

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 15 May, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

### OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table the Annual Report of the Pension Commission; the Public Utilities Board; and the Manitoba Telephone System Annual Report 1984-85, copies of which were provided to caucuses earlier.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the Annual Report for the Department of Highways and Transportation for the year ending March 31, 1985.

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to table the 1984-85 Annual Report of Manitoba Industry, Trade and Technology.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Real Property Act (Air Rights); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels

**HON. J. COWAN** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 3, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act; Loi sur les caisses populaires et les credit unions.

**HON. B. URUSKI** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 4, The Family Farm Protection Act; Loi sur la protection des exploitations agricoles familiales. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

**HON. A. MACKLING** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Trade Practices Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les enquêtes relatives aux pratiques de commerce.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's been brought to my attention that, as an oversight, I neglected to advise you that Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of Bill No. 3, recommends it to the House.

**MR. G. MERCIER** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration financière.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, in keeping with Rule No. 85, which allows a member to give an explanation so that the House can understand the purport of the bill, I wish to advise members that this bill would ratify the practice begun under Premier Lyon's administration with respect to providing the quarterly financial reports and legitimize them by legislation but, at the same time, in view of the deliberate withholding of the third quarterly financial report released on April 2, 1986 this year, rather than as in previous years which were February 9, 1979, February 22, 1980, February 20, 1981 and February 26, 1982, February 25, 1983, March 2, 1984, March 22, 1985 when the Minister of Finance deliberately withheld the third quarter financial report at that time to present with his Budget, this legislation would require the quarterly financial reports to be released to the public within 60 days of the end of the quarter. Madam Speaker, it would not ever allow a socialist administration, once again, to deliberately hold this kind of information from the public.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Before Oral Questions, I'd like to draw the attention of members to the visitors in the gallery where we have 25 students of Grade 8 standing from the Major Pratt School under the direction of Mr. Bill Laing. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

We have 44 students of Grade 9 standing from the Sanford Collegiate and these students are under the direction of Mr. Len Hew. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

We have 15 students of Grade 9 standing from the Kelwood School and these students are under the direction of Mrs. Tracey Teieck. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

On behalf of all the members I would like to welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Farmland - removal of education tax

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

Given the severe financial circumstances that are facing the farm community in Manitoba today there

are many public meetings taking place. I have a question for the First Minister regarding one of these public meetings. During a town hall meeting that was held in Dauphin on Tuesday evening - it was televised live on CBC TV - the Minister of Agriculture appeared to give a clear indication that the government was prepared to move on the removal of education tax off farmland to try and assist farmers in reducing their cost of operation.

My question to the Premier is whether or not this is indeed the position of the Government of Manitoba and when can we hear further of this initiative?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that one of his members was the one that raised the question with me, the Member for Virden, who was at that meeting. I indicated to him that in the whole process of review that is being undertaken by my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I have said this a number of times, until the data base for dealing with the whole question of assessment and the whole question of restructuring of the assessment area, that is a commitment of this government that we would undertake that review. At that point in time, with the review that has been undertaken by the Minister of Education on educational financing, the whole property tax area, we would be moving in on it. It was our intention - it was mentioned by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs - to proceed in this whole area during our mandate.

### Farmers - assistance to

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, the reform of assessment is long overdue, indeed the Weir Commission studied and provided a report by 1981, so we're now almost five years down the road since then. So we're not talking about merely assessment reform, we are talking about a measure that is within the grasp of this government to remove education tax off farmland, regardless of assessment reform.

My question to the Premier is: is his administration prepared to move on this much needed initiative to assist all farmers in Manitoba?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I think the Minister of Agriculture dealt with that question quite exhaustively, that it is a matter of proceeding in respect to a number of fronts to reach the goal of reducing the weight of school taxes on farmlands. That involves, not just dealing with the taxation system, but ensuring that the assessment system and the reform of same takes place at the same time. If the honourable member proposes that we follow one course, without recognizing there are other implications, then that is a very unsafe route to proceed.

I think what the honourable member ought to register upon his mind, arising out of that town hall meeting in Dauphin, was I thought a very clear indication, from all reports I had received, that it was time for the Federal

Government to deal with the overall question — (Interjection) — Well I see that the honourable members still wish to find excuses for inaction on the part of Ottawa. If they do so, Madam Speaker, then the farming population will continue to assess them accordingly as simply being valets to the Federal Government and the actions of the Federal Government in Ottawa.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, it's evident that the Premier was receiving second- and third-hand reports that told him what he wanted to hear because, indeed, that was not what the consensus of that town hall meeting was.

Madam Speaker, given the fact, since the Premier wants to try and deflect the responsibility onto Ottawa, given the fact that, even in this year of 1986, Ottawa has made commitments to western agriculture to try and address the problem in excess of \$600 million; given the fact that the Alberta . . . I wonder if the Premier would have his discussions with the Minister of Industry and Trade later.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, given the fact that the Alberta Government . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Does the honourable member have a question?

**MR. G. FILMON:** Given the fact that the Alberta Government has already announced this year an aid package to its farmers in excess of \$200 million, and Saskatchewan has similarly announced a package of more than \$100 million to its farmers in this fiscal year, what is this First Minister prepared to do to address the real needs and concerns of the farmers of Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, this government has nothing to be ashamed of insofar as its record of contribution to the rural community of Manitoba. It is this government that has tripled the amount of financial assistance to the agricultural community since its election in 1981. It is this government that has proceeded with a number of initiatives that have been frequently referred to in this House. Insofar as writedown of MACC loans, the additional input insofar as the Hog and Beef Stabilization Programs are concerned, it was this government that was prepared to act, despite the fact that unlike the province of Alberta, that the Leader of the Opposition makes reference to, we don't have a heritage fund, but with our limited resources this government cares, this government has given priority to the concerns of farmers. Madam Speaker, if we had a \$15 billion heritage fund, we would be doing substantially more and, I submit, much more than the Government of Alberta if we had the same circumstances, the same funds to work with.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** May I remind both the Leader of the Opposition and the First Minister and, indeed, all members on both sides of the House that a question should be a question, it should not provoke debate, and a preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn

sentence, and an answer to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with matters raised and not provoke debate. If all members could adhere to both Beauchesne 359 (1) and (2) and Beauchesne Citation 358, I think our question periods would be much more productive.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

### Farmland - removal of education tax

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, given the fact that the Premier has indicated that his government is prepared to do nothing more for farmers, despite the plight in which they find themselves, can he then tell us, because his Minister of Agriculture indicated that they are looking at the problem of removal of education tax, when does he expect to be able to come up with a proposal for the removal of education tax off farm land?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I regret that the Leader of the Opposition, as he is wont to do from time to time, deliberately interprets answers in a way that is most unfounded. I did not say that this government was not going to do anything further for farmers. There was nothing in my comments to so indicate, Madam Speaker. In fact, in the Throne Speech there are a number of initiatives by which this government will be proceeding during this particular Legislative Session, including the Farm Aid Program, the Farm Start Program, measures pertaining to purple gas usage on the part of farmers and, Madam Speaker, the whole question of education costs, the weight of same, is a matter of concern on the part of this government and we are presently, as I indicated earlier, we are undertaking our own efforts to do what can be done within a reasonable period of time in order to bring about relief in an orderly fashion.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, given that farmers are in serious financial difficulty and will indeed be facing greater difficulties throughout the year, what does he consider is a reasonable period of time for action on this matter of removal of education tax from farm land.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, it is very clear what the opposition is intending here. I think they have finally realized that there is a concern and a serious economic problem in agriculture, Madam Speaker. They are proposing to basically take bail out off the Federal Government, a billion-dollar problem with a \$10 million to \$20 million solution. That is really their solution to the problems of agriculture.

Madam Speaker, there should be moves on chemical pricing; there should be moves on fuel pricing, Madam Speaker; and there will be moves on the whole area of education tax. Those are the kinds of areas that we are involved in. Madam Speaker, the last Federal Budget took \$2,000 out of every farmer's pocket. They are now giving back \$600 to each farmer and they say that's a gift and they're defending them, Madam Speaker. They are defending that kind of move, Madam Speaker. Shame on you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I regret that it is the Minister of Education who is not telling the truth in this regard. The Federal Government has put in more than \$600 million since the beginning of the year to western agriculture and he ought not to forget it.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Education on a point of order.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Yes, on a point of order, Madam Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition made reference to remarks apparently made by the Minister of Education. I do not know what he is referring to and, in any case, I would not have been providing misinformation.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Given the theatrics and the waving of arms of the Minister of Agriculture, I mistook him for the Minister of Education.

Madam Speaker, on a further matter that has to do with concerns of the people in the agricultural economy, and indeed all of our economy in Manitoba, the First Minister has twice in the last four days made announcements with respect to free trade discussions and negotiations in this House. I wonder if the First Minister could advise the House what studies were undertaken by the Manitoba Government, either internally or by consultants commissioned by the government, with respect to the effects of free trade on Manitoba prior to his taking a position and making comments on behalf of the people of Manitoba at the First Ministers' Meeting in Halifax last fall.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, first I would like to correct a comment made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition which reflects not well upon his ability from time to time to misinform members of this Legislature and the public. The reference to the \$600 million involves a Western Stabilization Program. A goodly chunk of that money is contribution from the farmers direct themselves. You don't take money from the pockets of farmers, return it to the farmers of this province, and then try to give credit to the Tory Government in Ottawa, as the Leader of the Opposition tried a few moments ago. Talk about shell games and quick flips, that's a good example.

Madam Speaker, insofar as the question of studies pertaining to the issue of trade liberalization there is a study that has been done by Industry, Trade and Technology; there have been discussions that have been held by the Economic Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of farm, labour and business and different segments of all three sectors of the economy in respect to their particular views in respect to the issue of free trade. And the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology would be prepared, I'm sure, to deal with any questions pertaining to the policy study that's been done up to this point.

**Free Trade - studies,  
consultations, etc.**

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder then, Madam Speaker, if the Premier would be willing to table those studies that have been done by the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology with respect to Manitoba's position on free trade?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Madam Speaker, that's certainly something we can take into consideration. The Member for Sturgeon Creek shouted, "table it". I have here a contract he signed back in 1980. "The consultant agrees to keep confidential all matters concerning this agreement and to exercise every reasonable effort to prevent any publicity concerning the existence of, or any details or conditions of, this agreement." That's the kind of tabling of documents we had when he was a member of this House, and the member sitting beside him, Madam Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert, who was referring to withholding of information was the Attorney-General who would have authorized that kind of contract back in 1980 . . .

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** We don't run that kind of government.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. If a member wants to make a comment and ask a question they can stand and rise in their turn. A member was asked a question; a member is answering a question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, could you please ascertain whether or not that agreement that he's speaking about refers to free trade? That's what the question was about.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** May I remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that according to Beauschesne 363, a Minister may (a) answer the question; (b) defer his or her answer; (c) take the question as notice; (d) make a short explanation as to why an answer cannot be made at this time; or (e) say nothing.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, with respect, it appears as though the Minister has done (f) none of these, and I'd like to know what he's going to do with respect to the question I've asked.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Madam Speaker, I indicated that we will take that under advisement.

**A MEMBER:** Table it.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I don't have the contract here. I have another contract because, Madam Speaker, yesterday in this House the Member for Sturgeon Creek, from his seat, said that he never signed contracts with consultants which had up-front payments and he and the Member for St. Norbert, the picture of sanctimony . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** The Minister has continually referred to myself as signing a contract, waved it in this House, and I ask, Madam Speaker, that he table the Order for Return he is waving around in the House.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the point of order. I was presuming that the Minister was planning on tabling the document when he finished reading from it. Am I correct in that presumption?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Madam Speaker, you appear to be a fortuneteller as well as a Speaker. I intend to table this document, which is not an Order for Return, but which is an agreement which is dated the 18th day of June, 1980, and it is signed by the Member for Sturgeon Creek and, not only that, it provides an up-front payment for a consultant . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. On the point of order, I will peruse Hansard tomorrow, but I did have a recollection that the Minister started off by saying a document that he was quoting from which he would be tabling. I do presume that the Minister will, when he is finished his question, table the document that he is responding from.

The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Madam Speaker, there's a lot of noise in the Chamber. It appears that suddenly this penchant for open government has come to a screeching halt in the Opposition. I couldn't hear what you were saying, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I recognize the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology to continue answering the question, briefly.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to say that in this particular contract it wasn't free; it was at \$525 a day for a consultant back in 1980, and that would work out to well over \$100,000 a year in 1980, and I will table this document, Madam Speaker. I have a number of other contracts signed by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, as well, to demonstrate the clear hypocrisy of members opposite who suggest that there's somehow something unusual when we enter into . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry on a point of order.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The point of order, Madam Speaker, is that the question was asked relating to the tabling of documents relating to free trade. There is nothing in the question or answers or information given by the honourable member. He is abusing the privileges of this House; he is in contravention of all of your directives and orders to this point in time.

I think he owes the Chamber an apology and I think he must either table or refuse to table the documents in question. He is avoiding the question here.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** May I remind the honourable member, again, Citation 363 of Beauschesne is, "A

Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason, and insistence on an answer is out of order. A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege, nor is it regular to comment upon such a refusal. A Member may put a question but has no right to insist upon an answer."

Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology briefly finish his comments on his answer to his question.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was going to table this document . . .

**A MEMBER:** Now.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** What do you want me to do, eat it? You would like me to eat it. You're very embarrassed about it, but I won't eat it. You people will eat it because you people continuously suggest that we are somehow doing something improper. But, secondly, Madam Speaker, on the issue of free trade, I am informed that most of the documents dealing with consultation we have had have already been made public. I will examine the documents we have to ensure that those which haven't been made public will be made public.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I regret that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology wants to make a mockery of the rules in this House.

My question was a very simple one and I'll pose it to the Premier because I would hope that he won't deflect it and duck it and give it to his Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, to make a laughingstock of him and this House.

