge and just dumping it all in the water. They absolutely had no regard for the people's money in this province whatsoever, and then we have a Minister of Finance who stands up and says, "I am going to take the biggest tax bite this province has ever seen or any other province, percentage-wise, has ever seen in peacetime. I am going to take that much money out of your pockets." - (Interjection) - The sales tax did not take this \$368 million out. You, by the way, have raised the sales tax twice.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Remarks will be addressed through the Chair.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm sorry.

They have taken a tax bite out of the people's pockets to pay for their mistakes. In other words, they said, "We'll blow your money." As the First Minister was speaking the other day, he said, "When we had lots of money to throw around . . ." and that's exactly what the Member for Rossmere did, throw it around. Now we have a situation where they say to the people of Manitoba, we're going to dig in your pockets because of our terrible spending habits, and we're going to pay for the debts that we put you into by taking your money.

Madam Speaker, that's why the bells rang for an hour. We thought that was important. Quite frankly, the mechanic who I talked to this morning at the service station thought it was important too. I mention this, Madam Speaker. The Member for Rossmere, the Minister of Industry, keeps laughing all the time, and he does that now to just cover up for the fact that he doesn't know how to apologize or he doesn't know how to answer for his mistakes. That's basically the reason for his so-called laughing humour all the time. I suggest that he should see a psychiatrist.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, we held those bells last night to let the people know, and I believe - and I wasn't in the House, but I heard it when I was just in the caucus room - that the Member for Morris said that those bells would have rung for a week on that Budget had the rules never changed. We would have done the

same thing on this Budget as we did one other time, when we would have brought the people's attention to the fact that this government has taken more money out of the pockets of the people of Manitoba than you would ever believe.

I have one other thing to say, Madam Speaker. I'm not apologizing for the bells ringing. As I said, they'd have rung for a week and, if the First Minister didn't want to go, he could have stayed here for a week as far as I'm concerned. He thought it was so unimportant that he didn't get a pair.

Madam Speaker, one of the speakers on the other side of the House in the Budget Debate - and I might say to the honourable gentlemen opposite that there were speakers every day on the Budget and, other than one day, there were questions on the Budget put forward, usually by the Member for Morris.

One of the honourable members on the other side, in his speech, didn't like the fact that I said they were immoral. Quite frankly, I don't retract that. I think anybody who does not tell the truth to the people of the Province of Manitoba, anybody, is wrong. I think anybody who represents himself wrongly is doing something that is immoral. I think also, Madam Speaker, that when I used the word "immoral," I said that gambling casinos in Winnipeg are immoral because it's on the backs of the poor, and I believe that.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I hope the honourable member is not implying that honourable members in this House are not telling the truth. The actual phrase "not telling the truth" is listed as one of the unparliamentary phrases in Beauchesne.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If I have said, Madam Speaker, that they didn't tell the truth, I'll retract that, but I will say to them that there wasn't anything in their literature that they put out that was factual that they've done so far. And I will say that nobody was told during the election campaign that the deficit was what it is. Nobody was told all these facts that we're having come out about Manitoba Telephones and the Insurance Corporation. Nobody was told those things, so anybody can draw whatever conclusion they like.

But let's get back to - I believe that you don't hurt the rich with gambling. I've said this before, you never will. I say that buying tickets is one thing but, to run this province on the backs of the poor and gambling casinos on the basis that you're going to use the money to build libraries or something else, is immoral, and I won't retract that. You can all go home and look at your conscience and, if you all want to go over to the Convention Centre in the next couple of nights and take a look at what's happening over there, go over and take a look.

We have a Minister today who doesn't even know the age limit. She hesitated to tell us what the age limit is, because she didn't know. Madam Speaker, I can only say this also, that the young people of this province presently today have a 9,200 debt; everybody has. Madam Speaker, you know our family was blessed with having another grandchild just about four days ago, and he came into the world in Manitoba owing \$9,800 just because of this government. Every child will come into the world in Manitoba owing that much money. They think it's funny.

Every one of the children who come into the world with this government will have a bill on their back like you wouldn't believe, and they will have to grow up and they'll have to pay it off, and they don't care. The deficit is still a drastic deficit, especially after you've raised all of the money you have. You've raised all of the fees and everything, as was pointed out by my colleague from Pembina yesterday, and they sit and laugh.

So I, like the Member for Morris and my colleagues, if that bell could have rung for a month, it would have rung on this Budget and, if the Premier didn't think it was important enough to be there on time, that's his fault not ours.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

You know, from time to time as a member of Legislature, I'm asked to explain what goes on in this Chamber. Some of my constituents have asked me that question. I know probably members of the public in the gallery today are probably asking that same question, the members of the press even. I received a note, in fact, indicating there were four journalism students from Red River who were listening in on the proceedings and want to talk to me about it. I'm sure they would ask me what the debate and the discussion is all about.

You know, normally I can answer the questions, even on some of our more difficult-to-explain procedures, because there is a logic to our rules, Madam Speaker. There's a great parliamentary tradition of rules which have been established over centuries for particular purposes. But if there's one thing I could not do as a member of the Legislature, it's explain to someone what happened yesterday and why the members opposite chose to do what they did, because I feel there is no logical and legitimate explanation.

I want to take you through just very briefly what I can explain to members of the public. I can explain that there was a Budget Address on Monday, and then we had eight days of debate where all members had the opportunity to express their views on the Budget. I'm sure they would agree that is logical on an item as important as the Budget that there should be that debate. I could then explain that we have a rule which establishes that a vote will be held at a particular time - in this case 5:30 yesterday. That's quite logical. I could explain that members of the House were present for that vote. In fact, all members of the House were present, which only makes sense. I can explain that we had one vote on an amendment put by members opposite, and that all members of the House voted and that then there was a vote on the main motion to adopt the budgetary policy. I can explain that too.

Now comes the tough part. Vote was called, we had ayes and nays. The Opposition House Leader rose in his place and said, ayes and nays, Madam Speaker. Now what did Madam Speaker say? "Call in the members." So what happened? Every single member of the Opposition left the Chamber. How can I explain that to my constituents? They stayed out of the Chamber for 10 minutes, for 20 minutes, for 30 minutes,

for 40 minutes. They came back in approximately 55 minutes later and then one member, whom I can't mention by name, stood at the doorway and we waited another five minutes. Finally, the vote was called, bang on the hour, and we finally got to vote on the Budget Motions. How can I explain that to my constituents? "Call in the members," and all the Opposition members leave. It's not logical.

It's also, Madam Speaker, in my opinion an abuse of the rules, because the whole purpose of having the bells rung is to call in the members. It's for the purpose of alerting members who don't happen to be in the Chamber at that particular time of the fact there will be a vote. In fact yesterday, since all members of the House were in the Chamber when the vote was called, as proven by the previous vote on the Opposition's amendment, it is obvious, Madam Speaker, for the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who obviously does not understand the purpose of the rules, that they then decided to grandstand.

Well, I suppose I could explain that to my constituents too. That was the real reason, and that's come through in their comments today. They've said that the real reason they wanted to extend it for the hour is because they wanted to grandstand on the Budget. After eight days of debate, after having the opportunity to vote on their amendment, they still felt the need to grandstand.

Do you know what I can't absolutely explain to my constituents is why they did that when they were fully aware of the fact that the First Minister and the Minister of Native Affairs had to go to Ottawa for what, I believe, is one of the most significant conferences we've ever had, certainly probably the most significant conference on aboriginal rights. I say that, Madam Speaker, because in my constituency there are many Native people, and many Native people are concerned about aboriginal rights. Now how can I defend what the members of the Opposition did, when they knew full well the consequences of their action, something that was not prescribed by rules - don't let them suggest that, Madam Speaker - but something that was intended only to grandstand on the Budget. Now how I can explain that to Native people in this province anywhere, and certainly in Thompson. How can I say to them, well the members opposite really do care about aboriginal rights, when they refused to allow the Premier and the Minister of Native Affairs to attend a very important meeting on the first day of the conference?

As I said, Madam Speaker, I can't explain that. In fact, I expressed my concern today in question period about this particular issue. I really do believe that, whatever the intention of the members opposite was yesterday, it was a slap in the face for the Native people of Manitoba. I can take the consequences for this government and the embarrassment, quite frankly, for this province of the fact that our delegation was not there. I can take that, Madam Speaker, but I cannot take it on behalf of the Native people of this province.

I think the Minister of Native Affairs expressed it appropriately. I'm sure, if you were to talk to him today, Madam Speaker, he would say that Native people have been waiting for centuries for justice, for recognition of their aboriginal rights. Perhaps in that context, one meeting, Madam Speaker, while frustrating, will not historically make a huge amount of difference.

There are two things, Madam Speaker, that I've always found in my discussions with Native people, and those are two things: (1) that they do have a respect for tradition, but tradition which is appropriate and has a reason; and (2) that Native people have a sense of fair play, a good sense of priorities.

