

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 9 May, 1986.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, a statement.

Madam Speaker, recently, as members of this House are aware, the United States Senate authorized the U.S. administration to enter into comprehensive trade negotiations with Canada.

Last week in Toronto I met with the Premier of Ontario to discuss our provinces' position on the negotiations.

At the conclusion of our meeting, Premier Peterson and I reaffirmed our view that an early First Ministers' Conference is required to clarify arrangements for full provincial participation in the negotiations, in line with the agreement between all 10 Premiers and the Prime Minister at the Halifax First Ministers' Conference last November.

Although the Federal Government hasn't yet agreed to a special First Ministers' meeting, I am pleased to advise the House that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, will be coming to Winnipeg next Tuesday afternoon for bilateral discussions on the negotiating process.

I understand he will also be visiting some of the other provincial capitals next week, and will be reporting to the Prime Minister when Mr. Mulroney returns to Canada from the Far East later this month.

During next Tuesday's meeting, I will be advising Mr. Clark that we expect the Federal Government to live up to the Halifax agreement on provincial participation, and that we believe it is absolutely essential that a First Ministers' Conference be held quickly, before the negotiations get under way.

A great deal is at stake for Canada and for Manitoba in the upcoming negotiations.

The talks offer potentially important and positive opportunities to expand trade. They are also vital to overcoming increasing pressures of protectionism.

But Canada's sovereignty must not be compromised in any way.

Our agricultural support system must not be weakened.

Regional economic development programs must be continued and maintained and strengthened.

Key social programs must be maintained.

Safeguards must be provided for such vital service industries as transportation and for telecommunications.

Canada's cultural sovereignty must also be preserved.

The Prime Minister and Mr. Clark are aware of our position on this and on other issues, such as the need for ongoing consultation with the provinces, the importance of multilateral trade negotiations, and the requirement for adequate adjustment provisions for sectors and industries affected by negotiations. I will be reaffirming those positions next week.

I am pleased to advise this House that Mr. Clark's office has also agreed to include on the agenda for our meeting discussion of Manitoba's concern about possible U.S. nuclear waste dump sites in the Red River Basin.

I understand Mr. Clark will be meeting his U.S. counterparts in the near future. This subject is likely to be covered in their discussions as well. I intend to express our Government's appreciation to Mr. Clark for the cooperation that he and External Affairs have given to us, to this point, on the nuclear waste repository issue.

It is essential that we continue to work closely together to attempt to persuade the U.S. administration to remove the Red River Basin sites from any further consideration.

I will also raise, once again, our concern about the future of the U.S. Consulate here in Winnipeg - particularly at a time when we are attempting to improve our trade relations with the United States, and are successfully expanding other cooperative links with our neighbouring states of Minnesota and North Dakota.

A reversal of the U.S. State Department's decision to close the Winnipeg Consulate and several others in Europe and South America may not be possible, but we are optimistic that a significant U.S. Government presence can be maintained in our province.

I will report to the House on the results of the meeting with Mr. Clark next week.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased to respond to the statement that has been made by the First Minister with respect to a number of initiatives. I begin by saying that all of us believe that there is the potential for enhancement of our economy in Manitoba as a result of freer trade negotiations and discussions and opportunities that can accrue to particularly Western Canada, and Manitoba as well, through freer trade with the United States. We believe that those opportunities are worth pursuing, and worth pursuing in a manner that ensures that we put forward, as strongly as possible, the benefits for the Manitoba economy on the table and in the discussions, and that we ensure that we do not just simply fall in lock step with the position that some other groups have taken.

I think that there is a concern on our part that perhaps the Premier has changed his position with respect to free trade, that a year-and-a-half ago or so when he

Friday, 9 May, 1986

was speaking before the Western Premiers' Conference, and he said that he was in favour of freer trade with the United States, we all thought that was an encouraging sign of an openness in his approach to freer trade.

We're concerned now that his statements sound more and more protectionist, more and more as though he is being twisted and shaped by the CLC position, by the position of the federal New Democrats under Ed Broadbent, which is no, no, a thousand times no. His statements more and more seem to indicate that his concerns are not for the benefits of Manitoba and Manitoba's economy, but rather to try and allow him to change his position and come around behind those people who support the New Democratic Party in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, our concern will be that if this First Minister is really of the mind that Manitoba has to put forward a complete and balanced view at the table for free trade negotiations, that he should first set forth an all-party committee that would study the Manitoba position for free trade that would bring forward representation from all sectors of our economy, from agriculture, from the cultural sector and from manufacturing so that we would know what the positions are of these various different groups of our economy. We would know that we are indeed representing the best interests of Manitoba when we go to these free trade discussions.

Madam Speaker, I would urge the First Minister to set up such an all-party committee and to ensure that it solicits the views of all people.

I appeared at the Annual Meeting of the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, as did other representatives in this Chamber, and I know that they're very concerned that Manitoba should receive the benefits of a freer trade agreement, that Manitoba should be a participant in this in a positive sense.

I know as well that members of our caucus have met with agriculture groups in Manitoba and have received the same kind of urging, that we look to the benefits of freer trade, and we convert those benefits to positive action on behalf of the economy of Manitoba. So I would hope that the Premier, in addition to making sure that Manitoba goes to the table and discusses freer trade with the other provinces and with the Federal Government, that first he would have that kind of consultative process right here in Manitoba and include all sectors in our economy.

Very briefly, Madam Speaker, with respect to the concerns about the location of a nuclear waste dump in Minnesota, in the watershed of the Red River Valley, indeed all Members of the House, I'm sure, concur with the position that the Premier has stated, that we ought not to have to accept the negative aspects of somebody else's dealings in the nuclear industry; that we ought to ensure that we are protected from any hazards that might accrue to Manitoba, and we certainly will lend our voice in support to that initiative on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

Finally, with respect to the impending closure of the U.S. Consulate, we are very concerned with that, Madam Speaker. We're very concerned that only one consulate in all of Canada is being closed and it happens to be the one in Manitoba. We have to ask ourselves why that is occurring. We have to ask ourselves whether

the presence at a flag burning in front of the U.S. Consulate, the presence of several members of this administration, indeed, the Deputy Premier and several Ministers of this Cabinet, had anything to do with poisoning the relationships between Manitoba and our American neighbours, our good friends and neighbours to the South.

We have to ask ourselves why the Manitoba Consulate is being singled out, and we have to say, Madam Speaker, that first and foremost there is going to have to be a change in attitude on the part of this Premier and this administration towards our neighbours to the South. No longer can we find that kind of thing that happened when the flag was burned in front of the Embassy in the presence of many members of this administration can take place without a full and complete apology by the Premier on behalf of this administration. Maybe the first step towards having that consulate maintained open in Manitoba will be to have a full and complete apology by the Premier to our American neighbours.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I ask leave of this House to make a non-political statement, copies of which are available for distribution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Leave? (Agreed).

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I would like to announce that this week is being celebrated as Forestry Week . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: On a point of order, not even having had an opportunity to review the contents of the statement, but it has been the practice of the House that a non-political statement is made at the end of question period.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is leave denied?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on the point of order.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I would like to make a non-political ministerial statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is leave granted to the Minister? Is leave granted to the Minister? — (Interjection) — On the point of order?

The Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, if the Minister is making a ministerial statement, he doesn't require leave. He doesn't require leave to make a ministerial statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: He was asking to make a non-political statement, and asked for leave of the House. Does the House wish to give the Minister leave?

A MEMBER: He doesn't require leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: I rule that leave has been granted; the Minister may proceed.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I would like to announce that this week is being celebrated as Forestry Week in Manitoba.

More specifically, today marks Arbor Day, a day on which many individuals make a special effort to plant trees. The 1986 theme for the week is "Your Forest - Your Future." This theme attempts to increase our level of awareness for the importance of the forests to all Manitobans.

Our forests are an important part of the resource base for the provincial economy. Forests generate revenue of approximately \$500 million annually, and provide employment to 11,500 people directly and indirectly.

In addition, our forests are important in that they provide habitat for wildlife and they are the setting in which residents and tourists enjoy many hours of recreation and enjoyment.

The seedling provided for each of you is a selection of Japanese elm. This species is grown in Manitoba, and is noted for being superior in growth form and stem straightness. But most importantly, it is resistant to Dutch Elm disease.

I hope each of you will plant your seedling, keeping in mind that the chances for survival are much improved if you delay transplant to the latter part of May.

I would also like to invite each of you to view the many fine forest-related displays sponsored by the Manitoba Forestry Association at the Garden City Shopping Centre here in Winnipeg, and encourage you to take part in Forest Week activities.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

Firstly, I'd like to congratulate the Minister of Natural Resources on his appointment, and I want to also thank him for the seedlings that he has presented to us in the long-time honoured tradition. I had some concerns when I saw them and I was actually - well, not concerned when I saw them - pleased when I saw them because, with the indiscriminate cutting and scrapping that's going on within the Department of Natural Resources, I'm glad that they found the money to present these to us. I want to indicate to the Minister that I have planted the trees over the last years since 1977 and mine are all growing.

In expressing our appreciation for these seedlings here, I just want to express a little concern that as much as we all like these trees I think at a time like this the Minister might have been more appropriately making an announcement about the serious flooding conditions that we have in the province. I would certainly hope that he will pursue that matter and maybe have another statement in that regard.

Thank you.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before proceeding to Oral Questions, I'd like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 75 students of Grade 6 from the Shamrock School. These students are under the direction of Mr. T. Drieger. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

On behalf of all the members I welcome you here this morning.

Before proceeding to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all members of the House, particularly the new members, to the guidelines respecting question period. I'd like particularly to draw members' attention to Item 1, which is: "A question must be a question, must be brief, must seek information, must address itself to an important matter of some urgency, and must be within the administrative responsibility of the Government or the Minister to whom it's addressed."

I would also like to remind members that a question should contain a preamble not exceeding one carefully drawn sentence, and supplementary questions should not need a preamble.