I want to know whether or not the Premier will inform members of the House that he is prepared to table the documents and the studies that have been done with respect to Manitoba's position on free trade?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I'm going to prepare a list of documents that have been prepared, I think most of the documents have already been made public, background documents. Certainly my positions that have been taken at various conferences on behalf of the Province of Manitoba vis-a-vis free trade, I think some of them have been tabled in this House. But there is also background material that has already been made public and if there are background studies that have not been made public, then I'll be reviewing those, but a goodly number apparently have already been made public.

Since honourable members appear to have missed this important information that would have been invaluable to them in their own studies, I'll check in order to ensure that honourable members are getting all the information that we can possibly provide to them on this very important subject.

No. 2, Madam Speaker, I would like to provide honourable members with the list of the different organizations in Manitoba that have already been engaged in very extensive consultation with the Government of Manitoba. It's my understanding some 20 organizations in the farm sector, to the labour sector,

to the business sector and other groups in the Province of Manitoba, have had intensive consultation, have contributed to the Government of the Province of Manitoba as to their particular views, pro and con, in respect to the free trade discussions. So when we want to discuss openness, there has been a great deal of openness, a great deal of consultation. I wish I had the 20 or so organizations, the names of them, but I will read them out in the House so that honourable members know the extent of consultation which has already taken place and which I'm sure there'll be much more consultation in the weeks and the months to come.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, with respect to studies on free trade, we are not speaking about the government's position papers which it has put forward at meetings. We are talking about consultant's reports or studies that have been done with respect to the potential effect of free trade on our economy.

But taking it further, Madam Speaker, even within the last few days, we have heard from the Keystone Agriculture Producers who have said that they want an opportunity for input into the province's position on free trade.

We've heard from the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce who, at their annual meeting, said that they were interested in putting forward a position to the government and helping it with respect to its position on free trade.

My question very simply to the First Minister is, will he agree to strike an all-party committee of this Legislature, empowered to hold public hearings, to solicit the advice and information from the various sectors of our economy with respect to Manitoba's position on free trade?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I will be taking that certainly under consideration, a suggestion that I will be considering. I want to just also though indicate to the honourable member, and I would hope we would have the support of the honourable member once in a while in relationship to the Federal Government, nine of the ten provinces have taken very strong positions in respect to the need for participation by the provinces in the free trade negotiations that will be taking place. Only one province has excluded themselves from the overall provincial consensus, that being the Province of New Brunswick.

Madam Speaker, that issue must be first resolved because, if there is not to be meaningful participation by the provinces, there is no point us suggesting to Manitobans that there can be real input unless Manitoba has a real input, and that has been the position of all premiers in this country about the need for real input. Madam Speaker, I would hope, and I would hope the Leader of the Opposition at some point would respond, as to whether he supports nine of the ten provinces in Canada in saying to the Federal Government, there must be participation of a meaningful kind by the provinces of Canada from Day One in the negotiations, otherwise this will be a process that will not result in meaningful results for Canada as a whole.

Insofar as the various studies, I know that some of those - I'm sorry, I was trying to answer the question. Well, if honourable members don't want to hear the questions they asked . . .

## Mosquito fogging

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

**MR. J. ERNST:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Minister, in approving the City of Winnipeg application for mosquito fogging recently you added a condition of a 100-metre buffer zone for those people who so requested that their property not be sprayed. With the substantial rainfall in the last few weeks and the substantial number of warm days we have had just recently, there is a record hatch anticipated to be maximized approximately sometime during the coming long weekend, the first long weekend of the summer. City officials have indicated to me that with a 100-metre buffer zone, 500 applications judiciously spaced around the city would have the effect of nullifying the spraying or the effectiveness of the spraying and make it totally uneconomic.

My question, Madam Speaker, is this, will the Minister be reducing the buffer zone to 30 metres as requested by the City of Winnipeg?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The article to which the honourable member refers to also states that the city expects me to get back to them sometime during the course of next week, as I have indicated to them. In the meantime, Madam Speaker, there is nothing that prevents the fogging program to carry on as it usually did in previous years. Admittedly, there is an additional condition that was attached this year which wasn't there before, and that is what we are currently reviewing, but that does not preclude any fogging from taking place at the moment.

Madam Speaker, I wish to remind the member across that the city at one time had a 90-metre buffer zone that it, itself, had implemented. So if they could fog at that time with a 90-metre buffer zone, Madam Speaker, what we have asked the city this year is to — abiding by the other conditions that they have themselves applied in previous years — try to also respect the rights of those who did not want to be fogged.

It is still my hope, Madam Speaker, that the city will begin their normal fogging program and try to implement it in a reasonable way and see if that perhaps is not, Madam Speaker, the middle ground, the reasonable approach, thereby respecting the rights of both sides on this issue.

**MR. J. ERNST:** A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. The Minister indicated that the city had at one time a 90-metre boundary, and he is correct. The city, as a matter of fact, tried it and found it didn't work and got rid of it. You put it back into place, Sir. But the question is this, you indicated a moment ago, Sir, in the House that the city could start spraying if it wished. That is not true, as I understand it, because there is a condition now attached to that permit that indicates you cannot spray without . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. J. ERNST:** Sorry, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The member rose with a supplementary question which needs no preamble, much less needing an extensive debate. Does the member have a supplementary question?

**MR. J. ERNST:** Thank you for your correction, Madam Speaker, and I'll attempt to abide by the rules of the House.

Will the Minister then indicate, will he remove the additional condition he attached to that permit which said that the city may not alter the number of mosquitos caught in any particular trap in order to implement spraying?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Madam Speaker, that limitation is exactly the same one that the city itself says it has been abiding by in the previous years. The count of 25 mosquitos in the trap before it begins the fogging. That is the number the city says it has been using in previous years. So that is not a new condition, Madam Speaker. So there is nothing that prevents the city from beginning the fogging in accordance with that same restriction that the city itself says it abided by in previous years. I wish to add, Madam Speaker, that the 90-metre buffer zone that the city had in place at one time, and the member indicates did away with, which is true, at that time they did not have the larviciding program which now is in place.

**MR. J. ERNST:** I thank the honourable members for clapping when I rose, Madam Speaker.

May I ask the Minister then a further supplementary question? Will he allow the City of Winnipeg to deviate from the 25 mosquitos per day in the trap as they have been allowed to do in the past?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Madam Speaker, I provide essentially the same reply. The city says it itself has abided by that limitation before, and I don't see why it should arbitrarily, whenever it wishes, decide that if there is one mosquito in the trap that is time to fog. I think that was a reasonable limit. The city and the entomologist, Dr. Ellis, says it is a reasonable approach, then we agree and we've included that restriction as part of this year's fogging program.

## Contracts - signed by Member for Sturgeon Creek

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. J. MALOWAY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Could the Minister advise the House if there are any more contracts signed by the Member for Sturgeon Creek that provided for an advance, and the amount and terms of those contracts?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. May I remind the honourable member of Citation 357(1) which says that a question should not "seek, for purposes of argument, information on matters of past history."

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

### Mosquito fogging

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, my question follows on the mosquito circumstance raised by the Member for Charleswood, and my question is to the Minister of Health, that, given the success in predicting the last four outbreaks of equine encephalitis by the maintenance of the monitoring flocks of chickens and, given the grave reservations by Dr. Roy Ellis that the cutback in the monitoring program will not provide the Department of Health of adequate advance warning of an outbreak of encephalitis that may come with an enhanced mosquito population this year, my question to the Minister of Health is: is he prepared to reinstate the full mosquito monitoring program?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, this is something that actually should be discussed during the Estimates, the policy . . . I would say that we have other experts that have been giving us some other information; and no, at this time, we are not . . .

**A MEMBER:** What's your position?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, could the Minister give the assurance to the House that this cutback in the level of monitoring, which has been successful in predicting the last four outbreaks of equine encephalitis, will in no way inhibit his departmental officials from providing warning to Manitobans so they can protect themselves and their children from a potential outbreak of equine encephalitis that once it hits forces in humans it's simply too late to provide that protection?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No matter what warning you could have, the advice to the people of Manitoba is always the same. It's the same thing, they should be very careful. There is a list of things to do and, fine, we could, every summer, every spring we could say the same thing . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, my question is for the First Minister.

Given that the Minister of Health is bound to reduce the level of monitoring and put Manitobans under a constant alert for a threat that may not exist, would the First Minister use the funds that he could achieve by cancelling the contract to a defeated Cabinet Minister of \$55,000 to reinstate the Mosquito Monitoring Program and protect Manitobans from the potential outbreak of equine encephalitis, rather than provide a make-work contract for a defeated partisan politician, and protect the people of Manitoba and the children of Manitoba?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Speaker, the answer is the same. It's a question of education and the people of Manitoba, when there are mosquitos should take the same care to protect themselves. It doesn't matter what else is done.

### Manitoba Development Centre - Welcome Home Program

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services. On May 2nd of this year the Minister announced that 220 residents of the Manitoba Development Centre would be returned to community settings. In that only 64 members of that community were able to be returned to the other community in the last 14 months; how does this government intend to release 220 in the next eight months?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to comment on the welcome home. The planning for the movement out of the Development Centre has been going on and, in addition to the 64 who have been moved this year, we currently have approximately 135 plans that are about complete with the next grouping well advanced. We do believe we can reach the target in the time stated.

### Psychiatric nurses - training of

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. In that one of the major problems in releasing these clients into community settings is the lack of service, how will service, in fact, be provided when her ministry, at the self-same time, has ordered the end of the nursing school which provides the specialized service?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, the needs of the retarded children and adults in the community comprise residential care, education or day activity - depending on the age or employment - specialized medical supports, crisis intervention - in some cases respite care. What we have put together is that combination of services available in the community. The psych nurses who have been delivering the service at the Development Centre, some will certainly still have a role in the community delivery but the need for the numbers of psych nurses is definitely on the downswing. The Development Centre peaked at around 1,100 people living there. We're now at 740 and hope to level off about 550. So, it's quite clear that our need in the next few years for psych nurses for that particular specialty will taper off.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Another supplementary to the Minister.

Madam Speaker, it would appear, I think, that these patients who are living in community settings will, by the Minister's own words, require a continued facility and care. Surely that could be provided by people specifically trained in working with the mentally retarded, and yet we are no longer going to train those people. Why are we not going to do this?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, there are some similar skills and knowledge areas between the needs

of the workers who deliver the service in the community and the skills and knowledge acquired by psych nurses, but there are also significant other areas. What we have put in place is a plan to train the deliverers of service required in the new mode of service delivery, also training for the parents, for the community boards, and for the medical people and so on who will be delivering the service now throughout Manitoba.

### Education funding - level of funding for divisions

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Because the present education funding formula has seriously jeopardized the ability of school divisions, or a large number of school division, in providing their students a quality of education; and in view of the fact that the present formula or formulas clearly discriminate against low-spending school divisions, will the Minister take immediate steps to develop a single formula which will not discriminate against low-spending school divisions and will, in fact, take away the unrealistic local levy tax which has been imposed on local taxpayers?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, the questions asked by the Member for Roblin-Russell would require a thorough review of the Estimates of the Department of Education, certainly not the kind of question, I think, you could appropriately answer in question period. Let me simply say that it is rather simplistic thinking to assume that, in a province as diverse as this province is, educational needs that are diverse as they are amongst the divisions in this province, which spread from the needs of Northern Manitoba to Inner City, to rural urban centres, it is unrealistic to think that you're going to have a system for funding education which is satisfactory in all respects to all of those diverse groups. It simply doesn't happen.

Madam Speaker, to have a single formula that funds each of the divisions in an identical manner is impossible. The Department of Education has a number of priorities and one of those priorities includes equalization. The simple principle that there has to be, there needs to be on the part of government, some means of assuring that there is quality education across the province. That implies some difference in the level of funding that goes to different divisions. There are inequities, but they are not as simple to address as the Member for Roblin-Russell assumes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, Orders of the Day.

The Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to raise a point of order. I would like you to examine the document that was tabled by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and

examine Hansard and determine, as I think you will find, Madam Speaker, that the document that was tabled had nothing whatsoever to do with the question which related to free trade. The Minister has abused question period and your rules, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I will take that under advisement.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ellice and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Community Services who has 25 remaining, the Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In addressing the Speech from the Throne yesterday, I laid out the economic context within which our social programs have developed, and indicated that I wanted to focus more particularly on our social program strategy and comment on some of the initiatives that were identified in the Speech from the Throne.

I concluded my comments the other day, Madam Speaker, by saying that the social and economic programs had to be linked together whether we had rapid growth or whether we were rather at much of a plateau, whether the fiscal climate was an improving one or whether it was one in which we were having increasing difficulty, that it's our belief that the social programs must be supported and improved because they are the means by which the members of our community who, whether through misfortune, through disability, through other circumstances, find themselves unable to access the economy and the benefits of the economic activity in the province.

To that end, in the first term of this government, going through an extremely difficult economic challenge, our priorities were, first of all, to maintain the programs we had, the health programs, the education programs, the justice programs, the economic security programs and the social services where possible and at the rate we could manage to enhance those programs that would be intended to meet emerging needs and to meet needs which had never in the past been met in any comprehensive way. I think the record of the government during that period of time was an impressive one given that pattern right across the country was for retrenchment or failure to move on new needs.

I think the day care program is a good example of that where the budget tripled during the last five years. In addition, standards were put in and a very healthy development process — training of people, training of family boards — and a healthy building of that program took place. I might add, Madam Speaker, that the program is far from a mature program where it can meet all the demands that are out there. In fact, we would have been much further ahead had our predecessors in government maintained a steady development of that program that had been started in the Seventies. Instead, Madam Speaker, I find, in looking

at the number of spaces and the rate at which they were expanding, that in fact the total number went down in the period from 1977 to 1981. So some of our initial efforts were just to catch up to where we had been. Since then, however, the program has been growing steadily and initiatives announced in the Throne Speech are in concert with the promise made during the election campaign to gradually add spaces and to maintain the quality of that program.