I think, if they were to look at this objectively, they would have come to the same conclusion that the Government House Leader did, that I've come to, that many members in this House have. That is that, in the Opposition's scheme of priorities, the rules are there not to be used for their original purpose but to be used for grandstanding. More importantly that, on the scheme of priorities, when the members opposite had eight days to debate the Budget, they had eight question periods to raise concerns, when they had every opportunity to put on the record where they stand on the Budget, they still chose for that one additional hour, Madam Speaker, to grandstand when they knew the cost in terms of having this province properly represented at that Aboriginal Rights Conference. That speaks volumes for the priorities of members opposite.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have tried to explain the operations of this Chamber to my constituents many times. Most of the time I can't but, on this particular case, there is no way I can explain it other than to say that members opposite really don't care about aboriginal rights all that much because it's not a priority. Just that one hour that they could have saved, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they could have saved us all of this debate today. That one hour, they chose to grandstand on the Budget and not to allow the priority that should be accorded to the Aboriginal Rights Conference and to the concerns of Native people in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I did not intend to speak but, having heard some members opposite, I feel compelled to speak. I think it's important to recognize that our role in Opposition is to defend the interest of Manitobans as we see it, and what we have had before us is the worst Budget in the history of Manitoba. What I want to point out, and by virtue of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were justified in doing what we did yesterday. But what I want to point out is that, if members opposite knew how to handle the affairs of government, they would not have been in this situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let's just look back on the history of what has happened so far in this Legislative Session.

First of all, the government convened the House on Thursday, February 26. The House had only been adjourned up until that point of time. They had an emergency situation, as they described it, with respect to Sunday-closing legislation. If they had thought for a moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they could have had that legislation in during the process of the previous Session because the House was just adjourned, and the legislation could have been dealt with in a normal

manner. We thought it was an important matter. We granted leave so that it could be dealt with the first day.

But let's remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that legislation could have been dealt with in the normal legislative manner, because it's been the practice of the House for the past number of years to just adjourn the House in order that the House can be called quickly to deal with emergency matters, so that the legislation could have been dealt with earlier.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happened subsequently to that? We were asked to grant leave to deal with another situation on Bill 8, and then what happened? We felt a great deal of sympathy for the City of Winnipeg and homeowners in the City of Winnipeg, so we granted leave to deal with it. One of their own members did not grant leave. They couldn't control and didn't discuss with their own member, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Their own member refused to grant leave. Then we found out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that leave wasn't necessary, that the bill didn't have to be passed that quickly.

A MEMBER: You've got a point there, Gerry.

MR. G. MERCIER: So far, I've had at least two points, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now let me get to the third point, and our Government House Leader will appreciate this. I warned him, for example, about Interim Supply in the month of January when we had a discussion, when he informed me about the date for the calling of the House. That was going to be a problem to you, I said. You're going to have the Throne Speech and the Budget. What time is there for Interim Supply? Oh well, we'll deal with that when it comes up.

HON. J. COWAN: And we did successfully with your cooperation, and I appreciate that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Successfully, yes, because members on this side of the House have been cooperating on every one of these instances to overcome the deficiencies and the errors that have been made in the planning by this government.

Now what's the fourth point, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The fourth point is this. This great historical, significant meeting which they refer to, they knew about months ago . . .

HON. J. COWAN: No, no.

MR. G. MERCIER: How long ago?

HON. J. COWAN: It was called a week ago by the Prime Minister. We were not told about it a month ago, so be honest. And be honest about the court case a week before the Session came into effect.

MR. G. MERCIER: What did they do though, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They called the Budget for Monday, whatever the date was. In the past years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Budget has come in, where the Budget has been this close to the Throne Speech, the following day. The Budget could and should have been brought in on the Thursday following completion of the Throne Speech.

A MEMBER: It could have been.

MR. G. MERCIER: It could have been, but what was on that weekend, Mr. Deputy Speaker? That was the Federal NDP Annual Meeting.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. G. MERCIER: Now what happened? Here's the planning process, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Did they want to bring in this Budget before this Federal Annual Meeting to which they go as the sole-elected government in Canada, the only province in Canada that has an NDP Government? They didn't want to go to that Federal Annual Meeting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have discussed as one of the topics the Budget that is being brought in in 1987 by the only NDP Government. They were ashamed to go to that meeting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with that Budget, that greatest tax grab in the history of Manitoba, and say, look we're riding high in the polls federally, and this is the kind of Budget we could have federally if we only get in.

Now wouldn't that be great, Mr. Deputy Speaker? We'd have a Federal Government, this shining example of NDP ideology in power federally. They didn't want the taxpayers of Manitoba particularly at that annual meeting to be thinking, gee, if these guys get in federally, we're going to have this kind of Budget not only in the only province in which the NDP have power, we're going to have it federally. So they avoided calling the Budget on the Thursday, and they've created, Mr. Deputy Speaker, their own problem.

For example, consider the number of times we have given leave to cooperate to get the government out of a jam in the month-long Session we've had. Did the Government House Leader ask for leave? Did he ask for leave and say, look, the Premier has to be at a dinner meeting with the Prime Minister tonight? How about if we have the vote at four o'clock or advance the vote? Did he ask for leave? No, he didn't ask for leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now this was the most significant event taking place, supposedly, in the history of Canada this year. Did he ask for leave? Because we're only talking with what happened about one hour, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Why didn't he ask for agreement to defer the vote until Monday? He didn't ask for that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're talking about a one-hour delay - one hour.

The Government House Leader could have come to us and said, look, we'd like the Premier to be there, not during just the last half-an-hour of the meeting, which is all that could have happened. We'd like the Premier to be there right at the beginning and be there early. Did he come to us and say that? No, he didn't. He didn't ask to defer the vote.

Now you would have thought, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this was such a significant meeting, that he would have done that. I know you would have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but they didn't do that. Now because of their gross negligence in all of these areas, they have the nerve to stand up and criticize us for trying to bring to the attention of Manitobans the worst Budget that we've ever had in the history of Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's poppycock, Mr. Deputy Speaker, absolutely.

And we, on this side, don't have to accept that and the people of Manitoba don't have to accept that and let's hope, in the balance of the Session, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the government wants to try to accomplish something, they will operate in an efficient manner and they'll take these things into consideration. We've been cooperative in the past. We, no doubt, will continue to be, but I don't want the NDP to be blaming us for their incompetence, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable . . .

HON. J. COWAN: No, I'm not. Will the Opposition House Leader entertain questions?

MR. G. MERCIER: No.

HON. J. COWAN: No?

A MEMBER: What happened to our cooperation, Gerry?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the House Leader for the Conservatives forgets about when he says they could have done this, they could have done that, they could have done the other thing, was that all we needed - all the Premier needed - to get to that important meeting on aboriginal rights was to do exactly what had always happened in this House. That is, at 5:30 on Budget night, you vote.

Never in the history of this Legislature, as far as I know, and I've asked members all around me, some of whom have been here for a long time - this is my eighth Budget; there are people in this province who have been around for a lot longer than that - never has there been a bell-ringing incident after 5:30 on a Budget night. That never even crossed our minds. It was something that would never have occurred to us because we assumed there would be some logic in the Opposition. That was not something that came up in our planning.

Had the vote been held at 5:30, the members stood up and counted, the Premier would have been on that aircraft before six o'clock - that's seven o'clock Ottawa time - he would have been there before nine o'clock, and he would have been there for the business portion of the meeting.

What more did we need? We had everything going for us. We had the Premier, we had the only Minister in charge of Native Affairs, who is a Native himself in this country, on that airplane. Everything was fixed up. There was no reason to believe, no reason in any of our planning, that the Opposition would play that kind of a cute stunt because after eight days of debate on a Budget, they got nowhere. They wound up getting nowhere with Manitobans, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they tried one last desperate effort.

That's where I really think they went overboard. They were told immediately about this immediate problem, and we've heard all kinds of nonsense about the timing of the Budget. We set the timing of the Budget before the First Ministers Conference Meeting was set. That

meeting was set about a week before it was held. The Budget date had been announced weeks before that, and the Prime Minister, in order to accommodate the difficulty with this province, because any date given for that kind of a conference will have problems for one province or another, in order to accommodate the province that was having difficulty with this particular date, he said, well, we'll get the aircraft there; we'll make sure you're there for the important part. After the dinner, when we get into the discussion, you'll be at the table; Manitoba will be represented at the Canadian table on aboriginal rights.

The Opposition knew full well that was exactly what the arrangement was. It was in the press that day. In fact, members opposite were shouting across to us that day that the Prime Minister was a fine fellow who was giving us, at the Canadian taxpayers' expense, an aircraft to take our Premier to Ottawa, and our House Leader has acknowledged that fact and we appreciated that.

They, knowing that it was going to prevent Manitoba's voice from being heard, chose to walk out of this House at 5:30, shortly after 5:30 yesterday, didn't have the decency or courtesy to tell us that they were going to be gone for an hour, were immediately told by our Premier and by our House Leader that this was a crucial issue for us, and they wouldn't even have the courtesy to tell us that they wouldn't be back for an hour. I find that an astounding insensitivity to our Native people.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Madam Speaker, I believe it is a gross indignity that they did against our Native people. They should have had more sensitivity when they came up with that idea and when they were specifically confronted with the problem they were creating; then surely, at that stage, they could have backed off of that stunt and played some other game.

