

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 26, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

* (1335)

PRAYERS

Responsibilities

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORT

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the Annual Report for '88-89 of The Discriminatory Business Practices Act.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the same Minister, surely before you need a communications policy you have to have a program of initiatives you wish to enunciate. Since there is not any and there has not been under both the previous administration and this one in terms of previous ministry and this one—you did not have a ministry.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. Ed Mandrake (Assiniboia) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 4, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the previous Minister had no strategy. Therefore, what exactly did this individual do earlier this year when he was given this untendered contract? Could we have some specificity, please?

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, I am sure Honourable Members would like to join me in congratulating Paul Edwards (St. James) and his wife, Anne, on the birth yesterday of their son, Evan Lawrence Murdoch, who weighed in at 8 pounds, 15 ounces, a brother for Elizabeth. Mother and son are doing fine, I am told.

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors): Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and the Liberals can stop fighting for a minute, I will try to respond to that answer.

Mr. Speaker, the individual has been working on material that has been put together by the Seniors Directorate, preparing it so that it is very easily understood and very workable information that can be used—she may not be interested in the welfare of the seniors and elderly abuse—so that it can be a piece of a Discussion Paper that works very well towards the objectives of reducing and eliminating the elderly abuse in this province.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Also, I would like to draw Honourable Members' attention to the public gallery where we have from the Bethel Christian Academy, fourteen Grades 7, 8 and 9 students under the direction of Mr. Peters and Ruth Funk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans).

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

Seniors Directorate Communications

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this \$10,000 untendered contract is larger than the entire increase in the budget for the Seniors Directorate for 1989-90. This is a Government who complained about the previous administration's use of hacks and flacks.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Douglas Scott and Company Untendered Contract

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Liberals are really doing our best to increase the population of Manitoba but are being let down by the other two Parties within this Chamber.

Can the First Minister tell this House what is the difference between their strategy and the previous Government's strategy with regard to communicators or is it only that they hire them outside untendered and the others hired them inside?

Who is he, where does he come from, and what did he do for his \$10,000.00? My question is to the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey). Can the Minister tell the House who Douglas Scott and Company Communication Services are, and why they were given a \$10,000 untendered contract by his department?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise from the Leader of the Opposition that we have not done anything for seniors. It has been identified that those who are most abused in the seniors' category are women 75 years of age and older. I believe there was something like 800,000 put into the abuse centres, shelters for women, Mr. Speaker. So I do not accept the premise that the Leader of the Opposition has put forward. The individual was hired to perform a job for the people of Manitoba and it was done and well done.

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors): Yes, Mr. Speaker, to carry out a very important activity on behalf of the seniors in Manitoba.

Douglas Scott and Company Responsibilities

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, but we are still somewhat confused. We want to know exactly, specifically what this individual did. Can the Minister tell us what he did for his \$10,000 and where he did it? I mean, did it come out of Ontario or did it come out of Manitoba?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors):

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals cannot have it both ways. On one hand they are criticizing for not getting on and doing a job. We get on and do the job; now they are criticizing the individual who has done some of the work. You cannot have it both ways.

They pushed us to get action, we got action. It is going to work towards the resolve and the assistance of elderly abuse or the elimination of elderly abuse. I will get the details for the Leader of the Opposition. It is unfortunate that she cannot look at the positive things in life and look towards assisting the seniors as we are doing.

Untendered Contract

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, but this contract was let on February 3. How long does it take a Minister and this particular Government to find out exactly what is done for the contracts that they give untendered?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors):

Again, Mr. Speaker, I point out to the Leader of the Opposition, who does not want to look at the positive side of life but on the negative side all the time, we clearly expressed publicly on Friday with all the seniors that we could get in this place and outside at the Seniors Day, the Discussion Paper on Elderly Abuse which was well done and will lead to some resolutions of it.

I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition would be supportive of that initiative because her critic has been pushing for some weeks now and we have delivered, and I for the life of me cannot understand why she cannot get on the positive side of helping the seniors in this province.

* (1340)

Elderly Abuse White Paper Author

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):

Maybe he can answer a very specific question. The paper was about a couple of pages long and most of it came out of the Schell Report. Can the Minister tell us, did Douglas Small Communications actually write this document, and if they did not then what exactly did they do?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors):

Mr. Speaker, I have to make a couple of corrections with the greatest of respect.

Mr. Speaker, it was far more than a couple of pages long. I do not know who Douglas Small is that she is referring to.

An Honourable Member: Scott.

Mr. Downey: Yes, he was involved in the development of the paper, of putting together the information that had been developed. Yes, he developed the paper and, yes, I introduced it to the public on Friday. It is action, action the people of Manitoba wanted this progressive Government to take and we are carrying on with it.

Gold Mine—Shoal Lake Tailing Sample Analysis

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

Today, the Winnipeg Water Protection Group confirmed that there are indeed discharges of arsenic and other chemicals into Shoal Lake as a result of the recent emptying of the retention ponds and some other activities associated with Consolidated Professor Gold Mine Company. Does the Minister have the results of the province's water test, and will he table them in the House today?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated it would be this week that those tests would be done. They will be done tomorrow or Wednesday, I believe. I will certainly be prepared to share that information.

Environmental Impact Study

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):

The results today tabled with the public by the Winnipeg Water Protection Group contradict the statements made last week in media reports by the Ontario Environment Department.

Will the Minister now ensure that besides the federal environmental impact study, can he confirm today whether the Ontario Government is following their own land development policies around Shoal Lake, something that was developed in 1983 with our administration, although there have been many problems through all Government administrations? There is absolutely no question about that, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Government confirm today whether the full environmental assessment process under The Environment Act is going to take place under the 1983 Ontario land development policy that again was referenced by the community group today?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):

Mr. Speaker, the issue of the land use in and around the body of water which Winnipeg draws its supplies from is obviously every bit as much of a concern as the activities on the island. As a matter of fact, my officials are in Ontario today, and one of the topics that will be brought forward is planning control to try and make sure that the future of this very good supply of water is carefully managed.

Water Protection Plan Legislation—Federal

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, Governments of all political stripes have been fighting this issue for years. Quite frankly, I do not believe we have the legislative teeth in provincial environment Acts and even in the federal environmental Acts necessary to really deal with the drinking water challenges in Canada.

I think we can use those Acts but, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Environment—today the NDP is tabling and debating at second reading at five o'clock in Ottawa a Private Member's Bill to protect and enhance the quality of drinking water in Canada. This Bill would do more than what the environment Bills do. It would supersede the environment Acts when it comes to the areas of drinking water, so that we can fight for our drinking water ahead of time rather than always dealing with these rear guard actions province to province and province to federal Government.

Would this First Minister (Mr. Filmon) support this type of legislation, which I am sure he is aware of? Would he and the First Minister communicate to the Conservative Party, and the Liberal Party communicate with their colleagues in Ottawa, to pass this Bill in reading and in the House of Commons today so that we will have protection for our water supply that will supersede The Environment Act and really do the job that we all need as Manitobans?

* (1345)

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the legislation that is the topic of the Bill that was being introduced in Ottawa. I have seen the legislation that was to be introduced as a Private Member's Bill in Ontario.

My opinion of the Bill that was being introduced in Ontario was that it was not strong enough to do some of the things that we hoped to do. Frankly, in dealing with this specific issue which is Shoal Lake, and obviously that is why the Member has raised the question, we are obviously very concerned. That is why in my first answer I indicated that we were putting more options on the table to try and bring Ontario into further agreement with us in protection of water quality. Certainly that becomes, as society grows and our population grows, increasingly important that potable water supplies be protected.

Mr. Doer: I will table copies of this Bill in the Chamber today so the Minister can have the opportunity to read it before five o'clock eastern time, which is four o'clock our time.

Given the fact that the Ontario Government has said there is no problem with arsenic, and today a community based group said there is arsenic in that water, I would strongly urge the Minister and ask him whether, upon reading, if it is much stronger than the Ontario legislation which only deals within the boundaries of the Province of Ontario, would he not support the concept and the principles of having a Bill that supersedes even our

Environment Act on a national level so we can get national protection for our water supply that goes across boundaries, a priority I believe that is consistent with all Members from all political Parties in this Chamber? Would he not support the principle of that type of Bill, and would he not look at the specifics and confirm his support with that type of Bill today before the debate of the Private Member's Bill in the House?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I think I would be foolish to respond directly to the question not having read the Bill. Let me repeat the principles by which we are operating, and that is to do everything possible to assure and guarantee the quality of potable water in this particular example. Further national legislation that would enhance the availability and protection of potable water is an excellent objective, but in not having read this Bill or having seen the specifics of it, I will not answer directly the question.

Bill C-22 Challenge Manitoba Society of Seniors

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae).

Mr. Speaker, we are getting very confusing signals from this Government on the whole issue of drug patent legislation. Ministers responsible for Seniors, both past and present, have argued that Bill C-22 is going to provide necessary research and development. But just on Friday last the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) supported the court challenge launched by the Manitoba Society of Seniors and the Minister said, "I cannot understand why it is the Honourable Member would like to have two lawyers standing, one after the other, arguing the same things. I just do not quite understand how the involvement of the Department of Justice could assist in any way except to be repetitive."

The Minister could help by throwing the entire weight of his Government behind the MSOS Court Challenge. Why does he not show some leadership and finally bite the bullet and admit that this is a court challenge worthy of his Government's support?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The Honourable Member and other Members of his caucus seem to have trouble concentrating on what it is that is federal jurisdiction, and what it is that is in provincial jurisdiction. My response to the Honourable Member was to tell him that the Manitoba Society of Seniors is being represented by Mr. Arne Peltz in the discussion in the courts about Bill C-22.

Bill C-22 Provincial Jurisdiction

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): With a supplementary question to the Minister, the question of jurisdiction is exactly what the MSOS is arguing. The Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) should know that it is a constitutional argument that says this Bill is an encroachment on provincial jurisdiction. My question to the Minister is simple. Does he agree with the MSOS that Bill C-22 encroaches upon provincial jurisdiction?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The answer I gave to the Honourable Member the other day is the answer that he should accept. Now, I made reference in that answer to correspondence between himself and myself. The Honourable Member looked back at me inquisitively, and I should say that I did indeed receive a letter from the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) who first raised this matter with me, and I should make that clear for the record. The answer I gave is that the matter is being handled by Mr. Arne Peltz, and he is acting for the MSOS in that court challenge.

* (1350)

Bill C-22 Challenge Manitoba Society of Seniors

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, with a final supplementary to the Minister responsible for Seniors.

Last Friday the Minister of Justice in this Chamber said that he supports the arguments put forward by the MSOS, and there is no question that it would simply be repetitive. The Minister responsible for Seniors . . .

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

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) just read from the record of last week's discussion between himself and myself. The words that he has used in his question today do not appear there. What I said at that time was that if the Honourable Member had his way, he would have a whole courtroom full of lawyers all saying the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member knows that a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, kindly put his question.

Mr. Carr: Hansard speaks for itself. My question for the Minister responsible for Seniors is simple. Will he adopt the view of the MSOS and go to bat on behalf of seniors in this province rather than the multinational drug companies who are the only ones will benefit from this bad piece of legislation?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors): Mr. Speaker, the question that the Member asked directly relates to the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) and the constitutional matters within federal-provincial jurisdiction. I will leave it to him to respond to the Member directly. As far as the seniors are concerned, my colleagues, this Government, are very committed to supporting the seniors so that they can fully enhance their opportunities and live their lives to the fullest in this province.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Before recognizing the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), I would like to draw all Members' attention to the Speaker's gallery where we have with us this afternoon the Honourable Paul Dick, who is the federal Minister responsible for Procurement.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

Health Care Rheumatologist Shortage

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, 170,000 Manitobans suffer from rheumatic diseases; 40,000 between the ages of 30 and 45, and 2,000 are under the age of 15.

Mr. Speaker, these patients and their families are crying for help. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) was notified about this pending disaster in a Health Care Report that was given to him six months back.

My question is, will the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) advise this House what step he has taken since that time to correct the severe shortage of medical services for these patients and their families?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is correct in that I received correspondence from the Arthritic Self-Help Association, a group that I spoke to at their founding meeting in Winnipeg. As a matter of fact, it was during the election campaign of last spring.

Clearly, a number of Manitobans experience a great deal of physical and medical discomfort because of arthritic conditions which range from minor aches and pains to very serious conditions such as lupus and rheumatic arthritis.

This Government is fully aware of the difficulties experienced by those individuals. We are attempting, through reference of that information that was presented to me in November of last year, to come up with an appropriate plan of action whereby we hopefully can, over the next number of years, attempt to remedy a decline in the ability to serve those very seriously afflicted Manitobans with arthritic conditions, that very serious decline which has been a part of the Manitoba Health Environment over the last number of years.

Rheumatic Disease Services Waiting Period

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, during these six months, now we have only three rheumatologists providing services for Manitoba. The waiting period for severe cases, not for a minor complaint, but the severe cases about eight to 12 months, and patients will be compelled to go out of Manitoba and burden our health care system.

Mr. Speaker, it is a typical mismanagement of the tax dollars. Manitoba may lose the rheumatology

program. My question is, what special steps will this Minister now take so that we have a less waiting period for these patients?

* (1355)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I realize my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic is very adept at listening to CBC and reading the Free Press and coming up with his questions for Question Period today. I have been aware of the difficulties with the provision of service to those Manitobans suffering from arthritis. With all due respect to my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, we cannot solve every problem in health care overnight. My honourable friends in Opposition are starting to howl, and I would like to explain to them some of the initiatives that are working positively for Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

Rehabilitation

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, we have only 20 medical beds at the Rehabilitation Hospital, and the waiting period for physiotherapy and occupational therapy has increased while he is still a Minister. This is causing patients to become prematurely disabled.

Mr. Speaker: And the question is?

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, what special steps will this Minister take to provide the much needed rehabilitation services for these patients and their families?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, whilst my honourable friend is, as his role requires, raising issues in the House, I would wish my honourable friend would have the decency to indicate that there are increasing levels of services to Manitobans in health care in many, many areas. I do not expect my honourable friend to ever admit that because that means the health care system is in better condition today than it was a year ago. If we have the next 16 years of management in the health care system, it will be restored to a position of excellence that it ought to be. Mr. Speaker, I will admit that in one year we have not solved all of the problems in health care.