It's very much a developing program; we would like to develop it more rapidly. Should the Federal Government come through with the new cost-sharing program, we will in fact be able to do that. But whether or not the Federal Government sees fit to address this high priority need for young families, many of them single parents, for the children of the country, we are committed, Madam Speaker, even if it requires reprioritization of expenditure to keep that program developing.

We made significant gains in the housing area, again trying to use the authority and the initiative of the public sector to increase the supply of housing for those people who are not able, in the normal working out of the market place, to acquire affordable and quality housing. So our thrust went into low income housing, rental housing and renovation and repair of the existing housing stock.

In the employment services and economic security areas, we worked, in spite of the great difficulty because of many more people on social assistance by virtue of raising the minimum wage, gradually raising the social assistance rates to try and keep that dependent group of people at least within some fighting distance of the average standards of life in the community. At the same time, through the Jobs Fund and the particular training programs increasingly targeted to the employment disadvantaged members of the community, we tried to get as many people as possible off the dependency social assistance roles and into a situation where they could be self-reliant and make the type of contribution that they wished to make.

In the education field, we also worked on maintaining the system and gradually targeting it to make it more accessible and more fair throughout the province whether we are talking about elementary school education, the community college system or the university system and so on, through the health system, environment programs and labour programs where pay equity initiatives and pension reform are just two of the highlights of the last period of time.

Now, as we look ahead to the next period of time, Madam Speaker, faced with the knowledge that fiscal resources will remain tight, our priorities will be to reform the systems of delivery, to see that wherever possible we have a delivery system and a style of service delivery that supports the individual and the family in the community that is as efficient as we can make it. In some cases, this may mean a delivery of service by different groups of people so that we have the responsibility for delivering service, not always located solely in the top professional rungs, but where we have an appropriate mix of professional, semi-professional and the middle ranges of trained persons.

When I was listening to the Member for St. Norbert go on about child abuse, I must say I found my temperature rising on two counts. One, knowing that

when we came into government that we were dealing with a situation on child abuse where there had been no funding for the first point of response to child abuse; namely, the child protection centre in the health system. Furthermore, there had been no thought given to developing a system of response out there because one thing you find when you look at an issue like child abuse and the types of needs of the children, the families and the abusers, is that just providing professional health care or professional psychiatric treatment by a highly skilled professional, that will take care of one hour of a child's day maybe one or two times a week. What happens to that child the rest of the week? What happens during the 24 hours of each day? There must be a child and family service system, a community-based system that can provide the necessary supports. In time, hopefully through more public education, we will obliterate this type of social problem that we commonly share, but without developing a system-wide response, we really stand no chance of addressing it responsibly. So throughout the approach on this side through the Throne Speech and through the programs that we will be discussing during Estimates, we have taken the approach of how do you get the most efficient and effective system-wide response so that you deal with the whole range of needs of the individuals in need and not just with the short-term intensive need when they first require professional care.

Another principle that we are observing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we develop the programs, is to look at the equity of access to programs. It is often tempting to put all the money into the group or the organization that is initiating service, perhaps in the city, perhaps in one or the other of the small communities; but if we do that without figuring out how we can also provide a similar level and quality of service throughout the province, what we end up doing is having a patchy service here and there, very unequally funded, without having a capacity to provide equity of access. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've taken great care in building systems that will have, as part of their essential nature, an equitable access and equitable funding.

The final principle we have looked at, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and perhaps the one that is most difficult to deal with, particularly when times are very difficult economically, are the quality of life issues. There have been a great many people in our community whose quality of life has often been of low concern to people in public life. There has been a great deal of focus on the more visible sides of the economy, the production of goods and services, and not as much attention paid to what's happening to the Native people in the North, some of the immigrant people, certainly to women who have often not had a voice and their concerns have not always been on the agenda of public affairs.

The disabled have been another group who have been thought of, I suppose, in compassionate terms but often with very low expectations as to what they could accomplish, or even of their rights, to be functioning members of the community.

What we have done in the Throne Speech is to commit ourselves to the gradual development of the support programs that each of these groups need, not to be drags on the community, not to be permanently dependent on the community but to be enabled to be fully functioning members in parts of that community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I spoke the other day about the word "vision" and the fact that we have included it in this speech. I think the meaning that the word "vision" has for me is some picture of how, in the years to come here in Manitoba, all the members of our community wherever they are, in economic terms, in age, in state of well-being or illness or disability, can look forward to sharing in the common life. Now that has not been true in the past. I think people have ignored significant groups in the community and have said that because they can't, on their own, make it through the education system, make it into paying work, that somehow they're not pulling their weight. I think that's the tragedy of the individualistic and the market-oriented view of the community.

It's not that individualism and a respect and support for the market system are bad in and of themselves, but they are not enough. Without another view of the family and of the community, and a view of the economy as serving the needs of people, and all people having a right to be included as active participants in it, I think the vision is narrow and shallow.

We have a broader and deeper and more long-sighted vision but it's not an easy vision, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As we work to reallocate monies, to scrape up enough monies to provide these services and supports that people need, we will not find it easy. Some of the programs will grow slowly but they will be going in the direction that offers hope, that offers security, and that offers inclusion, and I think it's a vision of which we can be justifiably proud.

I won't go through in detail the different programs because they are better dealt with in the Estimates process, but I would just like to give one or two examples of what I've been saying.

In the health system, as we found more and more pressure in the acute care facilities, as we found more and more demands for high technology services and as we've wondered — I think everyone has wondered — can we really afford this magnificent Medicare system which I think, as Canadians, is one of our proudest accomplishments, can we afford it in the world of today and tomorrow?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm convinced that if we don't look at it as a total system, with services in the less costly environment, before we look at the acute care, if we don't build the continuous services like home care that can be delivered in the home, services that can be delivered on a not-for-admission basis in the hospitals, some way of dealing with the flow-through in the acute care system and in the personal care homes and in the senior citizens guest homes and so on. If we don't manage an appropriate use of the resources and services we have and build up the preventive, less costly end of the system, we're going to find ourselves really unable to fund and sustain the system as it currently is. So I think the home care initiative is indicative of a whole lot of support services that will in future be delivered to people in the least costly environment that is compatible with good quality service.

Another area, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the promise to the disabled citizens that in whatever area of government there are services available to the average citizen, that we will work with disabled citizens to see that they get the appropriate type of service, whether

it's housing, whether it's transportation, whether it's training or employment or just plain access to public buildings, that they will have our support in working for those services and supports that are their right so that they will indeed be able to make the contribution and become a full part of our community.

I look forward to going into the Estimates Debate in my own department and in explaining and describing the tremendous support of community organizations and volunteers in the community who, given an opportunity whether it's in the correctional system, whether it's in the child and family service system, whether it's in day care or working with the mentally retarded, are eager and ready to provide contributions to enrich the lives of their fellow Manitobans; and to me it's been a most gratifying development to see when, with a little organization from the government end and a lot of good will and hard work at the community end, that we have been able to build efficient and effective and really meaningful social services here in the Province of Manitoba.

Again, the final issue that I think we, as a party and as a government, have at the back of our minds and the base of our thinking are all the issues related to building a peaceful world.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's my belief that unless we find ways as a community to run our economies, to run our societies in a way that gives people hope and some fair share of, whether it's the economic pie, whether it's the decision-making authority, whether it's the opportunity to express themselves, that we as a human race don't find the answers to those kinds of problems that our hope of looking forward to a life of peace for our children and our grandchildren is not going to be very rosy. I think dealing with things like nuclear waste, repositories, trying to keep our environmental base life-supporting rather than life-threatening, is part and parcel of that total commitment.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Might I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your elevation as Deputy Speaker in this House. We have every confidence that, given the experience you have had as chairman of Committees of the Whole House, you will do an equitable job as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think at first, since we are starting a new Session, I would like to take the opportunity to thank, as I already have, the residents of Pembina constituency for my re-election. It was the third time back, and it was just as exciting this time as any of them with, of course, the disappointing outcome in terms of the general provincial election. But nevertheless, I take great comfort on behalf of the residents of Pembina constituency that they saw fit to do the right thing.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are approaching a Session where there are 18 new members in the House, and I would like to just briefly extend an invitation to each of the new members of the House and indeed to some of the government members who have been around for a while to come down to Pembina constituency, winter or summer. We have a lot to offer to you. Our

people are friendly; they are open-minded; they are decent folk. They are the salt-of-the-earth kind of people that it's a pleasure to represent. In the summertime, we can offer to you a variety of festivals and fairs, with the Corn and Apple Festival in Morden, with the Mule Derby in Miami. I'm sure members opposite would appreciate the Mule Derby, given Cabinet meetings, such as they are.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the first part of July, the Carman Agricultural Fair is celebrated for three days every year. It is one of the oldest established and consecutive fairs in Manitoba of its level and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what's important about the Carman Fair is its 4-H program. I think it would give all members of the House, and particularly the new members, a great deal of pleasure to see the 4-H Calf Clubs participating in the Carman Fair on 4-H Day. When you see little nine and 10-year-old boys and girls out there leading around 1,100, 1,200 and 1,300-pound steers that they can hardly see over the shoulders of to watch the judges in the showmanship class, it shows you the kind of spirit and the kind of independence and the kind of desire those young people have and get from the 4-H programs in Manitoba. It has contributed greatly to producing fine citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

As well, in the summertime, we can offer three different harness race meets for any of the people who fancy harness racing. In the wintertime, I'm pleased to say that my constituency contains three very fine ski resorts in Manitoba: Holiday Mountain, Snow Valley, Birch. We have got golf courses that will rival any in the City of Winnipeg. They are very very fine ones, and we have got a number of golf courses.

In the wintertime, we can offer you a variety of entertainment from hockey to ringette. I have to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this winter a ringette team from Morden was successful in a provincial tournament in Thompson and took home the gold. They certainly did a very fine job, and Mr. and Mrs. Howie Sager, the coaches, did very well with that team this year. They enjoyed their stay in Thompson, even though the member up there couldn't seem to straighten out the weather that particular weekend, but it was an enjoyable weekend.

I want to offer congratulations certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the 18 new members. I am pleased that we've got 11 of them on our side of the House. The talent and the dedication that our new members will show in this House over the next few days will make honourable members in the Treasury Bench really scratch their heads and wonder if it was worthwhile to win, because we've got the talent on this side of the House that could make the kind of government that Manitobans really deserve and, I'm afraid, aren't going to get from this current group that are occupying the offices temporarily.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, several members opposite have expressed a concern that we seem not to have accepted the fact that we lost the election and that we believe it is our divine right to win elections. I have to admit it would be nice if we could win a few more of them. I have only had one out of three, and that's not a very good average. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we didn't completely lose the election. We elected more members than last time. The government certainly can't take a great deal of comfort in the win that they achieved because they dropped four seats.

I have to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I take particular pleasure in welcoming such members as the MLA for Springfield and the MLA for Riel, returning that fine constituency to the right side of the political spectrum. The constituency of Ste. Rose is now back into a very very good column in the win system, and the constituency of River East, which is occupied by our very fine Member for River East. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has given a blue island of sanity amid a sea of red chaos in the north end of Winnipeg.

I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the performance of the Member for River East will strengthen our party in that area, and will lead to the demise of such individuals as the individual who seconded the Throne Speech, who may be here on his third election and the third one will be the one he loses, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, members opposite don't often recognize and maybe don't recognize what happened during the election. I just want to share with you very briefly. Because I want to tell you, there were so many areas to cover in this Throne Speech, not from the content of the Throne Speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but from the actions of this government over the past 10 months. The Throne Speech had really no initiatives in it that one could legitimately address and speak to as is normal course in the Throne Speech Debate. So I was having difficulty putting together a presentation for this afternoon, but I wanted to share with members opposite some quick statistics, if you will, from the election.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would be interesting for you to know that, in the constituencies represented by some 26 Progressive Conservative MLA's on this side of the House, we are representing 321,100 voters in the Province of Manitoba. On the other side of the House, we have 30 members and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they represent some 335,650 voters, not even 15,000 voters difference between the numbers represented on this side of the House and on the government side of the House. We have five constituencies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that have more voters in them than the difference in representation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

**HON. J. STORIE:** The government represents everybody, Don.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, you know, my honourable friend from Flin Flon says the government represents everybody. He should drive on some roads in southern Manitoba. He should go to the flooded area at Portage la Prairie and see what lack of drainage from their four years of New Democratic administration has done. If he thinks his government has represented all Manitoba, he is less intelligent than I have given him credit for, and that's very little.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have an average of 12,350 voters represented by each MLA on this side of the House, and 11,190 on that side of the House. We represent on average 1,160 more voters per MLA on this side of the House, and I might remind you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the four seats you won by were won by less than 1,100 votes, which is only the additional voters that each and every one of us represents in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there were a couple of other interesting statistics that can be pulled out. For instance, the Member for River East was voted for by some 6,600 residents. She is here on the votes of more people than two Cabinet Ministers sitting in that government right now, more votes than the Member for Logan and the Member for Churchill. Now isn't that an interesting circumstance, that the Member for River East can be elected by more people, more voters can vote for the Member for River East to sit in Opposition than vote for two Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you want to go a little further, I will tell you right now that in terms of MLA's elected to this House with less than 4,000 votes — nine of our MLA's were elected with less than 4,000 votes. Fourteen of the New Democrats were elected with less than 4,000 votes and the interesting statistic falls here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in MLA's represented by more than 5,000 votes, there are 11 on this side of the House and 4 on that side of the House.

That may not mean much because governments are elected by the majority in each constituency; but I just want members opposite to know that in addition to the statistic I give you about votes for the MLA for River East, 11 of our MLA's on this side of the House were elected with more votes in their favour than the Cabinet Ministers currently representing this government from the constituencies of Churchill and Rupertsland combined.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we go through an exercise every 10 years in this province of reorganization of constituencies and I think any thinking Manitoban would say that is one area that has to be addressed and will be changed.