Madam Speaker, we've heard some of the most incredible logic here from members opposite, things like the Sunday closing. Somehow we were supposed to have jumped in ahead of the courts to change our Sunday closing legislation which, incidentally, we were informed of - that is, the court decision was within what, a week, six days or so of the opening of the Legislature? Somehow we should have had that in hand before then.

Keep in mind that was legislation prepared and passed by the Conservative Government. It was their legislation that we were trying to fix up, and it was not, I believe, a favour to the NDP that people got together here and said we'll pass that legislation immediately. I believe that was our responsibility as members of this Legislature to do that. I don't see that as a particular favour to government.

But to make the point again, we had never had bell ringing before on a Budget vote. We've heard members opposite say, "Well, the Minister could have sat down any time." They full well know that probably there were members on both sides of the House who would not have been able to make a vote before 5:30, because they knew in their diaries that at 5:30 is when the vote is and they'll make sure that they would be here, not at 5:15, and never in my experience has the vote been held at a different time from that referred to in the

Rule Book. The Rule Book says 5:30 and that's when we could have expected to vote. Even then, they still would have rung the bells for an hour.

So again, Madam Speaker, what the Opposition did yesterday, having ignored the Budget during question period for eight days almost totally - here and there a little question - at the last minute trying desperately to get some political credit back, when they discovered that in so doing they were causing damage to our ability to represent Manitoba at that Aboriginal Rights Conference, they said that's okay. I don't believe that would have been okay had it been a bankers conference, had it been a conference of some of their big business friends. They would have made sure the Premier could get off and go to that. Somehow this wasn't important enough for them, and I find that astounding.

They will hear about this issue, Madam Speaker, not just today. They will hear about it tomorrow; they will hear about it next year and the year after and at election time. They will be reminded of the kind of activity they have caused in this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think today what you're seeing is a very embarrassed government and a totally incompetent and embarrassed Government House Leader. Madam Speaker, all he's been doing is hurling claims about us that we make insults, and that's been his big main claim as he runs through the newspaper.

Madam Speaker, we just hear insult after insult from that side of the House, but this Government House Leader, it's obvious; now we know why the Budget is so bad and why this province is so bad that they can't even run the orders of this House properly to ensure that the First Minister can go.

They delayed the Budget Speech because they wanted to go to an NDP convention. That's exactly what you people did. You went to a convention; you delayed the Budget Speech so that it would accommodate you. We accommodated you also. The First Minister did not have to be here for the vote, he had a pair, but he didn't want to go.

Madam Speaker, what you're seeing from your Government House Leader over there is one of the best jobs of cover-up I've seen. Last night he was mad. Sure, he was mad; he got caught with his pants down.- (Interjection)- Oh, is that Beauchesne? Anyway, he got caught with not having done his job. Madam Speaker, he was mad.

The House Leader is not mad today, Madam Speaker. He's walking around the House visiting with everybody. It's a feign bit of show, and I guess that's his job, but it is very feign. Let the record be that the House Leader isn't mad. This is the best thing they're trying to do to take the heat off what is one of the worst Budgets that this province has ever seen, the worst Budget.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if he's Chip or if he's Dale, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek points out, but it was he, Chip and Dale, that inflamed the member because of their incessant babbling and cheap shots and little yipping. Nothing was said yesterday when the

Member for Radisson screeched out "racist" to this side of the House, heard by everybody here. There wasn't one word mentioned about having him retract that remark. So when the House Leader gets up and condemns us for what we say, he better take a look at his own side of the House because that's where the mess is.

Madam Speaker, I'm incensed that they would think that we are not concerned about the Native people. I've probably had more to do with Native people than anybody else in this House except the Minister of Native Affairs, and I've worked with these people and I know their strengths and I know their needs.

Madam Speaker, to say that we don't care about the Native people is absolute bunk and I am incensed that anybody would point a finger at me anyway, because I know some of the problems, and this government is not addressing them. They are using them as a vote method, but they are not addressing the needs of the Native people. It's time they sat down and did that, Madam Speaker.

I won't take any more time. We should be addressing the Budget. This has been a great way for the Opposition House Leader and the government to deflect attention from the Budget by trying to do this, and they've been somewhat successful, Madam Speaker. I wanted to put my comments on the record, and I thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I wouldn't want to let this day go by without just putting a few comments on the record about what's gone on, well, in the last almost 24 hours. Madam Speaker, I don't really think that we have to apologize at all or be embarrassed at all on this side of the House for protesting, in the most effective way that we could, on behalf of the people of Manitoba and our constituents, who are terribly upset - many of them are really upset about the largest tax grab this ill-conceived Budget, the largest tax grab in the history of Manitoba.

I just want to say that I could suggest that the Premier of Manitoba didn't handle himself very well last evening, when he stormed out of this House.

A MEMBER: He rushed out.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: He rushed out and he stormed out, Madam Speaker. Why didn't he stand up and act like a man, Madam Speaker?

A MEMBER: Where was he going?

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Where was he going - or act like a decent person, Madam Speaker. We know that he was embarrassed by this Budget, and he was embarrassed that he was held back for a little while, to protest, but the people of Manitoba, the million people here in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, are the people who the Premier should have been concerned about last night. The aboriginal people of course, they are included in that million people. But all the people in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, he should have been thinking about their best interests.

A MEMBER: What about the conference? Why didn't you let him go?

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: He's at the conference, Madam Speaker, and I'm sure he will stand up for the people of Manitoba at this conference. I'm pleased to see that he did get there safely, Madam Speaker, and the one hour really made absolutely no difference when the most important issue in this upcoming year for the people of Manitoba is this tax grab that this NDP Government has perpetrated on the people of Manitoba.

The Minister of Industry and Trade stood up and said that what happened last night has never happened in this House before. Well I must say, Madam Speaker, that the type of Budget that this NDP Government presented has never happened in the history of this House before. He said that we had everything going for us, everything was fixed up, Madam Speaker. Well I want to tell you that the people of Manitoba don't believe that this government has fixed everything up by introducing this type of Budget. What you did was wrong. Madam Speaker, what the NDP Government did was wrong with this Budget; it was very wrong.

What we did last night was not wrong, Madam Speaker, in standing up and protesting on behalf of all of the people of Manitoba. Every person in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, who eats, sleeps and breathes is going to be affected by this very ill-conceived Budget.

The Government House Leader, Madam Speaker, has stood up today and said that, on many occasions for some reason or other, we didn't discuss this Budget, we weren't concerned about this Budget. Well in the last days over the Budget Debate, I must admit that the Conservative members did put their feelings regarding this Budget on the record during the Budget Debate, Madam Speaker. But I'll tell you what the members of the NDP did, Madam Speaker.

The NDP members spent most or the majority of their time not defending the Budget that this government has brought in, but criticizing the Federal Government, Madam Speaker, and criticizing every other province and the budget in every other province, criticizing the Winnipeg Sun, criticizing the Free Press, criticizing the Opposition, but not defending their Budget.

Madam Speaker, I've never seen a more grumpy crew than I saw sitting in this House last night when we came in to vote on the Budget, probably for a couple of reasons, probably because they missed their dinner hour and some of them had stomachs that were grumbling that put them in a very bad disposition. But what we did by walking out of this House, we stood up for the people of Manitoba, Madam Speaker. We stood up for the people of Manitoba when we walked out of this House and protested, on behalf of our constituents, Madam Speaker, this terrible tax grab that's been perpetrated on the citizens of Manitoba as a result of this Budget.

Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, I have a letter here from a constituent of mine that I received today, and I just want to put it on the record too. This will be some indication of what some of the people out there in the public are feeling about this Budget. It says, "To B. Mitchelson, MLA. I trust that you and your party will continue to be vocal with regard to the unfair taxation

programs that our socialist government has thrust upon us. I realize that we have . . . "

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of order?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe, in the Rules of the House, if the member reads from a letter, she's required to table that letter.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: There's no problem with tabling this letter, Madam Speaker. I feel that this taxpayer in Manitoba has a just concern, and there's no problem at all tabling that. I'll be pleased to do so, after I've finished putting it into the record.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, not after, right now you table it.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: No, well I'll - "I realize that we have a deficit and taxes must be raised, but 'Good God,' this personally puts me back about two years, as my wages have been frozen by my employer. I am a middle-income person and it hurts me bad. The least the NDP could have done to show good faith is to not increase their spending. As a businessman, I would not locate in this province. Is there any hope, or is this Budget cut and dry"?

Well, Madam Speaker, I must say that this Budget is cut and dry, and there is no hope. There's no hope for the people of Manitoba. There's no hope whatsoever, Madam Speaker. The only hope might be, Madam Speaker, if things turn around in the next election campaign and the people of Manitoba see and realize that the Conservative Government will look after their best interests.

Madam Speaker, those are my comments on behalf of the people of Manitoba. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, in normal circumstances, I wouldn't have . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood on a point of order?

MR. J. ERNST: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I'd like to know, with respect to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Health, are they interchangeable parts?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I've lost a little weight. I don't want to change with you, Jim.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member should know that he should not raise facetious points of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, in ordinary time I would have, I think at the request of the Minister of Finance, let him close the debate, but I heard that he wasn't too charitable yesterday when he referred

to the Minister of Health. If this is a way to prove my displeasure, I will use it.