I should also like to remind members that answers to questions should be as brief as possible and should deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Tax credit abuses - Minister of Crown

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is for the Premier. Approximately two weeks ago, the Minister of Energy and Mines admitted to his participation in a quick profit tax scam, NERC 1985, which he said allowed him to avoid paying \$35,000 in taxes. Yet, according to media reports, information from the Manitoba Securities Commission indicates that an investor buying the number of shares he claims to have bought would have saved \$58,000 and made an immediate profit of \$16,000.00. My question to the Premier is: has he asked the Minister of Energy and Mines for an explanation of this discrepancy?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, first I want to commend the Leader of the Opposition for asking the first question I believe I've heard from him in some five years, on the issue of national tax reform.

It is nice, indeed, now that we do have sudden converts to tax reform, and I'm just very, very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues are strongly in support of national tax reform at the federal and, I assume, at the provincial level as well.

Madam Speaker, insofar as the question of the Scientific Tax Credit, that is a matter that my Minister has fully disclosed insofar as his own personal dealings, 1984 and 1985, and has given information in respect to same.

Friday, 9 May, 1986

If there is any further clarification that is required, the Minister will give that at the proper time and under the proper circumstances.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I've clearly put before the Premier a question that indicates a difference and of major discrepancy between the information which the Minister of Energy and Mines has made public and information that comes from investigation at the Manitoba Securities Commission.

The Minister has indicated that he saved \$35,000; Securities Commission information would indicate that he saved \$58,000, as well as an immediate profit of \$16,000.00. Which figure is true, and does the Premier not believe that it's necessary to ask his Minister that?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The matters that are important insofar as the First Minister of this province is concerned is Ministers' participation insofar as any action that is illegal or any action that would be in conflict of interest. Those are the two important parameters that are very, very important insofar as the administration of any government.

I'm very pleased just to advise members because Manitobans know full well this Government and members of this Government have not engaged in illegalities or conflict of interest. I am not going to delve into personal income tax returns as to whether or not this particular amount is correct or that particular amount is correct, Madam Speaker.

It is not a matter of responsibility of this Government as long as there is not a matter of illegality, nor a matter of conflict of interest, and I have not been informed of either, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the Premier telling us that he isn't concerned that the integrity and the credibility of his entire administration is at stake if his Minister will not tell the truth publicly? Is he not concerned about that?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, my concern is only insofar as the Scientific Tax Credits are concerned, and the utilization by any member on this side of the Chamber is that honourable members who wish to impede the work of true national tax reform will lock onto those particular circumstances because they are not interested in reform, unfortunately, Madam Speaker. They are only interested in trying to frustrate true tax reform in this country, as witnessed by the fact that in five years there never has been a question on tax reform from across the way until they can particularize a particular circumstance, hoping to impede the cause of tax reform.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Federal Conservative Government . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I presume, on a new question.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Federal Conservative Government stopped the hemorrhage of

dollars from the Liberal program that allowed the Minister to bilk the taxpayer out of all of this money. The question at hand is: is the Premier not concerned that his Ministers tell the truth openly and honestly, publicly, so that the credibility and integrity of his administration is not in question?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, let me indicate to you that none of the Ministers on this side have ever intentionally misled anyone in respect to their own affairs are concerned. If there is a matter of calculation that is outside the parameters of this House, the Minister will deal with that in the appropriate way.

Insofar as hemorrhaging, Madam Speaker, the honourable member refers to closure by the Federal Conservative Government regarding scientific tax credits. I regret, Madam Speaker, that they allowed a ten-fold hemorrhaging insofar as tax breaks in the 1984 Wilson tax document dealing with capital gains exemptions of \$500,000-plus additional tax breaks to higher-income groups in this country. I will be delighted, Madam Speaker, not to deal, as the honourable member wishes to do, with gutter business, but to deal with substantial issues pertaining to tax reform in this country and the need for greater fairness, greater equity insofar as the tax reforms, so that low and ordinary Canadians everywhere can realize a proper and fair benefit.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the truth can never be gutter business in this House or anywhere else in this province.

Because the Premier seems to have difficulty understanding, I'll make the question simple. If he believes that his Minister of Energy and Mines has told the truth, then tell us, did he save \$35,000 on the NERC '85 investment, or did he save \$58,000.00? Which is the truth?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, we appear to be reaching a point of repetition in the questions. The Honourable Minister will deal, like any other member in this House, with the tax department in regard to his own particular tax figures. If there are inaccuracies, he will deal with the appropriate people, that which is the tax department, just like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, just like any other member in this House. The dealings will be with the appropriate officials of the tax department as to the precise and exact figures, Madam Speaker. No member on this side has anything to hide. Honourable members across the way may or may not, but honourable members on this side of the House have nothing to hide.

Madam Speaker, I note with interest the continued reluctance on the part of the Leader of the Opposition and, of course, all honourable colleagues across the way to discuss the real issues of tax reform in this country and the need to get on with tax reform in Canada.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I find it incredible that the Premier is not interested in the truth when it applies to his Ministers. I find it absolutely incredible.

My next question to the Premier is: has any other member of his administration, has any other member of his Government participated in such a tax scam, a

tax avoidance scheme, such as the NERC or any other scientific research tax credit?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, will the Premier then be informing the public as to which other Ministers participated so that the public may be aware, or other members?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I commend the Honourable Minister in question. As soon as I returned from business and a few days break, the Honourable Minister spoke to me. The Honourable Minister then commenced an initiative in order to ensure that the public be advised. I gather that the public is already advised through a release earlier this morning.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, then I wonder if the Premier would be so kind as to announce it in this House if it has already been made public.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, it is not a matter of House business. The Minister has indicated to the public at large the fact that he participated in one of the tax credit situations that are the issue of some interest. I believe that release has been so circulated.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I disagree that it isn't a matter for this House. The former Minister of Finance labeled these schemes "legalized theft." He referred to them as bilking the taxpayer of Manitoba; he made them a matter for debate in this forum in the past election; he made it a public issue that is relevant to this House, and I insist that the Premier make it public here if he has any courage at all.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition conveniently ignores what the Minister of Finance said at the time in question. The Minister of Finance indicated - in fact, at the very press conference that is a frequent subject of comment - that these scientific tax credits were wrong, wrong, wrong in law; that these scientific tax credits ought to be abolished, should never have been established in the first instance. But the Minister of Finance of the day said very clearly this: "I don't mean that in terms of people, the Manitobans who put this money into this. I'm not critical of them, the tax system is what I am critical of." Right from Day One, Madam Speaker, the position of this Government, including the former Minister of Finance, has been very, very clear; it is the law that's wrong.

Madam Speaker, what I regret on the part of honourable members across the way is, while they can pontificate and they can moralize about individuals, when it comes to taking a stand, as honourable members have on this side of the Chamber, about Wilson tax breaks, about scientific tax credits, they hide, they cower, Madam Speaker. But members on this side consistently, from Day One, have said they ought to be abolished, or that they ought not to have been initiated in the first place.

MR. G. FILMON: I can't believe the audacity of the Premier, talking about cowering and hiding and refusing

to answer this question, and tell us which of his colleagues is the guilty party. I can't believe it.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is: when the Minister of Finance made his announcement during the election campaign, accused people who participated in the scheme of legal theft, was he aware of the participation in such a scheme by any one of the members of his administration?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, if the honourable member is asking whether I knew, the answer is no. I can't speak for the former Minister of Finance.

Madam Speaker, when we talk about cowering and courage, I credit the particular Minister in question that he had the courage to immediately come forward and to — (Interjection) — indicate . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier knew nothing about this participation in such an investment, has he no guidelines or requirements on the part of the members of his administration to inform him of participation in schemes and investments, and of any of their assets that might impinge upon government policy?

HON. H. PAWLEY: What certainly the honourable member is dealing with is very, very interesting indeed. Firstly, Madam Speaker, no illegalities; secondly, no conflict of interest. What the honourable member keeps referring to is a matter that does not involve conflict of interest. Madam Speaker, I think what we need in this Chamber and what we need for consideration is an opening up of the conflict-of-interest provisions, so that we don't have individual kind of nickel-and-diming as honourable members are wont to do in this House; that everything is open so that the public and honourable members can see exactly what each and every honourable member on each side of the House has by way of assets so we don't get into this kind of character muckraking, wallowing in the mud as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is bound to do.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, if the Premier truly wants openness, why won't he begin by telling us the name of the other Minister who participated? That's what's needed here is for him to set an example, to show some leadership.

Madam Speaker, my only question about his suggestion as to what needs to come forward in terms of legislation for conflict of interest and openness is will it make the Minister of Energy and Mines an honest man?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I would ask whether that was a proper question and whether it is proper in this Chamber to impute dishonesty to any member of this Chamber. It is my view that it is contrary to the Rules of Order. It is my view that the Leader of the Opposition should withdraw that comment which imputes very, very falsely upon a member of this Chamber and totally baseless and unfortunately again a repetition of us wallowing in the mud that I referred to a few seconds ago.

Friday, 9 May, 1986

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd like to draw the attention of members to Beausiesne, Rule 359(6). "A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government."

It seems to me we are dealing with private financial matters of a member. — (Interjection) — Also I would like to draw — (Interjection) — Order please. Also I would like to draw attention of the members to Beausiesne, 316 which says that a question should not make inferences or allegations, impute motives, reflect upon members or upon decisions made by the House or cast aspersions upon persons within the House or outside of it.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, as you very clearly indicate, the purpose of the question period and the purpose of the question is not to impugn motives or reflect upon the character of any member of this House.

We have an incident where the Leader of the Opposition has very clearly done so. I would ask for the Leader of the Opposition in his role as an honourable member of this House to stand up and to withdraw those comments which are in opposition to what is provided for in Beausiesne as you have listed, and other citations in Beausiesne as well, and very clearly impugn motives on a member of this House and I would ask that he withdraw that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, if anything that I have said is in contravention of the rules of this House I will withdraw that.

Madam Speaker, I say to you that the comments that I have made have flowed from the inability of the First Minister to answer my direct question as to whether or not the information which the Minister of Energy and Mines has made public in a statement with respect to tax saving is true or whether the information that has been provided through investigation at the Manitoba Securities Commission is true. Until that cloud is removed from the head of the Minister of Energy and Mines, nothing I could say would exaggerate any in way the question of truthfulness and integrity that lies in his face.

