

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 4 March, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Madam Speaker.

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, I have a statement for the House.

I would like to inform the House that in keeping with an election commitment of the Provincial Government, the level of benefits paid to Manitobans by 55-plus, a Manitoba income supplement, will increase effective April 1, 1987.

A year ago, the government indicated that it would enrich and expand this program, formerly called the Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners, by doubling the maximum benefits paid by removing a pension income eligibility requirement and by annually indexing the benefits. The first two objectives were achieved last July and the annual indexing is now being introduced with the beginning of a new program year on April 1.

The programs's quarterly benefit payments will be increased by 4.5 percent in keeping with the change in the Consumer Price Index for Winnipeg.

The maximum benefits paid will increase to \$98.20 per quarter for a single recipient and to \$105.50 per quarter for a married person.

Income levels determining program eligibility will also be raised as of April 1 to ensure that persons currently receiving benefits will not become ineligible as a result of cost of living increases to their income.

The Provincial Government's expansion and enrichment of this program has resulted in a total of approximately 28,000 Manitobans receiving benefits during the 1986-87 program year. Madam Speaker, this is an increase of about 50 percent over the previous year under the previous programming.

The program's annual budget has essentially tripled from about \$3 million to \$9 million. It is expected that this year's indexing will increase the budget by a further \$500,000.00. These extra resources are being received by Manitobans who most assuredly need this extra income to maintain their quality of life.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I do thank the Minister for that statement.

I'm sure that the people who have been receiving this will be pleased to hear this news. It is a small

payment, but it is a help to people who really need it. I have had, as I told the Minister last year, many calls from older women who were having a great deal of difficulty with financing and this sort of thing does help them.

One problem, of course, that I do get phone calls about is the fact that people on social assistance either cannot apply for this, or if they do, it's deducted, and that is a complaint, of course, that we've heard.

Also, while I'm on my feet, I should say that I've had complaints in my office, a considerable many of them, and I mentioned them in my Throne Speech yesterday, about the deductions of the Canada Pension payments from disabled persons. I will, of course, be taking that up with the Minister at a further time.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### MTS - Jha, Bidhu

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Telephone System.

It follows upon the news of the requested and received resignation from the Board of MTS of Mr. Bidhu Jha, and this follows upon a series of questions that were asked on Tuesday, July 15, 1986 at the committee hearings for MTS in which my colleague, the Member for Pembina, asked whether or not this particular member of the board had any dealings, or rather, whether or not MTS had any dealings with this new board member's business in Winnipeg.

At that time, the Minister responsible, the Member for St. James, said that there would be the usual disclosure made and an absention from any decision-making. The general manager, Mr. Holland, said, "I would have to check specific information and provide that later," and the chairman of the board said, and I quote: "Nothing of that nature has come before the board since Mr. Jha's appointment."

My question to the Minister is: Did Mr. Jha ever make any disclosure of potential conflict of interest to the Minister or to the board?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, the matter of Mr. Jha's business relationship was public knowledge. In fact, Mr. Jha has been written up in the Winnipeg Free Press in the business section as quite a successful businessman with his enterprise, so it was clearly public knowledge.

Wednesday, 4 March, 1987

The issue of many of the tenders or purchases that were made by the Telephone System with Mr. Jha were made prior to the date on which he was appointed a board member - which was January 1986. In my way of investigating this situation, there were no contracts that went to the Board of Directors that Mr. Jha would have to disclose as a conflict in terms of a decision that is made by the Board of Directors.

However, Madam Speaker, and the record should show that the inquiries I've made indicate that Mr. Jha's company sold approximately \$50,000 worth of equipment the year prior to him being appointed to the Board of Directors and it sold approximately under \$20,000 - I'm trying to get the exact number - after he was appointed to the Board of Directors, but I should point out there was a fire that took place during that year as well.

The conflict-of-interest guidelines at the Manitoba Telephone System, there was a draft forwarded to the Board of Directors in '85. In the last two months, I have reviewed the draft conflict-of-interest guidelines and recommended that the board immediately pass interim conflict-of-interest guidelines rather than just leave it in draft form, and they have done so at the last Board of Directors meeting in February of 1987.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, the question is not whether or not there were articles written about Mr. Jha that disclosed what his business was, my question is to the Minister, did he ever disclose to either the Minister or his predecessor, as Minister, or the board that he had a potential conflict of interest with respect to equipment that he was supplying to the Telephone System under tender arrangements?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, as I say, it is common knowledge and public knowledge, quite public knowledge, that Mr. Jha was in fact the president and major shareholder in the company indicated, and Mr. Jha made me aware of it certainly the first time I met him when we discussed a number of issues including this relationship. So it was always disclosed to me, as Minister, on the basis of the first meeting I had, as is common knowledge in terms of the business holdings of many members in this House; it was common knowledge.

I have asked whether there were any contracts dealing with any business that would go to the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Telephone System that would in fact be of potential or actual conflict of interest for Mr. Jha's company and my initial information was that there was not, through the Board of Directors, and that that was dealt with at a different level in the Telephone System.

In saying that, Madam Speaker, I feel it is a very very awkward situation for an individual to be on a Board of Directors and have a commercial relationship with that Crown corporation. Mr. Jha agreed with me on that point and in fact we are in the process, and have altered it at the last board meeting, to indicate that a person who has a commercial relationship should not be on that Board of Directors.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, Madam Speaker, assuming that this Minister thinks that it is a very, very awkward

relationship, why didn't the previous Minister responsible think that it was an awkward relationship. Was it because . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. That question is not in order.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I beg your pardon?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** That question is not in order. The honourable member is seeking an opinion as to why.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, obviously, his predecessor didn't believe it to be an awkward relationship and this Minister now does.

My further question to the Minister is: Did the general manager ever prepare the report with the specific information that he promised on July 15 with respect to Mr. Jha's business relationship with MTS or MTX?

**HON. G. DOER:** As the member opposite knows, the former general manager is not working in the corporation any longer and I have not had any communication with the former general manager since his dismissal on November 21. The report that you have asked for has not been made available to me by the former general manager. Notwithstanding that fact, I did ask specifically for information on the commercial dealings with the individual indicated, and I did initiate that inquiry with Mr. Robertson.

As I have indicated, in 1985, prior to his appointment to the Board of Directors, there was approximately \$50,000 worth of businesses with Mr. Jha's company. In 1986, there was under \$20,000 with his company. I have not received any specific information that any one of those contracts went to the Board of Directors, as is a policy in the Telephone System. However, Madam Speaker, I think it puts people in a very awkward situation to be on a Board of Directors and have a commercial relationship on that board.

Mr. Jha agreed with me, and that's why we had a resignation from Mr. Jha so that not only would he not be in that awkward situation, but then as I proceeded to change the conflict-of-interest guidelines with the Board of Directors, commercial relationships would be clearly delineated so people wouldn't be in that situation.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, with respect to this line of questioning about Mr. Jha's relationship with the MTS in a business sense, the former Minister responsible for the Telephone System, the Member for St. James, said "I would assume there would be the usual disclosure made."

Can the Minister indicate, since he seems to indicate there was no disclosure made, what was the usual disclosure that was required for members of the board for the Telephone System at that time?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, it's the same kind of disclosure. In fact, it's pursuant to many of the provisions in The Legislative Assembly Act and many of the provisions of this Assembly. You don't have to stand up, Madam Speaker, every minute and disclose everything you've got, but if there is a specific issue

that is dealing with a pecuniary interest that you may have, we in this Assembly and board members of the Telephone System must disclose that. There were no issues that came to the Board of Directors specifically that would require that kind of disclosure.

However, it was well known that Mr. Jha was president, CEO, and a major shareholder of that corporation. I believe - and I've discussed this with Mr. Jha, and he did resign - that it doesn't make sense for an individual to be on a Crown corporation dealing in a commercial relationship with that corporation and that's why he made the decision; and that's why, Madam Speaker, the conflict-of-interest guidelines that I had in draft form, which included disclosures similar to this Legislative Assembly, are going to be delineated further to deal with the specific issue of commercial relationship, period, on an omnibus basis rather than just have it on a disclosure basis when something comes to the Board of Directors. I think that will be of more helpful conflict-of-interest guidelines for the Telephone System.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition's questions have been very direct and specific questions. In response to each one of these questions, the Minister has gone on at length ad nauseam well beyond the scope of the question.

Madam Speaker, I would urge you to request the Ministers to answer the question briefly and simply, and this will encourage cooperation in the House. If the Ministers don't, that will encourage a lot of non-cooperation.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, certainly, the answers have provided full information and . . .

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. COWAN:** . . . here we have another example, one more time, perhaps one of the first times during this Session, but certainly a continuation of what the Opposition did quite often in previous Sessions of them asking a question and then attempting to restrict the ability of the Minister to answer the question in a full and factual way. If they don't want that full and factual information in answers to their questions, the people of Manitoba want that full and factual information . . .

**A MEMBER:** No, they don't - not the facts - they're getting the same answers that we got on MTX.

**HON. J. COWAN:** . . . in answer to those questions, and that's what Ministers on this side will provide to them whenever it is required.

So for them to suggest that there is anything . . .

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Let me be clear in what we are hearing members opposite say from their feet and from their seat. The one member says they're getting too much information; the other member says they're covering up. How like the Tories to try to be on both sides of the issue at the same time.

However, I wish to provide you . . .

**A MEMBER:** Sit down, Jay, and have a little respect.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. I would like to hear the rest of the advice from the Honourable Government House Leader and then we'll deal with the point of order.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you. I wish to assure you, Madam Speaker, that we believe that this House functions best with cooperation, but beyond that, it functions best with full and factual information; and those two things, we promise to you, as Speaker of the House, to members opposite and to the public, and we will not have the Opposition attempt to muzzle Ministers when they are trying to provide full information that is of the benefit not only to them, even if they don't recognize that, but more importantly of benefit to the people of Manitoba who want to understand the full issue.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

**MR. G. FILMON:** No, on a question, Madam Speaker.

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

On the Honourable Opposition House Leader's alleged point of order.

**A MEMBER:** Pardon me, an alleged point of order?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** It's only an alleged point of order until we've decided as to whether it's a point of order, or not.

Order please. First of all, the Opposition in Question Period ask the questions; they cannot dictate as to the content of the answers. We have asked the Ministers, according to Beauchesne, Citation 358(2), on many occasions to keep their answers brief and not provoke debate.

In my opinion, the Honourable Minister was not provoking debate but was supplying a full answer. If the Opposition is feeling that I should be intervening as Speaker to limit the amount of information that Ministers give, I will take that into consideration. In my opinion, in this particular time, the Minister's answer was totally within order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Premier. If it was, in the words of the Minister for the Telephone System, general knowledge of Mr. Jha's business relationship with MTS and, if it was as this Minister has said, an awkward relationship for him to be doing business and on the board, why did his Cabinet appoint Mr. Jha in the first place?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I think the Minister has very clearly responded to that question, and I must say very fully and very completely.

There is no evidence of any conflict of interest at all. I believe there has been no material presented by the members today - no more material than in fact the innuendo and the mucking around that some honourable members across the way did yesterday in attempting to muckrake with the Minister of Highways pertaining to his sister-in-law - that there ever was any evidence anywhere of any conflict of interest. There was a problem of perception, Madam Speaker. This Minister of Telephones properly moved to ensure that any perception would be removed.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, given that presumably the business relationship between Mr. Jha and MTS was general knowledge and that it was indeed awkward, did that perception not exist at the time when he was appointed?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, the Board of Directors did not approve the day-to-day purchases of furniture that Mr. Jha was involved in. However - and the purchases had been going on not only with sales that he was making to Bell Canada, Manitoba Telephone System and major contracts to the Federal Government because of the quality of his work - quality of work, by the way, Madam Speaker, that was written up in the business section of the Winnipeg Free Press - however, Madam Speaker, I feel it puts an individual in a very awkward situation to be in a commercial relationship.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I regret that the Premier doesn't want to answer that question about perception and wants to leave his Minister out dangling, so I'll ask another question of the Minister. Are any other members of the board of MTS about to be asked to resign?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, the answer to the question is no. There are board members who are involved in their own individual decisions and I respect their rights to make individual decisions, but the answer to the question is no.

### **Perimeter highway - construction of northeast section**

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

**MRS. B. MITCHELSON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways.

Can the Minister of Highways tell the people of northeast Winnipeg when they can expect actual construction to begin on the northeast section of the Perimeter Highway?

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

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, it seems the Opposition members again are exemplifying their ignorance of a planning process, as they did yesterday, in that planning is for the long-term good and needs of development in various areas of the province. Whether it be in the City of Winnipeg or in the Selkirk area or wherever it might be, it is necessary to have that planning for the future.

The fact is the Perimeter Highway was not completed in its entirety when it was constructed, Madam Speaker, and since the gaps will in the future have to be filled in, in the northeast quadrant of the Perimeter Highway, the province is doing the responsible thing, and that is having a planning process put in place to ensure that the route that will eventually be required to facilitate the development of this route that the land will be acquired and planned for so that proper and orderly development will take place in that area. That is the objective, not the construction of that area at this time, Madam Speaker.