Transport Canada Air Services Closure—Dauphin

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger). The federal Government continues to target transportation for cuts and forcing the transportation to bear the brunts of deficit reduction, at least that is their excuse. Under the Liberal style and Conservative style of deregulation in this country, we have seen service, safety and jobs cast aside in the interests of the bottom line. We see it at CN; we see it at VIA; we see it in trucking; we see it at air services.

In view of a recent document that I have received from Transport Canada that now shows they intend to close the flight services station in various areas specifically at Dauphin, throwing six people out of work there and providing only remote services from Winnipeg, therefore undermining safety, can the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) indicate whether he has been advised of this decision and whether he was consulted on it before it was taken?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): The Member makes some very general statements which has happened in the past. I would like to indicate to him that I have expressed concern many times in this House already, some of the proposed or alleged cutbacks from the federal Government, indicating VIA Rail. Many of these things have not really happened at this stage of the game. We have expressed a concern and until we have something definite—I have talked with the federal Minister of Transportation about these issues. He again indicates he has a document that says there is a cutback. Until I get some information on this, as soon as I do, I will try and raise my concern and deal with it.

Mr. Plohman: There we have a Minister who has been by-passed again on serious transportation issues affecting this province. In view of the fact that the Dauphin flight services has been ranking seventh, eighth or ninth out of 21 in Transport Canada's central region, so many centres rank below in terms of the amount of services offered, and in view of the fact that the Dubin Commission following the Cranbrook crash recommended that flight services stations be in place at all airports serviced with scheduled air services, I ask the Minister whether he will raise this issue with the federal Minister and reject this policy that has been put in place by the federal Government to abandon air flight services at various airports in this country?

* (1400)

Mr. Albert Driedger: Mr. Speaker, yes, I will raise that issue. However, I want to indicate again that until there is something definite coming forward—we had the alleges of the Via cutbacks—and indications are that until a report comes down, we do not know what the cutbacks are. We do not know exactly what is going to happen until we get the final report. I can indicate to the Member that I will get in touch with the federal Minister and find out exactly what the circumstances are.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, this is incredible that this Minister is not aware of this issue. I will table, in this House, a document that I have that shows that the federal Transport Department intends to close the flight services station in Dauphin. I would say, in view of the fact that the Dryden crash occurred—(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Would the Honourable Member kindly put his question now?

Mr. Plohman: I do have my question. In view of the fact that the Dryden air crash occurred—(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Member for his final supplementary question. The Honourable Member will kindly put his question now.

Mr. Plohman: I ask this Minister to reject this federal policy that has involved accidents that could have been prevented at such places as Dryden where the air crash killed 22 people, and it had remote services, no flight services station. Will this Minister reject that policy and insist on the change—

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

Mr. Albert Driedger: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I will acquaint myself with the circumstances specifically, and I will raise the concern to Manitobans with the federal Minister of Transportation about the issue.

Ethnic Newspapers Distribution Assistance Program

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, with all the controversy surrounding the federal Government's April Budget, one of its important provisions went largely unnoticed.

The Publications Distribution Assistance Program, which assists Canadian newspapers and magazines with the cost of mailing, is to see major cutbacks. Announcements with respect to changes in this program were to be made by July 1 of this year, and yet, so far none have been made.

My question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). Despite this Tory Government's attack on Manitoba's ethnocultural groups by the removal of the funding provisions from MIC, has this Minister met with her federal counterparts to ensure that any announcements that are to be made by this weekend do not adversely affect the many ethnic newspapers in Manitoba? If she has not met with them yet, will she do so as soon as possible?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I will take the specifics of that question as notice and get back to the Member.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), with a supplementary question.

Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Minenko: Mr. Speaker, I just find it incredible that the Minister does not even know what this program is going to affect.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. As the Honourable Member is quite aware, we do not comment on the specifics of the answer.

Community Newspapers Distribution Assistance Program

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks will kindly put his question now.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): My supplementary question is to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner). Over 30 community newspapers and the people they serve will be adversely affected as a result of these federal Tory cutbacks. What is the effect of the federal Tory cuts on the community newspapers, and what are his plans to assist these newspapers which provide such a valuable bond between rural Manitobans and their communities?

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I have met during the last couple of weeks a number of times with representatives of the Community Newspapers Association. They have not raised this specific issue with me. I want to indicate to you that, however, I will ask them what their concerns are about this issue, and I will report back to the House when I have that answer.

Publishing Industry Distribution Assistance Program

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, with his final supplementary.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): My final supplementary question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

The printing and publishing industry in Manitoba is an important industry, not just for the economic, but also for cultural reasons. Given this Minister's stated commitment to Manitoban industries, can this Minister tell us what is the impact of the federal cuts which will impact, not only on ethnic community papers, but also on papers like the Manitoba Society of Seniors Journal, and what concrete steps will this Minister take to ensure that this important Manitoba industry is not adversely affected?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, throughout the months of January through April, I had extensive meetings right across the province with a wide variety of industry groups. At no time did they raise this issue with me at all. However, during other meetings that I will be having over the course of the next few months, I will certainly raise the issue with them. If they have concerns, we will bring them back to the House.

Province of Manitoba Ottawa Office Study

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I too have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

I note that on February 7, 1989, this Government signed an untendered \$25,000 contract to study the development of a Manitoba-Ottawa office. I tried to get the information out of The Freedom of Information Act. It was denied to us, so I am wondering now whether the Minister can tell the House whether the study is complete and whether he is prepared to table that study in this Legislature.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, on at least two occasions this Government has announced its intentions to establish an office in Ottawa, an office in Ottawa to deal with our visitors department on a regular basis, to make sure that Manitoba companies get the kind of response they deserve in terms of procurement on a regular basis.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we also want to deal with the question of tourism through that office. The fact of the matter is there are any number of head office organizations within Ottawa's environs that deal on a regular basis with having conventions. We see that office also dealing with the situation.

I might add to the Member for Brandon East that, yes, the study is completed.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I also ask the Minister if he would table it in view of the fact that we were denied this information under The Freedom on Information Act.

Government Policy Consultants Ottawa Office Study

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Can the Minister tell the House why he hired the firm of Government Policy Consultants Incorporated of Ontario to do this work? Why this particular firm, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): In terms of dealing with—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member will have time to get his remarks on the record. The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism has the floor.

Mr. Ernst: When the Government looks for expertise and advice on specific matters, it goes to consultants, particularly out-of-province consultants for those who have certain expertise and advice that they could give the Government. That is the criteria upon which it was based. For that reason, we hired this particular consulting firm.

Government Policy Consultants Ottawa Office Study

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Although we could not get anything under The Freedom of Information Act, thanks to the Ontario Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department we have been advised that the director of the company, Mr. John Johnston, former chairman of Mulroney's Manitoba leadership campaign runs this company. I would ask the Minister, would the fact that this person who is the former chair of Mr. Mulroney's leadership campaign in Manitoba and obviously an individual with close ties to the Prime Minister have anything to do with the awarding of this contract? Does the Minister believe that only by having someone tied directly to the Prime Minister will Manitoba be fairly treated by the federal Government?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East may be able to tell us about

untendered contracts under his administration. It is only because our administration is open and publishes these that he can find out information. He may like to tell us, Mr. Speaker, why his Government, on May 12, 1987, gave an untendered contract to Viewpoints Research for \$18,000.00. He may, in fact, want to tell us why Culture, Heritage and Recreation on May 26, 1987, gave an untendered contract for \$30,000 to Viewpoints Research or why they gave an untendered contract through the Department of Health on April 21, 1987, to Robert

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

* (1410)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order please. The Honourable Member for Thompson, on a point of order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, before the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has leave of his senses, I would ask that you would call the Premier to order. It is surely not in order as indicated in Beauchesne. For those Members opposite who have not read Beauchesne, it is a very serious matter. They should deal with it. It is not in order for the First Minister to give this type of answer, Mr. Speaker. We realize they are somewhat sensitive about the very legitimate questions raised by the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), but the First Minister should not abuse the rules of the House and should deal with the question raised, the very legitimate question by the Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). The Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), on the same point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): After listening to the lengthy pre- and post-ambls put a little earlier by the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohma), I should think the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) should blush even to refer to Beauchesne in response to my Leader's answer.

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

Workers Compensation Board Claim Delays

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation (Mr. Connery), and it is regarding the appeal backlog. I have a constituent who was forced to go back to work with back problems because he refuses to beg for other types of social assistance. I have another constituent who has had to sell her cottage and vehicle and now is having to look at selling her home because of the Workers Compensation backlog. I have yet another constituent in my riding who will be putting his truck up for sale if a decision is not made quickly on his appeal process.

Given the three cases I have just cited, and I have more in my riding, -(Interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is attempting to ask his question. Order, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation (Mr. Connery) to tell me what he would suggest I tell the injured workers in my riding about the backlog and the lack of commitment by this Government to address this very serious problem?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister responsible for The Workers Compensation Act): There is no question that we have worked hard to improve the Workers Compensation, but I have never denied in this House, and I will not until it is cleared up, that we do have a problem with the final appeals. They are excessive. I have had many meetings with the Workers Compensation Board. In fact, I had an hour-and-a-half meeting with the three members of the Workers Compensation Board where there is representation from the employers and the employees side to go over the length or the delay in the appeals, and I have asked them to give me a very short, soon resolve, so that we can shorten that length of appeal. It is about eight months duration right now and that is not acceptable that injured workers should have to wait that long. If the Member would give us those specifics, outside the House, I would be pleased to follow up and get an explanation for him.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be more than happy to give him the specifics. This Government is showing a lack of respect for the injured workers of Manitoba. At present there is a backlog of appeals at every stage of the appeal process. Given that we have injured workers going back to work, injured and others forced to sell their property because of this serious backlog, will the Minister apply additional resources into clearing up this very serious problem?

Mr. Connery: I wish the Member would not put misinformation on the record that this Government is not concerned about injured workers. We are deeply concerned about injured workers. I just told the Member that I have met, again, with the Board of Commissioners and we are working on a resolve to bring this into a proper perspective. They are looking at a three-month's duration as being an appropriate time and we hope within a reasonable period of time to achieve this.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I will give the Minister the numbers and he can give them a call and he can tell them what the problem is.

My supplementary question is—injured workers in the appeal process have regular monthly bills that they have to maintain—how does this Minister propose these people maintain their financial commitments while they have no income because they are unable to go to work?

Mr. Connery: Mr. Speaker, where there is need or there is a clear indication that there has been an accident,

an injury that occurred at the workplace, injured workers are given up-front money. That will continue to happen.

In the interim we are trying to determine the best method to make sure that people are processed very quickly. I can tell you that the Workers Compensation is going through a major review. The Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson) took the opportunity to make that tour and had the explanations given and the process that is in place to shorten those periods.

Mr. Speaker, it is coming. It is not there yet.

Whiteshell School Division Privatization

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach).

I think most Manitobans were shocked to learn on the weekend that a school district in Manitoba is contemplating or had contemplated becoming a private institution, partly because of the windfall that has been provided to private institutions by this Minister of Education.

Can the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) provide assurances to the people of Manitoba, the 13,000 teachers, the 200,000 public school students, that under no circumstances will school districts or individual public schools be privatized in the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I am happy today to rise on that particular question because, Mr. Speaker, under the former administration this same situation persisted. There was no kind of assistance given to the Whiteshell School District for the kind of inequity that school district was facing.

Mr. Speaker, when we took over Government last year to assist in a bridge financing, if you like, to try and resolve the situation in the interim, this Government provided \$100,000 specifically to Whiteshell so that they would not suffer the kind of inequities that they suffered under the former administration. We are working to resolve that situation at the present time with the assistance of my colleague, the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik). We have met with that school district, and before fall we hope to have this resolved.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, with time for a very short question.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, there was no answer to the question of "will he give assurances to the Province of Manitoba?"

Public Schools Privatization

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): My final question to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) is, has the Minister consulted with other public school officials about the seeming inequities that now exist, and the attractiveness that exists in the system for moving to a private system, that in fact they are additionally well funded under this

administration? Can the Minister provide assurances to the public school system, the hundreds and hundreds of trustees, that privatization is not on this Minister's agenda?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is a question there. The Honourable Minister of Education.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, privatization is not on this Minister's agenda.

I have met with the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and all other organizations that have some interest in education with regard to funding of public schools and independent schools as well. This Government has done far more for funding public schools in this province and making sure that opportunities for students right through this province are there far more than was ever done by the former administration in the six years that they were in Government.

* (1420)

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

I have a ruling for the House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On June 13, the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Chornopyski) took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) respecting words spoken by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey).

The words spoken by the Honourable Minister, "... the Member for Dauphin, who is skulking around in the back alleys, trying to cause problems for our Metis community and disrupting the lives of many people," were alleged by the Honourable Member for Dauphin to have imputed motives to him. Language which imputes unworthy motives is unparliamentary.

I have reviewed carefully the specific remarks quoted earlier in this ruling, and I have also read with care the Minister's complete comments respecting the activities of the Honourable Member for Dauphin in relation to Metis communities in that constituency.

I note that the Honourable Minister made several earlier remarks which might have prompted the Honourable Member for Dauphin to claim that unworthy motives were being attributed or imputed to him, which remarks the Honourable Member for Dauphin chose to disregard.

Words which are alleged to have imputed unworthy motives are quite often part of the normal exchanges which occur in this House, some of which may be unkind or discourteous, but which seldom are unparliamentary.

In this case, I am of the opinion that the words used by the Minister and quoted earlier did impute unworthy motives to the Honourable Member for Dauphin and are therefore unparliamentary. Therefore, I am calling upon the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs to withdraw the unparliamentary words.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no reason not to have those words withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: We would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Bill 11, after which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) will proceed into Interim Supply, followed by Bill 27, by leave, and Bill 30.

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 11—THE ELECTORAL DIVISIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Bill No 11 was read a third time and passed.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

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 Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in the Chair for Interim Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—INTERIM SUPPLY

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Mark Minenko): I call the committee to order. The Committee of Supply will consider a resolution respecting the Interim Supply.

RESOLVED that a sum not exceeding \$3,241,346,100, being 75 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, 1990.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Acting Chairman, what we are beginning on in the next few minutes is the process of providing the Government with authority to expend some significant portion of the total appropriation that hopefully will be voted to it through the course of the Estimates.