Employment, Summer - students

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Employment Services. In light of the fact that most university students are presently finished their classes and that high school students will be joining them shortly, could the Minister outline what plans his department has to provide summer employment for these young people?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

It has been the tradition in this House that question period is primarily a time for questions from the members of the Opposition. Certainly from time to time there will be questions from members on the Government side. This is the first Session of the Legislature. Only the Leader of the Opposition had an opportunity to ask questions. I know the Member for River Heights and the Member for Ste. Rose were both standing and in their seats when you chose to recognize the member of the Government benches. I therefore move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that the Member for River Heights be now heard.

MADAM SPEAKER: As the Honourable Government House Leader is well aware, one cannot move a motion on a point of order. I recognized the Member for Elmwood who stood sometime ago. I recognized him once already - that was interrupted. I also have seen both the other two members that have stood and they will be called immediately after the Member for Elmwood has an answer to his question.

The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I can advise the honourable member that it is the intention of our department and our Government to maintain a high level of employment programs for the young people of this province this summer, and particularly for university, college and high school graduates. Our spending is in the order of \$8.5 million, providing jobs for between 5,000 and 6,000 young people under the program called Careerstart.

In addition, we are maintaining the STEP Program which is a Summer Temporary Employment Program which is — (Interjection) — which will also provide 900 jobs. So I would say that we are taking initiatives in answer to the question what we are doing this summer - we are maintaining full scale, top level programs to help our young people.

Regrettably, I must observe the Federal Government has decreased its funding for young people by \$1.72 million this summer and I think that is very, very regrettable.

Flooding - Ste. Rose

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the fact that there are major flooding problems in the village and the surrounding area of Ste. Rose, I wonder if he would indicate what he intends to do immediately to help support the people of this town and surrounding area who have suffered so much from what has become a sadly common occurrence.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you Madam Speaker.

I am aware of the situation of flooding in Ste. Rose and, indeed, the Riding Mountain area. There is an

agreement that has been negotiated between the Federal and Provincial Governments and the Turtle River Conservation District to put in place flood control measures for the area. The timing of that will be that some construction will hopefully take place during 1986. They're in the process of land acquisition at this time.

In terms of the immediate situation that the people are facing, certainly all of the resources of the Department of Natural Resources will be made available to the people of the area to cope with that difficult situation.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: A supplementary, Madam Speaker, to the same Minister. Will he be declaring the village and that surrounding area a disaster area?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister, will he be declaring the village and that surrounding area a disaster area?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, the process that is in place when emergencies, such as flooding, occur has been established through the disaster assistance guidelines that have been established by this Government.

Of course, the EMO officials are aware, the Emergency Measures officials are aware of what is happening. They're assisting, in terms of the provincial response, initial responses from the municipal government, as the member is probably aware. Once the damages have been assessed, both private and public damages, and the reports have been received, the Disaster Assistance Board will consider them and forward them to myself in Cabinet, and consideration will then be made as to the compensation that would be paid for individuals and municipalities affected.

The guidelines are very clear, the cost formula, sharing formula, is there. This has been established by us and will be implemented if the situation warrants it and the guidelines apply.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: A supplementary, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Can the people of Ste. Rose have the assurance that every effort will be bent by his department to obtain flood control and facilitate the building of the ring dike immediately?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I think the commitment of the Provincial Government is clear. We've entered into an agreement with the Federal Government and the Turtle River Conservation District, and it is certainly our intention to honour our commitment under that agreement.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

Crescentwood property owners - return of caveats

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Honourable Attorney-General. Madam, on July 10 of 1985, An Act to Amend The Real Property Act was passed by this House, with the full agreement, I might say, of both sides. Unfortunately, in the process, it managed to damage severely the property rights of hundreds of my constituents. Is this Government at the present moment considering introducing legislation that will return the Enderton caveats and thereby protect the property owners of Crescentwood?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Amendments to The Real Property Act are under consideration and will be considered by my department more fully in subsequent weeks and by caucus and I will be in a position to announce details of those amendments in due course.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question.

The Honourable Attorney-General has said he's going to consider. I want to know if the property owners of my district are in fact going to get relief?

HON. R. PENNER: I note that the property owner is covered by the Enderton caveat - and it's not only the Enderton caveat - but many other caveats that were effected by the legislation - concurred in incidentally, not only by members of both sides, but by the City of Winnipeg - have sought . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: The Member for St. Norbert hasn't changed his behaviour from one Session to another.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If the member has a question he can ask his question when the Minister finishes.

HON. R. PENNER: I note that in accordance with what everybody assumed to be the proper course at the time, rightly or wrongly, but everybody assumed to be the proper course, the affected property owners in that particular area have sought and indeed are obtaining improvements to the zoning by-laws of the City of Winnipeg.

Members may recall that it was the thought that rather than rely on caveats which were put in place at the turn of the century and reflected the needs of that time, that the prevalent and prevailing zoning by-laws of a municipality - and in this case, of the City of Winnipeg - ought to be the first recourse for protection of front yard, inside yard alignments, usage and things of that kind.

I'm happy to know that indeed the requests of members of that particular community are being met

Friday, 9 May, 1986

by the City of Winnipeg. This is not to say that we won't consider what, if anything, can be done through The Real Property Act. I'm not in a position to make an announcement of that character in this House today.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A final supplementary. Attorney-General, you have in fact indicated that the City of Winnipeg has made a mistake and they are rectifying it. That does not remove, however, the responsibility of this Government to return those caveats to the people, and I think they should be done and I hope you will take it under advisement immediately.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
A question to the Attorney-General on the same matter raised by the Member for River Heights. Will the Attorney-General not acknowledge, as Hansard will confirm, that when he raised his legislation late in the last Session that he, in response to questions, confirmed that he had reviewed this matter with the City of Winnipeg and other authorities and that no adverse effects would flow from the legislation that he proposed and passed in this House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, that substantially is on the record and I obviously am not going to quarrel with the record, that would be an interesting way of beginning the Session; but, Madam Speaker, in fact, there are no adverse effects which have, to this date, flowed from that decision. That is the point.

The Crescentwood property owners, some of them, fear that some new types of development might come in on the heels of that decision effecting the character of the neighbourhood; that has not happened. I remain confident today, as I was confident at the time I made that statement in the House, that will continue to be the case.

However, because these people - and people, Madam Speaker, in your own constituency, some of them - are concerned, not I think being fully aware of the scope of urban zoning by-laws, we are, as I've said at the beginning of this series of questions, looking at the decision and looking at the possibility of amendments to The Real Property Act, should it be the case that the zoning by-laws are insufficient to protect property owners in retaining the essential character of their neighbourhood.

Farmers - assistance to

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I would like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. There have been some 230 bankruptcies or more in Manitoba over the last four years and the financial crisis is certainly getting worse. Bankruptcies are only the tip of the iceberg, as many farmers have voluntarily left the industry and many others have wound down their operations by selling off some assets.

The Federal Government has recently announced substantial plans to support the farmers of Western Canada. The governments of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta have also announced substantial plans to support their farmers in their province. I ask the Minister, on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba, what plans he has, what immediate plans he has, to support the incomes of the farmers, the grain farmers in particular, of Manitoba, all grain farmers of Manitoba, to put the crop in for 1986 and harvest it?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member opposite for the question.
I'm very pleased that members as well recognize, and I'm sure because of the added wet weather that we're experiencing in our province, that it will in fact in a number of regions make circumstances a bit more uncertain in terms of how soon crops can be put in.

Madam Speaker, this Government has put more money into agriculture than any government in the history of this province. Having said that, we recognize that no matter how much money we put into agriculture during this difficult period, it will not be enough. It's been recognized by members of the farm community across this nation. In fact, in a recent meeting with the Prime Minister of this country, that the difficulties being experienced by the grain industry, no matter what the Federal Government might do - and they didn't even encourage, quite frankly as we have done, to maintain the initial prices of wheat and to lessen the pressure on the farm community that is now being experienced because of the downgrading of wheat prices by anywhere from 19 percent to 24 percent as was announced several weeks ago.

Our Premier this week, in fact on Monday, met with the Federal Minister of Agriculture to discuss a certain number of options and considerations that the Federal Government should be putting into place. We will continue, Madam, maintaining our Loan Guarantee Program which has exceeded \$100 million — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, this province pioneered most of the innovations in loan guarantees in the whole area of debtor-creditor arrangements and adjustments. We will be moving with commitments that we made during the election this Session, and there will be other announcements made in due course, Madam Speaker, to assist the farming community.

We are now as well reviewing whether or not . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, a supplementary. In the area of loan guarantees, I see the Province of Saskatchewan has put out money to the tune of \$25 a cultivated acre at 6 percent for all farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am asking the Minister if he's prepared to move in that direction.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, that would be a policy consideration, and we will make those announcements if we will be considering that kind of movement.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell the honourable member that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . that a broad policy of that nature, I would not accept. I would not accept, Madam Speaker, because it's been widely - and that is why governments in the past have been clearly criticized - that regardless of the need in the community, those monies were made available. In fact, we were advised just recently that there are people in the farm community have taken that money, and gladly - I would at 6 percent take that money - put it into a financial institution and reinvest it for 9 percent and 10 percent. Would that be considered illegal by the honourable members opposite if that was done?

That would not be the kind of policy we would want to pursue, but we will be pursuing policies to, in fact, assist farmers who are hard-pressed, and our programming will be and will continue to reflect that kind of policy, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, as a further supplementary, I would remind the Minister of the absolute urgency of this situation, and the input costs are really the problem at the farm level. Is he prepared to reduce education costs for farmers, taxes on farmland?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I want to tell you that the problem is both input and income. It's not just on one side.

Madam Speaker, we were the first Government in this country to ask for a national inquiry into the prices of chemicals. We believe that the farm community in Manitoba alone has overpaid between \$25 million to \$40 million a year in the costs of chemicals. Madam Speaker, actions taken by our Minister of Finance to open the borders in competition on fuel prices has resulted in reduction of fuel measures.