**MRS. B. MITCHELSON:** Madam Speaker, a supplementary.

Is it this government's priority to hire consultants and hold public meetings for a project they won't build for several years, because they have squandered \$28 million in the Premier's bridge to nowhere, north of Selkirk?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, we have seen a prime example here where one member of the Tory Opposition follows the errors of the other in quoting a figure that is a figment of their imagination. It has no basis in fact and it has been admitted by the Member for Ste. Rose that the \$28 million figure has no basis in fact. He's admitted that and he should apologize to this House for misinformation to this House. And now the member is following his misinformation in her question. I don't accept that premise.

### **Lagimodiere Blvd.- noise barrier -**

**MRS. B. MITCHELSON:** My final supplementary to the Minister of Highways is: Where are this government's priorities when they spend \$1.2 million to build a noise barrier in the Minister of Environment's riding when completion of the Perimeter Highway would divert 75 percent of that truck traffic from Lagimodiere Blvd. and eliminate the noise problem?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The Member for River East seems to have some problems as to the facts in this particular instance, Madam Speaker.

I have said publicly that even if this route, the completion of the Perimeter Highway in that area, were expedited as fast as it could be done, it would not be usable for at least a six- or seven-year period. There's a planning process; there's the detailed design; there's the acquisition period and then there's the construction period with overpasses, Madam Speaker. That takes several years of planning before it actually can be built and constructed. That is not even an excuse for inaction by the City of Winnipeg with regard to the noise barrier, Madam Speaker.

### Natural gas pricing - legislative action

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I direct a question to the First Minister.

The First Minister has, on several occasions in the last few months, made some very strong statements with respect to natural gas pricing. He refers to it again in a very strong way in the Throne Speech by saying, "My government will not accept the situation in which the consumer is expected to pay more for gas than Americans or large industry. My government will announce policies to protect Manitobans from excessive gas pricing."

My question to the First Minister is: Among the options open to the government, could he indicate to the House whether legislative action is being planned? Is there any legislation that this government may be bringing forward with respect to this announcement?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, the commitment that we have is to ensure that natural gas prices are lowered and, as a consequence of that, we will not abdicate any options that may be necessary, legislative or non-legislative.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Just a supplementary, just so I understand it. It is possible that on this very important and major issue, this Legislature could be asked to deal with it legislatively. Is that confirmation?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I've indicated that all options are available to us. The principal concern that this New Democratic Party Government has is to ensure that the prices to the consumer are kept low, that the consumer is not ripped off by way of the price structure being proposed by Inter-City Gas. This government refuses to abandon any option; this government retains the option to use any alternative that may be necessary in order to achieve the objective of protecting the consumers of the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. H. ENNS:** A further supplementary to the Minister on the same subject, Madam Speaker.

The Throne Speech further indicates, again, a very strong feeling on this subject. My government expresses concerns that the agreement placed the average gas consumer at the mercy of private utility monopolies. I remind the First Minister that it was his government, this First Minister as a matter of fact, who renewed that long-term lease with that private utility just some three years ago, I believe.

My direct question to the Minister is: Among the options that this Minister and this government is considering, is it the breaking of that contractual obligation with Inter-City Gas that was signed by this government, by this Minister three years ago?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** As the Minister who in fact brought forward the legislation renewing the franchise

for one utility out of many utilities in the province, I'm certainly pleased to deal with the questions raised by the member who has indicated on the radio, prior to the Session starting, that his approach would be to phase out long-term contracts which would, if one followed his approach, lead to Manitoba consumers paying \$200 million to \$300 million more for consumer gas than they would otherwise have to pay.

Madam Speaker, we believe that all options have to be considered. We certainly believe that it is possible to ensure that gas prices be brought down and we would look at all ways and means. I wouldn't preclude looking at anything, Madam Speaker, just to ensure that we do have the ways and means to bring the desirable objective about, of lowering gas prices.

If one followed the Conservative approach of cutting out options, Madam Speaker, we'd never have the opportunity of lowering gas prices and would be held captive to gas prices set totally outside this province, without our being able to bring about hundreds of billions of dollars in benefit to the people of Manitoba.

### Wildlife feeding stations - slaughter at

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside with a final supplementary.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Madam Speaker, just by explanation. That subject matter, no doubt, will be raised on numerous occasions.

I have another question to the Minister of Natural Resources. I'm sure, Madam Speaker, the Minister is as concerned as many Manitobans are concerned but, in particular, a group of enthusiastic wildlife activists in my constituency, in the area of Inwood, in and around surrounding Dennis Lake, who are, particularly at this time of year, doing their bit to help our deer through the winter by feeding them, and the amount of indiscriminate slaughter that is taking place at feeding stations at night time. What is his department doing to help that group out to at least what I call unjustifiable taking of wildlife under those circumstances?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, I want to indicate to all members of this House and indeed to all people of Manitoba that we are concerned about the indiscriminate use of wildlife. We want to indicate, as well, our appreciation for the efforts of the Wildlife Association in its efforts to help wildlife through a difficult situation.

We recognize that throughout the province, whether we are dealing with the white-tailed deer, as we are in this instance, or with other species, that there will be illegal take and perhaps indiscriminate but legal take from time to time.

In reviewing the material that is available in this particular instance, if we have a concern, it is perhaps that the responsibility for the indiscriminate take is being targeted to a particular group. We want to recognize that there are people in society who have the legal right to take game at different times of the year. But I want

to make it clear that our enforcement people will be in the field working with the wildlife associations, asking for the support of people in the area by way of the TIP Program, to make us aware of who the offenders might be, and we will try to deal with it, but we want to indicate clearly . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. Will the Honourable Minister please keep his answers brief.

### Careerstart Program - policy changes

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

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Careerstart Program. The government has increased funding to the universities for the upcoming year, but at the same time this government is undermining the universities. For example, under the Careerstart Program, the government has recently restricted its funding to universities for summer employment of students, and for every three students the universities used to be able to hire, they will now only be able to hire one or perhaps none at all.

My question is this: How does he explain the policy of giving with one hand and taking with the other? In other words, can he explain the inconsistency of the action exemplified by these harmful changes to the Careerstart Program?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, I don't accept the arithmetic of the Honourable Member for River Heights, and can tell her that it is the policy of the government to spread the monies available under Careerstart Program as widely as possible to create as many jobs as possible for our young people this summer.

The universities have been classified as institutions along with some other large organizations that have multi-million-dollar budgets. We feel that they're in a position to at least provide a little bit of money towards employment of young people as opposed to the very small non-profit groups such as day care centres, groups looking after the mentally retarded and some small business people who have very very little money to hire people. So we're suggesting that there should be some commitment by the universities to put a little bit of money on the table to help create some jobs for our young people, not to hurt them but to help spread the money around, so that we can maximize the number of jobs created this summer.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** A supplementary to the same Minister. How can this government neglect a program like Careerstart, which provides long-term advanced training promotion programs; in turn, long-term stable employment, instead of concentrating on short-term low level employment?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, I say without any equivocation whatsoever that Manitoba stands head

and shoulders over any province in Canada in terms of what we're doing, or any past Liberal Government, in what we're doing for young people in terms of jobs.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, we have an array of programs. Careerstart is only one. I would like to remind the honourable member of our Training for Tomorrow Program, which provides permanent long-term jobs for young people, with preference being given to young people. I think if you go out there in the community, the people of this province realize that we have about the lowest level of unemployment of young people in Canada, and I believe the policies of this government go a long way to contributing to that very favorable low level of unemployment.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** A final supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

Would the Minister tell us why when this government prides itself on its consulting with groups, why it did not even inform the universities of these cuts and they had to find out on their career jobs application form?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, I reject the notion of not giving adequate advice. The fact of the matter is that the application forms, the information went out some weeks ago. This is the usual method of advising potential employers of the terms and conditions of the program. I think that it's wrong to say that there has been a cutback in terms of the monies available for the universities. The fact is that they're being reclassified as institutions, along with hospitals and nursing homes and so on because, Madam Speaker, as I've said before, we feel that there's a greater need to channel some money to the small non-profits and to the small business entrepreneurs.

### Gypsumville Radar Base - Interlake Tribal Council

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have a question to the Minister responsible for Crown Investments or Crown Lands. It's dealing with the Federal Government's offer to sell to the Province of Manitoba the assets of the Gypsumville radar base, which is being phased out, for the Interlake Tribal Council. Has the Provincial Government accepted that offer of \$1.00 from the Federal Government?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The property we are speaking of at the Gypsumville base is on lease to the Federal Government; the lease expires on the 1st of August of this year. They have advised us that they will be wanting to terminate the lease and the condition of the lease was that they would return it to its original state, that option is there. We have been approached by parties who are interested in undertaking training programs to have the property available to them for that particular purpose. It's the Interlake Tribal Council that has been pursuing that particular interest. What we want to be

Wednesday, 4 March, 1987

sure of as a province is that the liability for the ongoing maintenance and eventual restoration of the site is clearly identified and when that decision is made and we know where that responsibility rests, we will then give our advice to the Federal Government.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Natural Resources.

In view of the fact that the Federal Government is offering all the buildings and the assets on that Crown land which is owned by the province, to the province for \$1 for the use by the Interlake Tribal Council, as he has indicated, for training programs and positive actions for their organization, Madam Speaker, and in view of the fact that the option to buy those assets ends on the 14th of March, some 10 days from now, will the Minister proceed to take immediate action to work in the best interests of the Interlake Tribal Council and finalize the deal?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Clearly, Madam Speaker, our first preference would have been for the Federal Government to maintain its presence at the Gypsumville base. But given that there is an option being explored for the use of the property by the Interlake Tribal Council, a submission has been made to us for our consideration, and clearly, what we want to do is have an understanding of what the long-term commitments are. The members opposite suggest that for the price of \$1 we should proceed without any kinds of other considerations. We want to be fully aware of what our future commitments are. When we have a clear understanding through the submission that is presently before us for our consideration, we will then advise all parties of our decision.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Now that the Minister has the dollar, my colleagues have indicated, the final supplementary question to the Minister is this: In view of the fact that the option which has been offered to the government, by the Federal Government ends the 14th of March, the Interlake Tribal Council are quite prepared to take over and to carry out some programs that are positive for their people, why is the government dragging their feet? Will the government have their decision made? Will the Minister have his decision made by the deadline of March 14th?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, let the record clearly show that the dollar that was delivered to this side of the House will be returned.

On the other hand, had the members opposite forwarded to this side an amount which more adequately represents what the cost will be for restoration, which has been estimated anywhere from \$4 to \$8 million, then perhaps I could have an answer for him.

Madam Speaker, I want the record to show clearly, we are fully behind the efforts of the Interlake Tribal Council to put in place meaningful training programs for the people of the Interlake area. We recognize fully that there is need for that support, given that in other sectors support from the Federal Government for Native people is being withdrawn. We will not withdraw our support to Native people, but on the other hand we will not proceed blindly in absence of any kind of consideration of the long-term costs.

## Canadian Wheat Board - reduced payments to farmers

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. C. BAKER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Premier.

In view of the announcement this morning of a possible 20 percent cut in initial price to farmers by the Canadian Wheat Board, could the First Minister tell us if he has taken any action or if he plans to take any action in regard to conveying to the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board the tragedy and the chaos that such a cut would mean to western farmers?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, it is a good question and, in confidence, let me tell this House that I had fully anticipated the Leader of the Opposition would have led off his questioning today in respect to this threat to hundreds of Manitoba farmers rather than dealing in the muckraking that he was participating in a little earlier.

Madam Speaker, what we are dealing with is a very critical situation. The recommendation from the Canadian Wheat Board to the Conservatives in Ottawa to reduce the initial price of wheat will, as indicated by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, create hundreds and hundreds of potential disasters at the local farm level in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, the responsibility to ensure that this does not take place rests fully with the Federal Government. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government not to tie the price of grains to market price, but to follow the lead, whether or not we like it, of the European community and the American community of ensuring that there is a minimum price.

As a consequence, Madam Speaker, I am in the process of forwarding a telex to the Prime Minister to urge the Prime Minister to take immediate steps in order to reassure the farmers facing drought this year.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I would remind Honourable Ministers once more to keep answers brief and not provoke debate.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. C. BAKER:** A supplementary question to the First Minister.

Would he meet with the Leader of the Opposition and find out whether or not they feel the same way as you and they could send a resolution as well to the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I think it would be ideal for this Chamber to pass a resolution by all honourable members in this Chamber. That would reflect the intent of this telex to ensure there's a clear message to the Prime Minister in Ottawa, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, that the recommendation of the Canadian Wheat Board ought to be immediately rejected by the government in Ottawa. And, Madam Speaker, we could, in fact, have a resolution supported by all members of this Chamber. I think that the suggestion by the Member for Lac du Bonnet would indeed be an excellent one.