What I would like to do, Madam Speaker, very, very seriously - I want to congratulate the Member for Niakwa. I say this very, very sincerely because, if there's an honest member in this House, that is the member when he made the statement that you can't have it both ways. He stood up and when he was challenged and when people laughed at him, he said: Yes, I mean it. When you sit here - and I didn't want to take part in this debate at all, but how can you when you hear some of the things that are said.

Madam Speaker, we are told that we are spending too much money. We are told that the Budget - there's a deficit and so on. Then, in the same breath, by the same people, most of them - some are a little more embarrassed than others - they are saying, but you're closing beds. You're doing this; you're doing that.

Anyone in Canada, anywhere in Canada, every single province has the same concern. We have the best plan in the world. We're not panicking; we're not going bankrupt. But this is the time, if we're going to be responsible people, we don't wait for that. I'm laughed at, and the last member who talked thinks it's a joke when I'm saying we have the best plan in the world. When the richest country in the world, south of us, with their 37 million people who are not insured at all, then where there's another 20 million people who with the least bit, if they had a prolonged . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for River East on a point of order.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

I don't recall anywhere in my last few minutes of speaking that I laughed at all. I don't recall making any reference about our health plan in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.

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

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, that's hardly a point of order. I'll recognize that she has a beautiful smile. I'd also recognize that in the past she - well, she's always been nice to me. But the point is that she has challenged me in the past when I say that we have the best plan in the world.

As I was stating, I'm talking about a universal plan because that's what counts, all our people. I don't believe that there has to be a special elite class that get it all, like in the United States, and that's why I'm saying that.

Now the situation is that, in the United States, they are spending more money than we are. They are spending more of their percentage of the gross national revenue. Ours is about 8.8 percent and theirs is over 10 percent, and this is what they have. They have to run to different hospitals to get chemotherapy treatment, and these are some of the things that they have. It's pitiful and, if you see somebody in the hall here, it's the end of the world. We're all going to hell. I don't think that's fair.

We are either going to reduce the deficit and, if we're going to reduce the deficit, something will have to give. We will not be able to keep on giving the service that we have. People can stand on their own two feet, and say something and stay by it.

This government has said, we're going to tax you. It's going to hurt, but we will keep the health plan. I will get in excess of \$200 million more than I had last year. I still have to be very careful. We must bring some changes. That'll take time. Yes, we have a Federal Government that was in partnership who made the statement that they would be partners, who would reinstate the 50 percent and more in certain cases and are not doing it.

Having said that, even if they were because I'm not just fedbashing - I want everybody to notice that doesn't help. Even if they were giving us that, we would still have to do what we're doing now, - not only to save money but to improve the care. What makes you think that all the beds that are there now should be filled? We've had in the past people saying, buy this. The hospitals, they'd see us and say, give us this, give us that, we will save beds. And we've said yes.

We have bought machines that would keep people out of beds, and the people didn't go in the beds, but we fill these beds. That became added on, and we're adding and adding and adding. A while back, there was no such a thing as a CAT scan; now they want CAT scan. They're ordered, they're not all in place, we want something else. But do we say, cancel the CAT scan? No. It's more and more and more.

I will show you, during my Estimates, what we've had over the years. I will show you other hospitals. Peter Swerhone, who was here, has got a contract for 10 years, I think, to manage a hospital that's not built and probably will not be built. That is done everywhere. So if you're going to - this is something that should be - play your games. I met people in the hall who say, Larry, you're all right, but you don't expect me not to make points. Okay, make your points. But you'll have to remember that we must make the changes, and it's going to cost more money for the time being.

If you want - and I will keep every Hansard and I will give them to my kids, because I might be gone before this is all finished, but they'll go back and say what did you do? What did you do to try to help the things that had to be done?

You will not be able to point at the other guy and say, close this, but I need a personal care home in my area. That doesn't wash anymore. You can use that a lot and, politically, it's good. You can say, well there are so many people with all the money that we have in the Premier's Office, or you'll look at another area that you feel is worthwhile but, after, what happens? So you save certain things. Every single province is in the process of doing the same thing. It's not going to be easy. Do you know why? Because it's such a popular program that the people of Manitoba love it, and they say, why fix it if it ain't broke? But it has to be fixed for many reasons, to improve the situation, to have the people live better, to change the motivation, to get the people to take care of themselves more, to try different things. On some of them, we'll fall flat on our faces, but we're going to try. So that I think is an important thing.

There's another thing. I've been here a little longer than most of the people here, and I've never seen -

and I'm talking in general - a situation like we have now. We are wasting more time and this government, it was one of the main reasons - of course, you're pointing out our mistakes. That's fair enough. I'm going to point out some of yours. You forget that you haven't got a divine right to always govern like you did in the past, and those hated socialists - and there wouldn't be any socialists if the people had been fair before that. There wouldn't be any need for that, if the people would be fair.

In certain areas, there is no socialism or no communism and so on, because the people have been fair. But at times, people have to get together and fight for what they want. We're not all penniless around here. I will suffer as much as anybody, and I'm not rich. I'll suffer as much as the majority of you with this increase in taxes. I don't give a damn. If I've got it, I'm ready to share with somebody else.

The situation is this. There were rules in this House. You had 10 days to tell the people of Manitoba how awful this Budget is - fair play. You didn't need that extra hour yesterday. It was ill-conceived and it was childish, and you know it. It was completely childish, and you know it. You don't need those kinds of things. You have the rules. I never saw that in the Roblin years. I never saw that in Campbell or any other people, but just these last few years. The thing is that you have - the rules are there. We have ample time, ample time and ample opportunity to make our points.

Now there was another thing that was said not long ago about casinos. I know that we're talking about everything at the same time, but what about this casino business? The casino so far - sure there's a pilot project. There hasn't been one day more for a casino than when you were in power, not one day more except this tryout that they've had lately. Somebody has the gall to stand up and say, we're immoral. Where in the hell was he when they were in power? So he must be immoral.

Let me tell you that, when we made changes in the Lotteries, what we said is this. We will protect the public, we will maximize the profit. We didn't say, we will necessarily have more games. We said we will maximize the profits, we did that. Money that was going to the middlemen or backmen and so on, that's no longer there, and we succeeded. So, I don't want - who knows? Maybe, I don't like any more casinos. Maybe, I don't like casinos at all. I don't have to be told by somebody that I'm immoral, somebody that didn't say a word in the four years that he was in power.

So, Madam Speaker, it's understood that we're going to play politics. But damn it, let's try to be fair once in a while. And if we say, "I congratulate you," and I meant it and I mean it again very seriously, but you can't say that about some of these people. You know you can't say that about some of these people because they are the first ones that want more and more for them, but then are saying that you are spending too much money. What will it be? Do we want more beds; do we want more money spent? Well, then we need more money. We need a lot more money.

This government took a chance. Nobody likes to increase taxes. And some people will turn against them. That's what it's all about. But they made a decision, and I've never seen them hide behind anything else. They said we are making the decision that health care is important, and if we have to raise taxes and if it

doesn't help us with the deficit and so on, we will do it because we think it's important. We're ready to stand or fall on that, and that's what I'm talking about, about a little bit of fairness and a little bit of honesty. The Premier showed you the other day, and he put a price tag to the things that you are asking.

All right, Abe said, "We can have it both ways; it's our job to criticize." But why aren't you all as honest as he is? Why aren't you? You can't say on one hand

A MEMBER: That applies to both sides of the House

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right, absolutely, and that's why this government is saying we're going to spend more money. We will raise taxes, but we will try to keep the health care - exactly, exactly - but it doesn't make right what you say.- (Interjection)- Yes, yes, I will because you're one of them too that's squawking. You want more service, you want more hospitals in Vita, you want all those things.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Would the honourable member please address his remarks through the Chair, and the Honourable Minister of Health has the floor.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend is telling me to address my remarks through the Chair, and that would be very pleasant, we can have a nice chat, but he also asked me to conclude, so I will.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance to close debate.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'd like to thank all members for their support of Bill No. 9. It's interesting that the concern of members opposite is with regard to the Budget which we passed yesterday, and this bill, Interim Supply, does give the opportunity to talk in a general way about budgetary matters, but that's not what we have been doing for the last hour and a half, two hours.

We've been talking about a procedural matter of yesterday where they're trying to defend their misconceived actions of yesterday, not dealing with what they call the most important Budget in the province, or, as they've described, a Budget that takes the biggest tax grab in the Province of Manitoba.

They're wrong. They're wrong on that point talking about this, the biggest tax grab in the Province of Manitoba. If they would do a little research, they would find that the biggest increase in taxation revenue in this province was during the time of a Conservative Government. During the time of a Conservative Government in 1981, that's when the largest increase in revenue was taken from Manitobans by a Conservative Government; not by an NDP Government, not by a Liberal Government, but by a Conservative Government. That was the largest percentage increase of revenue in any . . .

A MEMBER: . . . are playing with numbers again.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: You don't like to play with numbers?

A MEMBER: They don't like the numbers.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: They don't like the numbers, Madam Speaker, but that's the reality. The largest percentage increase in revenue taken from Manitobans was during the term of a Conservative Government, not by an NDP Government or not by the Liberal Governments of long ago.