During the election, we made a commitment to change the method by which the tax forgiveness that the province provides will be changed. Those measures will be brought in this Session, Madam Speaker. Those are the kinds of measures we are taking to impact on the input costs.

We believe, as well, that oil prices should in fact be reduced below their present level, Madam Speaker, but I haven't heard any members opposite saying to their federal counterparts, force the oil companies to lower their prices to the farm community right across this country. They haven't raised that matter at all.

Anstett, Andy - conditions of contract

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: A question to the First Minister, Madam Speaker. Could he inform the House whether, in addition to the \$55,000 to be paid to the former Member for Springfield on a contract with the

Government, will he also be paid expenses? Will he be provided with a car? Will he be provided with office and secretarial space?

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

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I believe the contract with Mr. Anstett is a public document. I will certainly forward a copy of that to the member. It does not include vehicle expenses or secretary or that sort of thing.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I take that as an undertaking then that the copy of the contract will be tabled in the Legislature within a reasonable time.

My supplementary question then, Madam Speaker, is to the Premier. Could he explain to the House and justify to the House how he and his Government have developed their priorities whereby they have created a make-work expensive position for a defeated member of their party for work that could easily be done by existing staff members and at the same time eliminate 200 Civil Service positions, including six home economists who assist low-income families, single parents, rural families in difficulty? Can he justify establishing that priority in favour of his defeated members of his party, and eliminating these services for needy families?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: As the Member for St. Norbert was uttering his comments, I couldn't help but think that honourable members, if they had wished, could have sunk to the same level and questioned the engagement of a former member of this House, a former defeated Conservative candidate, a former Member for Fort Garry, as a high-priced consultant to the Conservative Government in Ottawa. My recollection is that honourable members in this House recognized that that honourable member would be able to provide valuable input.

Unlike honourable members across the way, Madam Speaker, we make no apologies for ensuring that we can utilize the talent made available to us in order to achieve our priorities as a government. Our first and foremost job is the improvement of the economy and ensuring, Madam Speaker, that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . Manitobans are given greater opportunity; secondly, the farms and the rural communities of this province; thirdly, to ensure there is greater fairness and equity within our society; and fourth, ensuring that Manitoba's position is made clear, made known fully, whether inter-governmentally and within the Province of Manitoba, standing up on behalf of Manitobans.

The former Member for Springfield, being a very talented and skilful member, I must say, one of the most skilful members who has ever sat in this Chamber,

Friday, 9 May, 1986

Madam Speaker, brings with him invaluable talents to contribute to that second area of priority that I mentioned a few moments ago, the improvement of the rural communities by way of his work that he will be participating in insofar as developing the fund for rural economic development. I am pleased; most Manitobans are pleased, except for the political partisan supporters of the party across the way, that we have the value in the former Member of Springfield to provide his input on behalf of Manitobans.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, the First Minister referred to the appointment of the former Member for Fort Garry, Mr. Sherman, but that was to an existing commission in a field in which he had been employed in the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I ask the First Minister, in view of the fact that he made this promise for this type of work during the election, when obviously he recognized there were people within the Civil Service who could carry out this type of work, is it more important to him to create a job for a defeated member of his party than to retain the services of people in the Home Economics Department who provide services to single parents, low-income families, rural families in difficulties? Is his priority to look after his defeated Cabinet Ministers, rather than help the needy people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture will speak to the issue of home economists, but I would like to correct some of the comments by the Member for St. Norbert.

First and foremost, the former Member for Fort Garry was not involved in filling a particular position left vacant, he was involved in consultation, contracts I understand, involving the privatization of the health care system, both on behalf of the Conservative Government, either on behalf of the Conservative Government in Ottawa and/or also the Conservative Government in the Province of Saskatchewan. We made no issue of that.

We did not, Madam Speaker, wallow in the mud there, as honourable members are doing now, insofar as the appointment of Walter Weir to head the commission in regard to assessment in the Province of Manitoba. We thought, in fact, he might do not too bad a job. We did not hesitate, Madam Speaker, to ensure that we had the services of a member like the former Member for Springfield to contribute to a very important priority of this Government.

The Minister of Agriculture will deal with the home economists part of the question.

Silviculture Program - layoffs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the comments made by the Premier here today, on Monday of this week, 22 people in the southeast were hired for a 20-week period under the Silviculture Program, and on Tuesday they received a two-week layoff notice already. I wonder if the Minister

of Natural Resources can explain, in view of his Premier's comments, why that happened.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I will take that as notice. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Question period having expired, I would like to draw the attention of members to the gallery where we have 40 students of Grade 9 from the Whitemouth Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. Steinhoff. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

On behalf of all members, I would welcome you here this morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, I have a matter of privilege I wanted to bring before the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a matter of privilege.

MR. J. WALDING: My matter of privilege involves not only me, but reflects on the House itself. I intend to conclude my remarks with a motion enabling the House to make remedy in this particular case.

When raising a matter of privilege, it is necessary to show that the matter is raised at the first available opportunity and, secondly, that there is prima facie evidence of a breach of privilege having taken place. You will find there is precedent, as recently as the last Session, for a matter of privilege having been raised on the first working day, and that is the day after the official opening day. As far as prima facie evidence is concerned, I submit a copy of a newspaper article in which the words referred to will be found in print which, I think, constitutes the necessary prima facie evidence.

It was on April 16th of this year that the Free Press carried a column under the name and heading of one Frances Russell which refers to me as an MLA, and uses the words, "blackmail and extortion," which, as members are aware, are both criminal offences. I find those words offensive; they are libellous; they are defamatory and they reflect on the House and on me as a Member of the Legislature.

This Mrs. Russell is not a junior or a new reporter, she is a very experienced columnist who should know better, and not use libellous statements in her columns. I don't think that she can hide behind a quotation from some unnamed third party, which she does, in quoting that other person as using those words. She must surely take responsibility for her use of those words in print.

The managing editor of the Free Press is one Murray Burt, and he is responsible, I understand, for the contents of the newspaper, and surely must have condoned the inclusion of that particular article. He is just as guilty of libel as Mrs. Russell is.

The Free Press, as you know, used to be a reputable newspaper with a good reputation right across the country. It has sunk to a new low of yellow journalism when it prints in its paper libels against MLA's which amounts to a contempt of this House in printing that sort of thing.

Members should bear in mind that if a journalist can get away with making accusations of a criminal offence against one member, then any journalist can make any allegation of criminal offence against any members and, indeed, against all of the House.

MR. D. ORCHARD: It's called fair comment, eh, Howard?

MR. J. WALDING: My friend from across the way mentions "fair comment," and fair comment I will accept, but the operative word there is "fair" and I don't consider it fair in any way to accuse someone of a criminal offence, as has occurred in this particular case.

In order that the House might do something about the matter, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet,

THAT the matter of the Frances Russell column in the Free Press of April 16th, 1986, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I table a copy of the offending article.

MADAM SPEAKER: Under Rule No. 30, I may permit other members of the House to make limited and strictly relevant debate concerning the member's motion of privilege.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, may I ask a question first? Was a copy of the newspaper article tabled? If so, could I have a copy?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Madam Speaker, first of all, obviously this is a matter that is being raised without any advance notice, certainly to members of this side of the House, and therefore perhaps much of what I say are my own personal opinions.

The paragraph in question refers to it, as several top Government officials put it, the Premier would not and could not submit to "blackmail and extortion."

It seems to me the first point I would raise, and I would hope the Member for St. Vital would raise it within his caucus. This eligibility is a quotation from a Government source, from either a member of caucus or a member of the Premier's Office and is a matter that should be raised with them. It is not, in my view, an opinion that is being expressed by the writer of this column that the member has been guilty of blackmail and extortion.

Further, it is my view, in my experience where there have been newspaper articles that are, let us say, defamatory of individuals, either in their personal or elected capacity - but I am familiar with a number of instances where comments have been made that are allegedly defamatory of individuals in their elected

capacity - that there are remedies for that and the remedies are to sue for defamation in a private way; and that is being done in many cases and members of the Government are particularly familiar with suits for defamation, and might be able to guide the Member for St. Vital in those types of actions as a result of their recent experiences.

Madam Speaker, Beauchesne does point out on Page 19, in Citation 51, that "It is always the responsibility of the House to decide if reflections on members are sufficiently serious to justify action."

In 1974, and again in 1976, members complained about newspaper reports and the Speaker allowed that a prima facie case of privilege existed. After debate the House declined to refer the matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I make no comment, Madam Speaker, on whether or not you wish to rule that a prima facie case of privilege existed, but if the purpose of the referral is to refer the matter to the Privileges and Elections Committee to subpoena one Frances Russell, to have her inform the members of the committee as to who these Government officials are - in the Premier's Office or members of his caucus - who allegedly accused him of blackmail and extortion, I'm not particularly sure that we on this side of the House would want to be a part of that type of a process.

I would say, and I want to say, Madam Speaker, I have great respect for the integrity of the Member for St. Vital, I have great respect for that and he's always conducted himself honourably in this House. No doubt that's why he finds himself on the backbench, Madam Speaker, but I want him to take these comments in that regard because I do respect him and I know members on this side respect him very much; but I am saying I have reservations about the process here.

The process is one that I think, firstly, he should consider a personal claim for defamation with his personal solicitor. Secondly, he should consider having discussions with the Premier whose Government officials, they are his officials, who accuse the Member for St. Vital of blackmail or extortion or discussions with his fellow members of caucus with whom he has chosen to join who may have referred to him in these tones.

I do not personally support a referral to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to summon a reporter to attempt to gain information as to who these people were. Certainly we're all aware that in reporting of the actions of elected representatives, words are used like "blackmail and extortion," if they were Frances Russell's comments, but they're used in the general, cynical attitude that people have of politicians, unfortunately, and I don't think particularly she would accuse someone of a criminal offence of blackmail and extortion.

Those are my remarks and I hope they're somehow helpful, but without notice, Madam Speaker, those are the thoughts I wanted to place on the record with respect to this matter.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you. A matter of privilege

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Perhaps, Madam Speaker, I might be allowed a few moments on this particular matter of privilege.