### Durwood Machine Works - incentive payment

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Business Development: Can she explain why Durwood Machine Works received almost two-thirds of the small business incentive payment for 1984-85, \$60,000 out of \$94,000 in total?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Madam Speaker, I'll be glad to take that question as notice.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I think while she's doing that, Madam Speaker, if she could also determine whether because department staff fudged the project that Durwood Machine Works had going with other businesses, then that money was paid to Mr. Rose as a compassionate settlement for their messing up the job?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Madam Speaker, without accepting any of the editorial comments, I'll be glad to report to the member when I have the information.

### MPIC - Carman Agri Services

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Autopac.

Could the Minister explain why Autopac is currently appealing the \$2.7 million Saskatchewan court award against Carman Agri?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure I heard that question correctly. Would the member remind repeating it?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, I want to ascertain from the Minister why it is that MPIC is in the process of appealing the \$2.7 million award from the Saskatchewan courts against Carman Agri. Is it because they believe they can have the award reduced in the courts?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Madam Speaker, yes, it is incredible. The Member for Pembina is very aware of what this claim is all about. It involves his constituent. It is fairly obvious that when MPIC is appealing a claim, it is trying to reduce the magnitude of the award.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, given that they are appealing it, they are very confident that they will

have the award reduced. Will the Minister now follow the suggestion I made to him and have MPIC provide the letter of credit to the Saskatchewan courts for the \$700,000 that Carman Agri is on the hook for because of mismanagement at MPIC, thereby removing the possibility that Carman Agri will be forced into receivership by that court action?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Madam Speaker, as the member is aware, the coverage provided by MPIC to Carman Agri was in the amount of \$2.0 million. The court award is \$2.7 million. It is clear that Carman Agri has a liability of \$700,000 on its hands. I want to assure the member that MPIC and its solicitors will do whatever they can to reduce the award through the appeal process, but in no way is MPIC responsible for that amount in excess of the policy coverage.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. C. BAKER:** I was wondering, Madam Speaker, if I could get permission of the House to make a non-political statement.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave? (leave)

**MR. C. BAKER:** Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Elmwood and myself, I would like to read to you an article wherein the two Manitoba bands receiving special awards on the weekend, at the close of the 12th Annual International Band Festival, sponsored by Assiniboia Optimist Club at the Winnipeg Convention Centre, the Lac du Bonnet Senior School Band, one of 172 bands and 51 states bands that took part in the six-day event was given a commendation award. The Chairman's award went to the Elmwood High School Band.

I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that all of us in this House would want to say to those two bands, "Thank you for work well done."

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

### HANSARD CLARIFICATION

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

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

May I make a small correction in the Hansard of Tuesday, the 3rd of March, Page 82, right-hand column, and on the ninth line it should read "I" instead of "they." "They talked," it said; I would prefer it to read "I talked," because I'm sure that's what I said. Thank you.



**ORDERS OF THE DAY  
THRONE SPEECH DEBATE**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, I would, first of all, ask if you would give me a five-minute warning prior to the end of my speech. I have a few things I would like to make sure that I get in and I have a lengthy address to give and want to make sure that I get it on the record.

I want to start today, Madam Speaker, by saying not only am I pleased to be a member of the Legislative Assembly when our new Lieutenant-Governor, Dr. George Johnson, was appointed, but as well feel very good about the appointment of the former Premier of the Province to the high court of the Court of Appeal, Sterling Lyon, to that high office in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I would like to refer to the Throne Speech - and I know it's improper and I would ask tolerance of the House - but I would say it's more like a Howard in Wonderland fairytale. One would wonder just where he is living at this particular time in his tenure as Premier. I believe he represents somewhat of a rural riding and he makes a lot of huffery and puffery about the problems of the farm community. I really wonder if he understands it; and yes, Madam Speaker, I am extremely upset and concerned today of the news we have received this morning that there's another proposal to reduce the initial grain prices by some 20 percent for the farmers of Western Canada.

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

That makes a total of a 40 percent reduction in their income over the last two years and I would ask, of anyone else in our society, who would be prepared to take such a blow to the chin? Not many, if any, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would in fact be prepared to accept or tolerate it. I call it a national crisis, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a national crisis which has to be addressed and addressed immediately.

I want to make a brief comment to the Mover of the Throne Speech because I think he must feel somewhat frustrated, coming from the riding which he comes from, standing in his place indicating that he no longer has a machine dealer left in the whole of that fine agriculture community. That is no disgrace to the Conservative Party in Ottawa or to the Conservative Party in the Legislative Building here. It is, I would think, somewhat of a major letdown for him of his New Democratic Party who have been in office some of the last 15 years in this province, and that he continues to see degradation of the support services for his farm community. It is an admission of failure of a massive amount, and I think that he would want to do something about it.

The Seconder to the Throne Speech, again, we have heard some of his lightweight recommendations that the Fort Garry Hotel be turned into a massive day care centre. I don't think that our society can stand that kind of a huge economic blow. Yes, the day care centres are needed, I'm sure, in the province, and could be provided through the private sector with government

regulations, but to come out with such a lightweight idea I think is a true demonstration of some of the thoughtfulness that's coming from the backbench of that particular government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to, as well, compliment my Leader who made an excellent base for us to speak to on such a little bit of information. He laid out a good, sound attack on a government that is incompetent. I want to compliment my other colleagues as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who truly feel the depression that is in the farm community. It is not every day that we can get the message to the people of the City of Winnipeg or the cities of this country and it has finally hit home to the city. It's been demonstrated, and I as well compliment the media who are carrying that message forward. I believe that it is uppermost in the minds of people and, particularly today, when we see a further recommendation to lower grain prices.

I want to touch on the Throne Speech briefly, Madam Speaker. I'll apologize, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's easy to get in the habit, and when one is busy and speaking, it's not always easy to hit the right mark and I apologize if I refer to you as the Speaker once in awhile.

But in the Throne Speech, on Page 2, he talks about generations of Manitobans have upheld a legacy, sharing a vision in common with those pioneers of land of rich abundance and of boundless opportunity for their children and their children's children.

I challenge the Premier to tell those children who are going to have to pay off the massive debts that he has incurred on their backs - some \$3 billion in five years - that there are boundless opportunities for their children and their children's children. Some legacy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some legacy for the children of our province. I think it's a disgrace that he would put that kind of thing in here when he has given them the kind of economic disastrous future that they have to face.

As well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder what kind of fairytale land the Premier is living in. He talks about the earlier part of this decade where we had some massive recessions, where he used massive government monies to try to correct the problem. Thirty-six percent of the people of Manitoba depend on agriculture for their incomes. A 40 percent reduction in those incomes over the past two years has a major impact on the economy of this province. We are not out of the depression in Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker; we are still in a massive depressed situation.

I want him to tell those 850 people at Canada Packers that we have a great province to live in, that he has done everything that will ensure them long-term job opportunities. I want him to tell those people who are going home, who do not have a job to look to tomorrow. It is so much and so blatant. It's obvious, again the Premier's trying to leave the perception with the people of Manitoba that he is doing quite well, that the province is doing quite well. He has spent billions of dollars of taxpayers' money putting us in debt over the past five years. Now what is he doing when this recovery is here? He's still spending \$600 million more than he's taking in on an annual basis and he says the recession is over. It doesn't square, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it just doesn't square.

I am not sure that he truly knows where he is at. I don't think he or his Cabinet Ministers have a clear policy objective before them, other than to look after their own elective futures. That's what it appears to be, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not the best interests of

Manitobans, not the best interests of the overall welfare of the province, but the welfare in the future of the electability of he and his New Democratic Party; and that is an objective which is going to destroy this province.

When we talk about 850 jobs at the Canada Packers plant that are being lost, let us talk about why that happened. The Minister of Agriculture put a beef program out some four years ago. Yes, he's bragging about the \$40 million or \$30 million that he has spent. I'll tell you how he got that money from Cabinet to start with.

He went to Cabinet and he said, "Not only will we maintain the beef herd in Manitoba, but we will maintain Canada Packers and all the massive packing house industry we have in the province." He has failed; he has used the taxpayers' money irresponsibly. The cattle industry has failed; the packing house industry has failed; the Premier has failed and so has the Minister of Agriculture. Don't let him try to blame the Federal Government. It's this government that has caused the downfall of the major packing house industry in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me put forward just how these people think, and they lip service again the farm community. Let us see how they think. We saw \$30 million go into Manfor in the last 15 months; we've seen \$100 million go into Flyer Industries; we've seen \$28 million go into Saudi Arabia and we've seen \$13 million go into McKenzie Seeds that isn't earning us any money or any interest. We have seen a bridge in the Premier's constituency, or next to the Premier's constituency, that is a boondoggle and an albatross around the Minister of Highways' neck, and it's at the expense of all the other services in Manitoba.

Would you add those figures together and take it times 10 percent, the interest alone is more money on those boondoggles than the \$30 million that he's now going after the farmers for. He says that nobody else in society has to pay back the money, but the agreement we made with you, the farmers, you have to pay it back.

Yes, I agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a contractual obligation that the farmers have to live up to, but why? Why just the farmers who have had to receive 40 percent less or are expecting to take 40 percent less in two years are now the only people in our society asked to pay the Provincial Government money back? I think it is a sham, I think it is unfair, and I think there has to be some social justice and some economic justice brought in as a common-sense approach to this incompetent group of people.

I say the interest only, the interest only off of all these other boondoggles, is the amount the Premier is asking to come back from the beef industry. What they're doing, rather than paying some of this money back, are getting rid of the herds because the marketplace is paying a reasonable return, and they are selling into the marketplace and getting out of the business because they don't want to have to pay back the debt that a lot of other people don't have to pay back.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to deal with one particular area and I want to spend a few minutes on it. I want the Attorney-General of this province to apologize to this Legislative Assembly and to the people of Arthur constituency for his mishandling of the safety and security of their lives and putting their properties at risk.

A year ago, my colleague, the critic for the Attorney-General's Department, asked, in this Legislature, the Attorney-General if he will be closing any RCMP detachment offices. Do you know what the answer is? And I can go to Hansard but I won't take the time to do it, but it is in Hansard. He said, "before anything is done, there will be a full explanation and discussions with those communities." Mr. Deputy Speaker, that did not take place. He misled this Chamber and the people of my constituency, and I will not forgive him for it. I can show you a file of letters from thousands of people from meetings that were held in protest of the irresponsible action that he recommended.

I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the real reason for the First Minister cutting back the RCMP in Reston, Deloraine and Winnipeg Beach. When we were in office, there was an agreement signed with the Federal Government; an agreement that said that the contribution by the province from 1980 to 1982, our term of office, an agreement that our share as a province would come to 56 percent and the Federal Government would pick up the balance.

This new Attorney-General, the incompetent, irresponsible one that we have now, thought he was going to be so smart; and he's such a smart, clever individual that he signed an agreement with the Federal Government. Yes, he signed it in 1982-83 and he agreed then to immediately pick up 57 percent of the costs. But by 1988, the province would have to pick up 64 percent. How dumb is he?

Now he's saying to the people of my constituency, "I'm removing the RCMP offices because we can't afford to have them." Well, we can't afford to have him, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and put at risk the lives and the safety and the property of people in the southwest corner of the province. The Premier, I think, should have taken more direct action, and I'd call for the resignation of the Attorney-General if he's going to continue with those kind of irresponsible policies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as well, I want to point out that he talks about the crime rate reducing in southwest Manitoba. When did it ever become that you have to have increased crimes to need the RCMP protection? Is not an ounce of prevention worth more than a pound of cure? It's just so ridiculous - his approach to the way in which he is going to balance the books of this province, take away from the safety of the people of the province, and do what? Scuttle it into a bunch of political supporters and political hacks to write press releases for him and try to make his irresponsible government look good.

The crime rate, in fact, has increased in some of the areas in which they're talking about. And here we have this government continually standing up saying that the Federal Government is passing on the expenditure responsibilities to the province. Well, you know the final option that they were left with in the southwest, in the constituency which I represent? They've said to those communities, to Pipestone Municipality, the towns of Reston and Deloraine, they said, well, we appreciate now that we have made a partial mistake but we'll keep one RCMP officer in those two towns. The town of Deloraine said that's fine. They had their own town police, so they said, well, we'll hire one, which other towns do. So that made two. But the Attorney General's office said, well, what we'll now do is we'll offer them

the option to hire locally, through the taxpayers' money, another officer.

Well, they are currently paying a half a mill into the general revenues of the province for RCMP protection. But now, because you live in Arthur, if you want the same protection that you've had, you have to pay an additional \$50,000 per officer, or 10 mills, to keep the same level of support that you think is important. Now if that isn't double taxation and discrimination, I don't know what is.

It's a passage of provincial responsibility onto the taxpayers of my constituency. I don't agree with it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I will continue to put the heat on this Attorney-General and this Premier to in fact replace the services that they have irresponsibly removed.