In addition, particularly the Member for Thompson mentioned, and others, that we didn't accept our loss in the election, that we couldn't accept that we lost, and I agree. I have difficulty accepting it and I simply pose questions to various of the backbenchers over there, as diminished as their numbers have become, that if during the election campaign, the third quarterly report had come out, as it should have come out, as it was known to exist by the Treasury Bench, would you have been able to explain, going door to door, another \$57 million in deficit? Would you have been able to explain that and would you have received the confidence of the people of Manitoba? That was one issue that you hid from.

Secondly, in some of the urban, north-end Winnipeg seats, would you have been able to have justified to them the Flyer Industries sale, where they, as taxpayers, were to put up \$3 million to encourage the Dutch company to buy Flyer? And in addition, to pledge on their behalf \$8 million in loan guarantees with no guarantee of jobs, only a commitment to attempt to maintain 250 jobs, would that have sold at the doorsteps of the Flyer Industry workers, had it been known during the election? I don't think so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to remind members opposite, and there's not very many of them left from 1969, but we are now in exactly the same spot with Flyer Industries that we were in 1969, providing a loan guarantee to the private owners of that company. I suggest to you that we will, a year and a half from now, be doing the same kind of exercise that the Schreyer administration did and they will be bailing out that

company to protect the jobs. I want to deal with jobs later on, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Would members opposite have wanted to have the Supreme Court decision, the most recent Supreme Court decision, to talk about going door to door when they, in government, put this province through convulsions in the French language constitutional amendment debate? Would they have liked to have explained how the Attorney-General didn't have his information correct when he predicted legal chaos when the judgment came down saying that there are no requirements for further services in the French language in the Province of Manitoba? Could they have sold that to their constituents? Could the Member for Swan River have sold that in Swan River?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he would not be here today if that Supreme Court decision had come down. If the tax scam had become part of information, public information during the election, would you have been able to justify the ripoff of taxpayer money in the Province of Manitoba by the Minister of Energy and Mines and the Minister of Environment? Would you have been able to justify that?

I note with a great deal of interest the smiles on the Minister of Energy and Mines' face. He should smile; he's all the way to the bank with about \$120,000 of taxpayer money. He should smile and he can probably justify it because he's lined his pockets with the kind of money that the Premier, in March of 1985, said and I quote from the Budget Speech of the Premier of this province, "I have yet to hear them," meaning us, "address the question of taxation in this House, unfair taxation that exists, which permits the affluent of our society to use loopholes, loopholes so they can duck their payment of a fair share of the cost of programs." Was he referring to the Minister of Energy and Mines when he said that? I believe he was.

Furthermore, the Premier said also in that Budget Debate, "Ordinary men and women of this province are paying more than their fair share of the bills while those with greater ability to contribute to the overall financial health of our country are not paying a cent." Was he talking about the Minister of Energy and Mines then?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we weren't surprised particularly about the participation of the Minister of Energy and Mines in that because we expected that sort of dual-principled approach that he uses consistently in this House, saying one thing and doing the other. He's done it for the eight years that I have watched him in this House; he will continue to do it. This time it has caused his party more political embarrassment, more internal strife than any other issue because they had to close ranks when it was discovered that he had taken part in a scam that they were criticizing during the election.

I wonder, when the former Minister of Finance, made the press conference — and I want to remind you — he did not have his press conference during the election to provide the people of Manitoba with real information. He had that press conference to try and somehow blame the Federal Progressive Conservative Government for the tax ripoff that his Minister of Energy and Mines took part in, in the hopes that some of the tarnish would rub off on the provincial campaign and the provincial Progressive Conservatives.

At that time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it's been mentioned already, the Minister of Energy and Mines

was asked by some bright reporter, some studious reporter, if he had participated, and lo and behold, he had a memory lapse, a memory lapse when he had already participated in the 1984 thing and had to sign his own tax form.

**A MEMBER:** . . . deliberately misled.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can't put on the record what the Minister of Energy and Mines did to the reporter and to the people of Manitoba because it's unparliamentary. That kind of language is ruled out of order.

When he told that reporter he didn't know, he had already signed his tax form in 1984 in which he saved, he and his family, some \$80,000 or \$90,000 and the interesting thing is he had already participated in the 1985 tax scam . . .

**A MEMBER:** For the second time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . because he was asked that question in late February and this particular NERC partnership, the subscribers had to be signed in by December 31, 1985, and furthermore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Article 23.02 requires the applicant to sign the application. The Minister knew that at the time and he misled that reporter because he knew the political consequences and he might have even lost his own personal seat if the people could have passed judgment on his hypocrisy during the last election. But no, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we didn't have the chance to do that. It happened afterwards.

It's curious to note that the Minister of Energy and Mines finally — finally — after a question by my leader, confessed to the 1985 participation and when he made his confession, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he followed his usual habits — old habits are hard to break — and he did not tell the truth in his confession. Again he did not tell the truth. He said there was a \$35,000 tax saving and when questioned in the House last Friday in the first question period, the First Minister weaseled and waffled and he said — if there's further clarification; if this particular amount is correct or that particular amount; if it's a matter of calculation. We knew right then that the Minister had misled the people in his confession. We knew that.

And what did the Premier say he would do, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The Premier said that he would provide the information to the appropriate people, which would be the tax department people. And what did he do? He ran outside the House and confessed again to the reporters. I hope this confession is the true one, because your credibility is completely destroyed in the eyes of the people of Manitoba.

But I don't bring the Minister of Energy and Mines into this tax scam and the legalized theft that his former colleague, the Finance Minister, described it as, because we expected that kind of action from him. But what I am shocked about is the participation of the Minister of Environment. I'm not particularly shocked that he took advantage of it; I'm shocked about the way he fell into the habit of the Minister of Energy and Mines in providing a rather incredible confession. Mr. Deputy Speaker, He should not have taken advice from the

Minister of Energy and Mines on how to confess to his participation in 1984. He should have been forthright; he should have been truthful; he should have said yes, I participated, not that I was generally aware of an investment made two years ago on the advice of my tax accountant but did not recall specific details. I was not really concerned as I was really under the impression it was not an SRTC; and then he goes on further to say that he had to borrow the money to make the investment.

No one will believe this letter by the Minister of Environment and his credibility, and I say this more in sorrow than in anger because I like the Minister of Environment. I have had more discussions with him. I've tried to resolve more constituency problems with him than any other Minister over there and I found him decent and honourable to work with. But unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he followed the lead of the Minister of Energy and Mines and put out this totally unbelievable confession. It destroyed, in part, his credibility — not as bad as the Minister of Energy and Mines — and I regret that that happened.

The point to be made here, and it's a good point that should be remembered by other members because, as I say, old habits are hard to break with a member like the Minister of Energy and Mines, but you don't like to hide things and try to deliberately mislead the press and the people because eventually the story will come out. You gain nothing in terms of personal stature and credibility by trying to hide the facts and mislead the people. Surely by now the Minister of Energy and Mines must know that and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that his actions go a long way to contributing to the lack of credibility that currently elected officials have.

The voters in Manitoba say we can't believe politicians and when they see the obvious attempts to change facts that the Minister of Energy and Mines went through, it reinforces the principle that politicians can't be trusted, and that is a blemish on each and every one of us in this House. You should be personally concerned, on that side of the House, of the impact your Minister of Energy and Mines has made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to spend the last part of my speech dealing with two specific issues. This government has been re-elected with a reduced majority, but nevertheless a working majority. I want to tell them that they face a monstrous challenge in this province, in this government, as we would have faced had we been the government. You know, unfortunately, many of the problems that they are facing are of their own creation in the last four years. They've got a monstrous deficit that is beyond the affordability of the people of Manitoba. Their taxation policy of the last four years has taxed Manitobans to the point of no return. There are very few taxes that they can place on the people of Manitoba to increase revenues and they are already implementing some cutbacks in very important areas of programs for people.

Now they're facing monstrous challenges, but on top of that, the potential for growth and for revenue in this province is declining. Our mineral sector is in trouble, as it is nationally and internationally. Our forestry sector is in trouble in this province, as it is nationally and internationally, and there is no question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that our farm community has serious problems.

I have spoken to agricultural issues for some eight and one-half years that I've been an elected MLA and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never, to my knowledge, used the term "crisis in agriculture" before, but I am using it today because that, Sir, is what we are facing in rural Manitoba — a crisis in agriculture. It's a crisis that cannot afford a government which will not react immediately, that will not take the situation in hand, show some leadership, show some direction and attempt to bring programs and put financing and backup in place to help the farm community right now. It's not as if, Sir, we are asking for something that's beyond the financial control of this province.

It has cost us, in the four years that this government was in place in their first term, some \$100 million to employ approximately 350 people at a bus manufacturing plant in Winnipeg. Agricultural support would not take nearly that amount of money because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the crisis in agriculture — and it is a crisis because in the first four years from 1977 to 1981 there were 23 to 25 farm bankruptcies in the Province of Manitoba. In the last four years that the Pawley administration has been in place there are some 223. That is crisis proportion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I cannot and I will not lay the blame entirely on the provincial administration because there are forces, internationally, that are causing declining revenue to the farms. The international grain market, is not conducive to a profit no matter what crop you may plant this spring. That is something that will change. It has in the past.

I started farming in 1973 and I was told by friends and neighbours that I was crazy to leave a good job to take up losing money in farming. In 1973 the international markets turned around and we enjoyed a number of very good years. That will happen again. It may even start to happen in a small way, Madam Speaker, because of the unfortunate disaster at Chernobyl. We don't know the impact of that on the agricultural community in the Soviet Union. It may well increase a demand for our product.

But the bankruptcies that I mentioned, Madam Speaker, are only the tip of the iceberg. They're only the final outcome of the disease, of the illness in agriculture and we have to get down to what the symptoms are. Well international prices are the major symptom and they're aggravated right now by a trade war between the United States and the European Economic Community. Those are external forces. I'm an eternal optimist as a farmer, and I believe that they will change and they will turn around. It may not be this year, but they will turn around, because the marketplace adjusts and as people move out of production, prices go up.

But the immediate cash shortage faced by the farm community is one in which governments must participate in and have a responsibility to protect the agricultural community.

I say that, Madam Speaker, knowing full well that I am asking this government to spend taxpayer dollars that are scarce. But, Madam Speaker, it is something that the Province of Saskatchewan has done and, just yesterday I believe it was, one of the Treasury Bench members mentioned how terrible the deficit was in Saskatchewan. That's right. The deficit in Saskatchewan is large, but they have committed, despite that large

deficit, over \$100 million in direct support to their farm community. Why have they done it, Madam Speaker? They have done it because they believe that agriculture is the backbone of their provincial economy, as has been said by members opposite. But once again, these people in the New Democratic Party are wont to say one thing and do the exact opposite. They will say agriculture is the backbone, and they will leave it to wither on the vine.

Madam Speaker, we are not in a circumstance right now where the bankruptcies that will occur at the end of this crop year — and I say, will occur, because it is going to happen. These are not merely the inefficient farmers or the farmers that are poor producers or bad managers. These are good managers that are caught in circumstances that they cannot control today. We are removing from the farm community, and the bankruptcies that will come up this fall, the muscle and the blood and the bone of the farm community. We're not talking about bad managers.

We cannot have the Minister of Agriculture and the First Minister sit and deflect questions and baffle-gab rhetoric about the Federal Government and their obligations. We need them to take action now. One of the courses of action we have suggested to the Minister of Agriculture, and I hoped he would do, is to convene the Committee of Agriculture in this Legislature so that we can determine whether MACC has changed their lending policy criteria. If they have, ask them to reverse it so that farmers can get operating capital, farmers who are refused by MACC, the people's lending agency if you will, and receive their funding from such notable enemies of the New Democratic Party as the Royal Bank and the credit unions. They are cancelled and refused by MACC, and given the money by the banks and the credit unions. We want to know why.

So we want the Minister of Agriculture to call the committee so we can call expert witness and find out if this Minister has any ideas. Madam Speaker, we do this in an attempt to help the Minister of Agriculture because, Lord knows, in that Cabinet there are no people who understand agriculture. We've got a collection of unionists, teachers, and professors — is he a professor yet, or is that long gone? It doesn't matter. But we don't have farmers. They left their only other farmer sitting on the back bench, and I don't think that he is going to be listened to when he tells you the problems. You should listen to the MLA for Lac du Bonnet as a master farmer of this province, and we would like to help the Minister of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker, taxation is one of the major problems faced by these members of the farm community who are facing difficulty. Do you know that taxation is costing the farm community probably more than any other single input that they have to buy? I'm talking taxation as it is reflected through property taxes and education; I'm talking about taxation on their fuels and energy inputs in their chemicals; I'm talking about the payroll tax that is imposed and paid by farmers across this province in greater dollar volumes than any other single person in the Province of Manitoba.

The Minister of Agriculture turns up his nose, because he doesn't understand agriculture and he doesn't understand how the payroll tax is passed from those paying it right through the products that they sell to the end consumer. Farmers buy more in the Province

of Manitoba as individuals than practically all other individuals in this province. Hence, they pay more payroll tax. I realize you don't understand that, but taxation is one of the woes in agriculture right now.

The Federal Government has moved to try and reduce the level of taxation on energy inputs. The Provincial Government could very easily remove education tax from farm property, education taxes which they have transferred to the farms over the last four years in record volumes. There has never been a government that transferred and offloaded more education costs to the next lower level of government than the New Democrats under Mr. Pawley. They have transferred education costs to the homeowners, the businessmen and the farmers of this province, and it is breaking the backs of farmers. That is why we made the commitment in our election campaign to remove half of the education support levy from farm property. I urge the Minister to take that on and do that, to provide that kind of relief.