Friday, 9 May, 1986

As you are aware, the requirement for the matter of privilege to be brought up is (1) that it is brought up at the earliest possible moment, and the Member for St. Vital has correctly identified that there is precedent for bringing up matters of privilege of this nature on this particular day, the first working day of the Legislature. So I think he has in fact followed the proper procedure in that regard.

As the Honourable House Leader for the Opposition has indicated, it is up to the House to determine, according to Page 19 in Citation 51, "If reflections on Members of the House are serious enough to justify action." And the course of action which the Member for St. Vital has indicated as being the preferred course of action through his motion, that is a reference to the appropriate committee, is one which the House should in fact have the ability to decide upon.

There is reference and there is precedent in respect to sending to the House, to the committee, questions regarding newspaper articles and reporting of newspaper articles - the Honourable House Leader of the Opposition will recall that he had been involved in one such incident where they were in fact government where a newspaper article reflected upon servants of the House and was sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for clarification.

Given that precedent, although it does not apply directly to this particular situation, does exist, you, Madam Speaker, if I may offer some advice, may wish to take this under advisement, review the existing precedents as to how they might apply to this particular situation.

There is of course precedent for taking matters of privilege under advisement by the Speaker and report back to the House so that we can review this situation at that time.

MADAM SPEAKER: A matter of privilege is a very serious situation and I would like to take the matter under advisement and report back.

Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Opposition Leader.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that under Rule 27 the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance; namely, the failure of the Premier to demand the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines following his admission that he participated in a quick profit tax scam for the taxation years 1984 and 1985.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have received proper notice from the member that he intended to make this motion. Under Rule 27(2) the member has five minutes to explain the urgency of debate according to Beauchesne 287.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in addressing the urgency of debating this particular motion at this immediate time, I begin by saying that given the responses today in question period, given the last two or three weeks of discussion in the media, it is absolutely fair to say that the credibility of this entire administration is in question. In fact, the integrity of the NDP

administration of this Province of Manitoba is in doubt at this point in time.

The discrepancy which the First Minister was unable to or refused to address today with respect to information given publicly by the Minister of Energy and Mines and the information available from the Manitoba Securities Commission casts a shadow of doubt over every member of this administration. Indeed, each and every person sitting on that side of the House today is living in a world in which their honesty, their integrity, their truthfulness has been put into question by one member of their administration. Having said that, Madam Speaker, I am quickly brought to the realization that in the course of question period, of course, we became aware that there is indeed a second member of this administration who has cast similar question and doubt on the integrity and the honesty of the people sitting on that side of the House.

I have been given, as we sat here over the past half hour, a copy of the letter which was sent to the First Minister by the Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health. Indeed, it raises even more urgency to the question of a debate and an urgent debate with respect to the suitability and the appropriateness of Ministers who have participated in the SRTC remaining in the Cabinet of this Government.

Madam Speaker, there are more and more unanswered questions coming up by the moment. Indeed, some of the answers that the Premier gave today place even greater urgency on it, anything possible to remove the shadow of doubt over all of the members of this administration in terms of integrity, in terms of truthfulness and in terms of their ability to carry out the very commitments that have been given to the people of Manitoba by this administration, not only yesterday in the Throne Speech but as we led up to this point in time.

Madam Speaker, as we embark upon the Session, the matter has to be dealt with immediately because potentially Ministers of this Crown will be entering into, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, serious financial commitments, serious contractual obligations, multimillion dollar ventures with respect to energy sales, with respect to potash developments, all sorts of things that have been referred to in the public domain cannot be proceeded with in my view until this matter is dealt with. Because the people of this province are asking, and legitimately so, whether or not they can trust either a Minister or indeed an entire administration with handling these major commitments without knowing whether or not they are acting in self-interest, whether that be political self-interest or financial self-interest, or whether they are keeping in mind at all times the best interests of the people of Manitoba. So not one decision can be entered into, not one matter of importance can be proceeded with, until we take this matter into public debate and attention right here and now, Madam Speaker. These matters must be dealt with.

Madam Speaker, further, in terms of urgency, the Premier has indicated only this morning that he intends to make the matter of taxation reform a topic of discussion later this month in Swan River at the Western Premiers' meeting. Now, Madam Speaker, in my view we cannot have that take place with any confidence, with any credibility, that position being taken by the

Friday, 9 May, 1986

Premier on behalf of this administration cannot be put forward as long as we permit him to keep in his Cabinet people who say do as I say but not as I do; people who say we must reform taxation, we must look after the needs of the poor people of this province and we must look after them through a fair taxation process, but just a second until I get at the trough and then we can do our work. We cannot have that. It's urgent that we deal with it now.

Madam Speaker, the third point that I make with respect to urgency is that the former Minister of Finance, now the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, labeled this particular scheme that the Minister of Energy participated in as legalized theft. We cannot allow decisions to be made by a thief in Cabinet. That is the situation, Madam Speaker, that we are faced with in the words of his own colleague, a thief.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, first, I would ask your advice. I believe I heard the Leader of the Opposition correctly when he said, or made reference to, a thief in Cabinet. This is the second time on this occasion, this opening working day of the Legislature, that he has imputed motives of that sort. I believe, Madam Speaker, that if that is the type of tone, the type of guttersniping, the type of muckraking, the type of imputations that they want to make on the character of members opposite is going to make it a very difficult Session for all of us. I would ask for the Leader of the Opposition to do as he did previously in the day and withdraw those remarks which very clearly impugn upon the character of a member of this House.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I will correct my remarks to simply reflect what was said by the Minister of Energy and Mines' colleague, the former Minister of Finance, who labeled those who participated in this scam as having participated in legalized theft. Madam Speaker, I will rest that on the record and say that anyone who has participated in legalized theft, as it was described by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, ought not to sit in Cabinet and make important decisions.

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

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, on a question of a matter of privilege.

The Leader of the Opposition — (Interjection) — I will have a motion, I'll do it on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Excuse me. Are you speaking on a matter of privilege or on a point of order?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: On a point of order?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The Leader of the Opposition has been misleading this House as to what I said to the people of Manitoba . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . and I believe that it is appropriate to set the record straight. I have a copy of the transcript of specifically what I said.

MADAM SPEAKER: Was the Honourable Minister clarifying a statement that he made? I'm sorry, I was having problems hearing.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I misspoke. I said the Leader of the Opposition was misleading the House. What I should have said was that he was incorrect, misinformed as usual, in terms of what specifically it was that I had said. He stood up in this House and said that I had labelled . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Point of order, clarification of a dispute between two members is not a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology on a point of order.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: On the motion . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

On the point of order, what is your point of order?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: On the point of order, I would like, Madam Speaker, to read . . . there is a point of order before the House. On that point of order . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: There is no point of order before the House. Are you raising a point of order?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Our House Leader raised a point of order. On that point of order . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader asked the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to withdraw some statements that he had made. In my opinion, the Leader of the Opposition did withdraw those statements. On the motion of a matter of urgent public importance, the Honourable Government House Leader has two minutes left in his five-minute remarks, and there are only two members that are allowed to have the five-minute opportunity to address whether this motion is in order because it is a matter of public urgency.

The Honourable Government House Leader with two minutes.

HON. J. COWAN: It will not take more than two minutes to very clearly identify why it is this matter is out of order. The matter before us is not as to the urgency of the matter itself and, without accepting any of the premises that the Leader of the Opposition presented in respect to why he would wish to discuss this particular matter at this time, it is certainly not a matter that is of such urgency that the business of the House should be set aside.

Madam Speaker is well aware of the precedents, as is the Leader of the Opposition, and I'm somewhat surprised that he would bring this motion forward in this way because, in fact, similar motions have been ruled out of order on almost all occasions when we

Friday, 9 May, 1986

were involved in the type of debate which we are involved in during this particular portion of the House, that is, the Throne Speech.

As a matter of fact, had he taken the time to consult with his House Leader he would have found out that his House Leader, on numerous occasions when these matters were brought before the House, indicated very clearly that because there is another period of time set aside for the business of the House during which these matters can be debated, this matter of urgency is out of order from that respect alone.

There is an issue at hand, and that is the issue of tax reform. I would be, as would all members on this side as my Leader has indicated, interested in hearing what members of the opposition have to say now, after many long years of silence, in respect to tax reform.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. J. COWAN: They will have that opportunity to stand in their place and put on the record very clearly, as they have had the opportunity for years previous and never taken it, to identify where it is they stand on that important position. If, in fact, they believe that the issues which they have identified, which are not the real issues at hand here - the real issue is a tax system which must meet the need of government to raise money in a fair and equitable way - they will have that opportunity to do so during the Throne Speech Debate which is going to take place for several days now.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

According to Beauchesne 287 and 286, a matter of urgency "... does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the Rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately."

I fail to be persuaded of the urgency of debate, based on both Beauchesne 286 and 287. There is an immediate opportunity with the Orders of the Day today on the debate of the motion for an address in reply to discuss far-ranging matters. Therefore, I rule that the motion is out of order.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I must, with due respect, challenge the ruling of the Chair.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have ruled that the motion is out of order. My ruling has been challenged. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. I rule that the ayes have it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Carstairs, Cowan, Desjardins, Doer, Dolin, Evans, L. Harapiak, H. Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, M. Smith, H. Smith, Storie, Uruski, Wadding, Wasylcyia-Leis.

NAYS

Birt, Blake, Brown, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, McCrae, Mercier, Mitchelson, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 30; Nays, 26.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan

THAT an humble address be presented to the Honourable Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba as follows:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address at the opening of the present Session.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I would like to offer you my congratulations on being elected to the highest office in this Assembly. You have the responsibility of preserving order in this Chamber and, with that responsibility, I know you will excel. You can only do it by gaining the respect of all of us in this Chamber, and that you will do by being fair and impartial in your rulings, and by upholding the great traditions of this Assembly.

I would at this point like to thank the people of Ellice for electing me to this Assembly, and I will not let them down. I only hope that I can live up to their expectations as a member of this NDP Government. I'm under no illusions as to why I was elected as the member of the Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Ellice.