I would like to address one other point that was raised in the debate in terms of this procedural issue that we've been spending our last couple of hours on, and that is the position of the government with respect to this Budget that we didn't want to have this Budget prior to an NDP federal convention.

Members on this side would have been proud, if we had the opportunity to be in the position we are in today of having this Budget presented and passed, to be able to go and talk about it with our colleagues nationally. In fact, I recently received, since this Budget has been brought down, invitations to speak on this Budget elsewhere in Canada because other people are looking at what we're doing in Manitoba, the success that we've got in terms of our economy, one of the best in the country. They want to look at how we manage the affairs in our province, not like the fiscally irresponsible government of Saskatchewan. And that's not a term that I've generated, Madam Speaker. That's a term that a former Conservative member uses, calling the Conservative Government of Saskatchewan "fiscally irresponsible."

But I am pleased that we have had this opportunity to debate in Second Reading of this bill, and I would hope that it now could receive speedy passage and we can get into committee to discuss it further.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Housing, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bill No. 9 for Third Reading.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 9, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1987, with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee of the Whole please come to order to consider Bill No. 9, the Interim Supply Bill.

Has the Minister of Finance an introductory statement to make?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Bill No. 9, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1987, is required to provide a interim spending commitment

and borrowing authority for the '87-88 fiscal year commencing April 1, pending approval of The Appropriation Act, 1987.

Bill No. 9 is basically the same as the 1986 Interim Appropriation Act, following the same format and containing similar clauses.

The amount of the interim spending authority requested in section 2 of Bill 9 is \$750,307,040, or 20 percent of the sum to be voted as set forth in the Main Estimates. The amount is expected to last until mid-June.

Section 3(1) - Authority for commitments for future years has been decreased from \$200 million for '86-87 to \$175 million for '87-88. This is representative of the future commitment authority required in '87-88 to provide for the financial obligations under the MPI lease arrangements. The total '87-88 commitment authority to be included in the Main Supply Bill is estimated at 350 million as opposed to 400 million provided for in '86-87. Expenditures for these commitments cannot be made in the '87-88 fiscal year unless additional spending authority is provided.

Section 3(2) - this section provides that the estimated amount of expenditures which have been committed under subsection (1) shall be included in the Estimates of the fiscal year in which the actual expenditures are to be made.

Section 4 - this section permits expenditures to be made to the full amount of each individual item to be voted in the Main Estimates, even though total expenditures are limited by Bill 9 to only 20 percent of the total.

Section 5 - this section stipulates that once the main Appropriation Act is passed, any funds expended or committed under the authority of the Interim Act will be deemed to have been made under the authority of the main act. This section providing the government with the authority to borrow a portion of it's '87-88 cash requirements is, however, not affected by this clause; that's section 12. The borrowing authority granted under this bill will be in addition to borrowing authority to be included in The Appropriation Act, 1987.

Section 6(1) - this section allows for the transfer to delivery departments of all money to be authorized for expenditure under the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote.

Section 6(2): This section requires that any transfers of money made under subsection 1 will be adjusted if necessary in accordance with transfer provisions included in the Main or any Supplementary Appropriation Act.

Section 7: This section provides that departments in order to render services or provide materials, supplies or property to other departments that a cost-recoverable may make required expenditures in anticipation of recovering the costs from other departments.

Section 8: This section is required to permit program expenditures to be made by implementing departments from subappropriations to be established in those departments.

Section 9: Is required to prevent expenditures of approved Jobs Fund programs made by implementing departments from subappropriations to be established in those departments. The amounts expended will be recovered from funds authorized for expenditure under the Manitoba Jobs Fund service heading.

Section 10(1): Provides that money authorized under this act for expenditures in respect of an agreement with the Government of Canada may be expended in anticipation of the agreement being entered into.

Section 10(2): - honourable members are all interested in this one - Provides authority to expend money on projects for which the Government of Canada will not cost-share, will only partially cost-share project costs.

Section 11 - Application of money - is a standard section which requires no further explanation.

Section 12 - is included in this bill to enable the Government of Manitoba to borrow \$300 million for its own cash requirements in the early part of the '87-88 fiscal year.- (Interjection)- I'm sorry, you missed a part?

This represents only a portion of the cash requirements of the Government for '87-88. The balance will be included in The Appropriation Act, 1987. A borrowing authority clause has again been included to enable the Minister of Finance to borrow a portion of the estimated cash requirements during the early part of the fiscal year.

Unlike the expenditure authority provided by the Interim Supply Bill this borrowing authority is not replaced from the Main Appropriation Act as passed.

For '87-88, total borrowing authority to be included in The Appropriation Acts will be \$700 million; \$300 million as included in the Interim Supply Bill, and a further \$400 million will be included in the Main Supply.

Mr. Chairman, with these few comments, I commend the bill to members of this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 5:00 p.m., it is time for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Chairman reported upon the committee's deliberations to Madam Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Res. No. 1 - International Year of Shelter for the Homeless

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 5:00 p.m., Private Members' Resolutions.

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the first resolution.

WHEREAS 1987 has been declared the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless by the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

WHEREAS the lack of shelter, at home and abroad, is often created by social and economic forces beyond the control of the people that it most victimizes; and

WHEREAS the increasing severity of such forces in recent years has dramatically increased the number of people left homeless; and

WHEREAS the lack of shelter for these people forces them to live in the streets, where they become targets for abuse and crime, and where they are trapped in a cycle of extreme poverty from which few are ever able to escape; and

WHEREAS individuals, organizations and governments are trying to address this situation by finding or creating shelter for these people; and

WHEREAS housing needs cannot be met solely by the housing market system unless complemented by a richer income support system or by extending public investment in housing or some combination of both.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly officially recognize and declare the year 1987 as the Manitoba Year of the Shelter for the Homeless in recognition of this basic human need; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Legislature commend the initiative of individuals and local organizations in their attempts to resolve this pressing social problem and in the hope that further public awareness will assist them in their efforts.

Madam Speaker, my resolution is seconded by the Member for Thompson.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is rather a common experience of some of us who have done some long distance driving to experience that after driving for so many hundred miles toward our destination we come to a city and it's already night and late, and then we're looking for a place to stay and every motel we check there is no vacancy.

It seems unbearable to some of us to have to spend the night without a place to sleep or a place to rest just for one night. Can you imagine how difficult it is for an individual person to spend the rest of his life without any place of abode, without any place of shelter, not for one night, not for a week, not for a month, not for a year, but for the rest of his lifetime? That is the deplorable condition, Madam Speaker, of a person who is homeless.

Homelessness is a state of living in which there is no place for the physical body to sleep, to rest, to renew and reinvigorate itself. Just as the physical body needs a place, just as the human spirit needs a physical body in which to repose, so does the physical body need a place of dwelling, a place of rest, a place to sleep in order that life can be meaningful.

It is one of a basic human need, this need for shelter, this need for a home. Next to our need for nutrition we need a place of dwelling, a place of abode. Yet, it is a sad fact of our life that there are people who have no place to go, no place to sleep, no place to rest. Home is a place where one always returns to. No matter how often he leaves the place, he always comes back

to it, he always has the intention of returning to that place. It is known as *de animus revertendi* (phonetic), the intention to return.

Of all places that we always want to come back to it is always the home that we want to come back to. It is the only place on earth where we are always welcome. It is the only place on earth that we feel secure, because it is the first place in our life as human beings, the first place that we learn how to give and to receive human love.

The place of home is also a place for human compassion, a place for sharing either of joy or of suffering. It is in the home that we share with others our faith in life. It is in the home that we first understand the meaning of respect for others. It is in the home that we learn how to obey the rules. From our youth, when we were young children, we learn how to obey the rules, and it is the basis later of our orientation as adult members of our society how to live under the rule of law and order. It is therefore important, Madam Speaker, that we satisfy and meet this basic human need of having a place we call home for every individual human being on earth.

The home is the place that we form the basis, the fundamental nucleus and building block of our social structure. It is the basis indeed of society, because it is in the home that we nurture the attitudes, the values, the beliefs of people who later will become citizens of the nation. And when the home is solidly founded and well-protected, then we build a citizenry that is as strong as they are reared in the home where they were brought up.

Yet it is a sad fact in our society that there are so many people who are without a home, who are homeless. The United Nations has estimated that throughout the entire world, in this globe where we all live together, there are at least 100,000 people who are homeless - 100 million who are homeless, pardon me.

In the United States alone, the greatest and richest nation on earth, the Institute of National Economic Research had made an estimate that there were at least 300,000 minimum to a maximum of 3 million people who are homeless.

In Canada, the Committee on Social Development made an estimate that there is at least a minimum of 20,000, up to a maximum of 40,000 people who are homeless in Canada. In the City of Toronto alone, they say there are at least 14,000 people who are without a home and, in Montreal, there were at least 10,000 people, mostly those involved in the drug and in the prostitution business, in Montreal. They were without a home.

So we could safely estimate that, throughout Canada, there would be at least 50,000 people who are homeless. Considering the climate in this country, can you imagine yourself being in such a situation to have no place to which to go home to when the weather is so harsh and adverse? Where would you go to have some heat? Out in the street, for people in this situation, in the worst condition of times. Their choice is whether to find a place to eat or a place to have a little heat. That is the only choice they can have.