I thank Members opposite for their indulgence in the manner in which they have entered into discussions and negotiations with respect to the bringing in of the Interim Supply Bill.

I would like to indicate, particularly to the House Leader and the critic of Finance (Mr. Alcock) from the Liberal Party, that when I had approached him previously and given to him a proposed date to which time the Interim Supply would carry, that being the end of November, unknown to me at that time officials within my department had written in a December 31 deadline.

I want to state for the record, Mr. Acting Chairman, that I apologize to the Member for that change. Certainly

it was an honest error, and no doubt it would be one that he probably would like to discuss somewhat more fully.

Nevertheless, Mr. Acting Chairman, it is a Government responsibility that they ultimately decide what is best to put forward in the legislation from the viewpoint of the people of the Province of Manitoba. We have done so and of course will be held totally accountable and responsible for it. Thank you.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Minenko): Do the Opposition Finance Critics wish to address this resolution?

Is the committee ready for the question?

Shall the resolution be passed?

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$3,241,346,100, being 75 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, 1990—pass.

The resolution is accordingly passed.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Mark Minenko (Acting Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider 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 Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS SUPPLY—INTERIM SUPPLY

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Mark Minenko): The Committee of Ways and Means will come to order, please. We have before us for our consideration a resolution respecting the Interim Supply Bill. The resolution reads as follows:

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, 1990, the sum of \$3,241,346,100, being 75 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, 1990, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Does the Minister of Finance have any comments?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): No comments, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Minenko): The Opposition Critics wish to address the resolution? Is the committee ready for the question? Shall the resolution be passed? The resolution is accordingly passed.

The committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Mark Minenko (Acting Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL BILL NO. 29—THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 Portant Affectation Anticipée De Crédits, and be ordered for second reading immediately.

MOTION presented and carried.

* (1430)

SECOND READING BILL NO. 29—THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) presented, by leave, Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 Portant Affectation Anticipée De Crédits, for second reading and be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Manness: Bill No. 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1989, is required to provide interim spending, commitment and borrowing authority for the 1989-90

fiscal year, retroactive to April 1, pending approval of The Appropriation Act, 1989.

The amount of spending authority requested is \$3,241,346,100, being 75 percent of the total sums to be voted (excluding statutory items) as set forth in the Main Estimates of Expenditure. Mr. Speaker, this is broken down, as follows:

Total general statutory appropriations.....	\$494,265,700
Total sums to be voted.....	\$4,321,794,800
Total Main Estimates of Expenditure	\$4,816,060,500

The interim supply calculation is 75 percent of the \$4.3 billion sums to be voted, which equals specifically \$3,241,346,100.00. This amount is estimated to last until approximately the end of December, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of future commitment authority included in this Interim Supply Bill is \$300 million, being 75 percent of the total amount of \$400 million which is to be included in The Appropriation Act, 1989. This represents an increase of \$100 million from last year's level and relates primarily to the commitment authority required for the financial long-term lease obligations for Manitoba Properties Inc. Expenditures for future years commitment cannot be made in the 1989-90 fiscal year unless additional spending authority is provided.

Mr. Speaker, a clause has been included to provide Government with the authority to make payments against accrued liabilities totalling \$2,272,000 as recorded in the accounts of the province as at March 31, 1989.

As in previous years, a borrowing authority clause has been included in the Interim Supply Bill for 1989-90. Bill 29 will provide the Government with borrowing authority of \$400 million.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 29 is required to provide interim spending, commitment and borrowing authority effective April 1, 1989, to ensure the continued operation of Government. This Bill replaces spending authority previously provided by way of a special warrant, which included sufficient authority to facilitate Government operations until the end of June. I would like to request co-operation of the Opposition in passing Bill 29 through all stages of consideration, debate and approval without undue delay.

When Bill 29 reaches the committee stage, I can provide Members with a section-by-section explanation. Thank you.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put some comments on this Bill 29. The present administration is spending about \$1,500 per person in Manitoba for our health care system and that amounts to about \$1.5 billion, approximately one-third our provincial Budget.

I have serious reservations about this spending. For the last few months, we have seen in Manitoba that our health care system is deteriorating in spite of the amount of money we spend on the health care system.

We are the third major spenders in Canada and still our population is not as healthy as in other places. We have not reduced the rate of ischaemic heart disease. We have not reduced the rate for cancer. We are not as healthy as compared to the other parts of Canada, but we still keep on spending \$1,500 per person in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, let us start from the earlier stages of life. We continue to have problems at our maternity wards throughout the city.

In 1987, when the previous administration tried to reorganize the obstetrical services in Manitoba they had no planning, and that is continued throughout the new administration, also. What they did, they have cut down Concordia Hospital and they have cut down Seven Oaks Hospital but without proper planning for the whole city and the other areas, the teaching hospital, such as St. Boniface Hospital and Health Sciences and the community hospitals such as Misericordia Hospital, Victoria and Grace Hospital. What this Government got from the previous Government was a mess in terms of the maternity services.

For the last one year we have not seen any planning from this administration either. We did not expect them to do it overnight, as the Minister is right, we do not have the answers. Nobody has the answers for health care to fix overnight, but the planning has to be started.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening, we have the Misericordia Hospital where there are plenty of beds available for the delivery services. We have the St. Boniface Hospital where we do not have adequate services for the maternity ward as well as for the post-partum ward. So what is happening, the patients are constantly being transferred and to be exact, for 28 to 29 times during this administration. If a unit has to be closed that is not management, that is mismanagement, that is a waste of the taxpayers' dollar and that is a major concern. Above all, you are exposing a variety of individuals, not only mother and the unborn child but also the families, other professionals who are related to that person, also go through a lot of stress. We have not solved anything, we still keep on spending the same amount of money, but we have not seen any answers from this administration.

There are two concepts everyone agrees with in the health care profession, that you cannot provide all the services at all the hospitals, but there has to be a plan that if you want to provide a maternity ward in the community hospital, which we would like to do and we would favour that, but at the same time have these two hospitals, such as the St. Boniface and the Health Sciences Centre upgraded to make sure that the tertiary care and the critical care is provided for all the patients not only in Winnipeg but throughout Manitoba. These units do have services for an intensive care nursery, they have other services such as ultrasound and other professionals who are very valuable to provide any critical maternity services, but that is missing. We have not seen any action. We were hoping that the Minister of Health would come up with some plans, but so far it is nil and that is disappointing.

* (1440)

Mr. Speaker, let us go to the second area which is distressing to the patients. I will address that area to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). I will give him a very simple example, a very mathematical example. No one has to be a genius to do that, anyone could just use a calculator and add those numbers. There are 90 patients waiting, as the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) agreed, they are waiting at the Health Sciences Centre for cardiac surgery, it is by-pass surgery. These 90 patients are costing taxpayers a lot of money. Why I am saying, it is costing a lot of money because these individuals are not getting the proper health care. They are going to see their doctors, they are getting all the tests done, they are filling the acute care beds, so ultimately, it is costing us more money than it otherwise would cost if you had operated on these patients. That is why I am saying this is a gross mismanagement. It is not being done.

This Government is not doing a proper job addressing this issue. They had the opportunity last year, they were given one year but with no action and now there is a so-called another committee. How many committees would this Minister need to make a decision? The decision has to be made by this administration. They are the decision makers. They should not be depending on each and every action and just pass the buck to the different committees and wait for it. That is not acceptable. The results are very clear. Everyone in Manitoba knows that this administration in health care is lurching from one area to another without any major improvement.

We never said to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), and to be fair to him, we did not say that he has to do it overnight, as he said very rightly that he cannot do it overnight, but one year and two months is not overnight. It is how many days? -(Interjection)- That is a long time. I think the responsibility on this Minister of Health is more than anyone right now. Why I say that, because the way this administration would handle the health care, it will help Manitobans for years to come, for decades to come. That is why I am saying somebody who, he or she, is going to occupy that chair in a few years time, will be in greater trouble than he if we do not fix this system now.

Why I am saying that, for the last 10 years the health care cost in Manitoba has tripled. The health care continues to rise, but still the long-term planning has to come from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). He is nodding his head, he is saying no. I think he will do it if he wants to, but he does not take the responsibility seriously in terms of having a long-term planning, and that is missing.

We have not heard anything for medical centres like Health Sciences or St. Boniface, except there was a nice line in the Throne Speech saying we want to upgrade the Health Sciences Centre to make it a world-class teaching and surgical centre. How can he even justify making a statement when you do not have these services available? The problem is getting worse and worse. Any teaching hospital, when they are losing all the specialists who are a part of the teaching hospital, how can they justify it?

Pediatricians are leaving, seven of them already left. There is no hope that more will come. There is no more

hope that others will stay, because of the different reasons. In this Budget, we have not seen any planning to include more physicians where there is a lack of physicians in a specialized service such as pediatrics, such as nephrology, such as rheumatology, interesting.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) said, well, we are doing research from the CBC and the Free Press. It is really amazing the number of questions, the number of items we have brought to the attention of this House so that we can make the best health care possible for Manitobans. The Minister is saying that we are just going with the research of the Free Press and CBC. I think it is an immature statement. It is not acceptable.

The question we raised today was a very serious one, and he accepted that. He was given the report six months back, and six months is enough time to make a decision. What he did, according to the media reports, he passed the information to the Health Services Commission, but he did not say that today. What kind of approach is that?—six months for a single report. The question here is who is the boss? Who is running the health care system? Is the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) running the health care system, or is someone else doing it? It is very clear from the number of issues we have raised, he does not know where the health care system is going.

There are 170,000 patients suffering from rheumatic diseases. These diseases range from minor arthritic pain to severe diseases such as SLE, rheumatic heart diseases and other areas. These patients who are 170,000 in number, they are suffering. They have to wait for eight to 12 months for a simple appointment to see someone to look at them. How can we justify spending \$1,500 per person and not give that kind of service?

This is a mismanagement because these individuals will, and they are becoming prematurely disabled because they do not get the physiotherapy, they do not get occupational therapy, and we have only 20 medical beds.

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

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): They do not like . . .

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is saying from his chair some unparliamentary words. I would ask him to stand up and repeat those words on the record because I think it will be extremely unparliamentary, if he would repeat those words what he said. He should be ashamed of himself.

Mr. Orchard: Are you going to sit down? Are you going to sit down? Sit down. Sit down, boy.

Some Honourable Members: Oh! Oh!

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Acting Speaker, this Minister does not run this House. I am elected by my constituents and they have the right to ask me to sit down, he has no right to do that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. The Honourable Member for—

Mr. Cheema: This kind of prejudice exists, that is why every time—

Mr. Orchard: You want this, you got to sit down.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Acting Speaker, that is why . . . I ask questions, it bothers him. That is the reason for not . . . for a long time, you understand that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster, on a point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker. I would ask for the Health Minister (Mr. Orchard) to explain what he meant when he made the comment, "Sit down, boy," and retract them unequivocally.

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

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Speaker, my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, asked me to put on the record remarks I made across the floor to do that. When he is the recognized speaker he has to sit down in order for me to do that. I asked him to sit down on several occasions, but he refused.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The same point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): The Honourable Member for Concordia, on the point of order.

Mr. Doer: Yes, I think it is inappropriate to use that term, "boy," when all of us are Honourable Members. Mr. Acting Speaker, I think we will have a lot of debate on policy in Health, we all look forward to it. I think we should keep the acrimony, as much as possible, out of it. I think it would be a good move to retract that statement and get on to the Health policy issues.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I would like to thank all Honourable Members for their advice on this matter. Although the exact word is not necessarily unparliamentary, I would like to cite for Members, Beauchesne 491, which sets out that the Speaker has consistently ruled that language used in the House should be temperate and worthy of the place in which it is spoken. I would ask all Honourable Members to consider that particular rule in any language they may use in the House.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Speaker, we have a tempest in a teapot. My honourable friend was asking me to put comments I made on the record. I indicated that he had to sit down for me to do that. In referring to him in the male gender I meant no offence, as he took it, I meant no offence to any Member of the House, to the Member for Kildonan, to any other Member of

this House, I simply wanted, as he challenged me to do, to stand up and put on the record that he had to sit down, that is what the rules require. There is only one recognized Speaker by yourself. To take that as any personal offence is entirely incorrect.

* (1450)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) for his explanation, but again would caution all Honourable Members that they should consider the terms they use in the House that may indeed inflame dialogue in this House.

Mr. Cheema: Thank you. I will consult, this matter that the Minister of Health just put on the record, with my caucus, and I will raise this very issue tomorrow, first thing when I get a chance, if that is approved by my caucus.

This Minister has said something which I will not accept. He has no right to say to me, "Sit down, boy." Mr. Acting Speaker, I was elected by the Kildonan constituents, and as long as they want me I will come to this House. He has no right, by any power. I will not sit down when he says to me.

An Honourable Member: It is here in the rules.

Mr. Cheema: I am reading the rules.

An Honourable Member: No, but he just ruled. He has ruled, so the issue is finished.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I have ruled on the matter and I would ask the—

Mr. Orchard: What more can I say?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I have ruled that the matter does not necessarily fall within the—

Mr. Orchard: I said that. What more do you want?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I have ruled earlier that the word used does not necessarily fall within the terms as set out as unparliamentary in Beauchesne, but I did caution all Honourable Members in accordance to Rule 491. I would ask the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) to continue with debate on this matter.

The Honourable Member for Concordia, on a point of order.

Mr. Doer: I believe that it is a term that was used by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that should be withdrawn, and I believe that it is important for us to get on with the debate on the health care system. The term he used can be perceived by an individual to be an insult, a very personal insult. I believe he should withdraw it so we can get on— (Interjection)— Well, as a Manitoban, I find offensive, the comment, and the statement has not been withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. As I mentioned earlier, I have ruled on the matter, and I would ask the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) to continue with his remarks today on this matter, this Bill.

Mr. Cheema: I will continue with my speech further, but as I said earlier, I still resent what the Minister of Health said, and I will make sure tomorrow, first thing when I get the opportunity, I will raise this question in this House.

Mr. Manness: It has to break, Mr. Acting Speaker.

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

Mr. Manness: On a point of order, this is going from the sublime to the ridiculous very quickly. As is required by the Rules of the House, the Member has to rise at the point in time that he feels his privileges as a Member, as an Honourable Member, have been in some way challenged.