Madam Speaker, the members opposite, I realize, don't understand agriculture and they don't understand the level of taxation paid by the farm community nowadays. I have often asked the United Grain Growers and the Manitoba Pool, as two major farm organizations in Manitoba, to undertake a study whereby they would take the \$100,000 roughly of input costs and expenditures that the average Manitoba farmer would spend in a year and break it down to find out how much taxation they paid to federal, provincial and municipal governments. And do you know what, Madam Speaker? I think if an organization would do that — and we don't have the research capabilities on this side of the House — you would find that the average farmer and his \$100,000 of input cost is probably paying \$35,000 per year taxes on that. That is an enormous burden to ask farmers to pay and, at the same time, to ask them to compete in the international market at market prices unsubsidized by anybody, and also to ask the farm community to provide you with the cheapest food of any consuming nation in the world with the exception of one, and that is our neighbour to the south.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't think that is a terribly unfair position to ask this government to address the issue of taxation that they can address, namely education taxation on farm property, not farm homes but bare farmland, and it would help the farm community immensely.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to offer a piece of advice to my honourable friends in government and to the First Minister and his Treasury Bench. You are elected for, theoretically, a five-year term now. You have started this term out with a consistent litany of complaints. About every issue that you have been woefully lax in, you have consistently blamed it on the Federal Government. It has been either transfer payments or equalization payments. You've always blamed the Federal Government.

Well, I tell you that message will wear thin on the observers who are out there wanting government to govern and to lead. You can't continue to blame someone else for the problems that you in major part created in the last four years. You were elected to provide government and, in government, you were elected to provide some leadership. I urge and ask and beseech and beg members opposite to show some

leadership. I realize, Madam Speaker, that leadership is not a quantity in great abundance in the Premier's office, but surely some members of Cabinet can help him develop the leadership role that Manitobans want and need to resolve the problems.

I am asking you to stop whining about the Federal Government and Ronald Reagan in the United States and whatever other outside force that you attempt to blame for all the problems in Manitoba, and show some leadership. Show some positive policy development, and start giving the Manitoba electorate the leadership they had hoped they would get at the end of this election. Stop whining and crying and start acting. Take on your responsibility like men and women of stature and of principle and of integrity. It would certainly help, if I can offer that advice, to show some leadership and stop whining — it would help for you to stop whining because then it would remove this building from the Guinness World Book of Records, because we're in it as the only building in Manitoba that has a "whine cellar" on the third floor of the building, and that's the Cabinet Room, Madam Speaker. These people have whined and cried about every problem blaming it on everybody else, but the Cabinet Room is now known as the third floor "whine cellar."

Madam Speaker, if members opposite cannot screw themselves up to provide that kind of leadership to the people of Manitoba, and if you are so confident that your mandate with the people of Manitoba is solid and that the people of Manitoba wanted you over all other parties, then given the disclosure in the third quarterly statement, given the Flyer Industry deal, given the Supreme Court decision, and given the legalized theft of the Minister of Energy and Mines and the Minister of Environment, if you can't provide the leadership now then remove yourselves from the pain and the torture of ducking the issues and of whining and just resign and have another election. If your confidence is there you'll get back in. If you don't then a government of talent, vision, ability and leadership will replace you.

Thank you.

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

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

I join with my colleagues in this Chamber to congratulate you on your election to the highest office in this Assembly. I am particularly proud because your presence here marks only the second time in Manitoba's history when a woman has taken on such an auspicious office, and because at this particular time you are the only female Speaker in this fast and complex nation.

I would, however, like to add my voice to members on this side of the House and to the voice of the Member for River Heights who have expressed grave disappointment in the Opposition's refusal to second your nomination which has shown very very deep and grave disrespect for our system, for our Speaker yourself and for our traditions.

You are to be commended, Madam Speaker, for your wisdom, advice, and guidance in that order, in the order and procedures of the House thus far, and I have full confidence that you will continue to excel in your duties.

I trust, Madam Speaker, that under your guidance a new era will be heralded reversing the current perception of the Chamber as a public playpen for little boys and that you will be instituting an honoured tradition of decorum and respect for all the business of this House. I know that my colleagues on this side of the Assembly are prepared to do our part in that regard.

I am proud, Madam Speaker, to follow the speech of our Deputy Premier, the Minister of Community Services and Corrections, a Minister whose work in the area of Status of Women has been outstanding and whose big shoes I will be trying to fill. The same sentiments hold true for the Minister of Finance whose work over the past four years has given new life to the arts, cultural and multicultural communities.

I stand before the Assembly today not only with the responsibilities of my portfolios of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, Status of Women and Lotteries, but as the newly elected representative from the Constituency of St. Johns, a constituency which connects very strongly to the issues of multiculturalism, heritage and status of women concerns.

Madam Speaker, I want to say I am thankful to the people of St. Johns who have elected me to this prestigious Chamber. I also want to recognize the work of the former MLA for St. Johns, Father Don Malinowski, and I hope on behalf of all members here express gratitude for his many years of service and sincerely wish him a healthy and happy retirement.— (Interjection) — The member should talk to the former member himself.

It is of both great personal and political importance to me to represent such a vibrant, diverse and exciting constituency. The people in my constituency have a true sense of community, self-help and revitalization that will enrich this NDP Government's commitment to a vision of Manitoba where economic and social life is grounded in values of ecological balance, justice and equity for all. The work that I will do both at the constituency and ministerial levels with neighbourhood associations, churches, synagogues, union locals, ethnic groups and women's groups will, I hope, do justice to the people in St. Johns and indeed to all the people of this great province. It will reflect the true spirit of a riding like St. Johns which combines grassroots activism with cultural celebrations and historical awareness.

The commitment, Madam Speaker, made in the Speech from the Throne to job creation and economic development for all men and women in Manitoba regardless of where they live, regardless of their ethnic or racial background, regardless of their disabilities is near and dear to my heart and, in fact, to the heart of the party of which I am proud to be a member. The vision of a government concerned about the needs and concerns of men and women from diverse cultures and backgrounds is at the centre of a belief that together ordinary people have the power to create changes and improve the quality of life in our community. We as a government must be and will be the instrument that is used by all groups who join to advance our common interests and concerns.

Madam Speaker, the direction articulated by my government in the Speech from the Throne is one which motivated my desire to run for elected office on behalf

of the New Democratic Party. It is a direction which envelopes my ideals of fairness and equity for all. It holds dear the value of the individual to the belief that each member of our society, regardless of who they are, deserves equal respect and dignity and has the right to the same opportunities as the next person.

These principles reflect a fundamental concern for a quality of life and they are no more appropriately applied than to a department such as Culture, Heritage and Recreation. Our culture is a true celebration of the many varied values, lifestyles, languages, legacies, experiences and lessons gained from many diverse peoples. Our government recognizes this diversity as a positive force; an asset to the rich and colourful fabric of our society.

We believe that culture, language and identity must be preserved in order to provide the generations that follow us with a legacy from which we can all learn and grow. We believe that true equality of opportunity must be realized for all ethnic and racial groups in our province and our multicultural policies must therefore be based on two basic principles: first, that multiculturalism as government practice must extend to every activity of government policy and program; and secondly, that effective development and implementation of multicultural policy by government is best achieved through community consultation and participation.

There are those who argue that the energy, the time and, most particularly, the dollars that our government invests in ethnocultural programming are unnecessary and even frivolous. Some have contended that our ethnocultural policy is an attempt to confer special benefits on ethnocultural communities — benefits that are, in their view, undeserved and unavailable to mainstream communities. I am proud, however, Madam Speaker, to be part of a government that has at its roots a belief and confidence in people and in the immeasurable value of ethnocultural diversity in this province. I can assure this Assembly today that this government will continue to embrace our historic commitment to justice and equality for all members in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, the Speech from the Throne spoke to a commitment my government has made to the enrichment of our communities through the promotion of multiculturalism and historical resources. To further this ideal, Manitobans from all walks of life must continue to develop a tolerance and respect for one another through a deepening cross-cultural awareness. We must be sensitive to a province composed of many people and to the fact that many of us came to Manitoba with rich and varied values and experiences. Equality of access and opportunity is rooted in an openness to one another.

Madam Speaker, our government also recognizes the value of the artist in our society today. Manitoba has been experiencing a resurgence in the arts over the past number of years. I am proud to note that it is now not only possible to produce a play by a Manitoba playwright with Manitoba actors expressing Manitoba experiences, it is also possible to do so with great provincial and national success. Manitoba Theatre Centre set box office records this year with *Tsymbal*, while Prairie Theatre Exchange had its best season ever with a fine line-up of Manitoba products. Our status

of a provincial identity will be strengthened in good measure by those people with the capacity to express to us our own condition, those people who are able creatively to teach us lessons about ourselves and help us to put our troubles and victories into perspective. It is my hope, Madam Speaker, that this dialogue will continue to exist, that Manitobans will have access to more opportunities than just passive absorption of stunts and speeding cars from our television screens.

Those concerned about the principle of subsidies to the arts community should remember that the heaviest subsidy of all is paid by artists themselves. ACTRA has reported that Canadian artists are second only to pensioners with their lowest national revenue category of earnings while the average income of full-time visual artists was less than \$8,000 in 1984 and only half of that coming from the sale of their art. Seventy-five percent of ACTRA members have an annual income of less than \$5,000 and, given the now well-documented wage gap, Madam Speaker, you can be assured that these figures are of course much more startling for women.

The contribution of the arts community to our cultural makeup is substantial. In return as a province, we must understand this gift and delineate more opportunities in order to utilize our own artist's capacity to produce. The Manitoba Government will continue to demonstrate our support to the artist through the Manitoba Arts Council, our cultural institutions and through increased support to the province's cultural industries, and we do so because of the implicit social value of the product generated and because of the accompanying economic values which spin off from it.

Madam Speaker, my government has very great concern that Canadians are able to retain the capacity to produce indigenous cultural materials. We know, for example, that in the film environment where, while 83 percent of film and video distributing companies were under Canadian control, 73 percent of the total gross revenues went to foreign control films. We have a publishing environment where, while 86 percent of book publishing firms are Canadian, 80 percent of the revenue went to foreign controlled companies, and a recording environment, where 84 percent of the recording industry companies were controlled by Canadians, they earned 11 percent of the total sales. Finally, our broadcasting environment where, out of 17,600 hours of drama programming available on English language television, only 2 percent is Canadian and for French language the figure is about 10 percent.

Madam Speaker, our government will not be supporting any free trade negotiations which weaken Canadians' and Manitobans' capacity to develop the skills and systems to strengthen our cultural identity through expressions of our own culture to ourselves and to the world. As we have demonstrated in Manitoba theatre, in an environment of confidence, caring and value, Manitobans can believe in themselves; governments must support the progress of those who aspire to relate the experiences of our peoples.

Madam Speaker, our government has begun to turn over a new leaf in our development of heritage infrastructure with the proclamation of the new Heritage Act on May 12, 1986. This statute will bring the act of heritage preservation more into the realm of ordinary Manitoba women and men. Powers are now available

to local governments and those powers are backed up with grant support. Once again the principles of local control, respect for the values of the local resident and a concern for our quality of life are going beyond rhetoric by translation into legislative and programmatic actions. Heritage preservation is now no longer confined only to the heritage professional and the academic. It is now a community reality and one we can all take pride in.

Madam Speaker, our concern for the capacity of libraries to provide low cost opportunities for Manitobans to experience an enhanced quality of life is realized in a major grant to the City of Winnipeg for book acquisition and a substantial increase in operating monies for rural Manitoba, and our government renews our commitment in rural Manitoba to library establishment and assistance so that local systems can continue to meet the changing fabric of our society.

Madam Speaker, our NDP Government recognizes the paramount importance of recreation going far beyond the confines of fitness and physical activity. Recreation is really about the basic health and well-being of all Manitobans. Our society, as it moves through the transformative nature of technological change, must be able to provide meaningful leisure opportunities so that people continue to participate and interact creatively within our communities. Leisure opportunities are needed to provide balance to our lives, to provide us with opportunities to reach into our creative cores, to meet others, to contribute to our community, to challenge ourselves, to demonstrate our skills and to focus our energy in new and ever expanding directions. In order to do so, Madam Speaker, we must engage in a reassessment process in order to identify users and to ensure that our recreation structures adequately meet the needs of all age groups, all cultures, men and women, all economic levels and all regions in ways attuned significantly to their respective needs.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of the vision conveyed in the Speech from the Throne, the vision that addressed our government's commitment to a more equitable society for all members in Manitoba. Our government has pledged continuous efforts toward assistance to those in our society who are more vulnerable to deeply engrained discrimination, to invisible and ethnic minorities, to youth, to the elderly, to sole support parents and to women of all backgrounds. My portfolios in Culture and Status of Women present a particularly important challenge in these efforts.

Issues such as economic security, decent jobs and wages, child care, health care, violence against women in all forms, these issues frame the very organization of a caring and humane world.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the women of this province deserve and expect a government that articulates a vision of a society that has room enough to provide benefits for all of its members but talking about this vision, as the members opposite tend only to do, simply isn't enough.

The women of this great province deserve and expect a government that articulates its vision through its deeds and its actions, a government whose commitment to women can be measured in terms of real progress and whose commitment to the future is clearly laid out in the form of policies and programs designed to continue the often all too slow movement toward the vision we share.

Madam Speaker, our government has already a strong record of demonstrated commitment through initiatives in the areas of child care, wife abuse, pay equity, family maintenance order enforcement, pension plan improvements, pornography, job creation and training programs. This government, unlike the tradition of members opposite, is willing to take concrete action in a comprehensive manner to ensure that equality for women is not left to a free, unfettered marketplace that has historically not exhibited any great ability to isolate or address the discrimination women experience in employment or in housing or in a myriad of other life situations.

The members opposite, in bed with their federal colleagues and tied with the concentrated wealth and power elite of this country, would have us believe that our economy cannot afford the cost of equal wages for women. They would have us believe that women have some sort of duty to carry the burden of economic and social inequality and that women, including the more than 24,000 Manitoba women who have single parent families, have no right to state intervention which would help redress a history of discrimination.