Sure, some respected the way I fought as a member of the City Council for my area; others had dealt with me and were pleased with the relationship, and many appreciated the way I went to bat for them to secure fairness at City Hall in dealing with a problem that they had encountered. Some just appreciated that I tend to call a spade a spade, and that I was not afraid to tackle anyone at the civic level. But it should be clear that the overpowering and paramount reason why I am the elected Member for Ellice is that I ran as a member of the New Democrat Party team.

Friday, 9 May, 1986

The people of Ellice, and indeed the people of this province, expressed their will on March 18th when they elected our new Government. The people of Ellice and the people of our great Province of Manitoba voted for the ideals of social and economic justice which this NDP Government represents.

That is why it is such an honour for me to be given the opportunity of moving acceptance of the Throne Speech of our new Government. This Throne Speech clearly shows the direction of our new Government. That is best illustrated by the following words in the Throne Speech: "... to help all Manitobans realize their full potential." Every initiative of our NDP Government enhances the opportunities for the women, men and children of Manitoba to achieve all that they are capable of. Many of these initiatives strengthen the programs which were successful during the first term of this New Democratic Party Government.

Our Government, during its last term, made the creation of jobs its main priority. As a result, today 481,000 Manitobans are taking home a pay cheque, 20,000 more Manitobans than were employed in 1981. I frankly cannot understand the traditional Conservative approach to the economy that has let private capital have the total responsibility of creating employment. The position taken by these Conservatives is that job creation really means the creation of short-term jobs.

But what is the Conservative answer when our economy goes in a downhill direction and unemployment rises due to external factors such as world surpluses and falling prices for our commodities? It is during times such as these that private capital dries up as the economic picture is gloomy. No businessman invests when he or she believes next year the profits will sink significantly or when, in the near future, it appears sales will dwindle to such an extent that their investment is in severe jeopardy.

Our NDP Government believes it should take steps to halt the downturn and, in fact, reverse the trend by job creation efforts. In 1983, our NDP Government established the Manitoba Jobs Fund with a budget of \$200 million to support direct job creation while, at the same time, providing many community facilities. The Manitoba Jobs Fund is just one program among many designed to expand the number of jobs in this province.

Let us look at one sector of activity of the Manitoba Jobs Fund over the last term of this NDP Government; that is, the Affordable New Homes Program. In 1984, the Manitoba Jobs Fund provided \$19.1 million to aid families to purchase moderately priced new homes at a lower interest rate than the prevailing market rate. This program not only encouraged renters to buy a new home, thus providing decent housing, but it also stimulated construction activity, resulting in many many jobs for that industry.

The other day I obtained a copy of the pamphlet put out by the Manitoba Jobs Fund called, "Limestone Generating Station - Labour and Jobs." Let me quote a section from that publication as it relates to jobs.

"Limestone means more than just energy. During construction, an estimated 6,000 person years of direct employment will be generated. With the construction industry in a slump across the west Limestone offers Manitoba a unique chance to maintain employment in the construction trades. Limestone means jobs."

But the more important effect of the job creation efforts of our Government is not the direct jobs that

are created, but the resulting indirect jobs which are stimulated. Every worker who is employed spends most of his pay cheque. For example, when such a worker goes and buys a stereo system he increases the viability of the stereo shop. When the stereo shop owner sees an increase in sales, he might plan to enlarge his building or at least hire more staff to meet the demand for his products. Every job created by this Government creates many more jobs, but indirectly.

All this helps to strengthen our provincial economy, thus encouraging private capital to invest. A businessman will only invest if there is a good economic outlook; after all, he will not invest his capital if the risks are too great if, indeed, he might lose his shirt. Business people know that unemployed persons spend less because they have less to spend if they only have unemployment insurance or other government assistance to aid them to survive day by day.

Can you see someone setting up a new business in the retail sector, say, in Newfoundland where about one in four is on the dole? Such a business will have a greater chance of success in a locality where unemployment figures are lower, where people, because they are gainfully employed, have more money to spend. Capital will always go to where it can achieve the greatest return. One simply does not invest in a slump.

Our province is experiencing significant growth in population, in personal income and in retail sales, reflecting the optimism which Manitobans have in their future. As a result, capital investment in our province is growing because the investment outlook is good. Statistics Canada, in commenting upon Manitoba's economic situation, reported that our province has had a 12.6 percent growth in capital investment during the past year, among the highest growth of any Canadian province.

On April 17th of this year, there was a very encouraging report in the Winnipeg Free Press regarding Manitoba's prospects in the decade ahead. The heading for the article was: "Manitoba Predicted Leader In Growth." The report goes on to state that: "The Royal Bank, in its publication, *Econoscope*, forecasts that Manitoba's predicted growth over the next decade will lead the nation." Canada's largest chartered bank predicts that Manitoba's economy will grow at an average real rate of 3.4 percent annually to 1989, and at 3.5 percent annually from 1990 to 1994.

The bank goes on to further state that: "This project growth is mainly due from this Government's decision to proceed with the construction of the Limestone Hydro Project."

So we New Democrats firmly believe that the answer to reduce a downturn in our economy is to proceed with confidence, actively taking a role in managing the economy to enhance private investment. Our New Democratic Party Government has lived up to its commitment to concentrate on improving the economy so all Manitobans will have a worthwhile future. It pleases me that the Throne Speech states that our Government will strengthen its commitment to job creation, which already has been the main goal of this Government.

But why does our New Democratic Government choose the priority of job creation? Why have we said we must work in a cooperative way with businessmen, workers, farmers, community leaders, presidents of

organizations throughout our province, as well as with leaders at other levels of government to create employment? Because employment does not just provide food on a family's table; because employment does not just provide a roof over one's head. Employment is also a learning experience, a growth experience. When one learns on the job and becomes good at it there is a satisfaction with one's life, especially if no one can match your expertise. As your skills grow, your confidence naturally develops. It may develop to such a degree that you may leave your place of work and set up your own business, and be self-employed. When your firm grows and could be called an established firm in the community, there must indeed be a lot of satisfaction in all that you have accomplished. Employment offers the opportunities of self-fulfilment.

Unemployment is a degrading experience that can destroy the dignity of an individual. The longer one is unemployed, the more devastating can be the result as door after door is shut in your face. The longer one is unemployed the more difficult it is to achieve a place in the work force. An employer asks himself the question, why has this individual been unemployed so long? Why has no one hired him or her? After all, there are always some job openings. Why has no firm or government grabbed hold of this person? Maybe he or she does not have such initiative. The prospective employer, in the majority of cases, just does not want to take a chance on someone who no one else wants. The employers thus question the worth of the individual and, before long, the individual himself generally starts to wonder why he or she cannot find work and, in turn, starts to question their self-worth. Unemployment scars the individual, and we in the New Democratic Party cannot accept this mutilation of our fellow citizens.

We have done much in the last term, and we are committed to strengthening our efforts so that anyone who wants to work will be able to work and be allowed to reach their full potential. We New Democrats cannot accept massive unemployment as a condition which we have to live with. We marshalled all our resources to fight the war on unemployment during our last term of office, and we will continue this battle.

Now compare our efforts in fighting unemployment with the Conservative Government of Alberta. Over the years, that province accumulated \$16 billion from oil royalties, and have done very little to create jobs in that province. Premier Getty of Alberta has said he will not touch the principal of the Heritage Fund, and many Conservatives in that province speak of saving the fund for a rainy day. This fund does give them the means to curb unemployment, but that government has refused to budge in its stand. They are really saying that an unemployment rate of 10.2 is an acceptable level in that province. The Metis Association of Alberta and the New Democratic Party of Alberta are right when they say that the funds could be used now to curb rising unemployment in that province.

We have limited means, but we are doing all we can to fight the unemployment disease to our economic system here in Manitoba. Thus, one is better off in seeking employment in this province than one is in seeking work in Alberta. I just cannot understand how the Conservative Government of Alberta can sit idly by with this nest egg when they could actually use it to improve their economy and reduce the unemployment levels in their province.

By the way, you should realize too that the election yesterday really showed that many people in Alberta are changing their minds about that government and are asking . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. SMITH: . . . how can any government be so callous.

But let us get back to Manitoba and the Throne Speech. In listening to this Throne Speech of our Government, I'm impressed with the vision, because it is a vision of equality of opportunity for all Manitobans so that every person can achieve his or her goals, only limited by the extent of their abilities. But I read the other day in the report of the Special Committee on Visible Minorities in Canadian Society, a federal report — (Interjection) — but let's get back to Manitoba and the Throne Speech

In listening to this Throne Speech of our Government, I'm impressed with the vision because it is a vision of equality of opportunity for all Manitobans so that every person can achieve his or her goals, only limited by the extent of their ability. But I read the other day in the report of the Special Committee on Visible Minorities in Canadian Society, a federal report called "Equality Now," that research has shown that as many as 15 percent of the Canadian population exhibits blatant racist attitudes. Well another 20 percent to 25 percent of the population have some racist tendencies. Will not these racist attitudes make it more difficult to achieve this vision of equality of opportunity for all? They definitely would if these attitudes spread and nothing was done to stunt their growth.

"All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." This statement is embodied in the universal declaration of human rights and in The Human Rights Act, a provincial statute which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, nationality, religion, sex, age, handicap or other group stereotypes. I am certainly proud that this act was passed by the former NDP Government of Premier Schreyer as it definitely was the first step to combat racist behaviour.

I am equally pleased with the affirmative action policies signed by the Minister of Labour and the then president of the MGEA on June 7, 1983. This policy reads as follows: "The Government of Manitoba and the MGEA are committed to the concept of affirmative action to redress existing discriminatory barriers and to enhance promotion and equality of treatment within the Provincial Government for women, physically disabled persons, Natives and visible minorities. By formation of this policy, the NDP Government in Manitoba and the MGEA have shown leadership to right so many wrongs."