The Member has done that, the MLA for Pembina, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) in my view has withdrawn. You, Sir, have acknowledged that withdrawal; you have ruled on the matter. The matter is officially closed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I would like to thank the Honourable Member for his advice, but would like to again add that I have ruled on the matter. I would ask the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) to continue in debate on this Bill.

Mr. Cheema: As I was discussing the long-term planning which is missing from health administration and with the interruptions from the other side of the House, it is becoming impossible even to be a human in this House and be equally acceptable for all Members of this House. I am not changing my position, that unless the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) withdraws his remarks, I will not speak on this issue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Member for Kildonan to speak on the Bill. I would ask him to continue his remarks on that Bill.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply and comment to some of the allegations my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic has made.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. On what basis does the Honourable Minister of Health—

Mr. Orchard: I am speaking to the Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): You are speaking to the Bill.

Mr. Orchard: I am speaking to the Bill, Mr. Acting Speaker.

We have had a number of opportunities to debate Estimates of health care in the Province of Manitoba. One of the things that we do in this House is we attempt, as reasonably as possible, to seek out ideas, to seek out positions, to offer solutions to problems that face the health care system. That is a process that has gone on for some time. In addition to that, each political Party in Opposition attempts to paint the worst picture of health care as possible because that is politically opportune.

I want to remind my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic (Mr. Cheema), that last year a grand total of 25 minutes was spent by the Liberal Party discussing the entire Manitoba Health Services Commission spending for the last fiscal year. I certainly hope that both Opposition Parties live up to what they say, that there will be a lot more debate on it this year because I look forward to that debate in the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The Opposition Parties have been identifying what they consider to be difficulties in the health care system, the Liberal Party much more so than the New Democrats, and that is understandably so.

Mr. Doer: Point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): The Honourable Member for Concordia, on a point of order.

Mr. Doer: The statements from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) are totally inaccurate if you look at the number of questions allowed in each Question Period. The Minister knows that. It is terribly inappropriate for him to comment, based on the proportion of questions in the Chamber. We will allow the public to judge his performance ultimately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order as disputes over the facts are not a point of order.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Speaker, the Liberal Party has asked a number of questions this Session on health care. That was the point I was making to my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Doer). Why and how I never questioned, or why I never questioned, but obviously the Leader of the New Democrats has some difficulty.

I have cautioned my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, on a one-to-one basis, that when you bring up problems in the health care system as you perceive them to be, there is an obligation to be able to offer a resolution of those problems. Now, that has not been forthcoming. With all due respect to my honourable friend, that has not been forthcoming from the Liberal Party. That is why I look forward to the Estimates process. I look forward to it because maybe the impression my honourable friend is making on behalf of the Liberal Party is the wrong impression, that being that the solution to every problem is to put more money into the system. If that is the only answer the Liberal Party has to resolving to what they perceive to be health care problems, then they are going to have to answer a number questions beyond that, i.e., where will the

resource, the money come from? How do they intend to offer those monied solutions to the people of Manitoba? That will only happen during the Estimates process because in Question Period you cannot get those kinds of answers from the political Parties. I suspect they will not be forthcoming.

Now in a number of issues, my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, has offered or appeared to have offered—and he can defend this if he thinks I am interpreting him incorrectly—that in terms of the specific discipline of medical doctors in the Province of Manitoba that more money in salaries or fee for service is an answer. That, we want to establish. Clearly, we want to establish how much more money the Liberal Party believes would be appropriate to put into that discipline of health care delivery, and we will only find that out during the Estimates process. I hope that is forthcoming because it is an obligation upon all Members of the Liberal Party not simply to, in a shotgun manner, bring out what they perceive to be problems, but also to offer solutions.

* (1500)

As a background to that, Mr. Acting Speaker, I will share with the House some conversations I have had with Liberal Health Critic (Mr. Cheema). I have indicated to him that I brought up a number of issues when I was the Health Care Critic, and in a great number of those issues we have moved to resolve the problem. The problem has not completely disappeared, but anybody who stands for election to this Legislature saying they can create the perfect health care system is not telling the truth to the people of Manitoba.

I guess, Mr. Acting Speaker, what I have to indicate to you is that when those solutions are started, for instance an ambulance with a significant increase in ground ambulance funding, \$1.9 million last year, when the budget was just a little over \$2 million—\$950,000 in this fiscal year—and another \$950,000 in the next fiscal year, we identified a problem and we moved to resolve it.

Have we ever heard any of my honourable friends in either political Party say, well, that was a reasonable thing to do and the Government is on track? - (Interjection)- My honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Doer) says, yes, we have. I guess I missed it. I guess I missed it, but I accept. I accept my honourable friend's, the Leader of the New Democrats, congratulations on that ambulance funding.

Just last week we had a question come from one of the Members of the Second Opposition Party regarding air ambulance service to northern Manitoba alleging a change in the criteria and policy and that resources were being somehow hoarded on the service. Neither statement is correct. I simply point out that in October of 1988, five months into our administration, we added \$180,000 of additional monies to the air ambulance service to provide 24-hour emergency backup service from the Health Sciences Centre to provide an enhanced level of service to northern Manitobans—again moving to address a problem perceived to be in the air ambulance service.

Do my honourable friends acknowledge that? Of course not. That is what you did for me yesterday. What are you going to do for me today? If you are going to criticize the system every step of the way, be prepared this Estimates session. I simply ask my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic (Mr. Cheema), to be prepared this session to offer some of the Liberal Party solutions.

When my honourable friend criticizes the length of waiting lists at the Health Sciences Centre and says we are doing absolutely nothing to help to resolve that issue, No. 1, he is wrong in that accusation; and secondly, my honourable friend, who is a medical doctor and knows this to be fact, must also tell the people of Manitoba that more open-heart surgeries have been funded in the last 12 months that we have been Government than ever before in the history of Manitoba; that more angioplasties have been done in the last 12 months of this Government than any time before in the history of this province.

Admittedly, the waiting list has increased, but have the decency not to alarm the people of Manitoba unduly and admit that more procedures have been done. More people have been helped.

* (1510)

In terms of the accusation that nothing is being done, that is wrong, Mr. Acting Speaker, for the Liberal Health Critic to say that—absolutely wrong. I have indicated to him that we have established a Cardiac Care Committee, basis the allegations that were made in early January to try and determine how we make the program of open-heart surgery work better between the two hospitals currently offering open-heart surgery procedures, St. Boniface and Health Sciences Centre. That party, that care committee, is already analyzing what constitutes the waiting list, how waiting lists are determined at each facility, and what each facility does in terms of the Cardiac Care Committee, cardiac care and services provided.

To say that nothing is going on is absolutely wrong, Mr. Acting Speaker, and I wish my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic (Mr. Cheema) would have the decency to admit that. He often says that if I have had my facts wrong in an answer in the House, he stands up and righteously demands an apology. I wish reciprocal action when he is wrong to do the same, but I have not had one single apology from my honourable friend when he says nothing is going on, when we are getting to the root of the problem in many areas of health care. He sits there and he shakes his head right now. Right now he shakes his head but he is not correct, because many of the issues that he has identified have been worked on over the past year and solutions are being worked on.

For instance, in the obstetric question my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, brought up constantly the number of times that admissions were denied at the St. Boniface obstetric unit because it was at capacity. It was 28 times in the past year and that is correct. I kept telling my honourable friend that we are taking a look at St. Boniface in the context of the

system, because you cannot simply make decisions in isolation at one hospital. That was done by the previous Government when they closed Seven Oaks and Concordia obstetrical units. They made that decision in isolation of the system, because they did not follow through with certain commitments that were made.

My honourable friend wants an instant solution, and I kept telling him that in Misericordia there is capacity to deliver expecting mothers' babies. The same thing applies in Victoria Hospital. The same thing applies in Grace Hospital. I said that makes it difficult for any Minister of Health to make a rational decision on one facility which is at capacity when there is surplus capacity at other facilities. My honourable friend took the liberty of going to Misericordia and seeing whether I was correct in what I was saying because he alleged that there was no 24-hour anesthesiology, which in fact exists at Misericordia, which in fact exists in Misericordia Hospital. My honourable friend was not correct when he made that accusation, and he did not apologize for that.

If you want to play the game of who withdraws and who apologizes, you have to be prepared to be big enough to apologize and withdraw when you are wrong, I offer to my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic because he has not been right in all of the things that he has brought to this House. I understand that, if he has not had his research fully done. I can understand that, but when you are wrong, have the decency to admit it, because that is expected of me and I have done that.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in the obstetric question, that is very actively under discussion between the hospitals right now, St. Boniface, Misericordia, Victoria, Grace and Health Sciences Centre, because we have to come to a resolution on that problem. To help out, I have to tell you that the system is co-operating between facilities. There is a good working relationship between Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface, in terms of the high-risk deliveries. There is a good working relationship between St. Boniface and Misericordia Hospitals to accommodate expectant mothers who, for reasons of capacity at St. Boniface, have to be referred elsewhere. The same arrangement is in place with Victoria Hospital.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I realize that is not satisfactory to an expectant mother who all along has believed that St. Boniface will be the hospital in which she gives birth to her child, but safety is assured every step of the way where another facility is necessary to be used. Victoria Hospital has offered two obstetricians and family practitioners the delivery services of their hospital and admitting privileges so that expectant mothers can deliver there. That is the ultimate of co-operation.

In the meantime, Mr. Acting Speaker, the system is being appropriately discussed by experts to come up and offer the Government a reasoned solution. Maybe my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic (Mr. Cheema) has all the answers today on how to solve the problem. I have not heard them. I have not heard them at all, but maybe he does. If he does, then he could save a lot of planning time if he simply told me today what should we do with the obstetrics situation

at St. Boniface. I would be pleased to hear his answer, but I have not.

Maybe that is an indication that the Liberal Party is adept at bringing issues forward and not very adept at offering solutions. I can accept that because that is Opposition. What I am telling my honourable friends is do not raise too many expectations and you are going to solve all the problems because, heaven forbid, if you ever get to be Government you will have a lot of focus on you from the expectations you have raised without any opportunity or ability to resolve those expectations. My honourable friend has on a number of occasions talked about other programs.

As I say, I look forward, Mr. Acting Speaker, to the Estimates process because not only will my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, have an opportunity to identify the problems which we can explore with him and the Liberal Caucus, their variation of answer to the problem and if it is a reasoned answer that does not involve a great deal of extra spending, I am certainly willing to listen. Even where there is a request for additional spending, that is an appropriate solution in some cases and we have done that.

We have started to focus on more resources, speech therapy and audiology. There has been some success at the Health Sciences Centre on the audiology side. The waiting list was 12 months when we came into Government one year ago. Today, because of additional resources put in place in October-November of last year, audiology is down to two months.

I did not hear my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, bring that out in his questions. My honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic in the Liberal Party said, well, what about the increasing waiting list for children, pre-school children, wanting speech therapy services? That has grown because the announcement of additional resources last fall by myself, by this Government, was very favourably received and raised the expectations of people who had maybe given up that they were going to have a chance to have their pre-schoolers receive services. They have applied to the Health Sciences Centre, and the waiting list has grown. That is a problem that is being addressed actively by this Government.

But the one thing that my honourable friends in the Liberal Party again have failed to tell the people of Manitoba is that more pre-school children are receiving service today than were receiving services one year ago. That is a positive accomplishment, not for this Government, but for those children. I consider that issue to be an extremely important one, a very important one because if a child cannot communicate adequately when they get to school, their ability to learn is impeded. That goes without saying. In the school system we have a significant resource of speech therapy, but it is after the fact, Mr. Acting Speaker. It is after the child reaches school. I would hope that we can turn the system over the years around so we intervene earlier, so that a child does not have a problem upon entering school.

I think that would receive no disagreement in this House, no disagreement at all. No, I have not heard from my honourable friends, but I would assume that

common-sense approach would be favourably viewed by even the Liberal Party and its Health Critic.

We will find out when we get to Estimates, but in the meantime, Dr. William MacDiarmid is taking and giving us what he believes is an appropriate course of action for audiology, speech therapy, physiotherapy and occupational therapy in terms of meeting the needs for those disciplines in the health care system. No doubt the solution that he is going to propose will cost Government additional resources, so it would be better not to have that report as Government.

We consider the issue serious, one that has been growing over the years, has not been addressed, needs to be addressed, and we are addressing it. Yet my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, stands up and says nothing is being done. Again my honourable friend is wrong, absolutely wrong.

That troubles me to some degree, because when the Liberal Party came in here in April of 1988 with renewed membership, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) said we are going to be different. We are going to be a responsible Opposition and offer constructive criticism, and we are going to offer positive solutions. That soon failed and fell away, because constructive criticism means that you do give credit where credit is due.

That has not been forthcoming. All we hear is the negative side from the Liberal Health Critic of how a waiting list is growing. That is correct. Speech therapy, that is correct. Open-heart surgery, that is correct, but at the same time more people are being served in both programs, because of what this Government has done in terms of resources. It is fair to criticize, but provide the other side of the coin, i.e., that additional people are receiving service.

That can carry on throughout the entire health care system, Mr. Acting Speaker, and that is why I say I look forward to the debate in the Manitoba Health Services Commission Estimates, because they will allow an opportunity, not simply for the Liberal Health Critic to identify what he perceives to be difficulties, but will give the Liberal Party full opportunity to indicate what the solutions are. Our solutions will be offered at Estimates time, as I was prepared to offer them last year, and I will be prepared to offer them this year in Estimates.

I believe, and I believe sincerely, that there is more co-ordination, more focus, more planning, more direction in health care today than there has been for a number of years. That is because we have taken and we have said that Government no longer has all the answers. We are actively seeking, from reasoned individuals in and out of the health care community, their advice on how we approach the many challenges to health care in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I can simply say to you I believe that approach will build a stronger, a better, a more efficient and a higher quality health care system in the Province of Manitoba. I would like every single day to be offering another solution to another problem that is identified or to offer a new direction every single

day. That is not the reality of health care today. You have to have your answers achieved at through a reasoned discussion that involves not simply the narrow issue at hand, but the health care system as a whole.

That is why you cannot make your decision at St. Boniface in obstetrics in isolation of the system, nor are we. That is why you do not make the decision in terms of extended treatment beds at municipal hospitals in isolation of the system. You must consider Deer Lodge and the impact of that new facility. You must consider the proposal at Concordia and Grace in that whole equation, and that is being done, Mr. Acting Speaker.