I want to tell members opposite, all members of this House — it may be of interest to everyone, particularly members opposite — that the implementation of The Pay Equity Act in the Manitoba Civil Service is proceeding very well.

Members will be interested to know that stage one of the negotiations between the Provincial Government and the Manitoba Government Employees Association has been completed. That first stage, which was the selection of a job evaluation system, has been completed and it was done so by mid-April. I am sure that members opposite will be interested to know that that is ahead of our scheduled deadline and it was done in the full spirit of co-operation.

I want to assure all members in this Assembly that that spirit of co-operation will characterize all of our future activities in this area.

Madam Speaker, I welcome the sensitivity of our government to the economic situation of women, with its commitment to advancing pay equity both in the public and private sectors, and I join with women nationally in their disappointment that the Federal Government would not be moved by Manitoba's excellent example to ensure that the recently proclaimed federal legislation on employment equity would be something more than a toothless wonder.

Our federal counterparts also continue to study child care, first with the Katie Cooke Report and now with the costly parliamentary task force which is currently crossing Canada. While more and more studies are taking place at the federal level, we in Manitoba are putting our tax dollars into action by improving and expanding much needed child care services. We will continue, as well, to urge and move the Federal Government towards adopting our model for a national child care act.

Madam Speaker, I stand proud in relation to the progress we have achieved to date and I am committed, through ongoing consultations with a variety of women's organizations, through constructive input from the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, through work produced by my staff at the Women's Directorate, and through the program and policy

initiatives of our government, to continue the progress made to date. I stand committed to work actively in this government and with all of my responsibilities to ensure that all my sisters and brothers can live in a world free from war; a world where social programs are not restricted while defence spending is increased; a world with a safe and protected environment; a world where each child is wanted and cherished and where the care and well-being of all children is a social priority; a world where the elderly grow old in dignity; a world where women and men are equal.

The Speech from the Throne, Madam Speaker, has provided us with the framework for the many challenges which lie ahead. As the new member for St. Johns, I am eager and excited to participate in this process.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am most honoured to be given the opportunity today to address this Chamber.

May I, first of all, begin by congratulating the members on both sides of the House who have been re-elected by their constituencies. May I also offer my congratulations to all the new members who have been elected for the first time. I look forward to contributing positively to the Chamber and I also look forward to contributing to the efforts of my colleagues.

I would like to take a few minutes to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to the people of Roblin-Russell for continuing the tradition of electing a Progressive Conservative to this Assembly. I pledge to them to work to the utmost of my ability in giving them the type of representation that they have enjoyed in our former MLA, Mr. Wally McKenzie.

I would like, Madam Speaker, to pay tribute to the former MLA of Roblin-Russell, Mr. Wally McKenzie, for I, along with the people of Roblin-Russell and indeed many people throughout the province, believe that he was one of the finest politicians that this province has seen.

Madam Speaker, I say that not to take away from any of the very fine politicians who have served or are serving this province. I say this because Mr. McKenzie's dedication to his constituents, his dedication to his party, the democratic process, and his respect for this House and the members of it, was second to none.

Madam Speaker, Mr. McKenzie contributed significantly not only to this House but also contributed significantly because he was a true gentleman to the political process of this province. He used to say, Madam Speaker, that Manitoba was where it was at; this was the place to live because the people here, as he used to call them, were the salt of the earth. He still says that today.

Madam Speaker, I think that Wally McKenzie will be missed not only by his constituents but by the members who have had the privilege of serving with him in this House. In his retirement, I would like to wish him well and hope that he has a long, healthy and happy retirement.

Madam Speaker, today I would like to say a few words about the constituency which I represent, Roblin-

Russell. In doing this, I would like to point out some of the attributes of the human resources of people that we have in our constituency as well as some of the natural resources that we have within our constituency and also mention a few of the concerns that the people of Roblin-Russell would like to have me share with you.

Roblin-Russell is a constituency which, as I said, is rich in the people that live there. We have a variety of people; people who have come across from Europe, whose forefathers have come across from Europe, and have made up a very rich constituency. They have built strong communities; communities that believe in the type of democratic process that we have in this province. They are people who believe in their communities and their children and they are concerned about the future and what the future holds for Manitoba, because they want their children to live in a place which is democratic and which believes in the virtues of democracy.

We have within our constituency two Indian reservations and I have come to know these people by the fact that I used to teach in a school where Indian students attended. I came to appreciate these people very deeply. In the election campaign, Madam Speaker, I was very pleased to see that these people too are looking for changes, changes within the kind of structure that we have in Manitoba, and are looking forward to a new regime, a new type of government for the province in the future. These people, Madam Speaker, are going to be supporting me as I represent them in this next while in this Legislature.

Besides the human resources, Madam Speaker, Roblin-Russell is rich in natural resources. First of all, I would like to mention the fact at the north end of our constituency we have the Duck Mountain Provincial Park, an area which is rich in timber resources. For many years people have made their living by harvesting the forests of this park. Many business opportunities have existed because of the Duck Mountain Forest Park and many job opportunities have been offered to the people who live in the area surrounding the park.

We have such industries as Roblin Forest Products which have emerged because of this resource. We also have other smaller sawmills; we also have Britcher Brothers Sawmill, which is near Roblin. Besides these particular lumbering industries, subsidiary industries, trucking industries have come to make successful contributions to the economic growth of the community.

However, Madam Speaker, as recently as a few months ago, it has become more and more difficult to obtain enough timber through permits to meet the requirements and the markets that are there. There is no shortage of markets. We are seeing a situation where the smaller sawmills are going out of existence because of the fact that they cannot get enough lumber to cut; they cannot get permission to cut enough lumber even though the timber is there.

We are seeing a major lumber operator who, at the end of June, will have to start laying off his permanent employees, of which he has about 20, and he has already started to lay off his part-time employees which are in excess of 20, because of the fact that the bureaucratic red tape and the attitude of this government has not allowed him to cut the forest that is already there.

There is enough forest in the area that he has been allocated that if he were to cut it until he decides to

retire, there will still be plenty of forest left. The markets are there. He has had to refuse people and companies that have come to purchase lumber because he cannot supply them.

We talk about the development of new industries, Madam Speaker. What do we mean by that? If, for some reason, there is an attitude whereby existing industries are not allowed to continue and grow and we talk about creating new industries.

The Duck Mountain Park not only provides an important supply of the resource of timber, it also has within its boundaries many beautiful scenic lakes. However, development of this area as an attractive tourist area is sadly lacking. Not only are the roads leading to the scenic lakes in dire need of attention, but the availability of such services as hydro to most of the sites is not a reality.

Madam Speaker, we live in a province which is the manufacturer of hydro, has an overabundant supply of hydro electricity, and yet, for some reason, we can't even supply the scenic lakes, the tourist areas of our province, with the kind of service that they should have.

I would hope that the new Minister of Natural Resources, who is also the Member for Swan River, will also see that there is a great deal of potential in the Duck Mountain Forest Park and that he will change the attitude that has been taken in the last four years and take the initiative to help develop or stimulate the development of this potentially great tourist area. That, in turn, will bring jobs to that area; it will bring tourists to that area; it will bring the tourist dollars in.

Just a few miles west of the town of Roblin runs the beautiful Assiniboine Valley and River. As a matter of fact, it's the same river that used to create a few problems for southern Manitoba and for Winnipeg until a Conservative government decided to tame the river by building an earthen dam between the towns of Roblin and Russell and also constructing the Winnipeg and Portage Floodways.

Well, the creation of the earthen dam, Madam Speaker, created what is now called the Lake of the Prairies. This is one of the finest pickerel fishing, sport fishing areas in Manitoba, as professed by many master anglers. At present, the lake is predominantly a sport fishing lake because of its newness.

When the dam was constructed there was also a blueprint or a plan for development of the surrounding area. At that time, there was a plan for campsites along the dam, picnic areas, swimming areas, a marina, a lodge, and even a ski hill. However, none of these things are there.

At that particular time, I was the president of a little ski hill that was situated south of town, and we all know what happened in 1969 and 1970. At that time, there were not many things such as grants for everything you could shake a stick at and our ski hill did not meet the standards, so we were forced to close down. But we said, that's all right, because we knew that there was a plan to construct a ski hill near the Lake of the Prairies. Now that's a long time ago, Madam Speaker, and to date there is still no ski hill in the area, although there was a plan for it.

But what has happened? Entrepreneurs have come through the area and said, now this is a potentially rich area. Why isn't it being developed? They have applied to try and develop various areas around the lake

because there is a great amount of tourist traffic through the area. I would invite anybody to come on any weekend and take a look at the amount of traffic that there is through the area and the number of tourists that are visiting the area itself. But bureaucratic red tape and a closed-door approach has prevented entrepreneurs from investing and developing a much needed area and this has prevented the creation of jobs, which we hear our government talk about. It has prevented the tourist trade from coming through and tourist dollars from flowing into Manitoba.

But in addition to this, Madam Speaker, the roads that lead to the access areas of the lakes have not been maintained. The Rural Municipality of Shellmouth maintained the roads up until a year or so ago, and by maintaining them the province did not give them any contribution or any funding. As of this year, the R.M. has decided it has been forced to discontinue providing maintenance to the roads leading to the access areas and it's going to be a good question as to who is going to do it now. It is my hope that the new Minister of Natural Resources will recognize the inadequacies that exist in that area and will take action in a manner which will encourage the development of the area as well as the proper maintenance and the construction of suitable roads and services.

There is a little development in that area, Madam Speaker. There are about 12 cottages that have been developed near the Lake of the Prairie subdivision and I think the first cottage was built there about eight years ago. To date there is no hydro service into that area and because there is no hydro service there is no telephone service into that area. There have been negotiations going on to bring hydro in and it's going to cost each cottage owner in excess of \$1,500 to bring hydro into the area. So there is a great deal to be done just in that area itself and I hope as I said, that the new Minister of Natural Resources will, in fact, take a more positive approach in this aspect.

Agriculture, Madam Speaker, is still the major economic activity in my constituency and in recent months and weeks, we have heard much talk about the crisis facing farmers, and the crisis is true and it's there. In fact, that crisis is not just in Manitoba but has been experienced through Western Canada. The announcements by the Federal Government have been timely in providing farmers not only with the kind of cash flow that is needed at this time of the year, but also with the confidence that the Federal Government recognizes the plight of farmers and is prepared to act in a positive way to assist them. Saskatchewan and Alberta have already taken steps to assist the farmers within their respective provinces. To date, we have seen nothing of substance coming forth to assist the Manitoba farmers. I fail to understand why the Minister of Agriculture is hesitating to provide immediate assistance to farmers who are in a crisis situation. Is it that there are no more resources? Or is it that the Minister of Agriculture does not have the influence of his Cabinet to make that decision?

In the last few days, Madam Speaker, I have heard the word "mandate" mentioned from the other side of the House, but mandate carries with it responsibility and the Minister of Agriculture does have a responsibility to the Manitoba farmers and it is my hope that he will act in the very near future in implementing

some immediate measures to assist farmers in Manitoba.

I would also like to say a few words with regard to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. It is my understanding that it was the purpose of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to assist farmers, especially young farmers, who may need financial assistance to start farms, who may need financial assistance to buy additional land or to get into farming. Recently, I have been receiving phone calls from several constituents who have applied for loans through MACC. They were refused. What was the reason for refusal? Well, Madam Speaker, it appears that the answer was the same from each one of them. By doing a cash-flow projection on their particular situations it was found that the cash-flow projections fell short and therefore the loan was declined. Now, Madam Speaker, it appears evident that MACC lending policies have drastically changed in the last few weeks - not the last few months - but the last few weeks. How are these farmers to exist and who are they to turn to if the Minister of Agriculture and his government have suddenly lost confidence in the farming community of Manitoba?

I am sure, Madam Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is not an insensitive person, or I would hope that he is not, and I would certainly encourage him to take appropriate action in order to assist farmers in this period of economic crisis in Manitoba farms. Positive alternatives have already been proposed by my colleagues and I might re-emphasize the importance of those proposals such as: low interest operating loans or low interest loans based on farm acreage and the removal of the education tax from farmlands which we heard about today.

What about the livestock industry, Madam Speaker? I have, just a few miles from my place from where I live, a farmer who started a feedlot operation some years ago. Everything was going along fine and then all of a sudden the beef industry was getting into some problems and we had an announcement of a beef program announced for Manitoba. The farmer was excited in the beginning because he thought with all his overhead expenses he was still going to be able to maintain his feedlot and carry on his operations. But wrong. What had happened was that in the announcement of the beef plan, the feedlot operators were excluded, so how are they to compete? First of all, how are they to compete with those buyers from Ontario, or wherever, when they go to buy their product or their feeder cattle? They can't compete.

Secondly, if they do buy them and they finish them out and then are going to sell them for slaughter, they can't compete because of the subsidies, Madam Speaker. So this particular feedlot for awhile became a hotel for cattle coming from the West, staying there for a few months and then moving on to the East. Madam Speaker, what does that do for the economy of Manitoba? What does that do for our packing plants in Manitoba? I say it does nothing.

Leaving agriculture, Madam Speaker, I would like to turn to another resource in my constituency and that is that of potash. Lately, and especially prior to and during the election campaign, a great deal was said regarding the development of potash in Manitoba and in specifically the Russell area. The idea of a potash mine for Manitoba, and especially for my constituency,

is certainly a popular one and an exciting one. But we had a great deal of excitement, as I said; we had lots of Ministers come and visit us; we had the Premier come and visit us about four times during the election. As a matter of fact, we were wondering whether he wanted to take residence up in our constituency. It is only fair to say that the people of Roblin-Russell are somewhat cautious about the types of announcements that were being made because they could see through that screen. As an MLA for the constituency, Madam Speaker, I would very much like to see the development of a potash mine in that area. Having said that, I must also point out that this province and its overburdened taxpayers cannot afford a development of a project of this nature when there is a vast surplus of potash in Saskatchewan. On a nice clear morning I can see the smokestacks of Esterhazy and the potash mine there and the mountain of potash that is sitting beside the mine. Madam Speaker, we know what the situation is in terms of the marketplace with regard to potash and that at the present time it is flat. Our people cannot afford the kind of experience that we have had, for example, with Flyer Industries and with Manfor.