Let me give you another example of another policy, that of the encouragement of cultural activities by the granting of government grants. I know the artistic director of the Blacklorama Cultural Association which sponsors the annual Blacklorama Cultural Reggae Music Festival. He phoned me the other day to tell me that the festival would be on home ground in Vimy Ridge Park - that is just south of my constituency - on August 3. During our conversation, he related to me that the Blacklorama Cultural Association had

received a grant of \$1,500 from the Culture, Heritage and Recreation Department, and a sum of \$8,400 from the Manitoba Jobs Fund. These two grants will help to make their programming more viable.

I will never forget the first year when I dropped into the Reggae Music Festival and saw people whose ancestors came from all over the world basking in the sun, listening to the compulsive beat of the reggae sound. Is it not reasonable to conclude that people who enjoy associating together will grow to respect each other? I believe that the Blacklorama Cultural Reggae Music Festival and Folklorama are two events which aid us in creating racial harmony within our capital city.

There are many other initiatives of this Government which promote multiculturalism, and these show our government is truly interested in helping all Manitobans to realize their full potential. For those members of the Conservative opposition who may not agree with our Government's policy, let me close this part of my address by citing a short poem by Robert Frost.

"Some say the world will end in fire, some say in ice. From what I've tasted of desire, I hold with those who favour fire. But if I had to perish twice, I think I know enough of hate to say that, for destruction, ice is also great, and would suffice." I sincerely believe that more people are hurt and many have their potential destroyed by hateful actions of others than this world ever realizes.

The time has come in this speech for me to share with you the greatest moment that I experienced in the election campaign. I don't remember the actual day, but I do recall rather vividly my enthusiasm following my reading of a press release with the heading, "Pawley announces 10-year 100 Million River Cleanup."

Our rivers in the early days of our country were vital for transporting goods, as they served as unpaved highways. You can just imagine how important they were to the development of our country before we had the trains, the triple-trailer vehicles and our contemporary planes. Rivers were the only efficient way to transport our products. In those early days, it must have been awesome to travel down our rivers and behold the landscape and wildlife. Our cities were tiny and did not have the people to contaminate our natural environment. Just imagine. There were no gigantic buildings standing along the banks to intrude into our view as we travelled down those rivers.

Today we can share part of that view and let me tell you - all of you - when you get tired from your heavy work load and need a real break, take a few hours and traverse a Manitoba river. It really never fails to refresh you as you're away from concrete, you're away from a bustling schedule, and you may not even hear the ringing of a telephone.

Rivers today are not just for recreational purposes. They supply us with fresh water. We need it to function, to drink, to grow food, to water our house plants, to bathe in. Life depends on it. There is no artificial water. Unlike Coca Cola, it has to be the real thing.

Fresh water is abundant in our great province in contrast with many other parts of the world. Worldwide, three-quarters of the rural population, and one-fifth do not have access to an adequate supply of water. Millions of women spend a good share of each day walking 10 miles or more from their homes to obtain enough water for drinking or cooking.

As I was saying, in Manitoba we have an abundant supply of water and, because it is so, we tend not to appreciate it. Turn the tap on, out comes the water. There's even water for bathing, washing the car, watering the lawn, operating industry, supporting agriculture and hundreds of other functions from filling water beds to carrying away the sewage that we all create, especially, I guess, some of you members on the opposite side of the House. Outside of air for breathing, probably nothing has been more taken for granted by those who have it than water.

The River Renewal Program of our Government will help ensure that our rivers are cleaner. We need to start to reclaim our rivers and river banks so that all Manitobans tomorrow can enjoy their beauty and have the security of a fresh supply of water. Winnipeg is probably the clearest, most visible example of how, as a result of increased organization and industrialization coupled with poor coordination and planning, our river system has deteriorated. It is time to put an end to that. Now is the time for the restoration of our historic rivers. Our rivers cannot be allowed to deteriorate any further.

River renewal is best accomplished with the cooperation and commitment of the cities and towns involved, along with the Federal Government and the private sector. This is a program for all Manitoba, a program all cities and towns along our rivers will be invited to participate in.

Our re-elected New Democratic Government will, over the next 10 years, invest \$100 million in this program to clean up our rivers. We expect the Federal Government to match that commitment and to participate as they have in other — (Interjection) — you don't think they will, eh? They've done it in other provinces and they should do it here, if they were being fair. We expect the Federal Government to match that commitment and to participate as they have in other provinces, and our Government will encourage all communities along the Red and Assiniboine Rivers to participate as well.

The River Renewal Program will see a single agency administer a new streamlined water policy. The program will see the creation of river basin authorities, drawn from participating governments and the private sector to direct the enhancement of the rivers which run through our cities and towns. When the study is completed and priorities are set, the work will begin to improve water quality to develop more recreational facilities, riverbank parks, walkways and bicycle paths, and improve the wildlife and fish management, and provide new facilities for fishing and boating.

Another direction of this Government is to advance the concept of pay equity so that equality of life will be improved for all working women within our province. It should be remembered that our NDP Government during its last term introduced a legislative program setting up pay equity within all Provincial Government departments. All Manitobans can be proud of the fact that their Provincial Government was the first Provincial Government to do so in this country.

Equal pay for work that is of comparable value is a concept that we all agree on in this Chamber. It is only just that women working at jobs of equal value to those done by men at the same workplace should be entitled to receive a pay cheque of equal pay. If we can agree,

as we do on this principle, should not every woman and man in this Chamber seek to have it apply to all working women in this province so we can have a more just economic system? I would suggest to the Conservative Opposition that they should be busy investigating ways to achieve the principle that they believe in. To believe in something, but never taking a step to making that belief a reality is indeed hypocritical.

Madam Speaker, this NDP Government will not make the same mistake as our Tory counterparts. On March 18, the people of Manitoba chose a government committed to the ideal of social and economic justice. They voted for a government with vision, one which cares for all Manitobans.

Madam Speaker, I pledge to work for the constituency of Ellice. I will work to see that ideals, so ably featured in the Speech from the Throne, will be fulfilled.

It's an honour and a privilege for me to move this Speech from the Throne for the Government of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, I, too, would like to congratulate you on your election to the highest office in this Legislature and I have full confidence in your ability and I am sure all members of this House, as the Session goes on and what I have seen today and yesterday, will also share that confidence in your abilities to provide us with guidance.

As a new member of this Legislature, I particularly look forward to your wisdom, advice and guidance as to the order and the procedures of this House and to ensure that there is fair debate and that I have opportunity to participate fully, which I hope to do.

I wanted to also thank the Premier and the Executive Council for the honour of allowing me to second the Speech from the Throne and my appointment as Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

I would also like to praise the Honourable Member for Ellice who just delivered an excellent speech. I think one of the things that is very noticeable in the Member for Ellice's address is his caring and concern and it is also what the Throne Speech is all about. I think the Honourable Member for Ellice made that very clear.

I think that is basically the reason why the Honourable Member for Ellice is the Honourable Member for Ellice and not somebody from an Opposition party.

I also want to congratulate all the other 56 members of this House who went through a winter campaign which I know was not enjoyable for anybody and who did the hard work that had to be done, from members on both sides of this House, to get into this place.

I particularly also would like to sympathize with those who did not make it and also put in the hard work and effort. I think they deserve some sympathy from us for what they did.

I want to give particular thanks to the people of my constituency, Kildonan, who had to elect me twice before I could actually be seated in this House. I thank them for their patience and, I hope, their good judgment. I believe, and I think perhaps somebody should check on this, that I have become an historical figure in this

Legislature, having been for two elections, seven months and five days before I actually was able to take my seat here. I believe that is some kind of Manitoba or Canadian record.

Also, Madam Speaker, I have some concern about, I'm a little confused on the rules. One of the things that I was led to believe is that debate in this Chamber is individual debate and what I have seen from members of the Opposition seems to be mass debate and I am not clear as to whether or not this is within the rules of the House. I await your ruling on that, Madam Speaker.

I would like, having mentioned the constituency of Kildonan, to perhaps describe my constituency to some extent to the members of this Assembly. I think this is probably my first opportunity to do that and I hope to be working very diligently for the people in my constituency. I would like my honourable colleagues in this House to understand who they are, where they come from, and what some of the issues are facing people of my constituency.

I would also like to point out that how elements of this Government's Throne Speech relates to the problems of my constituency and how this Government has a plan to be able to deal with the problems of my constituency and other constituencies in the province.

First, my constituency is made up of three primary areas. One is the Maples, the other is Garden City and the other is Old Kildonan. The population of this constituency is the largest population of any constituency in this province.

There's an interesting and very unique ethnic mix in my constituency which is basically made up, particularly in the Maples area, which is the newest area, of new immigrants and the sons and daughters and second generation to a great extent, of the immigrants of the last wave who came into this country in 1910, 1920, etc.

You have all races; you have all creeds; you have all religions and the community seems to work together. It seems to work together very well. There are certain elements of racism in the community as there are in the rest of the province. I think the Government has taken steps and the community is working very diligently to erase this and to bring an open minded attitude toward new immigrants from prior immigrants and from other people in other parts of the province.

Basically, the people of my area are middle class, hard-working people who work in trades, professions, small business, etc., who did support this Government in the last two elections and the by-elections, and I think with good reason.

One of the things that is happening in there seems to something of a housing boom, and a boom in the retail sector and manufacturing sector in my constituency. Those of you who have driven up McPhillips Road or have seen the north end of the Maples or Garden City can see there is an enormous amount of construction going on. The retail sector is booming in this area; housing is booming. I think a great deal of that is due to the efforts of the Ministry of Housing here. A lot of the housing has been built on and with government support on government land. I notice the Minister of Co-op Development has certainly helped.

There is one co-op on Leila which is expanding. There is a new co-op development being built on Mandalay

which I think will be equally successful. I think the efforts of this Government have allowed people to have decent housing in a nice neighbourhood and allowed businessmen to provide the services to service them and everybody to live comfortably and make a decent living.

I would also like to point out something interesting on a personal note about the ethnic mix. Last year the Maples High School soccer team won the Provincial High School Soccer Championship. There was only one Canadian born child - child, I say - on that soccer team. It happened to be my son. I'm very proud of the fact that he was the only Canadian born. I think it not only shows that the children can play together and win, it shows that their parents can work together and win.