Who are the homeless? Why are they homeless? How are we to explain this condition and situation in our society. The homeless mostly constitute those persons

who are dislocated in their social relationship with others. For example, in the United States, it has been estimated that at least one-half of all the males who are homeless are veterans of the Vietnam war. They were dislocated people. They could not, when they returned to society, find a place where they could fit. So they drift along and they become part of this multitude called the homeless.

Another group of people or homeless are those patients in the mental institutions who have been de-institutionalized in the hope that the society, the community will accept them back or that their immediate family will accept them. But the family is not ready, the community is not ready, resources are not available. These patients from institutions who are mentally ill have no choice but to be out there in the street to join the horde of the homeless.

There are people who are able-bodied, yet they are seeking employment and could not find employment for one reason or another. Their social insurance benefits may have expired; they have no place; they cannot pay the rent; they're kicked out by their landlord; they join the homeless. There are young people who run away from home, probably running away from abuse from their step-parents or foster parents. They momentarily, for a brief period, may stay with homes of their friends, but friendship will grow thin and they will be forced to leave the home of their friends and they will be forced to live out in the street.

There are single parents, mostly women, who hardly have any resources. The little they get, the little resources they have, they could hardly manage, and pretty soon they cannot pay the rent. They will soon be thrown out by their landlord and they will join the homeless.

Alcoholics, drug addicts, even common criminals, sometimes they prefer this kind of lifestyle because they don't want the law to find out where they live, and so they become homeless by choice perhaps, or by the force of circumstances. Why do all these people become homeless? The explanations, Madam Speaker, are many, but we can identify some of the causes of homelessness.

One is sheer dislocation in the social structure of society, the inability to cope with the harshness of life. Another is the failure of our family system. Unfortunately, the family system is breaking down slowly. We no longer take care of some of the members of our family who are so unfortunate in life. Moreover, there is distress of poverty, of chronic unemployment. There is the force and stress of jobs, and people simply gave up about the difficulty of the burden of responsibilities in life, and so they join the multitude of the homeless people.

In brief, it is the breakdown of the social system, the alienation of the individual from society that drives them and they become homeless. It is therefore partly the condition, the environment, of which the individual had no control. It is sometimes the insensitivity of some of us who are members of society, the so-called self-respecting decent people, who caused this homelessness.

The real issue, Madam Speaker, is there an obligation, is there an issue, is there an obligation on the part of society to take care and attend to these homeless, to answer their needs? Before they became homeless, these people were working also toward the building up

of our industry, of our economy. They had contributed their energy, their life. Soon, misfortune struck and they found themselves unable to cope and they became homeless. They who had helped build up the same society that we now enjoy, all the conveniences and comforts that we now enjoy, they were also part of it when they were able to work in the past.

It is not only a moral but a legal obligation of society, Madam Speaker, to help these people regain their places in the world, that they may be able to re-acquire their decency as human beings and as part of our humanity. It is therefore our duty and obligation in this year of the homeless in 1987 that we assume this responsibility to help these unfortunate people, who are mostly victims and casualties of our industrialized society, that they may be able to regain their respective places and regain their sense of decency and self-respect as part of humankind.

In this world where the race is not necessarily to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, nor bread to the wise, nor riches to the intelligent, nor favour to the man of skill, time and chance happen to us all, misfortune they have suffered, when suddenly misfortune falls upon them, it is our duty in this Year of the Shelter for the Homeless to help them regain their respected places as part of humankind with decency and with integrity.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Madam Speaker, 1987 has been declared as the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The lack of shelter throughout the world is generally created by social and economic forces beyond the control of the victims. Historically, the homeless have been viewed as alcoholics, drug addicts, transients; however, service providers - social agencies, that is - now report seeing homeless that do not fit these descriptions. More mentally ill are being seen among the homeless as well as more minorities and more women and children.

The major factors affecting homelessness and contributing to the homeless population, firstly, is unemployment; secondly, the deinstitutionalizing of mentally-ill persons and the lack of available community-based services for them; thirdly, alcohol and drug abuse; fourthly, decline in low-income housing; fifthly, cuts in public assistance programs.

Homelessness has been receiving greater attention in communities across the world. In North America, attention has been called to the number of people that wander the streets and sleep on heating grates and in other places.

In Winnipeg, not too long ago, attention was drawn to the individual that was making his home in a bus shelter and actually resented other people coming into his bus shelter. During the blizzard of November of 1986, the deaths of two street people from exposure was recorded.

What is homelessness? I think it can be described as any person who lacks adequate shelter, resources

and community ties, or anyone who lacks the resources and community ties to provide for their own adequate shelter. Many of these homeless people are runaway children, immigrants, displaced minorities, unemployed migrants, as well as the other people that I've already mentioned.

According to authorities and agencies, it is next to impossible to get an accurate account of the number of homeless people in the world and most agencies would only produce a rough estimate rather than an accurate account. Population is ever shifting, and according to surveys, even if all the homeless people could be located, most of them would not admit to being homeless.

Recently, Catherine Bainbridge, a reporter for the Winnipeg Free Press, did a series of articles entitled, "No Place To Go." According to her article, head counts and surveys by different shelters suggest that anywhere between 1,000 and 2,000 people are homeless in Winnipeg.

According to John Rogers, the executive director of the Main Street Project, the clientele is changing drastically. More young people are on the streets. According to the Canadian Council of Social Development, today's homeless include able-bodied men, uneducated, unskilled young men, as well as battered and abused women. In Winnipeg, fortunately, many of these are, as the expression goes, "warehoused for the night."

Ms. Bainbridge goes on in her article and points out that much of the problem in the area of Main Street is Native related. Inspector Heintz of the Winnipeg Police Department says that it is impossible to estimate the number of homeless children there are in Winnipeg. He reports that in 1986, there were 5,817 runaways; that's runaways that were reported, and Lord knows how many there are that were never reported, whose parents didn't care enough to report the fact that their child was missing. So again, the true numbers will possibly never be known.

According to Ms. Bainbridge's article, in Winnipeg two homeless people die each month. Between July of 1984 and July of 1986, there were 56 regular users of the Main Street project that died. A study of death among the destitute was carried out using police reports and newspaper obituaries. In 30 of the 56 deaths, only four people died of natural causes. The study contradicts many stereotypes about the homeless. Alcohol does play a less prominent role in their deaths than previously assumed.

An article in Maclean's Magazine estimates that on any given night there will be approximately 8,000 Canadians sleeping in hostels or on the streets. In the United States, the figure, as the previous speaker mentioned, will run anywhere from 250,000 to 350,000 per night. The Canadian Council of Social Development estimates that there are between 20,000 and 40,000 street people in Canada and these figures are very conservative.

While homelessness in some centres is approaching crisis proportions, social safety nets established by Canadian agencies and institutions have kept the problem from becoming worse than it is. Canada's social welfare system helps to sustain the indigent with money and Medicare. Subsidized housing is available to thousands of families and to old and disabled people

who in other countries might be homeless and destitute. For those without homes, there is a nation-wide network of municipal and privately funded hostels providing at least a warm place to sleep.

According to a program manager for a Winnipeg social services department, the only people out on the street in Winnipeg are those that choose to be or are so disoriented that they do not know where to go. It's a sad commentary on today's society that some of these destitute people live and die without much of a contribution to society, and when they die, it's almost as if they had never lived.

"In the search for long-term solutions . . ." - this is from the Maclean's Magazine - "In the search for long-term solutions of homelessness, experts in the field insist that a two-pronged approach is needed. We have to find some kind of a solution to this problem. More low-cost housing is clearly required in some cities," social authorities say, "and programs must also be put in place to help many of the homeless overcome the deadening effect of poverty.

"Increasingly, governments are responding to those needs with a range of programs designed to meet local needs. Ontario last month announced plans to provide 942 units of affordable housing for single and handicapped people and battered spouses, part of a sweeping long-term program to help those most difficult to house. Nova Scotia is building an 80-unit public housing project in Dartmouth with 10 units set aside for single mothers. "In Montreal, a city task force on the homeless, due to reports in April, is discussing a series of projects, including a crash program to develop low-cost housing accommodations.

"Ultimately, the nation's response to the homeless will measure the value that Canadians place on the lives of fellow citizens. No matter what their circumstances may be so far, Canada's response has by and large been generous. Let's give them something decent and see what they can do with it. Until we do that, we can't blame them for what they are."

I would agree that this Legislative Assembly officially recognized the United Nations' concern and further commend the initiative of individuals and organizations in their attempt to resolve the pressing social problem in the hope that further public awareness will assist them in their efforts. No single strategy has yet emerged to curb the ongoing problems, but the awareness of the problem is growing, and through the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly a greater knowledge of the situation can only emerge.

On this side of the House, we are prepared to pass this resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'm pleased to join in the debate on this resolution and I want to thank my colleague, the Member for Burrows, for putting forward a resolution on a matter that is of concern to all of us because it concerns one of the basic rights for our people.

In Canada, we believe that we have some of the best rights and freedoms in the country. One of the things that we pride ourselves on is that the people of our country are entitled to what we call the basics of life.