* (1520)

When we reach conclusions and have answers developed, we are willing to stand by the decisions we have made, and we have made a great number of them over the past 12 months in Government. Not all of them have been favourably received by my honourable friends in the Opposition. I expect that, but I believe that they have left us with a better health care system than we had one year ago, not a health care system without problems, because that does not exist anywhere in Canada.

I simply want to point out to my honourable friends that problems in the health care system of Canada did not get to be a topic of discussion in Maclean's, The Globe and Mail, and any other major publication across Canada until there was perceived to be a crisis in Ontario, Ontario under a Liberal Government.

It does not matter to me what the political stripe is of the Government in Ontario. It does not bother me at all, because I know the pressures they are facing in the system. The same sort of pressures are hitting the system right across this nation, and every single province is attempting through the best way possible to focus community intelligence, systems intelligence, and personnel intelligence, i.e., those health care providers, the intelligence and the wisdom they have, to give their respective Governments some hopeful solutions to health care.

A very positive direction on the national scene, Mr. Acting Speaker, among the provincial Ministers, is a desire that we share the workable solutions in our health care systems provincially with our counterparts across Canada, so that we do not, if you will, reinvent the wheel.

I think that is a signal that across Canada the problems have become non-partisan, that these problems are large enough in the health care system that we have to come to reasoned solutions, not flailed suggestions of Opposition, but reasoned solutions. Every Government, whether they be Progressive Conservative, Liberal or Social Credit is wrestling with the development of those solutions, each in their own fashion, each in their own province.

It is a goal of the provincial Health Ministers to share the successes and a caution on the failures, because we all have our share of those when we have tried to do things different in the health care system.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I simply close by saying to my honourable friends in Opposition, I look forward to the

Health Estimate debate this year for the sharing of ideas that they may have to solutions to the system, to the problems they perceive. I very much look forward to that, because the problem we have in Manitoba is probably an easier problem to resolve than in many other jurisdictions across Canada, and I can say that with confidence, having met with my counterparts. We are further advanced in some solutions than other provinces, and that is positive for the people of Manitoba.

As I did last year when I opened the Estimates of the Health Department, I look forward to the debate. I like the thrust and the parry of the debate. That has never troubled me at all, but I also look forward to the constructive suggestions from my honourable friends, not simply the easy identification of what they perceive to be the problems, but some semblance of where they believe the solution lies.

If it is in additional funding and additional funding only, then simply ask yourself before you make that argument why has not additional funding worked over the last 20 years in the Province of Manitoba, because the Department of Health has been the most generously funded department consistently in the provincial jurisdiction in the last 20 years. Before you come with simply the answer, you need more money, be able to identify how that is going to solve the problem when it has not in the past, and be prepared, Mr. Acting Speaker, to defend where the money comes from.

That is a request I make of my honourable friend, and I know that he will attempt, as critic for the Liberal Party, to accede to that request because health care is too serious a matter to simply only have alarming questions and no reasoned solutions to offer. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Mr. Doer: I would like to speak on the Interim Supply Bill and matters before the House.

I believe that this is a very important item. I know we are spending a lot of time on the Department of Health. Given that it is one-third of the Government's Estimates and therefore one-third of the requirement of the Crown for 75 percent of the total expenditures, it is appropriate that we spend time in this Chamber talking about health care and time we spend on other issues of priority under the Interim Supply Bill.

I would say that, yes, the Minister of Health is good at the thrust and parry of issues. Nobody has ever disputed that fact. We all enjoy that from time to time. The issue here is the administrative leadership of the department and where the health care system is going. I believe we will spend a lot of time in the Department of Health in the Estimates this year. We look forward to that process because there are some very important issues to raise. Why did it take so long to establish the Health Advisory Task Force? Why, after establishing the Health Advisory Task Force, was there so little representation from some of the key groups? Why, after one year of the Government being in office, May of '89, do we have the first newsletter coming out from the department, issue No. 1, in terms of the health care challenges facing this province? That to me is

symptomatic I believe of a department that has got a committee that is stuck in cement in terms of moving forward the agenda of the health care system and the priorities of Manitobans.

Yes, we should talk about where the money is coming from but we should also talk about how smart we are spending the money. That is why we have raised questions in this Chamber and will continue to raise questions in the Chamber about the extended care beds in Concordia Hospital and how we can use our money smarter at Concordia; how we have raised questions on home care and how we should not be underfunding through underspending our Home Care Program and cutting people off those needed programs and services throughout our communities; why we have not funded the Health Action Centre and the other community-based groups and Clinic, for example; why we do not have a thrust in prevention in health care; why we have not spoken out even today in terms of the changes and the warnings on the tobacco products that can result in dramatic changes in our health care system. Those are the issues that we will be raising in the Health Care Estimates and the priorities of this Government.

We also think there is a crisis in the health care system at the federal Government's nature. When we look at the numbers and figures that are being produced, and we produced the EPF numbers for the next five years under the present Budget, it carries on a trend of Government spending that I think is very inappropriate, Government spending that will provide for radical shares from the federal Government. It will kill us softly, 1 percent per year, I think those are the issues we want to discuss also with the Minister of Health.

In terms of Interim Supply, Mr. Acting Speaker, . . .

* (1530)

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Point of order.

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

Mr. Orchard: Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker, on a point of order. Twenty minutes ago, whatever, half an hour ago, my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic (Mr. Cheema), and I got into an across-the-floor discussion.

I understand my honourable friend, from discussions with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), has taken offence, personally, of comments that I have made to him across the floor. As I indicated, in indicating on a point of order before, I intended no personal reflection, no insult to my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic. I did not use that phraseology in any meaning meant in an offensive way. I want my honourable friend to be assured of that. To make that assurance doubly clear, Mr. Acting Speaker, I am fully prepared to apologize to my honourable friend for any discomfort that unintended remark might have left with him,

because I meant no insult, no connotation, or any other issue. To my honourable friend, the Health Critic, I will offer my apology.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Acting Speaker, speaking again on the Interim Supply Bill—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): Order, please. I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) for the matter that he raised, and I believe this brings this matter to a conclusion.

BILL NO. 29—THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989 (Cont'd)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Acting Speaker, continuing on the Interim Supply Bill. We have raised some issues that the Health Minister (Mr. Orchard) will, I am sure, read in Hansard in terms of the one-third of the Budget for the Department of Health and the priorities that we believe are important to move on.

I would note, for the Minister of Health's attention, that we do not think it is appropriate that Newsletter No. 1, dealing with the Health Advisory Task Force and the many health priorities, comes out in May of 1989, fully a year after the swearing in of this Minister and this Government. We believe that is a symptom, that is not the issue in the health care system, but we believe it is symptom of a department that is, quite frankly, not moving forward in community-based health and other preventative-based health which we believe is the solution for some of our health care problems although we recognize that health will always be insatiable, but we should be able to deal with many of the problems and challenges we believe in a much more appropriate way.

Talking about Interim Supply, I want to go on to a couple of other departments in Government. I want to talk about the whole area of the economic strategy of this Government. Last week we raised the whole effect of the Free Trade Agreement on the Government and asked whether there was any impact study going on with the increased activity in the manufacturing sector with the Mexican-based Canadian companies. I was disappointed that the Ministers did not have an answer on that question. They have ads now in the media dealing with the Free Trade Agreement and how Manitoba employers or employees can fully benefit from that agreement, but I think they are whistling past a few graveyards.

I really believe they should look at what has happened in Ontario when there has been movement of jobs in the manufacturing sector to the manufacturing valleys in Mexico with promises to reduce labour costs by over \$20,000 per employee per year. I do not believe that the Minister of Finance's predictions this year, which are below last year's predictions in manufacturing increases, can withstand over the next 10 years a massive shift in manufacturing based on production

costs through loopholes that have been identified before and now during the first stages of the Free Trade Agreement. I am raising it today because this is not the same kind of form perhaps of Question Period where we are raising things in a public way as part of our job. Perhaps the Government Ministers would take very close attention. I referred them to some articles previously in the Globe and Mail dealing with manufacturing jobs that have been lost from Ontario to go down to Mexico, and that is a company now that has moved in now to Manitoba and is circulating information to Manitobans. In fact, it is circulating information of opportunity in Mexico before the Government circulated opportunities in ads that were in the weekend's newspapers.

So I ask you, in the full non-light outside of Question Period, to please look at that. It is a serious issue. There are manufacturing companies now looking, as they did already in Ontario, and moving jobs that will affect families in this province. We cannot just take a philosophical position. I respect Conservatives for having a consistent position on free trade. I do not respect their position on it. I really believe that now that we are partially in the Free Trade Agreement, you have got to look at the change in the dollar, the fact that they are propping the dollar up. Part of that is raising interest rates. Is that dollar propping at 84 cents or 83 cents and the raise of interest rates that are affecting many of your constituents, is that any part of a silent part of the Free Trade Agreement?

When the McDonald Commission first reported on the economic conditions of the Free Trade Agreement, it studied the relationship of the Canadian to the U.S. dollar and they could not come up with any conclusions about what would happen. It was predicted though, at that time when MacDonald said we should make the leap of faith; it was predicted by Clarence Barbour for Manitoba that the dollar would stay around 79 cents, 78 cents, and that would help our export, there would be no reason to believe that it would go up. Well, it has gone up, Mr. Acting Speaker, and you look at the balance of payment problems with Canada and the United States, it has decreased from \$26 billion down to below \$10 billion to our advantage. That is a massive change under the Free Trade Agreement in the last year and a half, but it is not all because of the Free Trade Agreement alone, it is partially because of it.

If you look at the fact that the dollars has been propped up at 83 cents and 84 cents, and look at the fact that every political Party at the national level, including the federal Conservatives under Blenkarn, had said that these interest rates are having a devastating effect on the Canadian economy, and it is really doing nothing to deal with the alleged goal of the Canadian Government to deal with the inflation rate in this province.

Well, I believe, Mr. Acting Speaker, that the dollar is being artificially propped up to 83 cents and 84 cents; it is not in our best interests in terms of exports; it is not in our best interests in terms of the inflation rate and the interest rates in this country. I would much rather have the dollar go down to 79 cents or 80 cents and have greater exports and have lower interest rates.

I ask the question, how much of our economy is strangled for this 83 cent to 84 cent dollar? I believe it is part of the Free Trade Agreement. I have to tell you, Mr. Acting Speaker, I happen to believe that it defies any economic logic for Canadians, particularly in the regions. I believe there is something there that I cannot kick or touch in that Free Trade Agreement dealing with the 83 cent, 84 cent dollars.-(Interjection)-Yes, on a point of order, sure. I believe that is a very important factor.

I believe the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) wants to rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): The Honourable Member for Kildonan, on a point of order.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Acting Speaker, on a point of order, what happened about 20 minutes ago, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has apologized and I accept his apology. It leaves a doubt in my mind that when we are all Honourable Members in this House, what that special term "sit down, boy" means to anyone, not only to me, but all other Members. I am greatly disturbed and I think it really disheartened me today, for the last one-and-a-half years, why am I here if I am not going to be respected equally.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Minenko): I would just like to thank the Honourable Member for his comments; however, there is no point of order.

The Honourable Member for Concordia, with respect to the Bill.

Mr. Doer: Thank you. Just carrying on, on the discussion. I mentioned the Free Trade Agreement, and I really believe that we can make ideological positions in this Chamber, but I really believe it is important to take positions also on the basis of what pragmatically will happen in this Chamber for Manitobans.

Now we had our ideological fight in 1988, November 21, 1988, and our side of the debate did not prevail. We prevailed in popular vote, but we did not prevail in terms of seats. I believe, Mr. Acting Speaker, that there are very major impacts. There are winners and losers in free trade. We disagreed about whether there would be more winners than losers, but I think it is incumbent upon this Government to take a look at the losers as well as the winners. I think it is important beyond just defending the November 21st positions for all of us to take a look at who is winning and who is losing in terms of Manitoba families, because everyone of these families it does lose, it is another livelihood lost, and it is a major decision in our communities whether it is Ogilvie or Marr's Marina or others. I believe that we have to keep our eyes wide open on the effect of this trade agreement.

* (1540)

We have seen the changes in the unemployment insurance which will impact on this provincial Government, negatively, in terms of the welfare rates in this province. We have done an analysis of Winnipeg in terms of the changes based on the unemployment

rate. That will—I am sure the Minister has done that—have a very negative effect on our welfare rates and the contributions of the provincial Government. More than that, a family who is on unemployment insurance is in a lot different dignity position, based on paying for an insurance program, than a family who is in a situation of going on welfare, especially a worker that has been working for 30, 40 years. The thought of somebody that has contributed so much to society through no fault of their own, through a rationalization, a merger or some other New York Stock Exchange term, they never get laid off, they always get downsized. You never say what you mean any more. All of us, I guess, can be accused of the same thing. Nobody ever says what they mean any more. They get downsized and you lose your job. It is atrocious for those families and their communities.

I really believe that this Government has got to have an economic strategy and part of that economic strategy, we cannot deal with all of it today, is the winners and losers in a free trade environment, both in terms of social services, which we are seeing now with UIC, health care, whether we are seeing a mass of erosion over the next 5 years in this Budget in terms of the federal contributions or the regional development grants, which were predicted beforehand and are unfortunately coming true, or in the economic activity of the private sector and its ability to move capital and change labour, north and south.

I am also worried, on a personal nature, that we will adopt some of the U.S. labour standards, the right-to-work legislation and other issues that I think is antithetical to the Canadian quality of life and our traditions.

So that is health care and the economy a bit. I think in Interim Supply we should comment about the lack of rural economic development. We commented on the period of time when the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) proposed a rural development department, we said it should be Rural Economic Development. We believe that the positions that are in Business Development and Tourism and the ministries that are in Business Development and Tourism should be moved to the Rural Economic Development. We believe that business development, small business development and tourism should be moved from Industry Trade and Technology, and that Minister to Rural Development and call it Rural Economic Development.

The other area we would like to address is the environment. We believe that the Minister has inherited a huge problem. The former Minister had a philosophy of running the department that said it runs itself. Well, it ran him right out of the department, and that is too bad, because it is a very important priority area of the province. The First Minister made an error in combining Labour, Workplace Safety and Health, Labour and the Environment. We also believe that the First Minister made a mistake by separating Workplace Safety and Health and the Environment into two separate departments. We made the statement at the time of the First Minister's announcement, that you should keep them together, because what is unsafe inside a workplace, what is a cancer-causing good inside a

workplace is a cancer-causing good outside of a workplace.