It isn't just those communities that have protested that reduction; it is the union and municipalities that represent the total provincial elected representatives of the municipal bodies throughout Manitoba that have protested. When will this government listen to other people who are elected to responsible positions? Or is it a policy that after the agreement ends in 1988, to remove RCMP policing from rural Manitoba totally and go to a provincial police force? Those are some of the questions that I think it's incumbent upon this Premier and this Attorney-General to answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we go to a portion of the Throne Speech where he indicates his strength, his so-called - well, just before I conclude the RCMP portion, I want the record to clearly state, and I'm not against the Native communities getting support from this government, but there's an Order-in-Council passed in December using the RCMP money, the allocation - there's a \$28,814,000 for RCMP funding - they used that appropriation. They took \$20,000 out of it to send the First Nation's Confederacy to the Aboriginal Conference in Ottawa that's being held in this next week or two. I'm not opposed to them getting money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I'm opposed to them using the RCMP protection money for the constituency of southwest Manitoba. If he's short of money, why does he have it for this particular purpose? It's a false and phony argument.

I want to go to the federal-provincial relations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because he talks about needing a strong central government, needing federal-provincial cooperation and relations. Well, yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he used for his own political advantage the MTX affair which none of us were very happy about, that we were extremely upset that it was awarded to Quebec over Manitoba. Yes, we were extremely upset about it.

My concern is this Premier of the province - and I represent an area where there are people who feel very strongly about how Eastern Canada has advantages over Western Canada - he has pushed those people to the verge of wanting to separate from Eastern Canada. Is that a responsible position for the Premier of the province to take, to push people, to hype them up, to where they say we would be better off as a Western Canadian country rather than a part of Canada? That is irresponsible action by the Premier of the province.

And now he says in his Throne Speech that we should have a strong central government and we should be cooperative. He's speaking out of both sides of his

mouth. It's very irresponsible. I can take him to people who are very, very upset and agitated that we haven't made a move in this country to separate. That's what this Premier can have laid on his head for his activities and actions, particularly - and I say this - particularly when there wasn't one line in the Throne Speech complimenting the Federal Government in their support for a major farm machinery manufacturing plant in Winnipeg known as Versatile. They weren't even invited; they weren't even part of the negotiations. Do you know why? Because they'd have screwed it up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we need is - yes, we need criticism of the severest kind - but we need positive criticism when it is due and when it is acceptable. That's what Canada is about; that's not what socialists are about, but that's what fair Canadians are about.

I would have thought there would have been one line in the Throne Speech, if he really meant what he said about this great central government and nationalism, that he would have put one line saying I would like to acknowledge the activities and work of the Federal Government supporting the Versatile Manufacturing Corporation maintaining those hundreds of jobs in Winnipeg, maintaining those hundreds of dealerships in Western Canada, and they are to be complimented for it. But he didn't have the intestinal fortitude to be a man about it. He didn't have the intestinal fortitude or the courtesy to come back and tip his hat. No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the kind of people who are running our province and they are a disgrace to the people of this country. He is a disgrace and his Ministers are a disgrace.

As well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it was a positive move that they put money into the Neepawa plant. I think it was a positive move that supported regional economic expansion and development in this country, and the province put money into it and they should have put money into it as well, and they should be proud of it. No, they are standing up, kicking the Federal Government because they helped the Neepawa plant and said it is why Canada Packers closed. That is so much hogwash and not hog kill it makes me sick. A phony, false argument. - (Interjection) - That is right. Two-faced.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as well when we talk about what he has in the Throne Speech and we talk about the activities of Crown corporations, I think that the people of Manitoba found little comfort in what they saw this First Minister doing with our Crown corporations.

Why wasn't there a line in the Throne Speech supporting his Minister who was responsible for the MTX and MTS affair, and his backbencher from Inkster who at their convention suggested they should be selling where possible Crown corporations? Why did he not acknowledge a policy which his own Cabinet colleague, his own backbencher, have agreed on and should be advanced?

Should there not have been one line in there, whether it be a legislative committee or some White Paper on the sale of Crown corporations, to actively dispose of them where it is in the best interests of the province, to take them off the backs of the taxpayers? Yes, it would have been an acknowledgement not only to the people of Manitoba that there was some corrective action being taken, but an acknowledgement to his own incompetent backbenchers and his Cabinet

Ministers that, yes, they maybe did have an idea that should be further evaluated.

What about McKenzie Seeds? I'll be talking about it as this Session goes on because I am seeing some of the most phony, phony perceptionism coming out of the profits of McKenzie Seeds. - (Interjection)- Profits, my eye. I can tell you there is a \$13 million investment in there, at 10 percent interest is \$1.3 million the province isn't getting anything back on. I can tell you the Member for Brandon East still isn't clear on some of his past activities with McKenzie Seeds and I will be disclosing some of those in the coming weeks as well. He thinks he may be sitting in a comfortable pew but he is not going to be too comfortable.

I want to address for a few minutes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the issue of the agricultural matters and surface rights. I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he has looked at the resolutions which he heard at the Surface Rights Association meeting in Virden recently. If he hasn't, I want to table the resolutions that were presented by the Surface Rights Association asking for fair and just treatment of surface rights people. Because there have been some terrible, terrible settlements made; there have been some bureaucratic decisions made that have not eased the cost and expense of having oil wells on your land.

The legislation was set up to assist and help farmers. Yes, it was to be a fair arbitrator between the oil companies and the farmers, but surface rights legislation is self-explanatory. It should be legislation to protect the farmers, but this is work in reverse. This has been a problem for farmers because they have hired some incompetent bureaucrats to run it. And they have been nothing but a pain and I would hope that he would look at these resolutions which I am prepared to table for the best interests of the development of his new amendments to the legislation.

We had the Minister of Mines and Energy stand up with a great petroleum support program. Well, it may have, it may have some positive effects. Hopefully it has. Nothing, nothing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that will have the impact that the taxation changes that were made during the Conservative years had, when it allowed Manitoba to compete with other provinces in the royalties in which we collected.

They have at least made a move, but I'll tell you that there are some selfish motives as well by the government and the Minister. Do you know why? There hasn't been an oil well drilled in the last few months; well, there might have been two or three. There might have been an oil well drilled, but do you know the main reason? The pipeline in which this government just had to invest in has a trickle of oil in it. They have to get their pipeline full again because it will be an embarrassment to them if they don't get more oil recovery in the Waskada field.

There are a lot of those wells that need an injection of recovery, waters to make them recover, and what is happening is that they are, I would hope - (Interjection)- that it is successful because the oil activity has helped and helped in a major way. The employment is being missed in the southwest corner.

But the Minister has the embarrassment of having to invest in a pipeline because of his philosophical approach and now he has got to start to get some oil to put into it so he isn't totally embarrassed.

I would like to know the flows of the pipeline over the past few months so that he can stick it in my ear which he would like to do. You know, that's really what I would like, but I think he is going to be the embarrassment.

But the other thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that it is a direct opportunity to encourage more revenue for him to get his hands on. Irresponsible spending is the reason the taxpayers are bent so badly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are bent badly not because we aren't generating incomes in this province - the oil wasn't generating money for the province - but they have irresponsibly spent it and they have got to look at both sides.

I would hope that the program which the Minister has announced is successful. I can tell you that the employment opportunities that would go with it are extremely important.

I think it's important to touch briefly on the hydro. Thank God, we have the lowest priced hydro in this particular time in our society in this country because it isn't going to last long. It isn't going to last long and I think the people who are using hydro better enjoy it. As was pointed out by my leader, that \$45 million in hydro sales is all that has been made off an over \$2 billion investment on behalf of the taxpayers of Manitoba.

I can tell you when you put 10 percent interest to those numbers, that 45 million comes a far cry from the \$200-and-some million interest that is going to have to be carried by the taxpayers. So I tell the people who are using hydro in Manitoba, enjoy it at the rate that it is today because it isn't going to last very long. It's going to run like their payroll taxes, their sales taxes, they are going to skyrocket. I can predict that and I can assure you as well that we don't need a second heritage fund to look after the excess money that any Crown corporation that this government has ever run. The people in Saudi Arabia and other areas will look after that for the taxpayers and any surpluses.

I want to talk a little bit on social justice and then I want to put some positive items forward. I'll have to deal somewhat with agriculture and I'll do it at the same time. But social justice, as far as I'm concerned, and you will see on the Order Paper the return or the request to support the House of Commons on capital punishment.

I believe that it is the wishes of the majority of Canadians to have that happen. I believe that it is the wishes of the people of Canada, the majority of Canadians, to have the return of capital punishment. That's what I am trying to do and I think it is a responsible action to take, not very nice, but it is too bad our society has pressed that back on the minds of the people of this country. But it is there and I can assure you that I stand foursquare with the majority of Canadians who support it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the agricultural front, I want to touch on the Keystone Agricultural Producers. They have been waiting for the Government of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party, to implement enabling legislation so that they can have their own checkoff for their own farm organization.

Not one word, not one word in the Throne Speech about checkoff for the Keystone Agricultural Producers. Not one word, and you know why, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Because this Minister of Agriculture and his cohorts took it upon themselves to destroy the cattle producers' checkoff program which was brought in by a Conservative Government. They are now faced with having to approve the same kind of legislation and don't have the courage to say they were wrong in what they've done and introduced the Keystone Agricultural Producers enabling legislation. Why not, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Because it's in the best interests of our agricultural community to proceed in a responsible way along that path, but they made a wrong decision. They took some political action that they thought was in their best interests and now they can't move in a direction which the majority of the Manitoba farmers want.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

He talks about MACC. MACC is the biggest problem some of our farmers are having today. Try and get a loan approval through MACC; try and get a reasonable negotiated lease with MACC today, where a farmer who is in serious difficulty can go in and say, look, I can't pay you \$12,000 for the lease of that piece of property. No, it's not happening. I have a constituent who is being held to the wall because he can't come up with the money. He'll be put off his farm by MACC because of their irresponsible action. That's exactly the truth.- (Interjection)- I am not defending the banks at all. I'll defend my constituents.

Anyway, let me conclude that MACC is a big problem and has to be brought before the legislative committee, which has been called for by my colleague from Virden, to tell us precisely what their policies are and how they are carrying it out.

Madam Speaker, I want to say to the Member for Swan River, to the Minister of Natural Resources, what kind of a Minister would go to Cabinet with a Cabinet document, fully supportive of elk ranching from his department, go and sell it to his Cabinet, get Cabinet approval and then come out and read an article in the paper and go to caucus and say, well, I'm scared of the policy which I believed so much in two days ago, but I don't believe in it anymore because it's going to hurt me? I can tell you, that's a government for you. That's a government of conviction, I can tell you; they'll take you a long way. That's where we're going, right down a long way, because that's how the whole darned government worked. They haven't got the conviction of their own beliefs.

I'm not going to get into issue whether elk ranching is right or wrong, but I am talking about an incompetent Minister who said one day he wanted it and the next day he yielded to something that scared him. He saw his shadow in the woods and away he ran. Well, I can tell you, he'll pay the price and I'll see that he does pay the price.- (Interjection)- No, I have a Native Affairs Critic role to play and I think that the Minister of Native Affairs has had a year now to prove that he is more than a token to this government. I believe that he has to bring forward some positive White Paper suggestions on how to improve the employment in Native communities, how to improve some of the social problems that they have.

I would ask him to call a legislative committee, that we could travel throughout not only the North but the south to get the impressions of Manitobans, Natives

and non-Natives, as to how we could improve and build together this province to remove the deficits off the backs of the people of this province and to make everybody's life just a little bit better. That's the challenge I have for the Minister of Native Affairs and I believe it's a positive suggestion and would hope he would follow up on it.

Madam Speaker, how much time do I have left in my . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has six minutes remaining.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Six minutes. Isn't it something? How time goes fast when you're having the government on the ropes.

The Minister of Agriculture yesterday and I am again somewhat - I'm just amazed that a Cabinet Minister would stand when we have such a major crisis in our agricultural community and go back and say the great things that he has done. We have been telling him since 1981 that there is a crisis in agriculture, that the farmers are going broke left and right. What has he been doing? He talks about we're going to have a Family Farm Protection Act. That'll solve all. We're going to reintroduce and strengthen the foreign investment legislation. We're going to bring in an Interest Rate Relief Program. Madam Speaker, he is still in his office as Minister of Agriculture and farmers are still going broke.

My colleague from Pembina says he would listen if he had one original idea. He has not brought forward one positive idea, but I'm going to bring some ideas to the Legislature and to the people of Manitoba that there are some people who are thinking, who are concerned about some long-term policies and programs for this Minister of Agriculture and for the country of Canada.

I believe that it is time that this Legislature and the people of the province and all of Canada started to pay attention of two objectives which I think are there. I refer to it as the Family Farm Preservation Program and Manitoba Land Conservation Program which can be melded together, which can accomplish the support of our much needed family farm unit.