I think we would all agree -(Interjection)- keep it down a just a little, I can't hear myself talk over your talk - that having food and lodging, having food on the table, and a roof over your heads is something that is not just a privilege in Canada, but it is a basic right.

It is a responsibility of all of us to try and deal with a growing problem, one that societies throughout the world are facing, but one that I believe fortunately in Manitoba, although it's hard to predetermine the exact size of the problem, we do know and believe that this is a manageable problem in Manitoba. So I think that with the concerted effort of all of the agencies that were mentioned and all of the organizations and with the support of the government, which we intend to give, I believe that we're going to be able to, first of all, identify the problem which is I think our first job; and secondly, begin to identify a number of approaches to deal with it. Because as the member opposite indicated, there isn't any simple solution; there isn't any single solution; and there isn't any individual, group, agency or level of government that can deal with this problem adequately.

We're also fortunate that in Manitoba we have been able to continue to provide some of the most stable, some of the most decent and affordable housing in the country, and that through our past efforts and programs we have some of the highest level of social housing, low cost housing of anywhere in the country where we have provided about 17,000 units and have also provided a tremendous boost in housing for our senior citizens, so that many of the groups that generally are having problems with housing, senior citizens for instance, in Manitoba, we can take pride in saying that this is not a serious problem in Manitoba.

It is interesting that the kinds of people who are homeless are changing and that there are very few of them who we would now consider to be in the senior citizen category. The reason for that is that the job that has been done in providing a large number of senior citizens' accommodations throughout the province which is fortunately giving our seniors decent and affordable housing.

However, we know that while our seniors are adequately housed to a large degree, that we have a growing number of disaffected, defranchised people for a wide variety of reasons who do not have a place to live. I suppose the biggest concern for us is our young people, the growing number of youngsters where you read articles where they've got a couple boys who are 12 and 13 years old who are talking about being on the streets and living on the streets and how they manage for themselves, to find places to sleep at night and to find food to put in their mouths which is done through stealing. At some point they are so exhausted and so tired when they get up every morning the first thing that occurs to them is that they're hungry and they have no food and no place to go for food, so they have to steal. They soon become so exhausted that they are glad to be caught because they are put in the Youth Detention Centre and they are given a roof over their heads and food in their bellies for a short period of time.

We know that we have a shocking increase in the number of able-bodied people, young men who want to work, who for many reasons are now finding themselves unemployed. We know that once people

have been unemployed for a period of two or three years, you establish a pattern that is very hard for them to break out of, so it's one of the reasons why we're concentrating a lot on youth employment in our province because we know what once they fall into that trap that it's very difficult and we must keep them out of that as much as we can.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

We have a growing number of young women who are becoming pregnant and while they may have a place to go during their pregnancy - because Villa Rosa offers housing for about 100 young girls at a time - the concern is that when they leave they often do not have a place to go. They're often cut off from their education, cut off from their family and friends, have no place to go and unfortunately do what may seem to them in the short term to be the easiest thing to do and that is earn their living on the streets, Madam Speaker. That's something that we want to help our young girls from falling into a life like that. What they need is homes; they need love and care; and they need help to continue with education.

We also have places like Rossbrook House, Madam Speaker, who have done a herculean job in providing a place for young people to drop in, in providing education programs for young people where the retention rate and the graduation from the junior high and the senior high programs are far better than they are in our traditional education system. They should be saluted for that.

They have 50 to 60 children sleeping on the floor at night because they have no place else to go. They're sleeping there without beds; they're sleeping there without blankets because they don't have those provisions, but they at least have a safe haven because that's what Rossbrook House is for many youngsters and the only safe haven that they have. So we must see what we can do about providing accommodation and housing and help and support to families and to abused children so that they don't end up in those situations.

I think one of the first things we have to do is try and identify the size of the problem and it's quite true that the predictions range from about 800 to about 2,000 in Manitoba. One of the things we have done is that our government has taken the homeless as one of the priority programs in the Department of Housing for the coming year, and I might say probably for a number of years beyond that, Madam Speaker, because we know we're not going to be able to solve the problem with just one year of attention and one year of programs.

But we have done a number of things already, Madam Speaker, and intend to work very closely with the agencies and try to not only provide help and support to them, which they're entitled to, but actually provide leadership and develop initiatives on behalf of my department and our government, so we are carrying our share of the responsibility to deal with this serious problem.

I have recently hired a consultant who is one of the top consultants in Canada dealing with issues of the homeless. He has recently completed a report in Ontario called "Roomers, Boarders and Lodges" that identifies the problem there and because, in the course of

preparing that consulting report, he travelled to every province in the country. He probably has more of an understanding about the complexity and what some of the solutions might be than anybody else. We have hired him recently and I expect to have his initial report into my office next week. He has spoken to representatives of 29 or 30 agencies and groups in the Province of Manitoba to find out what information and statistics they have, and to get information about what they thought the solutions might be. I intend to be looking at those recommendations very seriously and hoping to move, not in isolation, but in concert, in cooperation with the agencies themselves to deal with the issue.

Last year, we took our first step, Madam Speaker, in dealing with the issue of the homeless by agreeing to support the Salvation Army with \$4 million for their project, for their new Salvation Army Hostel. That will provide 200 beds, Madam Speaker. While it's true that they already did have a hostel there providing some of those beds, there is a difference, the quality of the housing is the first major difference. But secondly, there are two parts to it. One, where people just come in to sleep, and they're given a bed and a place to sleep, but the other part of the project has separate single private rooms, for those people who are more stable, and for whom they believe they can have an opportunity of working into the system a little better way. They move them into this transition housing in the Salvation Army.

We are also talking and working out, working on another project with the Main Street Organization which is one of the key delivery agents for street people to have a place to go. We are looking at the possibility of another 80 to 100 beds that we hope to consolidate with them, with our support, that we hope that we can provide an additional 80 to 100 units.

But it's clear that we cannot just build hostels. That is not the solution to the problem. You know, Mayor Koch in New York, is looking at their housing problem and they're looking at 15 hostels throughout the city at a cost of, I think, it's hundreds of millions of dollars, \$100 million. They're looking at spending money to try and deal with this problem. Well, if all we think we're going to do is build hostels, then we are going to be building more and more hostels all the time. We have to start dealing with the problems and deal with those.

We also have to look at what housing is already available. I want to give you an indication of the approach that our government is taking. The first approach, I think, is to try and identify the size of the problem. I've asked them to try and target and break down the groups so that we can separate the numbers of people who we always call sort of hard to house. There are the men and women who have been on the street and lived on the street for years and years. We want the numbers of young people, young men and women who are unemployed, we want the youngsters who have run away from home and don't have a home.

Those that are ex-psychiatric patients perhaps is another category, Madam Speaker. I think it's important that we identify how many of each of those we have, because the solution to the problem is going to be different for each of those groups. We're going to have to try and decide what to do with those young people who don't have a place to sleep at night - the children.

Then we're going to have to decide what we can do with psychiatric patients who have come out of institutions and who have not yet found a place to go, or young, single-parent mothers who have had a child, and who have been disowned, in some cases by their family, have left school and who also have no place to go, except, Madam Speaker, the street that welcomes them with open arms.

The profession of prostitution is always willing to take our young girls, at younger and younger ages. So we have them on the streets at 12, 13, 14 years old. Another shocking thing is the age of the young girls getting pregnant is reducing. It used to be 15, 16, 17. There are larger and increasing numbers now around 12, 13 and 14, so that we have children having children, Madam Speaker, and that is a concern for all of us.

So the first thing we want to do is identify the problem and try and get as much information as we can about which groups there are so that we can target our programs.

The second thing we want to do, Madam Speaker, is look at the housing that is available. Before you run out and build a lot of houses or a lot of accommodation, you first have to look to see what you've got and then change rules and regulations that are keeping some of these people away from having access to some of this accommodation.

For instance, in some cases they don't have access to some of our good programs because they're single, because we didn't use to have single people who didn't have housing, or because they don't have children. So that if you've got a young male who is unemployed and in a desperate need, he could actually be kept out of having access to a lot of our programs because he is single, because he's not married and because he doesn't have children, because so many of our programs are targeted towards families and couples and people with children.

But we have some places that we can look to. We know that in our senior citizens' homes right now, we have an increasing vacancy in our bachelor suites and there is a reason for that. The bachelor suites used to be the minimum requirement for building in senior citizens homes. Now one bedroom is the minimum requirement. So what is happening is that a lot of our senior citizens now want the one bedroom. They might have been satisfied with the bachelor suite before but now the one bedroom is the minimum and it's available. They're all on the list for one bedroom. What is happening is that we've got an increasing number of bachelor suites that are vacant.

Madam Speaker, I can tell you that there are a lot of people on the street for whom those bachelor suites would look like a castle. So we mustn't say and continue with the old regulations that says, "Well we built them for senior citizens; they don't want them anymore so we're going to leave them empty." We have to say that there are somewhere between 60 and 100 units that are presently empty that would be wonderful accommodation for some people who do not have accommodation, and we're going to look at changing the regulations that presently keep them out of having access to that accommodation.

The other thing that we're looking at, Madam Speaker, is regulations that affect people's ability to rent out . . . Oh, 15 minutes, oh leave just for two minutes,

one minute to wrap up, leave - one minute to wrap up. Okay.