Also another thing that this brings to mind is the Seven Oaks School Division, which serves the majority of my constituency and some of the Premier's constituency, has long been recognized for being one of the most - and the Honourable Minister for Seven Oaks - progressive school divisions in the province. That reputation I think is well-deserved. You have a very hard-working school board; you have some excellent teachers, their programs, that of the Provincial Government, as far as linguistic and cultural benefits to the people, the parents and the children of the constituency, which have been taken advantage of by the Seven Oaks School Division, and the schools seems to be expanding and doing extremely well.

Another area which has been worked on is good senior citizen housing. This Government has promoted and in the Throne Speech it's noted that this will continue to be expanded. Some of the best senior citizen housing in the province happens to be in my constituency. There is no question that more is needed. There is also no question that more will be provided by this Government as outlined in the Throne Speech.

Another thing is there is a building at 1010 Sinclair, which is in my constituency, which is a residence for people who are disabled through either illness or through auto accidents or what have you, which is an exemplary facility for this kind of person.

An interesting thing with Government support that has happened in this building is the Seven Oaks Day Care Centre has moved their operations into the basement of this building to allow a mix and a feedthrough between disabled people and children who are not disabled. I think this is an excellent program. I think it serves as an educational and involvement vehicle for both the disabled people who live in the building and the children, to be able to have a better understanding. What we saw in the Throne Speech was very clearly this Government's commitment to aid the disabled. I think one of the things that has to happen on both sides of the House and in the public before we provide the aid to the disabled is something very simple. That's understanding of what it is to be disabled and an empathy with the disabled, not just sympathy.

My constituency president, who has been my constituency president for some time, who was the office manager in the campaign, is a blind woman with one leg. The first reaction people had to her was that, how can she run a campaign office if she's blind? How can she answer a multi-line phone? People expressed concern and, very simply, if we make those decisions without asking people who are disabled - they have

learned to cope. She brought out this penlight which beeps when it hits the phone line. She knows which phone line is on. She took messages. She ran that office in a military, sergeant-major type of manner such as I have never seen in a campaign before.

I think one of the things we have to learn is to allow the disabled to speak for themselves, to allow them to be involved in planning for themselves, and not make judgments for them.

I would also point out that this particular woman has led a campaign against the City of Winnipeg to stop them from paying less rates or no rates for public transit. Her opinion is that she is a citizen. She uses the public transit, and I think generally what she is saying is that she wants to be treated and given the same opportunity and fair treatment. She does not want to be sympathized with or patronized. I think one of the problems we have with the disabled is we have a tendency to do that. I think, very clearly, we should stop doing that, and I think what we see in the Throne Speech is this Government's commitment not to patronize and not to sympathize, but to work with the disabled people of this province to ensure that they have fair treatment and fair access to all the facilities that this province provides.

Getting back to Kildonan, another little problem that I think some of the other members have seen in developing areas, in the Maples and north Garden City and particularly developing areas, is the lack of door-to-door mail services. I think one of the problems and one of the reasons for this is the privatization of the post office. In turning Canada Post into a Crown corporation and, in the recent Budget Speech of the Honourable Mr. Wilson in Parliament, Mr. Wilson stated very clearly, and gave a timetable, that Canada Post must be self-financing. Basically what I hear him saying is, whether or not the service is adequate to the public or not, and whether or not the price is fair to the public or not.

Well, I think what we are seeing in my area and what people are seeing in the new developing areas is, the public be damned! The object of the exercise is to balance the books, and what used to be a public service that was a requirement for the people of this country to be able to keep informed and to be able to communicate has now become secondary to balancing the books in Canada Post. I think that is an awful situation. I think, if this is what happens with privatization, then privatization be damned!

I think this brings me also to the matter of Conservative dogma. The Conservatives accuse us, on occasion, of being a dogmatic party, that we have a dogmatic Government, that we are the ones who run down streets with red banners and whatnot. What you see in the Throne Speech and what is very clear in the Throne Speech — (Interjection) — Is that some more of that mass debate that I'm hearing?

What we see in the Throne Speech here is a Government that's committed to a planned economy, planned social services with a game plan, with an idea of the future and, on a pragmatic basis, dealing with the issues of the day as they are relevant and as they come up. This is not commitment to dogma that private enterprise is always better than public enterprise, what my Conservative friends on the other side of the House say. I would like to see them explain to me how Dome Petroleum is better than Manitoba Telephone.

Friday, 9 May, 1986

They also say that private employers and private management is superior to public management — (Interjection) — I will get to that. I think what they are basically saying, which is insulting to every civil servant in this province, in this country, is civil servants, by the definition that they work for government, are naturally inferior to people who work for McDonald's or General Motors. I find that offensive, and I also think, if anybody considers it carefully, they know it is not true.

I think one of the things, and I think when Mr. Sherman was asked to look very carefully at the health care system and to consider privatization, I happened to read his recommendations to the Honourable Jake Epp, and they're not quite as clear-cut or as specific as Mr. Epp would have us believe or the way the press misinterpreted, I believe, what Mr. Epp was saying.

Basically what Mr. Sherman was saying was what I consider rational, reasonable argument. Basically what he said, if it works, don't fix it. Good management is good management, whether it's in the private sector or public sector. We, on this side of the House, have always believed that. We believe that public enterprises with good management can be as efficient, if not more efficient, than private enterprise.

I think the dogma coming from the other side is that is impossible by definition. I think the reality of that is - I give you once again Dome Petroleum and Manitoba Telephone. I give you Chrysler versus Manitoba Hydro. Nobody bailed out Manitoba Hydro. I think what we are talking about and what Mr. Sherman was talking about is the idea of a non-dogmatic approach to planning the economy, to planning the social services, for planning the mix, is the fact that you have to have a plan. The business community has to know where it's going.

One of the things I have heard lately as a distinct and continuing criticism from the business community of the Federal Conservative Government is, very simply, they do not know what's happening one year down the road, they don't know what's happening five years down the road. You can't plan a business, and I'm sure people on that side of the House, some of whom may be able to run a chicken shack or a used car lot - I have very sincere difficulty believing that the members opposite can run a government.

Certainly there has to be a plan. The fact is where a dogmatic approach that you privatize everything, that only the private sector can do it, has been proven wrong in this country over more than 115 years. The fact is that a plan allows both business people and working people to understand what their future is and how to plan the operations of their own industry.

The Conservative supporters from the business community - and this was in the Financial Times, I believe, I cannot quote specifically, but it has certainly been public in various financial papers - do not know where they're going with the Conservative Government because the Conservative Government federally has no plan, no direction. The tax system seems to be changed on almost a daily basis. It is a hodgepodge and a mess, and I think the members opposite, certainly in question period today, were pointing out indirectly that very fact, that the tax system in this country is just insane.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, I am interrupting the debate in accordance with sub-rule 3.(4).

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, we are prepared to grant leave on this side, although I can't speak for the Member for River Heights, if the member wishes to speak for another five minutes to conclude his remarks.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you.

Since I only have five minutes, there is something that struck me this morning and that has been striking me in the media for the last few days. I have always had some concerns, as I'm sure most members of this House had, with some of the cults that appear from time to time in this province. There seems to be a new cult, a new self-proclaimed messiah with 25 disciples in the Church of Posturing Purity, who talks about - and I heard it this morning. I have heard the words "integrity" and "credibility" as if there was a monopoly on that. I have the words "truth," "morality," "honesty." I have also heard a word that I had never heard before and that's "labelize," "labelizing."

I want to say that I feel this is a very dangerous road. I am not particularly condemning the honourable new messiah, as he's self-proclaimed, the holder of virtue in the palm of his hand, but what I am saying is this is a very dangerous road and it goes back to the New Testament where they say: "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone." I think, as we are all honourable members in this House, there is a certain reasonable level of honourableness. I do not think any man or woman in this House can stand up and claim a monopoly on virtue and purity. I am beginning to hear that over and over again.

It is also an extremely difficult problem to look at the situation, for example, with Sinclair Stevens and Noreen Stevens. Let me point out what is happening here. Here is a man who puts his money in blind trust - his wife who holds the blind trust, who makes a loan from a company that is doing business with his department in the Federal Government - which has gotten approximately \$130 million worth of business. What Sinclair Stevens is saying is that he didn't know she did it. He doesn't talk to his wife about such issues; they did not discuss the situation of her making the loan. I would say if I believed Sinclair Stevens, which I should because he is an honourable member, I would suggest that he has another problem. Here is a man whose marriage is in serious trouble. His wife goes out and borrows \$2.6 million and doesn't tell him? I have a very serious problem with that.

I would like to point out - and I think this is not only as a caution to the members opposite, but members on this side of this House - I would like to point out that people who get up on white horses and stand on the pulpit and wear the white gowns and white cloaks are the ones where the mud and dirt shows up best. I would suggest that if one wishes to stand there and take a position of having a monopoly on virtue, a monopoly on truth, a monopoly on all that is good and kind in the world, one should be very careful.

I have only a minute or two left so what I would say is I look forward to this Session as a learning experience,

Friday, 9 May, 1986

I have already learned something this morning. I have learned some lessons about good and evil, about truth and beauty. I intend to learn a great deal more in the coming Session of the Legislature. I intend to work with my Premier and my colleagues to make sure that this Government continues on the planned road to make this province the best province in this country, to stand up against the federal erosion of our plan to make this province the best province in the country, and also to learn exactly what is a Progressive Conservative. You know I've always wondered what that is. It's one of these terms like industrial park or military intelligence or organized chaos that doesn't seem to fit. I also see the inconsistency. I see the Leader of the Opposition in this House and then I watch in Parliament where they seem to agree on some issues but they don't agree on other issues. I think there is a certain consistency. The Leader of the Opposition in this House points fingers at us and says we stand up with Ed

Broadbent. Well we do stand up with Ed Broadbent; we are the New Democratic Party. I'm waiting to learn; I will learn. I will enjoy participating in debate and it's been a pleasure.

Once again, thank you very much for allowing me to do this, Mr. Premier.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, that debate be adjourned on the motion.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: In accordance with sub-rule 3.(4) this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday next.