Family farm units don't only produce food, Madam Speaker, they produce people. They produce people who I believe are some of the strongest and some of the best people of our country; not about saying other people from other areas of society aren't as good, but what I'm saying is they produce people. You, Madam Speaker, may appreciate some of the background that you had coming from rural Manitoba, as some of the other members.

So I believe that we have to preserve the family farm unit as the unit which produce food, but as well I think we have to redirect their energies and their abilities to things other than the production of the traditional grains and types of things that we are caught in, in the international trade war. I believe we can do that and we can do it in conjunction with a policy on conservation. There are many acres, thousands of acres in this province and in Canada that tried to maximize their production because of the tough economic pressures.

I believe that a program should be developed, an act should be developed, that we could set a fund up,

that contributions could be made by Provincial and Federal Governments. The billion dollars that went in last year to produce more wheat I believe could have been redirected to help farmers in another way. I think it could have been diversified into other things. I believe the Provincial Government, rather than continuing dumping millions and billions of dollars into money losing Crown corporations, should put a percentage of taxpayers' money into a family farm preservation and land conservation unit.

I say there are some successful farmers who have been given production rights under legislation would be prepared to pay a checkoff to put into. I say a voluntary checkoff to put into a fund to help their neighbours, because when barns burned down years ago, neighbours helped neighbours to rebuild those barns and I think we can do that.

I think there is a voluntary checkoff needed from the non-essential food purchases. I tip a waiter or a waitress who serves me a drink and doesn't spill a drink on me 10 or 15 percent, yet here's the poor farmer who's taking 40 percent reduction in his income, doesn't get a darn nickel of gratuity. I believe that a credit card should have a line on there saying, "Family Farm Preservation and Conservation" for persons to voluntarily contribute.

I believe there is nothing wrong with a direct tax on society that is earmarked to go into a special fund which is not administered particularly by government, because if you talk land bank as you talk land lease, it has connotations of state takeover and that doesn't wash with the farm community. It can be played cheaply, politically. We've done it, you've done it, but I believe there are some sincere people out there who want to help.

I say a board of trustees to administer this program should be established and I make recommendations: federal-provincial appointees from successful farm operations and conservation districts. I say the Dean of Agriculture could be one, the president of the Union of Municipalities, the presidents of United Grain Growers, the president of the Women's Institute; those leaders. I don't care, I think we have to cover all bases to make sure it's administered properly, not by bureaucrats but by people who are farm sensitive and need to see some long-term policies.

I see the operations of this policy and this program is carried out where if a family farm is in serious trouble - or not so serious - maybe they just feel the pressures of lower grain prices and want to divert their attentions and their interests in other ways that they're able to. It's not unlike the United States Land Bank Program, where they say I have 1,000 acres or 500 acres that I want to commit to conservation. I don't want it to produce wheat because all I'm going to do if I produce wheat is owe my banker another \$200,000 in five years. I want that farmer to sit on that land, I want him to be a part of that community, I want him to manage that land, and I want him to not produce wheat. I want him to have \$25, or \$30, or \$40 an acre a year so that he can get paid a reasonable return - or she can get paid a reasonable return - for living and managing that project.

I believe that conservationists should support it. The environmentalists, why would they be against it? And, yes, those farmers out there who are still going to be

producing wheat will support it because it will make their products worth more. It will make their products worth more. And I think, Madam Speaker, that we, and my colleague from Virden recommended the Agriculture Committee be called, that they be given a special mandate to look at some long-term objectives. Yes, we've got to deal with the short term, and society has to put some money into the short-term relief of those farmers who are facing such high costs and low returns; and yes, we need a review, we need an investigation into the costs of chemicals and fertilizers. We don't need to fight between provincial and federal, it has to be done, so take the lead and do it at the provincial level.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for your endurance and if I had leave I could have finished my speech, but I thank . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed) Indefinite leave?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, I am about to conclude my remarks and I do thank members of this Assembly to provide me with the leave which will allow me to conclude my remarks, and it will be very short, but it is a very serious problem, as I have said, it's a national crisis that is facing us.

The farm community do not want to see or to hear that there aren't any options, and that we want to have to continue to go before debt review panels, for what purpose? To tell us that, yes, we'll write off some of the debt this year, and you go back and do the same thing over and over again for the next two or three years and come back again to a debt review panel and we'll do the same thing over again.

What society, what we have to do, what the Legislatures and the House of Commons, I believe, have to do is work jointly with the clear objective - it's not going to solve everyone's problems - but the clear objective of redirecting some of the energies and the abilities of our family farm producers into alternative production methods and types of product, because we are told that Russia - and we know that Mr. Gorbachev was the former Minister of Agriculture, and that he is going to implement programs that - yes, are going to produce more food. They are going to produce more food. The communisms will never be self-sufficient, but they are going to produce more.

We know that China, we know that India are now exporters of grain, of wheat, traditional markets for the farmers of Western Canada. United States and European Economic Community are in a trade war and neither one of them in the near future are going to back down. The United States have the power of the United States Treasury behind them; that's who those farmers have behind them. The European Economic Community have the taxpayers of the European Economic Community on the direct check-off on every item they purchase and they went hungry during the war and they're not going to go hungry again. There are going to be massive productions of foods in these areas.

I say, Madam Speaker, we have to take serious action now to direct our farm people and to conserve our

land and to preserve our family farmers, and it can be done either by legislative action in this Assembly or by some other form at the House of Commons level.

I thank the members for allowing me to conclude my remarks. It is the future of the people of the rural areas of Canada, and the future of the people of the cities of this country who depend on farmers to feed them that's at stake, not any political future of any individual.

Thank you.

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

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, it is for me an honour to join in this debate on the Throne Speech. I want to begin by offering my congratulations to the Lieutenant-Governor on his new appointment. Congratulations to all of the members of this House and I hope that we will, during this Session, Madam Speaker, be able to achieve many good things for the people of Manitoba.

I enjoyed listening to the previous speaker who has the ability to speak rather easily and I know he could have gone on for a lot longer had we allowed him. But I did enjoy his remarks and found that he had indeed some interesting things to say about one of the very critical areas that concerns us all, and that is indeed the field of agriculture. I'm sure some of my colleagues will want to make remarks in this debate on that particular issue as well.

As for myself, Madam Speaker, the Throne Speech has talked about things that have to do with economic benefits for the people of Manitoba and the quality of life. I will choose to speak on the latter, especially two areas that relate to my department, and I will do firstly in French and then the second half of my remarks will be in English.

Madame la présidente, durant les dernières années, le public manitobain en est arrivé à comprendre que les croyances traditionnelles au sujet de l'environnement ne sont plus vraies. Nous avons l'habitude de croire que notre isolement par rapport aux sources de pollution nous garantissait un environnement sain. Ce n'est plus vrai. Le désastre de Chernobyl a distribué une contamination radio-active sur l'entièreté de l'hémisphère Nord. De nombreux lacs et forêts de l'Ontario et du Québec sont ravagés par les pluies acides, résultant naturellement en partie de sources polluantes situées à des centaines de milles aux États-Unis.

Dans le passé, nous croyions que les régions seulement modérément industrialisées pouvaient échapper aux dangers de pollution. Ce n'est plus vrai.

Au Manitoba, nous avons déjà eu dans le passé à combattre certains déversements importants de produits chimiques. À certains endroits nous avons décelé déjà de hauts niveaux de mercure dans les poissons. Donc, nous ne sommes pas à l'épreuve ou à l'abri de la pollution.

Nous sommes aussi toujours préoccupés de la qualité à long terme de notre source d'approvisionnement d'eau pour la Ville de Winnipeg, de Selkirk et bien

d'autres communautés de la province. Nous avons aussi dans le passé l'habitude de croire que le développement économique et la protection de l'environnement étaient incompatibles. Ce n'est pas vrai, et bien au contraire. Il doit exister un lien entre ces deux, c'est à dire l'économie et l'environnement, car c'est notre prospérité future qui en dépend.

Un emploi sur dix au Manitoba est relié au secteur forestier. Et l'industrie touristique génère des milliards de dollars en revenu. L'avenir long terme de notre économie dépend d'un environnement sain. Notre agriculture en dépend aussi.

Nos connaissances environnementales récentes nous révèlent un message clair. C'est à dire, même si nous sommes relativement exempt des plus graves problèmes environnementaux que connaissent certaines autres juridictions, nous ne pouvons nous permettre le luxe d'attendre que les problèmes apparaissent. Nous devons agir maintenant pour prévenir les problèmes.

Plusieurs actions concrètes figurent à notre agenda - et sont parmi nos priorités.

Madame la présidente, il est important que les membres de la chambre soient bien informés des bases solides que nous avons posées durant les cinq dernières années. Ces bases nous permettrons de franchir des étapes importantes dans les années à venir.

L'étape la plus fondamentale parmi toutes sera l'introduction d'une nouvelle loi sur l'environnement. La loi actuelle, en vigueur depuis près de vingt ans, servait bien sûr la plupart des communautés et industries de la province de façon adéquate lorsqu'elle était introduite il y a déjà près de vingt ans. Et à l'époque, la province ne possédait même pas les mesures rudimentaires pour contrôler la pollution.

Depuis, nous avons sensiblement rehaussé nos capacités pour faire face aux accidents environnementaux. Nous avons augmenté les pénalités et nous avons accumulé les données qui serviront au maintien d'un environnement sain. Et à travers les années, certains amendements ont été apportés à la loi à titre d'amélioration. Cependant, les principes et les procédures de base sont les mêmes, ou à peu près, depuis 1958.

Dans l'interval, énormément de chose ont changé et, en particulier, nos connaissances et nos valeurs environnementales. Les pressions sur l'environnement ont changé. Ces pressions sont à la fois plus nombreuses et plus complexes et certaines d'entre elles ont leur origine à l'extérieur de notre province.

Le dossier des connaissances environnementales s'est beaucoup amélioré. Aujourd'hui, il ne peut y avoir de doute. L'environnement ne doit plus servir d'égout pour les déchets chimiques et autres contaminants toxiques. Nous savons que certaines de nos actions peuvent avoir un effet négatif sur l'environnement même si elles ne causent aucun contaminant. Nous savons que les problèmes environnementaux sont complexes et en conséquence il sont plus faciles et moins coûteux, à long terme, à prévenir qu'à guérir. Si exemple il nous en faut, nous n'avons qu'à nous référer, par exemple,

à ce que nous savons maintenant du dépotoir de Hooker ou Occidental sur la rivière Niagara ou les incidents qui se sont produits dans les Grands Lacs pour réaliser qu'il en coûtera des centaines de millions de dollars pour corriger les problèmes que connaissent ces régions. Alors, encore là je dis il vaut mieux prévenir que guérir.

De plus, les attentes environnementales de la société ont changé. Les gens ne sont plus prêts à accepter quelques dollars de plus dans leur poche contre la pollution de l'air et des cours d'eau. Au contraire, les gens veulent que le développement économique soit créé mais plus au dépens de la dégradation de l'environnement.

Madame la présidente, durant cette session nous allons introduire une nouvelle loi pour la protection de l'environnement, comme je le disais. Ce projet de loi revêt plusieurs aspects.

Tout d'abord cette loi élargit l'ampleur de la protection de l'environnement pour y inclure toutes les incidences environnementales résultant d'émissions de polluant, ou tout autre impacte résultant d'un projet quelconque.

Elle renforce aussi cette loi la portée réglementaire tout en apportant des incitatifs importants en vue d'une meilleure planification avant qu'un projet de développement soit entamé.

Elle introduit un nouveau mécanisme qui aura pour fonction d'aviser le ministre et permettra une meilleure participation du public.

Elle est aussi flexible et permettra l'essai de nouvelles approches environnementales telle la médiation.

Évidemment cette loi, sous tous ses aspects ne plaira pas à tous - même si nous avons largement consulté avec le public manitobain. Le projet de loi qui sera introduit, plus tard dans la présente session, reflétera un grand nombre des préoccupations soulevées durant la période de consultation. Il y aura bien sur ceux qui croiront que cette loi ne va pas assez loin, qu'elle n'est pas assez exigeante. D'autres croiront que cette loi est trop sévère et enfin d'autres seront en désaccord avec certaines clauses de la loi. Chose certaine, Madame la présidente, je peux affirmer sans hésitation qu'à travers la période de consultation et dans les nombreux brefs que nous avons reçus, nous avons obtenu un appui sans réserve sur les principes fondamentaux de la loi.

La question des déchets nucléaire figure aussi de façon importante à notre agenda pour la présente session. Cette question était déjà critique lorsque le Chef de l'opposition était ministre de l'environnement. Et j'ai bien l'impression que ce sera encore une question cruciale lorsque nous tous ici aurons quitté la scène de la politique provinciale.

Nous sommes prêts à mettre en place toutes les mesures possibles afin d'assurer aux générations futures le plus de protection possible et afin d'éviter qu'on choisisse au Manitoba ou près de nos frontières un site pour l'enfouissement des déchets nucléaires. Notre politique durant les cinq dernières années a été conséquente et le demeurera.