I did not know at the time that we were making those announcements, at the beginning of May when the Cabinet was shuffled, that we would be so correct some five, six weeks later, in terms of the exact regulations that have been changed by Cabinet and unannounced by the Government, announced by the Opposition. We expect that the changes will be announced shortly. I do not know why we are waiting past any Cabinet Wednesday to make those changes to those regulations and go back to where they were before, but you cannot have credibility on the sustainable development based on a speech from the Throne. You have to have credibility on sustainable development based on real Government policy. You really look at the laws and you really look at the regulations and you really look at what the Government is doing. It is going backwards on the environment and going backwards under the Workplace Safety and Health.

I recognize it was the former Minister who was quarterbacking these changes with a couple of selected members in the Chamber of Commerce, but I even know that a couple of selected members of the Chamber of Commerce have distanced themselves from the former Minister of Environment. They have said we did not even do that, even we in business do not want to take blame for all those changes, that is not our fault, that was the former Minister's fault. We do not know what he was doing on some of these proposals. Even some of my business contacts are saying, oh, god, we did not go ahead with that proposal, please do not blame us for that.

* (1550)

So I think one Wednesday of Cabinet has been too many for the Government not to change those things back. I would hope that this Wednesday it will be changed back again and we will have it finished before the Government stands. I see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) shaking his head. I look forward to a pretty good fight on this one because this is the kind of fight we like. We have been raising it since April 10. I know which side of people we stand on. We stand with the workers and the public on cancer-causing goods. If you want to stand with David Newman—the Member is finally going for it. The Member for the Chamber of Commerce, the Minister of the whatever it is now, is finally talking about this issue. I would be very embarrassed to face the new Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) and the new Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) having hung those changes and regulations on their shoulders and their necks. It must have made the former Minister—I do not know whether you could sleep at night after doing that, to watch two new Ministers have to defend those terrible changes. I could not have slept at night if I would have left changes and cancer-causing goods to two new Ministers and their portfolios.

Mr. Acting Speaker, you must hang your head in shame, I am sure the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery), in terms of those changes. We thought when the Cabinet shuffle was made we had gotten rid of all those changes

but they keep popping up. We await the real date, the July date, the permit being approved in St. Boniface. I wonder what the former Minister was doing with that one, the thing that blew sky-high in the air. It seems everything the former Minister touched blew sky-high. There are still things popping out the closet on a daily basis.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): The only difference is I have paid my way as I went through life.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Acting Speaker, especially that \$200,000 that was written-off from that bankrupt company in Portage la Prairie, real man of action all right. My taxes are in that money. I do not quite enjoy that bankruptcy any more, it was not bankruptcy—

I have to admit there is improvement. It used to take us about five minutes to get him off his feet, it took us at least six and a half minutes now when we went on to his areas. I know the damage control team in the central Premier's office has things pretty controlled now. They have the sock in his mouth. They have the hook around his neck when he stands up. We appreciate that believe me.

We will continue to—these are by way of general questions, Mr. Acting Speaker, but we believe in terms of the health care system, in terms of rural economic development, the environment, the economy and other key areas that there is a day of reckoning for the Members opposite, in terms of the cracks in their public relations walls. We will continue to widen those cracks not because we want to, but because this Government is not very good for Manitobans over the long run. Thank you, very much.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): I welcome this opportunity to speak briefly on the Interim Supply Bill, even though we are in the midst of Agriculture estimates. I get the distinct impression that we probably will not get very much further in the Estimates process between now and when we hopefully recess in three or four days, but I will not give up as the Minister of Finance indicates. One of the difficulties you have even when you are in the debate on the Estimates is that the errors of omission are the ones that are difficult to deal with because, of course, they do not appear as a line on the Budget. I think what we are faced with within the Agriculture budget is what I would regard as some serious errors of omission.

I think the first thing that I have to repeat, and I have brought this to the Minister's attention before, is my disappointment in the overall size of the Agriculture budget. Last year, we were dealing with a budget of \$107.3 million approximately, this year it has been reduced to 88. Now it was feasible to anticipate a significant reduction because of the drought aid that was provided last year. The drought aid last year was only \$18.3 million, so the reduction is actually more extensive than just the removal of the Drought Aid Program from last year.

The other thing that one has to appreciate is that there are at least two items in the budget this year

which I regard as shot-in-the-arm type of things, both of which are over three-quarters of a million dollars.

They are the Excess Summerfallow Program which is something that should have been looked at a long time ago. It is included in the budget at \$880,000,000, of which one-half of that goes to the federal Government

An Honourable Member: Thousand.

Mr. Laurie Evans: Eight hundred and eighty thousand dollars, of which half of it will be picked up by the federal Government. The other one that is one shot in the arm is the support to the honey producers of \$759,000.00. You add those two together and you are looking at a budget that is very substantially below what it was last year. Even if you take the figure that is budgeted of \$88.3 million, you are looking at a budget which is 1.83 percent of the total budget for the Department of Agriculture.

The Minister says spend more. I am not advocating spending more, I am advocating looking at the repriorization. I am satisfied that agriculture has to be identified as—if not the top priority, it certainly has to be identified as one of the high priorities, because the Minister has gone on record as saying this is the backbone of Manitoba's economy. While you are spending 1.83 percent of your Budget on that backbone, all I can say is that we need to have a better health system, because that backbone is going to get weaker and weaker and it is going to need some assistance; 1.83 percent of the Budget in this province is not sufficient to address the problems that are related to agriculture at the present time.

The other thing that is of major concern to me, Mr. Acting Speaker, is not only the size of the budget, but the fact that the four areas within this budget which address what I would refer to as the basic programs area, namely, the Agricultural Development and Marketing Division, the area there, there has been an addition that is far below the rate of inflation. In other words, there has not been a cut in that area of program. The regional services, the area where you are looking at the extension, once again that increase is below the cost of inflation, and finally the area of Policy and Economics Division, once again below the cost of inflation, so the three major components in the Department of Agriculture that relate to ongoing programs are all in the range of 1 percent to 2 percent—in other words, approximately or even less than 50 percent of the cost of inflation.

There has been in my opinion, Mr. Acting Speaker, a failure to address the areas where there is a need for some innovative thinking in agriculture. In other words, there is nothing that I would call new within the Department of Agriculture as far as initiatives are concerned that would assist in the revitalization of our rural communities.

One can always argue, why do you bring in the federal issues here, but we are faced with a federal Budget which has just been brought forward a few months ago where we are already looking at a sizable reduction in the federal support to agriculture. Now we are looking

at a reduction in the provincial support to agriculture, so you combine those and you are looking at a devastating situation as far as the rural communities are concerned.

We can look at just a couple of these things that have been serious. One, for example, is the reduction in the rebate for farm fuel which, on the average farm, is going to cost that producer somewhere in the range of \$700 to \$1000 per unit for that one issue alone. If you take a look at some of the other measures that are taking place, there is a 25 percent increase in the cost of freight, a significant cost to the producer. We are looking now at the Grain Commission and others that are involved in the regulatory process, adding additional cost to the farmer.

We have also been told that we might as well contemplate the complete demise of the so-called ad hoc programs, and unfortunately for the farming public, they have had to rely on these ad hoc programs for several years now, whether it be special grains payment or drought payment or whatever it is. I think the first thing the producers are going to realize is that even though we have had good rains and the crop looks as though it is off to an excellent start and the prices will be higher, the cost—

An Honourable Member: Is that a guarantee?

Mr. Laurie Evans: There is no guarantee of that but it looks promising.

The point I want to make is that the increased yield and the increased prices in all probability will not compensate for the lack of the ad hoc programs that the producers have had to rely on in recent years, so it could well be that even though the environmental conditions are better than they have been in past years and the prices are better, the farmers in fact may still find that their return is lower than it has been in the previous years.

* (1600)

Mr. Acting Speaker, there are a couple of other areas in the Agriculture budget that one has to be very cautious as to the interpretation, and the Minister during Estimates has clearly indicated the figures that are attributed here to crop insurance at the present time are meaningless figures, because I assume that the negotiations are currently going on, and there is another meeting on the 1st of August.

So all of a sudden we are probably going to be looking at an increase in the Agriculture budget that could be in the range of another \$15 million specifically for crop insurance. I do not want to be misconstrued as being accused of being opposed to crop insurance, because I am certainly not. I am very supportive of the Crop Insurance Program. But here you have a situation where the federal Government is offloading a very substantial amount of the cost of crop insurance onto the province. While there are some improvements being made in crop insurance, they are certainly not to the tune that would warrant that sort of an increase of cost to the province. I gather from the negotiations that are going

on, the other provincial Ministers of Agriculture have not taken a united stand and forced the federal Government to continue to pay the bulk of this cost. In other words, the offloading is serious.

The other area in the Agriculture budget that one has to look at with caution is the whole area of income insurance fund, which is the area that covers the cost of the various tripartite insurance programs. Here again, Mr. Acting Speaker, I am fully supportive of the concept of tripartite insurance, but the figures that are in the Estimates have to be looked upon as guesstimates at best because they are dependent on world markets. They may be close to being right, or they could be 25 percent to 30 percent off in either direction. So one has to look at this overall budget as being one that is certainly open to a lot of interpretation. One has to take a very flexible view on it in terms of the \$88 million that has been identified in the budget as being a realistic figure.

I want to dwell briefly, Mr. Acting Speaker, on the areas that I feel the Minister and his colleagues have virtually failed to take a serious look at, because the only things that they have identified as being significant in terms of the agriculture component of the Budget are the reduction in the education tax, which we all applaud. One could question as to why they went only from 25 percent to 35 percent. It would seem to me that if they could go the full 25 percent in the first year, perhaps they could consider going a little more than just an additional 10 percent this year.

The other items that they identify as being significant are the refund of aviation fuel tax purchased for crop spraying and the retention of the full exemption on marked fuel for farm consumption. These are both significant, but they are both relatively small. So one has to assume from that there was a little bit of soul searching or grasping for straws in order to identify the significant components as far as the agricultural budget is concerned. In fact, they were of relatively minor significance.

The other area that has not been addressed or referred to in the budget is the whole business of the closure or the shutting down of the Beef Stabilization Program, which here in Manitoba meant that the Government had to cover off something like \$17 million, which was the deficit position. This is not clearly identified anywhere in the budget, and one has to assume that it was picked up outside of the Department of Agriculture, but it is certainly not mentioned.

As I said before, the other aspects of tripartite, one can only wait and see as to how realistic the figures are that the Minister has provided.

The other area that is not mentioned, but one that is in the farm papers almost on a daily basis now, is the concern that rests with the whole concept of supply management. Here again, no mention in the budget of any support for supply management, even so far as providing funding for those in the supply management areas to go out and fight the cause, if and when they need to. We have already had very clear indication, Mr. Acting Speaker, that the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency is in bad shape because of the problems within

the organization as to the allocation of quotas. We have seen situations within the dairy industry, which is the other major industry that is under supply management, where the federal Government was asleep at the switch and forgot to put the right products on the exempted lists so they are now trying to make up for lost time and have that list added to and they have lost their credibility with the Americans. The Americans said, no way, if you could not realize that yogurt and the mozzarella cheese on pizza mixes and whatnot are things that are of significance to the dairy industry, do not expect us to add those to the list later on.

Likewise, they are having trouble with the poultry industry. There has been a significant increase in the quota that is permitted into Canada, and I think that it is fair to say that the supply-management sectors of Agriculture do not have the type of protection under the Free Trade Agreement that is necessary.

In talking about the Free Trade Agreement, I do not know how many have taken the time to read the, *Adjusting to Win*, the famous de Grandpre Report which has given very short shrift to agriculture and has come up with the nonsense that if we are going to process agricultural products here in Canada, we should be prepared to provide those agricultural products to the processor at the same price that their processing counterparts can get the commodity in the U.S. That simply means that either the producer has to take a beating on the component that goes into processing or the consumer has to pay more and, therefore, become even less competitive in terms of the prices that are available in Canada as opposed to the United States.

So the de Grandpre Report certainly has not addressed the issue in a meaningful way, as far as agriculture is concerned, as it relates to free trade. I think that the Conservatives, both federally and provincially, have made it clear that they do not have a great deal of sympathy for the supply-management. I think that those who are in the supply-management commodity areas had better be very, very cautious as to the long-term future of that particular component of the industry.

Another area that I think one has to regard with a lot of caution is what is happening to the Canadian Wheat Board. Now we have seen a Minister take unilateral action where he removed oats from the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, and he has done it simply by an Order-in-Council. Now you have some of the farm organizations talking in terms of what they refer to as flexibility as far as the marketing of other grains are concerned. I think within a short period of time we are going to see sufficient pressure put on to have at least some components of the barley production removed from the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board. It could well be that it is malting barley. The only reason they will not be contemplating the removal of Durham wheat from the Canadian Wheat Board is because it cannot be done through an Order-in-Council.

While the Minister has taken unilateral action, in terms of removing oats from the Canadian Wheat Board, he does not have the courage of his conviction to think in terms of a plebiscite dealing with canola, flax, rye,

the other crops that are of more significance than oats, to find out whether the producers would contemplate, or would be in favour of those particular crops being under the Canadian Wheat Board.

So, as far as the current Minister is concerned, Mr. Acting Speaker, it is a one-way street and one has to really question his conviction, as far as the retention of the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned. I think that when one went to the meetings that were held this spring, where the advisory members were talking to the membership at large, it was disgusting to see that the Minister had effectively muzzled the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canadian Grain Commissioners. In other words, they were to tow the Party line regardless and in actual fact went so far as to even prohibit the utilization of some of the duplicating facilities, and that type of thing in the offices, so that the advisory committee could not use them. So one certainly has to question the sincerity of the current Minister when it comes to the retention of the current strength of the Canadian Wheat Board.

There are a lot of other areas in the agricultural section, Mr. Acting Speaker, that were virtually ignored. I refer to such things as the whole question of the registration of pesticides and fertilizers and the patenting and the legislation, the generic herbicides and so on. This is an area that is of particular concern for the producer, but it is not mentioned in any place within the provincial Budget, given very short shrift in the federal Budget.