Madam Speaker, I would hate to see a situation where, because of false pretenses, people all of a sudden began acquiring property, building businesses, creating all kinds of services and then suddenly to find that it was an empty dream. Madam Speaker, before we get into constructing and developing a potash mine in the Russell area I will be making sure, and I will be impressing upon the government to make sure that there is, in fact, a solid market in place before we are prepared to start development.

Further to that, Madam Speaker, the taxpayers of Manitoba should not bear the risk. I think it is a more practical way to have private entrepreneurs who have spent their lives developing expertise in the area of mining and potash mining to take the risk. If the project is viable, then will the people of Manitoba profit by jobs, the creation of jobs and all the extra things that come with it.

As I travelled through my constituency throughout the campaign, Madam Speaker, I was astonished at the condition of the provincial roads. Highway 366, between the Towns of Grandview and Inglis is a major route around the Riding Mountain Park. During the years of the Conservative Government, Highway 366 was started and a part of it was built. When they were defeated, unfortunately, construction on that highway stopped. To date, there is a portion of about 20 or 23 miles of Highway 366 that is in deplorable condition. By comparison, Madam Speaker, if you were to travel on Highway 366, which is a provincial road, and then turn off that highway and go on a municipal road, you would find that it is a pleasure to drive on a municipal road as compared to this provincial road.

In speaking to road contractors in my area, Madam Speaker, the general feeling is that road construction in Manitoba as a whole, with the exception of an area east of me, is virtually at a standstill. I feel, Madam Speaker, that we cannot continue in this fashion. Road construction and road maintenance is important to the communication, to the cultural exchanges of people, and we cannot neglect it for any period of time.

I was, however, encouraged when the Minister of Highways tabled his Highway Construction Program

for 1986-87 to find the resurfacing of a small portion of Highway 45 included in his program. However, it must be noted that when CSB Foods, just west of Russell at Harrowby, was built, there was a commitment made — in 1982, I believe it was — that this road would be looked at immediately. Well, here we are in 1986-87, we finally have a commitment.

Now if one were to look at the map of my constituency, you would find that it surrounds the Riding Mountain National Park on three sides. The R.M. of Grandview is situated on the north side and the R.M. of Rosburn is situated on the south side. We have heard much discussion regarding rural development and regional development. People on both sides of the park have for many years requested the construction of a road through the park. Now this request has been before the House as recently as last year when the former Member for Roblin-Russell, Mr. Wally McKenzie, proposed a resolution requesting the Manitoba Legislature to recommend to the Government of Manitoba to consider, to negotiate with the Government of Canada to construct a highway connecting the communities of Rosburn and Grandview. But the resolution didn't go anywhere and, to date, we don't have a road connecting the two communities.

And why is the road important? It is important for several reasons: No. 1, it is important as an agricultural link between the north and south side of the park; it is important for industrial development and trade, Madam Speaker; it is also important for social and cultural exchange; and it is also important for tourism. Besides that, a highway through the park would provide a natural fire barrier, in case one got started either east or west of it. Madam Speaker, I would hope that this matter will come up again, and we will be able to resolve it by encouraging the Federal Government to take an initiative and to build a road through the park.

Madam Speaker, the towns within my constituency are basically service towns. They are service centres for the rural communities; they are service centres for the farming community. The two major towns of Roblin and Russell, as well as the Village of Binscarth, are just a few short miles away from the Saskatchewan border.

On March 26, the Saskatchewan Government removed the retail sales tax on clothing to a limit of \$300.00. Although this has had a very beneficial effect to consumer pocketbooks in Saskatchewan, it has had a very negative and adverse effect on the clothing merchants and also other retail merchants and service outlets in the small towns along the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border, not only within my constituency but also in the constituencies that lie right along the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border.

In 1983, Madam Speaker, a similar situation occurred with respect to gasoline. After the Saskatchewan Government removed the tax on gasoline, we found there was a great discrepancy in prices. After much debate and pressure from the former MLA of Roblin-Russell along with many of the other MLA's from this side of the House, the government acted by removing a portion of the road tax on gasoline in towns along the Saskatchewan border. By establishing this precedent, Madam Speaker, I believe it is the duty of this government to intervene in this manner in a way which will allow merchants in towns along the Manitoba-

Saskatchewan border to compete on a fair and equitable basis with merchants in the nearby Saskatchewan towns. Small business entrepreneurs cannot afford to lose their business traffic to the towns in Saskatchewan, and immediate attention is required to resolve this problem.

Mr. Wally McKenzie worked very hard to have the much needed medical facilities, senior citizens' homes and personal care bed space improved in the Roblin-Russell constituency. Today we still see a great shortage of senior citizen housing and personal care bed space.

It is sad to note that one community in my constituency does not have a single senior citizens' dwelling or a single senior citizens' housing of any kind. The tragedy is that senior citizens are forced to move from that community to a neighbouring community where they don't have family, where they know very few people, because the service is not provided for them within their towns. In addition, other communities, not only the one, but all the communities within that constituency are in need of senior citizens' housing. They are in need of the better hospitals. They are in need of personal care bed space. I will be pressing the government to address itself to those issues.

I was extremely surprised, Madam Speaker, when the Throne Speech was read that there was a complete absence of the education in Manitoba from the Throne Speech. What does this absence mean? What does it indicate? Does it show the government's priorities? Surely an issue as important as education should not have been ignored from the government's Throne Speech.

I must say, Madam Speaker, that education is a priority for the people of Roblin-Russell. It is a priority and there are some concerns with regard to education, concerns with regard to the quality of education, the standards of education, the curriculum development and implementation, declining enrolments, education funding and many other areas. It is interesting to note that, after much talk regarding the quality of education, finally a committee has been put in place to look at the quality of education in Manitoba.

An area of education, Madam Speaker, which is receiving much attention these days in many school divisions across this province is that of the education funding, because it seems that the shift has now gone from the provincial funding to the local taxpayer responsibility. When the new GSC funding formula was brought into effect, this formula was meant to take care of all the discrepancies in funding. There was supposed to be an equitable base for all divisions receiving their funding. Unfortunately today, we have before us a situation where there is not only one formula but indeed three or maybe more. Low cost school divisions, those school divisions who are efficient and are effective and get the value out of their dollar, or those school divisions which have special circumstances are finding it almost impossible to carry on because of what has resulted.

A school division within my constituency, Madam Speaker, is finding that while its local levy is increasing by 8 percent and more, the provincial revenue from the province has decreased by 4 percent. Now I hope that the new Minister of Education is listening and that he has the courage to address this very important issue because there isn't just one school division that is in this situation.

As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, I wonder how many of the school divisions in this province are on the new funding formula as it was originally set, how many are still on the old formula and how many are on no formula at all.

Education, Madam Speaker, is important to us throughout Manitoba. I think that when a government says that it is going to support education to the 80 percent level, there should not be any gerrymandering of the figures. If they are going to support it to 80 percent, then you support it to 80 percent and don't try to mislead people. Madam Speaker, local taxpayers have borne the burden because of the shortcomings of that formula which was put in place, and there is a need to change that formula but there doesn't seem to be the willingness to change it.

I would like to cite another example, Madam Speaker, in terms of education funding and that is this: because of the fact that the funding has been lacking from the province, school divisions have been faced with a choice — do they deficit finance, do they go to their local taxpayers and ask the local taxpayers to make up the difference that their province was responsible for or if they have a nominal surplus do they go to that? Well, the former Minister of Education wasn't long in recognizing that there was some nominal surplus and somehow that that could be tapped.

But that nominal surplus was never put there by the province; it was put there by local taxpayers. But unfortunately there is a drive to take away that nominal surplus from the local taxpayers by not living up to the responsibility that was meant to be lived up to by the province.

So, Madam Speaker, although the education aspect was not mentioned in the Throne Speech, I hope that there is some good will on the part of the Minister of Education to do something positive for the education system of Manitoba.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I look forward to working with my colleagues and for the people of my constituency who have elected me to this Chamber.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It is once again a pleasure for me to join the Throne Speech Debate and as is customary, I would certainly like to congratulate you, Madam Speaker, on your appointment to this extremely important office. I know that you will carry out your duties in a forthright and honourable fashion and I look forward to needing your guidance on very few occasions, but will certainly be more than willing to accept such guidance should the occasion arise.

I would also like to congratulate the new members in the Chamber, both on this side and members opposite. It is always an honour to be an elected official, a member of the Legislative Assembly, and I want to tell members opposite that I hope they are not disillusioned unnecessarily by some of the antics, particularly of people who have been in the Chamber for some time.

There is a process that seems to occur in the Chamber. It is not unfamiliar to myself and members

who were new to the Legislature in 1981 and there are a number on your side as well, it's a process that seemingly everyone goes through and I must say that the speech that was just given by the Member for Roblin-Russell was, I think, an excellent beginning and perhaps one of the few examples that we have heard since the beginning of the Throne Speech Debate that clearly dealt with the issues of his constituency and issues of concern to the province, certainly the only one from that side.

I believe, as the Member for River Heights suggested, it is an important aspect of the Legislature and one that is all too often forgotten for the few simple pleasures of perhaps scoring some points.

I want to say as well that, particularly for new members, members in the opposition benches, that they have from a certain perspective a particularly desirable position because, Madam Speaker, they can have it both ways.

Madam Speaker, I heard the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell express his concern, and I've heard it in the speeches from members opposite pretty consistently, on the one hand the very deep concern and legitimate concern expressed about the fact that the province is in a deficit position; everybody recognizes the need for financial restraint and the restraint that the government faces; they can talk legitimately about that major concern, but on the other hand, they don't have to be responsible whatsoever in what they request.

So we have the Member for Pembina and the Member for Roblin-Russell talking about the great need that exists, the need for the farm community. The Member for Pembina used the word crisis, he said for the first time in many years the farm community is facing a crisis. We heard from the Member for Roblin-Russell about the need for expenditures on roads and yet we hear a concern about the overburdened taxpayer.

So you can have it both ways. You can say my constituents demand this, we need more money for education, we need more money for health care and yet you can still say, well we want everything, but you guys keep that deficit down. That's the real problem. In opposition you are afforded that luxury. You don't have to deal in a responsible way with the complexities that the Treasury Bench and the caucus and the government face on a day-to-day basis. And that's not to belittle in any way the very legitimate concerns that were raised by the Member for Roblin-Russell or anyone else.

The fact of the matter is, and I hope you enjoy it and continue to enjoy it in perpetuity, the right to have it both ways, the right to say we want the deficit controlled and we want more spending. It is a luxury. But I hope that you will recognize in your remarks and in your comments over the next number of months that it isn't possible, I believe honourable members opposite are intelligent enough individuals to recognize that it is not always possible to have what you dream for, that in fact there are certain realities you are going to have to face, that we're facing every day, and that over time we will see a moderation in the requests and the demands and the expectations that members opposite have. What is achievable? What is achievable in the face of some difficult financial circumstances that the province faces and that the Federal Government faces?

Madam Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek says who created it? It is a very legitimate question. I heard one member opposite talking about the fact that in the last four years, a substantial deficit has been built up in the Province of Manitoba and I remind you that the Federal Government built up a deficit of some \$35 billion in one year.

Madam Speaker, we hear the comment, of course, that it was the responsibility of the previous government. It is equally as plausible for me to say that the circumstances from 1981 to 1985 were the responsibility of the previous government who laid no groundwork whatsoever for economic development in the province, not in the farm community, not in terms of mineral exploration and development. I could say that legitimately. So let's remember that members opposite are enjoying a luxury of being able to have it both ways. But it is a luxury; it doesn't represent reality and they will come to grips with that, I am sure, over the coming months.

Madam Speaker, I am particularly pleased to be back as the representative of the Flin Flon constituency and I want to take a moment to thank the people who have expressed confidence in me and, as is customary, I would like to pledge my continued efforts and devotion to the cause of representing the constituents in my constituency.

Madam Speaker, I said earlier that it is indeed an honour to be able to be a representative in this Legislature and part of what makes it an honour is one's ability to lend assistance, to lend a helping hand to individuals, to groups and to organizations in my constituency and I look forward to doing that.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be back in government as well, at a time when governments across this country have been facing some very perilous circumstances. Witness what happened in Ontario and what happened in Quebec and what recently happened in PEI and the fright that was thrown into the Alberta Government in the recent election there.

So, Madam Speaker, in a time when populations have very unrealistic expectations of government in many respects, it is an honour to be back representing the people of Manitoba on the government side of the House.

That leads me nicely into my next comment, which has to do with perhaps some of the unparliamentary, uncomplimentary things that have been said over the past little while by members opposite and perhaps unwittingly by members on this side towards persons within this Chamber. I want to, just for the record, set the stage for those kinds of comments because it needs to be done. Members who are new members haven't had that history, haven't experienced that four-year crucible of experience.

Madam Speaker, I think that it is important to recognize that two things very much affect the comments of members in this Chamber who have had some experience here. One of them, of course, and I don't want to misquote Shakespeare, but hell hath no fury like a Tory scorned. I may be mistaken; I may be misquoting him. I may be misquoting him but the point is, of course, and the Member for Pembina recognized it — he said that there is a lot of disappointment and discouragement in not being elected to government — there is a certain gratification, I suppose, standing on

this side when we have gone through some horrendous debates, some very taxing times, to say the least, and members on that side took a great deal of delight in pointing out their success in the polls some two years ago. It took determination, it took guts, it took leadership, it took a lot of hard work to continue with the real priorities of the government — jobs and economic development and equality issues, issues that affect working people — and to set that behind us and to become the government once again.