Nous continuerons à encourager la recherche pour disposer des déchets nucléaires - recherche d'ailleurs, Madame la présidente, qui se fait déjà au Manitoba. Cependant, nous voulons employer tous les moyens possibles pour faire en sorte un site d'enfouissement ne soit ni situé au Manitoba ni dans un bassin qui draine vers le Manitoba.

Vous vous souviendrez de l'opposition vigoureuse que nous avons monté de concert avec les gens du Minnesota contre les sites potentiels envisagés dans la vallée de la rivière Rouge du côté des États-Unis.

Nous croyons qu'il est maintenant nécessaire d'apporter à la considération de la Législature un projet de loi qui affichera clairement la position du Manitoba vis-à-vis l'enfouissement des déchets nucléaires - de sorte à ce qu'on interprète dorénavant plus faussement nos intentions à cet égard. Ce projet de loi interdira l'établissement de sites d'enfouissement de déchets nucléaires au Manitoba. Nous générons très peu de déchets nucléaires, nous n'en retirons pas les bénéfices énergétiques et ne voulons pas être le dépotoir des déchets nucléaires provenant de l'extérieur.

Nous produisons autres types de matières dangereuses dont nous sommes prêts à prendre la responsabilité. En 1981, nous avons initié un programme à trois volets qui aurait pour aboutissement l'établissement d'un système visant le traitement de nos déchets dangereux.

Nous poursuivons assidûment chaque étape en vue de l'aboutissement de ce programme. Déjà nous avons en place les moyens nécessaires pour implanter et réglementer ce système.

La Loi sur le transport et la manutention des matières dangereuses fut adoptée en 1984. Cette loi vise à protéger le public et l'environnement contre les effets nuisibles d'une multitude de matières dangereuses transportées quotidiennement sur nos rues, nos routes et nos voies ferrées.

À la session dernière, nous avons adopté la Loi sur la Corporation manitobaine de gestion des déchets dangereux. Cette année, nous adopterons certains règlements sous cette loi et aurons bientôt en place, l'exécutif de la Corporation. De plus, cette année nous aurons à faire le choix de technologie et le choix d'un site pour la gestion des matières dangereuses du Manitoba.

À travers toute la stratégie gouvernementale se retrouve un lien fondamental - celui entre l'économie et l'environnement. Cette relation est d'importance capitale car, comme je le disais tout à l'heure, c'est notre avenir qui en dépend et c'est aussi l'avenir des générations futures. Les gains monétaires à courte échéance et au détriment de l'environnement ne doivent plus être appelés "développement". Le mot développement suggère le progrès. Le gaspillage de notre capital environnemental irremplaçable n'est pas le progrès - et plus personne n'oserait appeler ce genre d'activité du nom de "progrès".

J'ai l'honneur, Madame la présidente, de présider le travail sur l'environnement et l'économie auquel comité participent les gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux,



le secteur privé, et les groupes environnementaux. J'espère que notre travail aboutira à un consensus national et multilatéral sur des principes de développement fondé sur une économie et un environnement sain. En tant que gouvernement, nous avons déjà adopté une série de principes environnementaux qui guideront dorénavant nos décisions.

Il n'est pas question d'attirer de nouvelles industries en relaxant les contrôles sur la pollution. Cette notion est de plus en plus inacceptable à l'industrie et l'exportation de la pollution est aussi inacceptable.

Les problèmes causés par les pluies acides que connaissent l'Ontario et le Québec proviennent en bonne partie de sources situées aux États-Unis. Et même si le Canada devait réduire ses émissions d'anhydride sulfureux, que j'appellerai SO<sub>2</sub> à zéro, sans des réductions considérable du côté américain, alors l'est du pays demeure dans une situation problématique. Pourrions-nous bientôt, entre voisins, résoudre ce problème de pollution trans-frontière? Je l'espère. Jusqu'à maintenant, les négociations n'ont pas porté fruit.

Même si au Manitoba les pluies acides ne causent pas de problème sérieux, nous ne pouvons pas être indifférents. L'Ontario connaît des problèmes aujourd'hui parce qu'il est situé en aval des sources importantes de SO<sub>2</sub>. Dans l'avenir c'est peut-être nous ici au Manitoba qui seront en aval de sources de polluants. Il se peut aussi que les symptômes problématiques mettent quelques années avant de faire surface et qu'il soit trop tard pour corriger la situation. Alors il vaut mieux être prudent et prévenir qu'avoir plus tard à guérir. La dégradation de l'environnement n'importe où dans notre pays est un problème qui doit nous préoccuper tous.

À cet effet, le gouvernement manitobain a adopté la position que nous devons faire tout notre possible pour contribuer à résoudre le problème des pluies acides. Voilà pourquoi nous avons choisi de participer à la recherche, à la surveillance et aussi nous sommes compromis à réduire les émissions de SO<sub>2</sub> dans la province de 738 kilotonnes à 550 kilotonnes par année avant 1994. Nous voulons ainsi contribuer à faciliter les négociations en vue de réductions semblables du côté américain. Mais c'est aussi par mesure de prudence en vue de la protection de notre propre territoire.

Madame la présidente, cette année devrait nous permettre de finaliser les démarches nécessaires, en réponse au député de Emerson qui me demandait cette question il y a un instant, je dis donc cette année devrait nous permettre de finaliser les démarches nécessaires devant nous permettre d'atteindre notre but du côté des émissions de SO<sub>2</sub>. Bientôt la Commission de l'environnement tiendra des audiences publiques sur un nouveau projet de règlements à cet égard.

Je sais que les membres de l'Opposition vont surveiller attentivement nos actions, et offriront des critiques, des critiques que j'espère seront constructives, à certains moments. Personnellement, même si les défis sont de taille, je crois qu'une année

des plus intéressantes se présente à nous et je suis confiant que nous serons à la hauteur de la tâche.

Madame la présidente, je voudrais maintenant considérer un autre domaine non moins important, c'est à dire celui de la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail.

Le discours du Thrône énonçait notre engagement envers:

- une économie saine,
- la qualité de la vie et
- un environnement sain.

Le maintien de la santé et la sécurité d'un demi million d'hommes et de femmes qui constituent la main d'œuvre du Manitoba est crucial à l'atteinte de ces buts.

Lorsqu'on considère les pertes qu'ils causent, les maladies occupationnelles et les accidents au travail ne reçoivent pas la considération ou l'attention qu'ils méritent.

Encore le député d'Emerson parle d'un autre sujet que je voudrais absolument toucher, c'est à dire celui de la Commission des accidents au travail si le temps me le permet à la fin de mes remarques. L'an dernier, le terrorisme mondial a causé 2,200 pertes de vie et chaque jour les médias en font largement état. Par contre, on entend rarement parler des pertes de vie causées par les maladies occupationnelles ou les accidents au travail, alors qu'on estime les décès à 180,000 et les accidents à 110 millions annuellement.

Au Manitoba en 1986, plus de 50,000 travailleurs ont réclamé auprès de la Commission des accidents au travail; ce chiffre représente un sur dix travailleurs. C'est une situation tout à fait inacceptable.

Ces accidents en plus de représenter douleurs et souffrances à des travailleurs et leurs familles, portent aussi atteinte à la qualité de la vie des Manitobains - même s'ils ne font pas les grands titres dans les nouvelles.

C'est en 1977, sous le gouvernement Schreyer, que la Loi sur la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail était adoptée au Manitoba. C'était un premier pas important en vue de miser les efforts sur les systèmes plutôt que sur les symptômes qui causent les maladies et les accidents occupationnels.

Durant cette première décennie, le secteur de la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail a mis sur pied la base d'un système qui a pour but la réduction et l'élimination des risques reliés à la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail. Je crois que nous sommes sur la bonne voie.

Il y a maintenant au Manitoba plus de 1,000 comités conjoints sur la sécurité et l'hygiène au travail.

Plusieurs centaines de milliers d'heures ont été consacrées à éduquer les travailleurs dans le domaine de la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail. Je suis confiant que ces efforts porteront bientôt fruit.

**Translation will appear in subsequent issue.**

Madam Speaker, tripartite approaches to problem-solving have matured and government's knowledge

about standing problems has improved, it is time to set priorities, and to ensure that they are accomplished through carefully planned implementation strategies.

Today I would also like to share with you an outline of those initiatives which I believe will allow us to begin a new chapter as we enter the second decade of The Workplace Safety and Health Act. These initiatives will first provide Manitoba workers and employers with a strong right to know, to prevent work-related accidents and illnesses; secondly, develop management strategies that will focus on the problems of specific economic sectors; thirdly, provide committees with a means for identifying and controlling work-related health and safety hazards, in order to prevent work-related illness and injury; four, review enforcement and prosecution policies to ensure that they are tough and precise when this is required; five, ensure that technical and occupational health services are available to Manitoba employers and workers; and finally, six, address the special needs of the small workplaces.

The coming months will see the establishment in Manitoba of a system for preventing work-related illnesses, a system for identifying and controlling the silent killers that exist in our workplaces. This system will be based upon the Workplace Health Regulation referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

The development of tripartite mechanisms, notably through The Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Committee, has created a healthy environment for working cooperatively to solve specific problems. While we reach for the stars in reducing work-related accidents and injuries, we must have our feet firmly on the ground and build on the years of common experience and knowledge about common problems in specific industries.

Recently I had the pleasure of attending a successful tripartite mining conference in Thompson, and was able to report that the major revisions of the mine, health and safety regulation had finally been completed and adopted. Cooperative approaches such as that, found in the mining sector, will be extended to other industries in Manitoba.

Prevention must be put on the agenda of health and safety committees and the implementation of the workplace health regulation will provide an opportunity for this approach. The information that is required for this regulation will be summarized in a prevention plan prepared for each workplace. This will serve as a summary and guide for eliminating hazardous conditions.

The preparation of prevention plans will provide joint committees with an agenda that points to the future. It will allow workplaces to proceed, not only in reaction to accidents, but to work precisely towards eliminating these accidents, proceeding again from the angle of prevention.

To strengthen the priority setting process, my department will be developing information systems to address the problem of occupational disease data collection. While we are making strides in setting up systems to strengthen prevention through improved application of knowledge, we must not lose sight of the dictum that says, "You often get what you inspect, not what you expect."

Accordingly, my department will be reviewing its enforcement and prosecution policies to ensure the

effectiveness of these measures in deterring non-compliance with occupational health and safety legislation and standards.

Over the past several years there has been an increase in the number of prosecutions that have been conducted, from a total of four in the first six years of The Workplace Safety and Health Act, to a total of 11 in 1986.

Finally, the special problems of small workplaces will be addressed. Approximately 98 percent of Manitoba workplaces have less than one hundred workers. Systems that make sense for the large corporation, with its sophisticated occupational health and safety program, do not necessarily make sense in a five-person body shop. We must ensure that the steps that are required to protect the health and safety of workers takes this in full account.

My department is exploring programs to make compliance as straightforward as possible for small business. Procedures will be incorporated to avoid unnecessary paper burden and to ensure that assistance is available so that each shop will not have to reinvent the wheel.

This then is a skeleton of the structure we are building. The foundation has been constructed over the past decade. There are many problems that have emerged and will continue to emerge, such as smoking in the workplace and work-related stress, tight building syndromes, etc. There will, unfortunately, still be circumstances that will alert us to problems that even the best planning cannot anticipate in a rapidly changing world. Our approach, as I stated earlier, must be to address systems and not merely symptoms. Preventing work-related illness and injury, in my mind, Madam Speaker, is a non-partisan affair. It is a thrust that unites employers and employees, or at least it should. It is a thrust around which all members of this House can unite and, I hope, will unite as well.

One payoff will lie in reducing the health care and social costs that threaten all of our programs by eliminating important sources of disability. The real payoff, however, will be an improved quality of life that will also make Manitoba an attractive environment for doing business today and tomorrow.

The final point that I would like to share is that this government remains committed to taking an integrated approach to managing our workplace and natural environments. We do not intend to promote the establishment of systems that control hazardous waste disposal through our province at the expense of concentrating dangerous exposures for workers within these facilities.

We do not intend to promote the development of ventilation systems, Madam Speaker, in workplaces to protect workers' health, only to see pollutants transferred into the general environment. My department has, since its establishment, pursued ways of ensuring that problems do not get transferred from one compartment to the next. This is unique in North America and something in which all Manitobans can take pride.

Madam Speaker, could I ask for a little bit of order?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. If honourable members would like to have private conversations, I'm sure they can find some other place to have them.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** I just have a few seconds more to go, Madam Speaker, to conclude my remarks.

Working within an integrated unit that addresses the problems of natural and working environments, we in Manitoba are better equipped to handle the problems of the cradle-to-grave management of hazardous substances and avoid the problems of the Love Canals and the Bhopal type of incidents. This government remains committed to accomplishing this goal in the only way that is possible, through the active participation of all Manitobans.