So one has to assume that once again a Tory is a Tory, and they are quite willing to let the private sector take its course of least resistance, and if the farmers are the ones that suffer in the interim, so be it. There is no willingness to ensure that this does not happen to the producer. You have situations here in Manitoba, for example, where you have a deposit on a pail, when you buy a pail of herbicide you have two different agencies now that are charging money for the so-called disposal of that pail. There are little things like this that on the surface do not appear to be too significant, Mr. Acting Speaker, but in terms of the cost to the producer they become significant over time.

Another area that is not really dealt with at any length in this particular Budget is that of farm financing. There is a statement that there is additional assistance to the beginning farmer, but it is very difficult to find it in this document, the Budget document, as to exactly where it is and what sort of a procedure will be used in order to facilitate the support to the beginning farmer. It is given very, very cursory treatment, Mr. Acting Speaker.

I want to applaud the Government for taking the initiative as far as the soil and water conservation strategy is concerned. I attended some of those hearings and the public participation, of course, was very extensive and I think that it was a meaningful participation.

* (1610)

I do have concerns, Mr. Acting Speaker, as to what the follow-up is going to be. Here again you have these vague promises that there will be something done

sometime by somebody somewhere, but it is never clearly spelled out as exactly how fast it is going. You get the impression, when you listen to a Tory Budget or a Tory Throne Speech that time is of no essence, that something will happen sometime somewhere, but there is no urgency ever identified in any of these issues. It is always a case of platitudes with no time frame, and I am very concerned when you look at these things and there is not a time frame associated with them.

This brings me to another area that I feel needs to be addressed and that is the whole concept that is being brought forward anytime you have a dilemma, you strike another committee. We have seen now the Advisory Council to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) which is supposed to look at the method of payment for the Crow rate benefit. Here we have a benefit of something like \$700 million a year that is being allocated at the present time to the railways.

We know the stand of the Tory federal Government, they want to pay it to the railways. We know the stand of the Tory Government in Alberta, they want to pay it to the producer. I was in error, the federal Government wants to see it go to the producers, Alberta wants to see it go to the producers. Grant Devine, the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, is not too sure what he wants. He is talking about a 50-50 split, but as is usually typical here in Manitoba we do not have a made-in-Manitoba plan. There are no recommendations put forward yet by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). Instead of biting the bullet and doing something on a very pro-active stance, he has struck a committee with no time frame that will come in sometime with perhaps some recommendations that are beneficial to Manitoba. My suspicion is by the time that committee gets together, comes up with an agreement, that probably it will be after the fact and once again Manitoba will be doing what has been dictated by the federal Government and the other provinces.

Likewise we have a situation where the red meat industry in this province, as far as the processing and packing is concerned, has virtually disappeared, but what do we have? Do we have a pro-active stance and something very definitive? No, instead what we have is the establishment of a Red Meat Forum. That Red Meat Forum is a volunteer organization with no clear-cut funding. Here again, you are dealing with a situation where there may be something recommended sometime but there is absolutely no time frame.

We have had a committee that has been established to look at the concept of decentralization. What have we seen in decentralization so far? The re-establishment of physicians in Boissevain, and now the establishment of a tripartite committee which will be located in Portage la Prairie—that so far is the extent of any decentralization. Obviously, that is a very small and perhaps a significant but certainly a very small beginning, Mr. Acting Speaker. So we are a long way from a comprehensive plan as far as decentralization is concerned that would be beneficial to rural Manitoba.

There is no evidence anywhere in this Budget that there is any co-ordination between the departments that should be involved. Obviously, Agriculture, the Department of Rural Development, Health, Education,

there needs to be co-ordination. The co-ordination never seems to be there. So you get the impression that you have all of these departments which are entities unto themselves, that the communication that occurs between them is minimal, and that certainly if the communication is minimal one has to assume that the co-ordination is non-existent.

There is nothing in this Budget, Mr. Acting Speaker, that would lead me to be optimistic about the future for rural Manitoba. I think once again, here you have a front bench and the Cabinet in this Tory Government, which is made up primarily of individuals with a rural background, and yet there seems to be a complete lack of support for the rural requirements, the rural problems that we have and we cannot go on and on and on.

All you have to do is to drive through rural Manitoba and see the ghost towns that are out there, the towns that are dying. There has to be something done. You stop in any one of those towns, and they tell you that they are not getting equality of service when it comes to health. They are not getting equality of service when it comes to education. They are suffering, they are dying on the vine and they are hoping. There is really nothing to provide any hope. When you look at the Budget, Mr. Acting Speaker, here again we are faced with a great deal of procrastination, the establishment of committees but absolutely no time frame. Now there has to be a lot of thought given to exactly what you are going to do to foster the revitalization of rural Manitoba. There have been concepts put forward such as income stabilization at the farm level which I think has a lot of merit.

Here again we are faced with something that was first proposed as early as 1981. We are now in 1989 and it is still in the so-called committee and paper and studying stage. One can assume at the rate at which it is progressing that income stabilization probably will not be a reality in this century.

I think we have to step back and realize that this century is virtually gone. Another few months and we are going to be into the last decade of this century and do not have all the time in the world. If we do not do something in the next decade to try and revitalize and rejuvenate rural Manitoba, rural Manitoba will be a thing of the past. It has to be done. There is not a situation where there is no time limit on this.

The time is past for the establishment of the committees, study groups, hearings and all the rest of it. This Government, many of the Members have been sitting in Opposition here for six-plus years. It is time they had a plan that is ready to put into action rather than start thinking about the development of a plan at this time, so we are looking at action.

Just to pick out a couple of the specifics, Mr. Acting Speaker, we have been talking now for many, many years about the right-to-farm legislation. We are not going to see right-to-farm legislation in this particular Session. There is no real guarantee that we will see it when we come back in the fall. We have had a great deal of discussion about changes in the farm ownership plan, discussing a problem that has been with us now

for several years, nothing on the horizon that would indicate this is going to be changed.

I just want to impress upon the Members of this House that I am not satisfied with the way agriculture has been treated. I think it is a shame that the industry which has been identified as the backbone of this province is given a budget which is equivalent to 1.83 percent of the total budget. Members opposite say spend, spend, spend. I am not advocating greater expenditures. What I am advocating is that you take a look at agriculture, give it the priority that it needs and give it a fair share. It is not being given a fair share. All I am asking is to bump it up to something in excess of 2 percent of the total, which would be a major increase.

I have to dwell on one other topic that is of concern and has been for many years, Mr. Acting Speaker, and that is the whole question of research. Here we have a situation where the university for many years has been identified as the research arm of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, but the funding for that research has remained static now for many, many years. There is no indication of any improvement. When the farm economy and the rural economy is in the doldrums, that is the time you should be plugging some more funding into agricultural research, because it is identified in many cases that is the area of best return on your dollar as far as an investment is concerned, but it has been totally ignored.

Why is it totally ignored? It is totally ignored because this particular Government has the philosophy of laissez-faire that the private sector will do everything. Well, the private sector is not going to pick up and run with these deficiencies. They are not going to do it. We have the past history. The private sector does not do it in western Canada and, unless the Government takes the initiative to provide the stimulus, it will not be done. Without a sound, strong research base, agriculture in this country is in trouble, so they are going to have to rely instead, if they are not prepared to do it themselves, on it being done nationally.

The Conservative Government at the national level has reduced and allowed the serious erosion of agricultural research. That means you have to rely on the United States or you have to rely on western Europe or the Japanese in order to provide the expertise and the updating that is necessary for us to be viable within the marketplace. We pride ourselves as being effective and efficient in the marketplace, but that can only last so long unless we keep stride and make sure that we are up to date as far as the agricultural research is concerned.

With that, Mr. Acting Speaker, I think I have indicated some of the major areas that I feel are lacking. I would be remiss though if I did not bring to your attention one other area that is of major concern to me. That is the fact we have been told ever since this Session began that the ERDA contracts are under negotiation. One of the major ERDA contracts, subagreement in agriculture for \$38.5 million was made up of \$23 million from the federal Government and 15 million from the provincial Government. This project ran out as of the 31st of March of this year. We are now spending money

that was surplus in there, that was not utilized during the initial five years, but all of those sub-projects within that subagreement will slowly die a natural death as the money runs out.

I think it is evident from the discussion we heard regarding the subagreement on tourism that in all probability these ERDAs will not be renewed. If those ERDAs are not renewed, it is going to be a very significant blow to the agriculture sector, not only the research but a lot of the conservation work, the conservation districts, forage programs, that type of thing were conducted under ERDA, and without the replacement of ERDA with something at least of equal magnitude, then the agriculture sector is going to suffer.

* (1620)

I am not impressed with the Agriculture budget. I have given the Minister his due credit in some of the areas where he has taken an initiative, but I get the feeling that the Minister of Agriculture, in this Cabinet, has very little clout. I get the impression that he must sit in the back bench and allow those who are on the front bench to override him and that Agriculture takes the crumbs that are left over after all of the other priorities have been established. So once you have health satisfied, you have social services satisfied, you have education satisfied. If you are fortunate, there is a little bit of dropping left over for Agriculture.

All I am trying to impress upon Members Opposite is they have got to get their priorities right, get agriculture up near the top and for goodness sake in the next Budget, if you cannot do it now, make sure that agriculture gets at least 2 percent of the Budget rather than a measly 1.83, which is what I would call very insufficient for the industry that is the backbone of this country. You have one choice, either you improve the support so that the backbone is stronger or you rely on the Health Department to keep agriculture alive, one or the other. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Mr. Jerrie Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Acting Speaker, the date on the Interim Supply Bill is in some respects traditional. Every Legislature, in most cases at least, are required to deal with it to allow the Government to continue to spend money as an Interim measure until they receive final approval for the expenditure of funds through this body.

No one, I think, on either side of the House, certainly on the Opposition benches has any intention of stalling, delaying, frustrating the efforts of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to ensure that the Bills of the Province of Manitoba can continue to be paid. The Interim Supply debate gives us an opportunity, once again, to review not so much the budgetary policy of the provincial Government but of the spending policies of the provincial Government. Many people on this side have had an opportunity to pass judgment on the Budget, and I do not intend to rehash the Budget Debate. I think we have, for the part of the New Democratic Party, supported some of the budgetary measures of the Government, some which I think were of particular interest to working people and those related primarily to the tax measures, which saw some taxation relief to lower and middle income families in the province.

Mr. Acting Speaker, that does not mean that we are not concerned about the priorities that are being established by this Government, and in particular the spending authority. We are about to provide the Minister of Finance with Interim financing for the programs that are provided to the people of Manitoba. As I say, on the whole that is a worthwhile objective and not something that Members on this side would want to frustrate. We also, I think, are obligated when we are given opportunities like this, to review the specific implications, ramifications of the Government's spending priorities when they reflect on our constituencies.

The last week, two weeks, have been particularly trying for me and my constituents unfortunately as we begin to understand the sense of priorities coming from particular Government departments and particular Ministers of this Government. I received a letter from the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) last week announcing to myself that the Department of Highways and Transportation was closing the Motor Vehicle Branch in Flin Flon. I feel that this is a grievable action on the part of the Government of Manitoba. There is a long history to this debate, and I would begin by saying that some three or four months ago I learned, quite by accident, that the department was contemplating closing the Motor Vehicle Branch in Flin Flon. For the record, the procedure that is being followed by this Government—never mind the appropriateness of the policy of closure but in terms of the treatment of the individuals who have, in some cases, served the province for 20 years plus—is also reprehensible.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the departmental officials flew into Flin Flon in the morning, had a quick meeting, less than two hours with staff, and caught the plane out of Flin Flon, leaving the impression that the office would be closed, two of the staff would be laid off, and two more transferred. You can appreciate that I got some calls from constituents and some of the people involved who were upset and angry at the treatment, not to mention concerned over the implications that the loss of this service would have for a community of some 8,000 people and serving a much larger area.

When I found out that the department had these plans in mind, I contacted the department, spoke to the Minister, and raised the issue in a public way. I also met with people in Flin Flon who I encouraged to do likewise because we are told by this Government on a continual basis that they are concerned about decentralizing services. They are concerned about jobs in rural and northern Manitoba, and this did not appear to me to be a legitimate way of achieving those objectives. In fact, it is counterproductive in every sense of the word.

I was pleased after my intervention and the intervention of some of the people in Flin Flon, including the mayor incidentally who was the Progressive Conservative candidate who ran against me and also opposed this heartless and cruel practice and intention, we succeeded in having the matter reviewed. We received a nice letter from the Premier of the Province (Mr. Filmon) saying this matter was under review. The

matter was not under review for very long, and as I say, I received a letter last week from the Minister indicating that the office would be closed.

Mr. Acting Speaker, when we were here discussing Interim Supply, it makes me wonder why we would support an Interim Supply measure which includes, for my constituents, cutbacks. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) gets quite irate, gets on his high horse, so to speak, when anyone on this side suggests that the Government is cutting back services. So there be no misunderstanding to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), there have been cutbacks in services.

Individual seniors from across this province have said, yes, we are getting cut back. The rules are being applied ruthlessly. Seniors in every corner of the province are saying, yes, I have been cut off. I have been asked to pay for this service when it has been provided in the past to me. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) need not be upset by the revelation on the part of Members on this side of the Chamber that there are cutbacks taking place.

Those cutbacks, unfortunately, are not solely happening in the Department of Health. The Department of Highways and Transportation is another example. The sad fact of the matter is that these cuts, the reduction of service to Manitobans, is happening across Government departments. The Department of Natural Resources has seen a \$300,000 cut in the Parks Branch, year over year, in the details released by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), \$300,000.00.

I would be the first one to acknowledge that when we were Government the Department of Natural Resources, and particularly the Parks Branch, did not always get their due. The Government appreciates this, and the previous speaker talked about the difficult decisions that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), and the Government had to make when it came to whether to fund Health and Education versus Agriculture.

* (1630)

The same arguments apply when one has to consider whether to fund Health and Education versus additional services to our parks, or additional services to people who use parks. But what is so ironic and perhaps paradoxical about the latest cut to the Department of Natural Resources, and the Parks Branch in particular, is that at the same time the Government chose to increase fees to seniors to introduce, actually for the first time in Manitoba, additional fees for seniors. I learned a few days ago that we are now the only western province that requires seniors to pay an entrance fee into a provincial park.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, the additional costs to Manitobans as a result of cuts, the additional costs to Manitobans that have become a part of living with a Tory Government, are out there and they are being felt day by day by my constituents and the constituents of every Member in this Chamber.