Madam Speaker -(Interjection)- I'll have one of Steve's minutes. I just want to make one point.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to speak one minute? (Agreed)

HON. M. HEMPHILL: One minute. Madam Speaker, I only want to make one point and that is this Government - my department and this Government - recognizes that people are entitled to decent housing, and recognizes that whatever the number are, and whatever kind of people they are, they deserve our attention and they deserve not only the work of organizations out in the field but of our government. We have a strategy and a package of programs that we are going to announce in the coming months that will indicate that we are living up to our responsibilities to deal with this very serious issue.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'd like to place a few comments on the record as seconder of the motion. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the Member for Burrows for bringing this resolution to this House. I think it's an important area that we do have to reflect on and do have to discuss as legislators and, I think, as citizens of this province.

I'm quite pleased to see that the United Nations has declared this the International Year of the Homeless, because I think it is a significant international problem. When we're talking about those people who are homeless, it clearly is a problem that applies here in Canada. It applies in many developed nations and many underdeveloped nations.

I do commend the previous speakers for, I think, clearly indicating that it's not a problem that is confined to one particular group in society or particular type of individual. There are a number of types of people in society who find themselves in the situation of being homeless and being in a very desperate situation. It includes single men and women in many cases. It includes the poor elderly. It includes those who have lost their marginal housing. It includes ex-offenders, single parent households, runaway youths and I think what has been described as throw-away youths. Youths who have been kicked out or forced out of their particular homes. Some of the individual human stories that the homeless can tell, I think, are heartrending. If one looks at Canada, which prides itself in terms of its social programs, and how we pride ourselves, even in terms of housing, and some of the housing programs that are offered.

I look, for example, at some of the reports of some of the homeless. I think it indicates very poignantly how desperate the situation is. The Toronto Star, for example, reported on the Adnami Oate (phonetic) 48, who was sleeping in her van with her dog after being evicted in Toronto. She's herself a volunteer worker on behalf of hungry people - and found herself homeless. There was a story describing how Kim Pelletier, 25, and her employed husband and four children were living in one

room at a hostel after they found themselves homeless after their basement apartment flooded.

There's a report in the Ottawa Citizen about John and Shirley Bacon, 45 and 32, one employed and the other on a disability pension, who were living in a tent in the west end of Ottawa. Then there was a story of Brad Hopkins, reported in the Hamilton Spectator, who has custody of his two daughters but needs a home to regain custody of his two sons. He can't do so because he's homeless; and how 34-year-old John Traverse, who is blind, was evicted from public housing after being charged with assaulting his wife and found himself living in a Toronto bus shelter.

So we're not talking about statistics, Madam Speaker. We're talking about individual human tragedies. Let anyone suggest that these tragedies are not occurring here in Manitoba. I would say that, even we in Manitoba, even despite the fact that we do have some of the best housing programs and some of the best social support programs in the country, we do have many people who are homeless.

As I said, they're in no particular group or category but, in each case, I think each homeless individual is an individual human tragedy. Sometimes, it's through neglect, Madam Speaker, public neglect, sometimes through direct action. I notice, for example, in B.C. where, for Expo 86, the Provincial Government allowed hotel operators to evict some 750 poor tenants from their hotels. How many of them found themselves in substandard housing or found themselves without housing? So governments in some cases can, through neglect or through deliberate action, contribute to the problem.

I look at the situation in the North where, through decades of neglect, we now end up in a situation where many Native people find themselves in poor and substandard housing or without housing. I know, in my own constituency of the sad situation that developed when a project, the Knight Riders Project, similar to the Main Street Project, was closed, Madam Speaker, because of lack of federal funding, and how that project which took people physically off the streets and gave them shelter and directed them towards the counselling and treatment that they often needed because, in many cases, these were individuals who were suffering from alcohol abuse or substance abuse, how that service is no longer available in my community. I sometimes wonder if things might not be different if that service was available when, for example, I see people found frozen to death on the streets because of lack of shelter. There was a case, Madam Speaker, in my own area just recently of that. Perhaps the provision of the Knight Riders service may have made a difference - who knows? - but it's something that certainly bothers me as an individual, is the fact that perhaps that life could have been saved if the funding had been available.

So it's something that affects all of us. It's just a matter sometimes of opening our eyes. As I said, in my own community where many people do have adequate shelter, there are many who don't and some who have no shelter whatsoever. I think we really have to direct all our energies towards dealing with the problems that they raise.

But it's a problem that has international dimensions as well, Madam Speaker. In fact, if one looks at the situation in many other countries, it's horrendous, the

degree to which people find themselves homeless. It's very clear in the case of developing countries, when one looks at how many people who are marginal economically find themselves in shanty towns or living on the street, literally living on the street. But it's something that's also significant in the developed countries as well.

I look at the horrendous situation in the United States, our neighbour to the south, one of the richest countries in the world where, in the last number of years, there's been a sky-rocketing number of homeless; a country with so much potential, Madam Speaker, that has forced many people out on the street through deliberate cuts in services to deal with the needs of those people, whether it be in terms of mental services or in terms of shelter because both of those budgets in the United States have been cut back substantially in one of the richest countries, one of the superpowers, one of the most developed countries in this world. So it's an international problem.

I would suggest that there are things that we can do in Canada to assist. One is through development funding. I think we have to contribute far more of our resources to development funding. I saw last night, I think, a report on the CBC which indicated just how much of a difference can be made in terms of shelter in developing countries with proper assistance. There was a report on the activities of Bob Ogle, who'll be familiar to many members of this House as a former Member of Parliament, who has dedicated his life to the cause of developing countries and particularly in terms of providing shelter and who now, finding that his life is slipping away from him, still wishes to return to Brazil, the country where he made such a commitment toward providing shelter for the homeless. So we can make a difference in terms of providing development funding.

But there's another area as well, Madam Speaker, which is particularly important, and that is in our policy in dealing with refugees. Many of the homeless across the globe at the present time are refugees. They fled warfare in their countries and persecution. Many of them have found that they've become permanently without permanent homes. They live in camps where that kind of warfare and social unrest only continues to breed.

I'm concerned, as a Canadian, when I look at some of the directions that I see us taking in terms of refugees. I'm concerned about the mixed signals that we've received recently in terms of policy toward refugees. I want to say that, as a Canadian who is concerned about the homeless, I want to see our historic policy toward refugees, a policy which extends a helping hand to refugees continued and maintained and not weakened, Madam Speaker. I think we have an obligation, as a country that has so much, to do whatever we can for refugees, including providing them with the opportunity to live in Canada free from persecution, political persecution, and free from their individual tragedy of finding themselves homeless.

In concluding, Madam Speaker, I would stress that this kind of resolution is more, I think, than merely an opportunity to talk about a concern. It's an opportunity for each and every one of us to reflect on how significant that concern is. I think as individuals we have to take the message to our constituents. The fact that, yes, a

difference can be made, sometimes through government.

I mentioned some of the programs that we have in terms of low-income housing. The Minister for Housing mentioned some of the other programs, for example, the recent support for the Salvation Army, which is one of the most significant organizations in dealing with the homeless. So, yes, governments can make the difference, but individuals can also make the difference as well, Madam Speaker.

I look in the area of Northern Manitoba and the needs of northern and remote communities, and I am convinced that the solution lies with people in those communities having greater control over housing in their communities, controls in terms of its administration, controls in terms of setting standards, controls in terms of funding.

I look at so many other areas where individuals can make a difference: in terms of development funding, in terms individual contributions to the many worthy organizations which are working on housing development projects, projects for the homeless and those without shelter across the country, but also working with organizations that are dealing with those problems right here in our own province. That support, Madam Speaker, can be financial at times, but I think it can be also be, just as importantly, moral support and even perhaps, most important, it can be support through the direct actions of people working with individual service organizations in their communities, doing something for probably the most unfortunate people in our society - the homeless.

So let's reflect on that, Madam Speaker, and when, as I hope we will, we pass this resolution, let's take it as a commitment, not just as a Legislature, not just as an official body, let's take it as a commitment that we, as individual members of the Legislature, leaders in our own communities, that we take it as an individual commitment throughout this year - the International Year of the Homeless - and hopefully, in the future, as well, to do more for the homeless in Manitoba.

So, Madam Speaker, in concluding once again, I hope this resolution is supported unanimously and I hope that it will give us all an opportunity to do a lot more for the homeless in our society than we have done up to the present time.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak on this resolution. I would especially like to commend the Member for Burrows for having brought it forward.

The debate that I've heard so far is very interesting because I think there are three facets that have to be considered. No. 1, I think the Member for Assiniboia did a wonderful job in fact in describing the problem, what is the problem we face today? No. 2, is taking a look at what are the casualties, why do we have this problem? Why are there people out on the street? No. 3, I think, is the kind of thing that was brought up and touched upon to some extent by the Member for Thompson, but basically touched upon in much greater

detail by the Minister of Housing and that is what are the solutions?

I have some tendency, when I look at this resolution, to see the issue involved here and who is responsible for what's happening. I think the Member for Assiniboia did a reasonable service . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I'm interrupting proceedings according to the Rules. When this motion is again before the House, the honourable member will have 14 minutes remaining.

The hour being 6:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)