Manitobans are rightly proud of equality of life and an environmental quality that is rivalled in very few places, if any. This government will ensure that this legacy will be enjoyed by future generations.

How much time have I got, Madam Speaker?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has about eight minutes remaining.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** That gives me time to address some of the remarks that were raised from the other side.

Basically - and I hear this raised all the time by members of the Opposition - make it easier for small businesses and, indeed, we are trying to. But I have given figures that speak loudly in terms of what has been happening in the workplaces of Manitoba. Members have to realize that when they say the compensation costs are too high, I have to remind them of what I've said many times before. We, as a government, are not responsible for the costs of these accidents and illnesses that have been appearing in the workplaces, and have been increasing over the years, in spite of all our efforts.

It will, indeed, require a commitment on the part of all - government, workplaces and workers to bring down those costs, the direct costs which we know in terms of compensation. There are many additional costs, the indirect costs, in terms of damage to equipment, in terms of training time costs, in terms of trauma, in terms of lost morale in the workplace, which have to be added on to those direct costs. Therefore, the costs to the whole of the economy are much greater than the ones the members are used to referring to; but if we're talking about compensation costs, Madam Speaker, there is no reason why, in Manitoba, there should not be compensation services commensurate or equal to those provided in other jurisdictions. Manitoba workers are entitled to equal compensation services.

Madam Speaker, these costs are bound to rise because they are closely tied to the average pay of workers. They have to reflect the mounting costs of chiropractic and medical care. They have to reflect the mounting costs of indexing of pensions. They have to reflect the time loss. They have to reflect the costs of rehabilitation, many of these things which were not provided before, Madam Speaker. And I can argue that with any one of the Opposition with facts and figures, which should have been, but were not provided to injured workers of Manitoba prior to 1981. If there are additional costs to provide these services, there should be. It's unfortunate that the costs or the rates were kept artificially low . . .

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** There was a surplus . . .

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Because the costs were kept artificially low. You were not paying - I hear the Member for Emerson saying, "There was a surplus." A surplus which is only there because you were not paying for services that should have been paid. So as soon as you start paying for that, Madam Speaker, the surplus went, like that. No, it's not a value judgment. The Member for Morris says it's a value judgment. It's not a value judgment. The law says that these services should be paid for.

Contrary to what the members say that you should only raise the rates enough or you should pay out only in services whatever money you have coming in, based on whatever rate you decide it should be, that's not what the law says. The law says that you should calculate what the costs are going to be and establish rates in accordance with that. - (Interjection)- The bank, Madam Speaker, is not broken. The fact is employers in Manitoba are not paying unduly high rates. They're paying rates that are third lowest in the country. They have paid rates, Madam Speaker, that were lowest in the country for 10 years and those were the artificially low rates.

In the Seventies, Madam Speaker, the rates were going down. I have to say that between now, 1986 and 1974, the rates have gone up 60 percent. The cost-of-living index has gone up 120 percent, so they haven't gone up unduly, Madam Speaker. They haven't gone up as much as they have in other jurisdictions. When the members are saying, yes but they've gone up 20 percent this year, they've gone up 20 percent last year, they've gone up 20 percent the year before that, but everybody knew that it was a question of going up, 72 percent in one year or going up at a lower rate level for a period of years. We discussed that with the employers, Madam Speaker, and that is the way they wanted it to be applied, over a period of years and that's the way we have done it.

So it is all fine and I can accept that the employer is not going to say he's happy when he has to pay higher rates, but by the same token - (Interjection)- that is not true, Madam Speaker. The Member for Portage is saying it's the second deterrent for business. If that were true, Madam Speaker, then that would be reflected on growth of business in Manitoba. As I've said, Madam Speaker, Manitoba's rates are the third lowest in the country, the third lowest in the country. So you can't have it all ways. Business will say that at the time that the rates are raised, Madam Speaker, but when I meet with them, which I have when I was in charge of compensation, they understand and they agree that they would prefer - and so would I prefer the rates to stay where they are, but if we're going to provide a fair and equitable service to injured workers, then there is no reason why we have to do worse than other jurisdictions. We have to do the best we can and certainly, we have to be fair and equitable.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's fire again, to once again rise and speak

on the Throne Speech. Madam Speaker, this is my sixth opportunity of doing so and may I wish you and indeed all members of the House well over the Second Session of the Thirty-Third Legislature.

Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by spending just a few moments on some of the grim reality that does exist within my constituency, the rural riding just bounding the city to the southwest.

Although we have been favoured over the last couple of years with some very good crops, let me tell you at this time there is a siege mentality coming into existence. There is a hunkering down taking place and it's not one that is preparing for an onslaught of a weekend storm. It's one that's preparing for an economic siege of the worst magnitude that probably will have been seen in the history of this nation.

Madam Speaker, to drive that point home, let me indicate to you, although I haven't done the calculations, that in terms of 1933 grain prices, what we are probably going to realize in equivalent purchasing power over the next crop year will represent something in the area of 15 to 20 cents a bushel. That's the grim reality which faces rural Manitoba; indeed rural Canada, particularly rural Western Canada today and over the next few years. Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, we can say that the farm community sees what is coming and major portions of it are, I think, prepared to do battle with the grain economy over that period of time.

Madam Speaker, it's good to return. I've been away for five-and-a-half months; indeed as have all members of this House and yet something struck me - as I'm sure struck other members of this House after they had been in attendance for two days - it felt like I hadn't been away for more than a week-and-a-half and some would say for a shorter period of time. The arguments are the same. Some of the asides are the same and of course that's good. It's great to have people that don't change too drastically within a given year because indeed if people changed so suddenly, I think we would begin to wonder what strange disease they had maybe contacted over the last few months.

Madam Speaker, however, over those five-and-a-half months, I've watched with interest over many of the political developments that took place. I couldn't help but watch the Provincial Government -(Interjection)- well the members say the Federal Government, I'll mention something about that to "Halfway Bridge Plohmman," I'm sorry, the Minister of Transportation. I couldn't help but notice, not only sitting in the committee that was dealing with affairs of MTX, but also as somebody that was at home, of course, watching the newscasts, how, in my view, the government was somewhat successful, in deftly and adroitly managing to sort of extricate their Cabinet from the responsibility that, in my view at least, should have been coming toward that Cabinet for the very serious financial losses associated within MTX.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

How it was that the Premier was able to move the former Minister out of that role and replace him with the Minister of Urban Affairs and prevent, in some significant fashion, those of us on the committee from really directing specific questions to Ministers as to their culpability in this whole area, I thought the

government did sort of a masterful job in being able, at least at that time frame, to remove, deflect, the criticism that may be coming down to members or specific people within their Cabinet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would think members opposite would want me to comment on the CF-18 incident, and I have no difficulty doing so. I can tell you, as a Manitoban, I was abhorred and upset with that decision when it was rendered upon the people of Canada and, specifically, upon the people of Manitoba. In my own mind, quite frankly, I haven't found any way that I can justify it. I know I run into differences of opinion with people within my political party over that, but quite frankly, I cannot in any way justify the CF-18 incident.

Yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP reaction to that really struck me as purely political motivation from their part. You know, I can understand members, particularly, of the economic portfolios of the Cabinet, I can understand how they could be outraged; but to see the Premier of the province tripping up the steps in Ottawa and feigning indignation as to how mad he was with Mulroney over this case - I honestly say I could see some of the other Ministers, particularly the former Minister of Finance, I could read it on his lips and I could see the seething in his eyes - but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier feigning this absolute abhorrence, total disgust and indignation with which that decision was made really was no credit to the attempted united outcry that should have been emanating from this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I couldn't help but notice the government when the Second Quarter Report financial standing was released how the Minister of Finance attempted to justify the fact that there was a \$100 million increase in deficit and how it was because, well, we had this problem, we had that problem; and yet we're finding today, we question today, we're sitting here in anticipation of the Third Quarterly Report wondering yet if the forecasted deficit indeed will be beyond \$600 million, bearing in mind that there are Special Warrants being passed.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I watched from some distance as the Second Quarterly Report was announced. Well, I couldn't help . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Member for Morris has the floor. Can we have some order and stability in the House.

The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I couldn't help but notice the members, their response, when one Michael Decter laid before the province the report that he had done on expenditures and tax reform.- (Interjection)- Well, the Minister asks what I thought of it. I'll be addressing it on many occasions over the proceeding months, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But I'll say this on the surface: to me it was a comprehensive report and one that is worthy of reading, and one that I think will serve all people who are interested in financial matters in this province. It will give them some type of guideline for a better understanding. So I give it its dues in that respect. Some of the conclusions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not support. But, nevertheless, it's a useful document for bringing forward discussion at a certain level.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I found it interesting that that document, though, which was in some respects very, very critical of the financial management capabilities of this government and the systems that they have in place, and yet I did not detect any major commentary by any Minister, certainly the Minister of Finance, as to the government's weaknesses within financial areas. I'll be more specific a little later on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, within that area.

I noticed the Cabinet changes. Of course, some considered them minor. Yet one couldn't help detect how it was and how it is that the Premier has decided to give so much more responsibility to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I really wonder how the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Education felt, and I'll even throw in the Minister of Transportation, how they reacted to this deft move, this clever move by the Premier to give more responsibility and, of course, more focus to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I'm wondering what they're saying to their colleagues or to their constituents and their people who are close to them within their constituencies.

**A MEMBER:** How about the patient Member for Thompson?

**MR. C. MANNES:** So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm wondering if some patience is wearing a little thin.

Of course, I watched carefully, and I've watched carefully over the last couple of months, when all these musings by the Premier and by the Minister of Finance trying to forewarn Manitobans that there are major increases in taxation forthcoming. March 16, Sir, we are told will be the day when Manitobans will realize how serious the fiscal affairs of this province have been mismanaged over the last five years. All Manitobans will realize at that date that finally there is no tomorrow. The reality of what we're in and what we have been in for the last two or three years cannot be pushed back yet another year. Yet, in his musings, the Premier says, well, we've decided we're not going to really look at the expenditure side of government. People want expenditures within a whole host of government areas and we, therefore, will look at the revenue side. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it interesting how it is that the Premier has prepared us all for major increases in taxation.

Of course, I've also watched closely, not only over the last week but indeed over the last two months, the reaction to agricultural realities. It's without doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the farm community of this province feels that this government has let them down badly in a whole host of areas; that this government, in spite of their attempts in dealing with farm foreclosures by bringing in Bill No. 4 which, of course, as you know, we fought to the bitter end; in spite of that very meagre attempt to address the major concerns within agriculture, most rural Manitobans and farm Manitobans realize that this government has no understanding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can tell you nothing offends me more than when the Minister of Agriculture rises in his place and says finally they understand, pointing at us. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know better. I know you know better; you've been in this House the same

length of time that I have. Every rural member, and there are so many on this side that have risen to speak on agricultural issues time and time again, have addressed the real problems of agriculture. Yet the Minister of Agriculture stands in his place and criticizes us for not having an understanding and not bringing that understanding forward if we do to all Manitobans as to the seriousness of the agricultural industry in this province today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not disappointed with the Throne Speech. Quite frankly, I was amused. This Throne Speech quickly stated what a wonderful job the Provincial Government was doing and has done over a period of time. Of course, it was embellished with the word "caring"; and how many times have we seen the word "caring" and adjectives like it in the last four or five years? It stressed how well our economy is doing relative to other provinces, and so on and so forth. But it didn't dwell on that for a terribly long time this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because there was a higher agenda item, and that was to very quickly, before everybody fell asleep within this Chamber - and indeed, people are falling asleep very quickly - it very quickly turned its direction to the Federal Government. All of a sudden, that became the underlying theme.

So within Pages 2-4, the government, in a self-serving manner, had congratulated itself for the things they felt they had done to allow Manitoba to say that, in a comparative sense, in a relative sense, we were doing well and, yet, within Page 3, all of a sudden we started the political agenda and began to attack Ottawa. Of course, that was the underlying theme throughout the rest of the speech.

Let me say to the comments from across the way, I can be critical on a whole host of issues and decisions that have been taken by the Federal Government, and I think in the past I have been; but within the area of fiscal management, the only salvation that this nation and this province has today is the Federal Government that's in place in Ottawa.

If the members opposite don't realize that, then I want them to stand in their place when they speak on the Throne Speech and tell me that Michael Wilson and, indeed, the Federal Government in Ottawa is doing the wrong thing. I want them to stand and say that there's a better, easier way and I want them to document them. Just like they challenge us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to tell us what is the better way, I'm asking them to do the same.

So it didn't take long for the Throne Speech to move into that area.

**MR. H. ENNS:** The Minister of Health wants to do it now.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I would ask that he would maybe do it on his time, when he speaks on the Throne Speech, although if my throat becomes any worse, it may be a short contribution on my part.