While we are considering, while we are contemplating whether to pass Interim Supply, to pass this legislation

providing spending rights to the provincial Government, I have to consider the needs of my constituents when it comes to education and training. We know that the Department of Education and Training has cut some \$3 million out of the Job Training for Tomorrow Program, training that was targeted to young adults in Manitoba, training that is sorely needed by the increasing number of young people who are unemployed, who cannot find employment, who have exhausted other alternatives, both in terms of continuing education and job opportunity.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the timing is wrong. We certainly have to question the spending priorities of the Government. I believe quite firmly that the Government over time will start to hear from those young people who are left unemployed, who are now scratching to find employment in other parts of the country. The sad fact of the matter is that these kinds of policies and these kinds of spending decisions are relatively painless in the short term. Most people do not understand the implications.

What we do find over time, however, is that when people cannot find a job, when they cannot secure employment in their area, they migrate to other areas. They migrate from Brandon, Portage, Flin Flon and Thompson to Winnipeg. When they cannot find employment in Winnipeg, and the unemployment is probably more disheartening in Winnipeg than in other parts of the province, then they move to Ontario or they move to British Columbia or they move somewhere else.

That is the impact that we are seeing now. They move to the big T.O. They move anywhere they can find a job, anywhere they feel is more inviting in terms of employment and opportunities.

So we are going to see over time the continual decline of Manitoba's population. We are going to see the out-migration of our best, our most talented and our young people, Mr. Acting Speaker, because of the policies of the provincial Government.

I talked about Education and Training. The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) has refused a company in Manitoba that was producing educational software. I learned some two months ago that the Manitoba Computer Assisted Learning Consortium, MCALC for short, was in danger of having to close its doors because of lack of support from the provincial Government at a time when it was making significant strides toward self-sufficiency in an area, incidentally, which is extremely competitive and time-consuming in terms of development of courseware that is utilizable by a majority or a significant minority of school divisions in the province and learning institutions in the province.

The Minister had an opportunity to lend some support to an organization that would in the final analysis produce Manitoba software for Manitoba high schools, and would have accessed an educational software market which is huge in North America and in the rest of Canada. The Minister chose not to do that.

The penalty for that again is not going to be evident to most people until we realize two or five or 10 years

from now that students in Manitoba are using computer assisted learning resources, but those resources are coming from New York or Scandinavia or somewhere else. We are losing a business opportunity here and we are losing an important tool in the support of rural and northern Manitoba because it seems to me and it seemed to school divisions throughout the province and the new Distance Education and Technology Branch that this approach to providing alternatives and options to our learners in rural and northern Manitoba, whether they be high school learners or adult learners, was a reasonable alternative and something worth supporting, but, no, the Government could not afford to spend money to support that kind of an organization. It was not from lack of trying.

I met with one of the principals of MCALC, in fact, an individual who spent the better part of five years developing the idea, promoting the idea, and working for the organization. To say that he was disappointed is an understatement.

I think the consequences are going to be significant over the long term for teachers and students in rural Manitoba, for those adults seeking upgrading opportunities and adult basic education opportunities in the province. It is another example of questionable priorities on the part of the Government.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there are other examples, educational examples of questionable decisions. The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) for reasons only known to himself has interfered, in my opinion, with the operations at the university in support of perhaps a friend, a political friend—I do not want to go too deeply into that—but interfered in any event by agreeing, apparently outside the normal process of university approval for courses, course decisions, tuition decisions, to provide support to the Faculty of Management. On the surface, one may say there is nothing wrong with the Government providing externally and outside of the process, additional support to a faculty, except when one considers the implications.

There is a process at the university for determining which courses will be offered by a faculty. Those decisions are made on academic criteria, on the criteria of the needs of the students for a full and complete program. They are not done at the whim of an individual. Despite the decision on the part of Government to provide some \$215,000 this year to the Faculty of Management, I can tell you with some degree of certainty this proposal that has been prepared by the faculty in all likelihood will not pass. It is being reviewed by the Senate, it has to be approved by the Board of Governors and only at that time, only after those two processes have been followed should the Government have dared to involve itself. What it is doing is signalling to the university community that the best way to get money from the university itself is to lever that money by approaching the Government, getting some support for a particular program, going to the university and saying we have a million if you will give us some.

Now, that is no way to establish a university program. Universities have functioned as independent entities without that kind of leveraging for centuries and the interference, in my opinion, by this Government and

with the support of the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) is unconscionable, and it will come back to haunt the Minister because there is going to be a mini revolt at the university. His actions will ultimately make it more difficult for the faculty to have its plan approved, and I think it will raise the hackles of many of the other leaders in other faculties who do not want to become involved in that political process to have their programs ratified and funded in an appropriate way.

Mr. Acting Speaker, it is another example of money that is being set aside for, in my opinion, a political reason, not for an educational reason and that is simply not good enough. It raises, I think, a legitimate question about the priorities of the Government and how those priorities are being addressed or approached.

The Department of Education is also embroiled in a battle with school divisions, in particular one school division, about capital funding. I had an opportunity to meet with the Winnipeg School Board, representatives of the Winnipeg School Board who incidentally are extremely unhappy with the treatment they have received from this Government and the Minister of Education in particular. I know how busy the Minister's schedule is, but the Winnipeg School Division has been snubbed on at least five or six occasions by the Minister.

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

Meetings have been cancelled, and that is no way to treat a school division that serves 20 percent, 25 percent, 23 percent of the total student population in the province. He seems to have endless time for private schools and their particular problems, but he has no time whatsoever for the public school system, and that is unfortunate. The capital allocation for school construction this year, although it has increased over what was allocated last year, is still not adequate to meet the needs. If the Minister would have had the time to meet with the Winnipeg School Division Board he would have known that their immediately required capital support would have been in the neighbourhood of \$40 million.

* (1640)

I do not know how many people in this Chamber know that the Winnipeg School Division is unlike any other school division in the province, and I represent an area that has some unique characteristics. The Winnipeg School Division has 21 schools that were built before 1921—21 schools built before 1921—built before there were energy codes, built before there were safety standards, built before we became, I guess, increasingly aware of the cost of energy inefficiency and other kinds of inefficiency. Those schools simply do not provide the supports that a modern school can provide to its students and its staff.

The capital requirements of the Winnipeg School Division are monumental. As I say, simply to replace those 20 schools would cost in the neighbourhood of \$60 million to \$80 million. The school division is anxious that some of those needs be addressed. Certainly they are never going to be addressed if they cannot even meet with the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). It is an affront and it is unacceptable. It raises the whole

question of priorities of that Minister and the Government in general.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Madam Deputy Speaker, Madam Deputy, Deputy, Deputy Speaker, the problems with the services being provided to the people of Manitoba from this Government go beyond education. In Flin Flon—and I go back to my own constituency—the Flin Flon General Hospital has been waiting for a \$15 million upgrade, renovation and rebuilding for at least two years. They continue to be stalled and put on hold by the Government. Again, needs that are going unmet, health needs, means increasing and continuing high levels of patient transfers from Flin Flon to other centres for services that should be available in a hospital the size of Flin Flon, but they cannot be made available until we have some rebuilding and some additions provided to the physical plant.

I have already discussed briefly the fact that there is a genuine concern in northern Manitoba about the provision of health care. I recognize that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) likes to pretend there are no problems, but the fact of the matter is there are problems. My colleague from Thompson (Mr. Ashton) raised one with respect to the Thompson Hospital. The Minister will say we cannot fix these problems over night, but it certainly does not make the people in northern Manitoba feel any better when the Minister gets up and denies there is any problem because we are all aware of the fact that there are problems.

There are problems getting specialists. There are problems retaining doctors. There are problems retaining and attracting nurses. There are problems with the kinds of services that are offered in northern Manitoba and, Madam Acting Speaker, there are problems in providing northern transportation and emergency transportation from northern communities.

The Minister was quite exercised the other day when I raised the problem a constituent of mine had in receiving what she felt, and her doctor felt, was adequate and necessary emergency care. The fact of the matter is that this patient had a right not to be satisfied. I do not care whether the Minister wants to stand up and say, well, there has been policy change, we have not changed our approach to dealing with these issues. If that is the case, the policy is still wrong. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) needs to take those problems more seriously because it is an affront to the patient, her family, the doctor and the citizens of Flin Flon to say there is no problem. It is simply not good enough to have rules that create a potential health risk. In this case, perhaps the nature of the illness contributed to the problem.

One of the requirements of transporting, evacuating a patient is that they have an I.V., an intravenous needle. In the case of someone who is a hemophiliac—in this case not a hemophiliac but has a blood disorder which prevents the clotting of the blood—an I.V. would be completely counterindicated, as physicians like to say. The fact is that the doctor could not do that and, obviously, using his best judgment said they should not have it. Is that what he is suggesting? Is the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) suggesting to meet the criteria just jam a needle in? Is that what he is saying? That is ludicrous.

So what I was saying by asking the question about the policy, I was not trying to belittle the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). I asked a legitimate question to protect the interests of my constituent. The Minister of Health, as he usually does, overreacted, became belligerent, rather than accepting the fact that from time to time there are problems, even with the Minister of Health's system. If he had not been so defensive, perhaps he would have come out looking a little better on this issue, rather than looking foolish, attacking an MLA for defending his constituent. However, I want to thank the Minister for making me look good in the eyes of my constituents, I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): You needed the help.

Mr. Storie: I needed the help, as my colleague for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) so thoughtfully added.

Madam Acting Speaker, the measures that we are approving, the spending that we are approving here also contains significant funds for cost-shared programs. Now my friend, the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), referenced his concern over the Canada-Manitoba Agri-Food Agreement. The Agri-Food Agreement is a cost-shared agreement that has many similarities with other cost-shared agreements with the federal Government. First of all, it requires 40 percent support from the provincial Government or 50 percent. I think the Agri-Food Agreement is a 50 percent agreement. Other agreements like the Tourism Agreement provide for 50 percent cost-sharing by the province. Agreements like the Northern Development Agreement require 40 percent. So, Madam Acting Speaker, when we are approving Interim Supply, we are also approving the expenditure of provincial dollars in support of these cost-shared agreements.

The Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) was quite right to express some concern about the future of the Agri-Food Agreement and where it is going and what it will lead to. It has led to additional investment in the Province of Manitoba. It has led to additional research into food processing and so forth in the Province of Manitoba, all important to our economy and agriculture in general.

There are many other agreements which also contribute directly and indirectly to the provincial economy. I have referenced on other occasions the importance to northern Manitoba of the Forestry Agreement, which supported the establishment of a nursery in The Pas, which supports the reforestation of our cut-over areas, our logged-out areas, supports silviculture research, an important tool in the Department of Natural Resources in helping that department deal with the obligations it has to the province in terms of reforestation and forest management.

I have mentioned on a previous occasion the Mineral Development Agreement, again an agreement that has been widely praised across Canada, not only within the mining industry in Manitoba for its thorough geological analysis of Manitoba's geological structure. It is very thorough, it has helped to identify potentially significant mineral finds and also significant potential

for oil and gas and all of those other products which we rely on and Canadians rely on. The information that is gathered is used by mining companies, exploration companies, oil companies, etc.

The Mineral Development Agreement has assisted in providing that information so that we can develop our natural resources. One of the, perhaps, most interesting results of the Mineral Development Agreement, was the discovery of usable granites in the Province of Manitoba. Some people may not know that we are now quarrying granite in the Province of Manitoba and exporting it to other parts of the world. We have also found, through our geological surveys undertaken through the Mineral Development Agreement, granites in the Cross Lake area which are believed to be of quarriable quality. So the Mineral Development Agreement is important to the province.

* (1650)

I reference this perhaps at a critical time, or an opportune time, given that the coffers of the provincial Government have expanded to the tune of \$100 million and \$117 million from the previous year due to mining tax revenues.

The mining community is contributing more than its fair share to the welfare of the province, the welfare of this Government but we are not seeing anything set aside for mineral exploration development, assisting mining communities in difficult times, set aside for the prospect of community downsizing or massive layoffs in northern mining communities, single-industry communities I might add, Madam Acting Speaker.

This is also a shortcoming. The Government appears ready to spend money that is generated in northern Manitoba from resources that are found in northern Manitoba, to other purposes. I want to say that is creating some consternation, some dismay amongst Northerners as they ask the legitimate question, is it not time that some of the wealth that is produced in the North is used to support the North, whether it is in services like Motor Vehicle Branch, in terms of modernization at Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, or in terms of the support from the Government to tourism in northern Manitoba?

The cost-shared programs, Forestry Agreement, Mineral Development Agreement, Tourism Agreement, the Northern Development Agreement itself, all are important to the province and to the economic well-being of the regions in the province and it is distressing, needless to say, to see a decreasing level of provincial commitment. We know there are unexpended moneys in many of those programs, but we have seen no commitment whatsoever on the part of the Government to continue to support those activities.

It is not just the NDP MLA for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) requesting that the Government consider those priorities. Madam Acting Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the original agreements, the original Northern Development Agreement and the original Mineral Development Agreement were developed in consultation with Northerners and those people involved in those particular activities. Those agreements

represent a lot of thought and considered opinion on the part of many Manitobans, including northern Manitobans.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

To simply say we are not pursuing these or to show no initiative when it comes to pursuing these agreements is indeed unfortunate. The Government obviously is taking a calculated gamble, and it seems to be a gamble which implies that the North is not important, let us tap its wealth and let the chips fall where they may in terms of the economic survival and the economic success of communities in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the cost-shared agreements between the province and the federal Government are not the only areas of concern on this side of the House or with the New Democratic Party. We are also concerned about the taxation measures which were introduced in the Budget. I will have an opportunity to continue my remarks a little bit later, but thank you for your patience.

Mr. Speaker: When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have seven minutes remaining.

I am advised that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, is about to arrive to grant Royal Assent. I am, therefore, interrupting the proceedings of the House for the Royal Assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Cliff Morrissey): His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

His Honour, George Johnson, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed a Bill, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Bill No. 11—The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les circonscriptions électorales.

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, doth assent to this Bill.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some changes. I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Praznik for Ernst.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is a will in the House to

waive Private Members' Hour and carry on, or what is the will of the House?

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): There would be an agreement to call it six o'clock if the Government so wished and then we will continue the debate on Interim Supply at eight o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? (Agreed)

The hour being 6 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 8 p.m. this evening.