Madam Speaker, it must be frustrating to members opposite who were in the Chamber for the period 1981 to 1986, to have experienced the let-down of the March 18th result. So that has created a certain, I think, bitterness in some of the remarks that were made by members who were in the Chamber at that time and that's understandable, but I want to say that it's nothing personal. In fact, members have said this to me, some of the things that are said in the Chamber need not and should not be carried outside the Chamber and I think that's the spirit in which most of the dialogue and the debate is carried on in the Chamber. It's important for members to know that.

Madam Speaker, one of the other things that members who have had the opportunity to be here before like to do — perhaps more the new members — is indulge in some post-election speculation, some post-game analysis, if you will. Certainly I found the lead up to the election one of the most bizarre in the history of the province. Madam Speaker, I think one of the most curious aspects was the decision in mid-January, by the Leader of the Opposition, to set up task forces to court public opinion. Here we have an Opposition who, for four years, sat on their hands — I can't remember what other kind of description one could put on it — but who created no real vision in their own terms, who set out no alternatives for the people of Manitoba, who were not interested in consultation but in confrontation and four-and-a-half years into the term of a government said, well, we'd better consult — sent this magnificent task force into 12 communities and can you believe it, Madam Speaker, consulted with over 100 people? Madam Speaker, most members on the Treasury Bench consulted with 100 people a week for four-and-a-half years.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that this government can take legitimate pride in, for the past and certainly for our intention into the future, is our desire and our willingness to consult.

Madam Speaker, we had that kind of paradox where nothing happened and then there was this rhetoric of consultation and the consultation, in fact, fell somewhat flat as we saw the cameras pan existing members, potential members in the audience who presented briefs to these task forces.

So, Madam Speaker, we have the paradox of a government in waiting some three years ago, laying none of the groundwork, a government in waiting who, contrary to common sense, had no platform to announce when the election was called, in fact had to wait two and three weeks into it. Now, Madam Speaker, I can only assume that speaks to a lack, and that lack has to be in leadership.

Madam Speaker, we have heard much rhetoric, particularly from the Leader of the Opposition, with respect to the lack of vision in the Throne Speech, the

lack of planning, the lack of direction, the lack of coordination . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. J. STORIE:** There is nothing like a little slapstick comedy in the middle of a very serious speech.

Madam Speaker, we heard a lot of rhetoric in the remarks from the Leader of the Opposition about the lack of planning and direction. Certainly, it was not evident in the advertising, the campaign of the provincial Conservatives that they had any sense of direction. They had none. It's obvious from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in reply to the Throne Speech that they still have none. The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition's speech was a diatribe about certain inanities which he felt were important, but there was no theme in that speech.

Madam Speaker, one of the other, I suppose, interesting contradictions in the approach taken by members opposite was their criticism of the lack of planning. Yet when it came to their "Policies for People" — I believe that was the euphemism they put on that particular document — they talked about a general 6 percent increase in social spending. Does that sound like good planning? We don't know where we are going to spend it, but we promise we'll spend 6 percent. We'll do it if it kills us. Madam Speaker, there was no plan. I think that's what the people of Manitoba saw. Perhaps the election results, contrary to the opinion of the Member for Pembina and perhaps other members, the Member for St. Norbert, are a vindication of the people's good sense.

Madam Speaker, I suppose you have to ask yourself: what did the people of Manitoba vote for? What did they vote for? I think, in part, they voted for a record of a government which, under very trying circumstances, succeeded far beyond what other Provincial Governments were able to accomplish in terms of employment, in terms of jobs created, in terms of services to working people, in terms of investment, both public and private sector. Madam Speaker, we used that very effectively during the campaign, because people were able to recognize the fact that this government had a record to be proud of, an economic record to be proud of. But even more than that, Madam Speaker, members on this side, candidates who are not here, members of the government also spoke to issues which were never mentioned by members opposite.

Madam Speaker, it would be instructive for the new members of this Chamber to go back particularly to the last Session but, if they care to, to review Hansard from the 1982-83-84 Sessions, and look at the record of the Conservative Party, that Opposition, when it came to supporting issues that really mattered to people. Look at the record. It was a very mixed record. In fact, in the last Session, we saw the most unusual spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition standing up to vote one way on an important matter, whether it be legislation changing requirements for pension, whether it was legislation dealing with seat belts — oh, pick any issue important to people that you may, and you will find a tremendous divergence between what the left wing of the Tory Party and the right wing of the Tory Party

considered appropriate. There was that kind of division within the ranks of the Conservative Party from Day One.

The fact is that the people of Manitoba stood up on March 18 and voted for a government that has been committed, is committed, and will be committed to people issues, whether we are talking about Workers' Compensation, whether we are talking about workplace, health and safety, pensions, day care, you name it. So it's important to recognize what they did vote for.

Madam Speaker, I suppose it's curious that the Leader of the Opposition and some other members opposite have commented on the fact that the Throne Speech was nothing more than a rehash of election promises. Well, Madam Speaker, for the enlightenment of members opposite, a government of good conscience, a political party of good conscience makes commitments that it intends to keep. Now that may be strange to members from the Conservative Party. They may make election promises which they don't intend to keep. The facts, I think, would verify that.

The Leader of the Opposition would make the comment that, well, all they're doing is rehashing their election promises. I thought that's what going to the people for a mandate was all about. I thought we were supposed to put our platform before the people, and then we were supposed to take the reins of government and implement those promises and live up to our election commitments. There was a phrase that I once used, you know, "With the NDP, a promise made is a promise kept." It's not something that the Conservative Governments, certainly the federal Conservative Government or the previous Provincial Conservative Government can use with any kind of authority whatsoever.

Madam Speaker, I believe, and I think the public believes, that the Throne Speech did set an agenda. It set an agenda that was explicit, that followed directly from the promises that were made during the campaign, the commitments that were made, and it followed along the themes of economic development and renewal, rural and agricultural development, fair and equitable distribution of goods and services to Manitobans and, finally, last but not least, standing up for Manitoba. I think that the Speech from the Throne is a blueprint for what Manitobans expect from this government, and expect under difficult circumstances.

Madam Speaker, before I turn to some substantive remarks in reply to some of the comments from the Leader of the Opposition about one of the issues that was raised by him, and that is the importance of education to Manitobans, I would simply like to say that members opposite have reflected fairly often in their comments the fact that the Throne Speech didn't mention something. Madam Speaker, Throne Speeches, I suppose, are arbitrary documents in some respects. We had a Throne Speech in 1984 which was extremely long. It mentioned everything, and was attacked by the Opposition as being too long and too specific. Madam Speaker, it simply isn't possible for a Throne Speech to contain all of the things that a government is doing. The fact is that each ministry, the government as a whole, has set a direction. It's very clear to the electorate, while it may not be to the Opposition, and we intend to follow it.

Madam Speaker, getting on to the specifics that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition and tangentially

by the Member for Roblin-Russell, I want to comment on the facts — and I use that term very loosely with respect to the Member for Tuxedo's facts — about the state of funding, about his insistence that in fact no problem existed in terms of federal transfers to the Provincial Government.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, May 12th, the Leader of the Opposition quoted a number of statistics, statistics that quite obviously he received or he had been fed, from the Federal Conservative Government; facts, Madam Speaker, which are demonstrably wrong; facts, which not only this government says — (interjection) — Madam Speaker, I used the word "facts" in the context that the Leader of the Opposition spoke them. They are not facts. The Leader of the Opposition seldom speaks facts.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has used information which he has obviously obtained from some other source, which is demonstrably wrong, which the Provincial Government has said is wrong, and moreover, every other provincial government has said is wrong.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition claims that the province is spending on post-secondary education some \$223 million. He says that in Hansard. Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we spent \$360 million on post-secondary education and there is a tremendous discrepancy in those figures.

Madam Speaker, the problem with those figures comes from the Federal Government. The fact is that the Council of Education Ministers of Canada reported that discrepancy to the Federal Government, had identified for the Federal Government the fact that they were underestimating — "they" being the Federal Government — were underestimating the amount of money that the Provincial Government was spending on post-secondary education across Canada to the tune of \$1.8 billion.

Madam Speaker, I have a telex that went from the Chairman of the Council of Education Ministers for Canada, the Honourable Jean-Pierre Ouellet, the Minister in New Brunswick which says: "It is our understanding that the figures which the report will put forward is representing provincial expenditure in support of post-secondary education understate actual provincial expenditure for the year 1984-85 by some \$1.8 billion."

Madam Speaker, that information — the information that the Member for Tuxedo used in his address — is wrong. That is important to recognize. It's important to recognize because that kind of misinformation coming from the Leader of the Opposition, which he has spewed forth on other occasions, does a serious disservice to education in this province. It does a serious disservice to people who pay taxes in this province. It does disservice, in fact, to the students of this province.

Madam Speaker, we have argued and are arguing with the Federal Government to encourage them, to change that information, to make that information more factual because it is creating a crisis in post-secondary education in this province. Madam Speaker, it is not good enough for the Leader of the Opposition to purport to report facts when he should know better, because he was in government. Not only that, in January of 1985, when the province first started volubly putting forward the argument that we were being — to put it

colloquially "shafted" by the Federal Government — the Leader of the Opposition said, oh it's just bellyaching.

Well, Madam Speaker, one of the most respected members who sat on that side from 1981 to 1986, the Member for Turtle Mountain, joined a delegation, went to the Federal Government and in fact confirmed that we were actually being mistreated; that if we look at the whole area of post-secondary education and health funding, the province, which now pays 57 percent of the cost, is going to be paying 64 percent of those costs by 1990.

Madam Speaker, there is a bill before the House of Commons right now, Bill C-96, which is being used to create what I believe is a very serious situation for the people of Manitoba and more particularly for the students in our schools, in our post-secondary institutions.

Madam Speaker, there is no truth to the suggestion that somehow the province was not meeting the needs of education in the province. In fact if we look at the years 1981 through to 1986, the EPF transfers to the province increased about 35 percent. That is exactly the same amount of increase that was received by post-secondary education institutions in the province. What's more, Madam Speaker, on the whole, if you consider both post-secondary education and health costs in the province, our costs increased about 47.9 percent, away beyond the increases and transfers that we received from the Federal Government.

What about when the members opposite were part of the government? How did they treat post-secondary education and health? Madam Speaker, the EPF increases, when they were in office, were some 55.9 percent, and provincial increases in support to post-secondary education and health were 32 percent. So let's not argue that this government hasn't lived up to its commitment to post-secondary education and health. It isn't the case at all.

Madam Speaker, it is no longer good enough for the members opposite to continue to be apologists for the Federal Government, because that kind of rhetoric does a disservice to Manitobans, and they too were elected to represent Manitobans.

Madam Speaker, I would be the last one to stand up and say that the education system in the Province of Manitoba is without fault. There are inadequacies in the system. There are anomalies. There are anomalies in the way that educational funding is provided. But, Madam Speaker, I certainly reject categorically the suggestion that on average the children of Manitoba are not provided with a quality education. I say that out of an understanding of the commitment that the people who are involved in the educational system have to that system. I'm not talking simply about teachers. I'm not talking about just parents. I'm talking about the school boards and the many, many people who serve in a voluntary capacity to provide direction to our curriculum, who provide advice and counsel to school boards and to teachers and parents and principals and superintendents. The fact is that our system is working.

Madam Speaker, certainly the opinion polls that have been announced over the past couple of years would confirm that certainly in the public school, particularly the elementary section, that we are doing a good job;

that people perceive us to be doing a good job. If there are areas of concern, they rest primarily in the high school. — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, the Member for Morris points out that 67 percent of the people are concerned. What the Member for Morris does not suggest is that that concern does not fall in one specific area, that some of those 67 percent may be concerned about the science curriculum, some may be concerned about the vocational portion of high school education.

The fact is that the Minister of Education, who did an admirable job for education in this province over her tenure in the Department of Education, announced in January that there was going to be a high school review, that it was time. There had not been a high school review since the early 1970's and it was, in fact, time.

Certainly we recognize there are challenges, particular challenges facing the high school as the expectations of our society change. As the demands of industry and business change, as technology changes, there is a need to review that and that review will be undertaken.

Madam Speaker, on the whole, the education system is serving Manitobans well. If you disagree with that then I think you should be apprised of the facts that in 1984 Statistics Canada undertook a graduate survey of both college and university students. And what did they find? They found that Manitoba graduates enjoy a higher level of employment than the national average, in both community colleges and universities. On average, they enjoy higher earnings; on average they believed that their courses were necessary, prerequisites for the jobs that they hold.

Madam Speaker, in the case of the technical schools, 91 percent of the graduates are employed. The system has not failed Manitobans in any major way. That's not to say that it isn't appropriate to look at change; that is not to say concerns that exist should not be addressed. It in no way suggests that there should be any universal condemnation of a system that has served this province well. It served us well through to our university, our post-secondary education. Our high schools have served us well also.

The fact is that in this year, in 1985, some 35 percent of the graduates will continue on to post-secondary education. In 1981, that figure was 31.5 percent, so progress is being made. Our high schools are doing a job. Having said that, there are some significant areas of concern and those need to be addressed.

Madam Speaker, I wouldn't want to leave the impression that the school system is in any state of decay. We have a financial crisis. We have an obvious political commitment to the education system and one that we will respect and honour. There is a commitment, a commitment to change and I've said in one of my first addresses to educators in this province that I don't believe in change for change's sake but, where a change is required, change will occur; and that change, Madam Speaker, is going to occur with the co-operation, with the consultation of other major groups in the education system and we will do that.

I'm prepared to give you the floor if it is 5:30. I have a few minutes. Could you indicate how many minutes I have, Madam Speaker?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister has three minutes remaining.

**Thursday, 15 May, 1986**

---

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, I certainly have three minutes of remarks remaining and I will take those at 8 o'clock.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m., when the Honourable Minister will have three minutes remaining.