The theme then, and the theme in every one of their policies over the last year, in every one of their statements, indeed, in every one of their comments within the House, of course has been to blame whatever shortcoming exists within this province upon the Federal Government. I guess that's fair game; that's been part

of political history for years in the past and it'll continue to be for years in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what areas did they talk about? Of course, they mention agriculture. Thank goodness they had the wisdom to mention it earlier on in the Throne Speech because as I have indicated before in my assessment, we're in probably for the worst time, agriculturally, in Western Canada, in the history of the nation, and we're right in it today. Yet I can't help but remember something that the Minister of Agriculture said yesterday in his speech. He said, "You, you people over there," referring to us, "you were the ones, because you were in full support of the high interest policy, the insane high interest policy."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, firstly, who supported the federal people who put that in? But secondly, and I say to you because I think you understand it, was there any other way of killing that merciless high inflation which was destroying everything and everybody and everything that we stood for within this nation? Was there any other way? And there wasn't one member opposite who was able to lay before us the other way or the alternative to stopping inflation, because you know who inflation hurts. It hurts your constituents and it hurts mine; it hurts those people who have worked all their lives to put a little bit of money away to keep them in their last days on earth. That's who inflation kills, and yet members opposite were saying, "You, you Conservatives supported high interest rates." It was a broad axe way, yes, high interest rates. Preferably there would have been a better way, but there wasn't a better way. There was no better way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can tell you, many of us within society at my age were hurt, were driven out of business, driven off farms because of high interest rates, but sometimes these hard measures have to be taken.

Moving on, the Throne Speech talked about inadequate equalization, and I know the Minister of Finance, this will be very high on his agenda as he addresses not only the Chamber, but as he addresses groups outside as to why it is that once again, once the Budget comes down, we will realize that we have a massive deficit; and he is going to point at Ottawa again, and he's going to say the reason that we have that massive deficit is because our equalization payments have fallen.

I'm well aware of the arguments that the Minister is going to use and firstly, I thank him for inviting those of us who wanted to be in attendance in his office in early January to receive from his officials a briefing with respect to this matter; but Mr. Deputy Speaker, something was very obvious, became readily apparent through the discussion presented to us by his officials at that time.

What became apparent was again, firstly, the economy of this nation is not producing as well as we wish it might. Of course, what that means is that the equalization distribution pie isn't growing as quickly as we'd like it, indeed, as quickly as may have been forecast two or three years ago. So it only makes sense then, if you're used to a growing slice of a growing pie and that pie no longer grows at the rate that you wish it would, that your slice isn't going to grow as quickly. That's the first very elementary point.

The second point is almost as elementary. Members opposite for years have been boasting how well this

economy is doing relative to the other provinces in Canada. Carrying that argument one step further, that means, if you accept the logic of that argument - which I don't necessarily do - but if you do accept that, then it only makes sense that the other provinces are going to want to command a larger share relative to Manitoba. That only makes sense, so much so that there is now a new recipient province - Saskatchewan never did share in equalization payments, I'm told, but they do now. This year they're coming on to it.

Two factors - if the pie isn't growing as large as you thought or forecast and, secondly, if there is now another share, another slice to be taken out, and quite obviously those other people who had slices, you yourself, are going to receive a smaller share. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's be well aware where the Minister is coming from when he continues and will continue over the next number of months to berate the Federal Government for reducing Manitoba's share under equalization.

And yet, let it also be said that some of the arguments that the government uses, as to the formula, are ones that we can support. It is worthwhile looking at the components of the formula and maybe, in some respects, lending support to the government's argument as to how Manitoba is treated under the formula, vis-a-vis other provinces. Indeed, we're prepared to enter into those types of discussions with the Minister of Finance and help, such that our province does receive its fair share, but no more than it's entitled to under the provisions of that equalization formula.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I couldn't help but notice also just yesterday, when the federal Estimates were announced where, under the Expenditures of Established Program Funding, that our level, the magnitude or the measure of our support is going to increase to \$511 million, up 5 percent, and yet I didn't hear any comment from the members opposite; but at least the Throne Speech now puts the terminology in a little fairer way and it talks about, and I quote, "Our concerns in this regard . . ." And they're talking about sharing the national resources. It says, and I quote, "Our concerns in this regard have been heightened by past federal actions which have resulted in lowered and inadequate growth in federal transfer payments to provinces."

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sort of ambivalent to that statement because "lowered", it says, well that's a better word than "cutback," at least they didn't use the word "cutback." I don't know if we succeeded last time in at least moving over that hurdle in discussing that point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the third item that I detect in the Throne Speech that I must comment upon, of course, is that whole area, and I again want to talk about the inadequate growth in federal transfer payments. Let the members opposite indicate forthrightly in the Budget when it comes down, that indeed, in total, they will be increasing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, like I was saying at the beginning, as I was listening to the Throne Speech, I felt as if I were eating the same leftovers for the tenth consecutive night. In some respects I was glad to eat, and yet I must tell you I was sick, I was sick. The Throne Speech provided no imagination; it provided no daring; of course, it provided no leadership and, therefore, no

confidence, and that is why my leader, Mr. Deputy Speaker, moved the amendment as he did. It makes one wonder really who will lead us because we are on the brink of some major disasters affecting our primary production in a number of aspects of our industrial makeup, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And yet, it makes one question who is going to lead us during these difficult times. I have certainly received no confidence from the Throne Speech as laid before us last week.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this province is in serious financial condition and I know the statements may seem simplistic to some, I know it seems redundant to others. Some would say it is overstated, socialists would say it's overstated; others, some journalists would say it's reactionary and it's right wing and, of course, Conservatives would say it's a basic truth. But, quite frankly, in my view, this province is in extremely serious financial straits.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, nobody questions, at least I don't, some of the intentions of the members opposite, indeed as they try to bring forward policies. - (Interjection)- My member says, don't be too generous. Well, I won't be too generous. I'll tell you a story about good intentions, how good intentions can absolutely kill you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It was 40 years ago when I suppose the woman of the house used to do some of the work like shorten trousers for the gentlemen and the husband of the house. I understand that doesn't happen that often anymore, but there was a preacher, Mr. Deputy Speaker - and he was probably a Presbyterian minister because he only had one pair of pants - and one day, as he was leaving the pulpit, he stumbled and he looked down and he noticed his pants were much too long. He mentioned it to his wife, he asked her if she could maybe shorten his pants. The whole week went by and as he put the pants on again to go in the pulpit the next Sunday, he noticed again that they hadn't been done but he forgot about it and gave the sermon and was leaving the altar and this time he stumbled even more and some people in the congregation, some members said, look, you had better do something with those pants or you're going to have a serious fall. So he went home and this time he mentioned it to his wife, and also to his six daughters who happened to be there. Nothing happened, he put them on again the Sunday following, gave the sermon and this time he tripped, he tripped coming down. He went home and he said, well surely I don't have to say anything to the good womenfolk of my house this week. The whole week went by and nothing was done, nothing was done. He went to bed Saturday night and his wife, who had gone to bed, realized, my God the poor guy next time is going to kill himself, I better go and fix those pants. So she got up in the middle of the night, took them down into the sewing room and took two inches off the legs. She was happy with the job, went to bed, but half an hour later the eldest daughter woke up too, and so on and so forth. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the intentions were good, but do you know what was left, do you know what was left, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

**A MEMBER:** Bermuda shorts.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Bermuda shorts, you're right, that's what was left. And that's what this government has done to this province over the last five years.

**A MEMBER:** The case of the shorts.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

**MR. C. MANNES:** How can anybody question some of the good intentions directed toward some of the support in agriculture; how can somebody question some of the spending that was directed toward the CAT scan; and how can anybody question some of the good intentions within Natural Resources as it's provided drainage, badly needed drainage, in a whole host of areas and dykes. Nobody can question the good intentions of some of the decisions that this government has brought.

But, when you accumulate them, and when you add them up, Madam Speaker, when you do that, what you end up doing is destroying something that is good. And, believe me, when we turned over this province, the fiscal management of this province to the members opposite, there was a good sound standing order in this province. The members will tell you that, oh, we drove people out; protracted economic restraint had driven people out, they'll tell you that, but that's nonsense, and time has proven that that's nonsense. And so they had to pay off their election debts, Madam Speaker, they had to pay them off. And, all of a sudden, do you know what crept into the good intentions? Things like 27 percent pay increases over 30 months; something like increase in provincial spending of 19 percent in one year alone, Madam Speaker; something like allowing the Workers Compensation Board to amass a deficit something in the area of \$60 million.

Members opposite can say that those are all good intentions, but they have the same impact upon a province that had a very sound economic fiscal standing, Madam Speaker, and today, what has it done, five years later? What's it done? Well, it now has the Premier musing publicly as to how much more all of us are going to have to pay by way of increased taxation.

So that's where it has driven us, all the good intentions of members opposite. And you can bet, Madam Speaker, you can bet your bottom dollar that we will not allow Manitobans to forget about it. We don't know how much the sales tax is going to go up once the Budget is announced, but we know it is going up; we don't know what new levels of taxation are coming in. Is, indeed, this Provincial Government going to move into the Decter Report and cause now taxation on land transfers? Is it going to increase the payroll tax, and on and on?

Well, Madam Speaker, do you know what state we are at? The members opposite and the Minister of Finance may very well announce a whole host of taxation measures, but you know we are to the point, today, where if this government opposite increases tax revenues by 8 percent or 9 percent, and manages to hold expenditures to 5 percent - which they won't do in my view, in my view it will be more than 5 percent - they will make no noticeable difference in the deficit. And that's where we are at today, and it is at the same place the Federal Government was a few years ago, and some would say still is today, but at least there has been a courageous Minister who has at least attempted to bring some reason into the area of finances.

Madam Speaker, members opposite don't seem to realize that in the Federal Government situation, all the

revenue which is being raised today covers all the expenditures except one item and, of course, that is the servicing of the debt, and the servicing of the debt is almost equivalent to the deficit. What's going to happen when the Budget of this province comes down on March 16? Expenditures, I would predict, are going to move into the area of \$4.2 to \$4.3 billion.

Madam Speaker, the service cost percentage expenditure, I'm sure, will be in the area of 11 or 12 percent. Do you realize that then represents an interest payment of somewhere of \$450 million? Yet all the new taxation levels, all the taxation levels which are going to be announced and the increases in taxation will do very little to chop away at the deficit as it now exists.

So we're against the wall in the terminology used by many, Madam Speaker, and I don't know, quite frankly, what it is members opposite plan to do, but we'll all know soon enough.

Madam Speaker, I've got to read one brief quote from the Decter Report and I'll be reading many. It says this - I believe it was Page 43. Pardon me, Page 54 of the Expenditure Management Report, and the item is: "Long-term expenditure reduction" and this is what has been asked or suggested. Decter said this and I quote: "It is recommended that a long-term expenditure reduction process be commenced with the following framework, guidelines and motivational factors." First of all, just a blank statement, it is recommended a long-term expenditures reduction. "(a) Departments be asked to define cost-reduction options which could be implemented over the next three years in particular, but over a longer time frame as required to achieve savings in specific areas."

I am wondering, Madam Speaker; indeed, members on this side are wondering whether the Minister of Finance has included that recommendation, as he's come forward and drawn his Budget, in concert with members of the Cabinet and has come to some determination as to whether or not it is in the best interests of Manitobans that there be a reduction in spending. Or is he going to continue to say, no, everything on the expenditure side of government is sacred?

We know for a fact, Madam Speaker, in his pre-Budget consultations, that he called in groups and he gave them no opportunity to pass judgment on the expenditure side. I won't name two of the companies we know that approached him and who wanted to begin to address the expenditure and then have the Minister of Finance say to them, I don't want to hear it. I don't want to listen to expenditure reductions. You're here to talk about where we can increase revenues.

So, Madam Speaker, we're wondering whether indeed the Minister of Finance is going to listen to Decter and look at some of his recommendations and draw some fruit, at least from - was it a \$60,000 consulting job, \$70,000 consulting effort? - or whether they're going to ignore it completely and go merrily along their way and drive this province off the financial abyss. That's why March 16 is so critical in -(Interjection)- so many respects.

Madam Speaker, members opposite have fun with us from time to time, particularly the Minister of Health. He's always saying, well, what would you do? Of course, he likes to say, well, there's division amongst the midst, that some of like to spend and some of like to save.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Oh, come on. There's you, then there's a Red Tory.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has two minutes remaining.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Two minutes?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Leave, leave.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Unlimited time.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Madam Speaker, I don't think my throat will continue, so I'll just use the two. I'll turn down the leave on this occasion. I'll save it for the next time I speak though on the Budget. I'd gladly have leave at that time.

Madam Speaker, let me -(Interjection)- Now, I am worried. If the Attorney-General says I had a good speech, Madam Speaker, I think I will sit down right now - and I believe him.

Madam Speaker, seeing my train of thought is totally destroyed right now, I think it's only fair that I suggest that those people who would come after us and say what would you do, what would you do in these fiscal matters, only realize that you can't roll back the clock three or four years ago. It's unfair that question be posed to us because, Madam Speaker, there has been so much damage done to the fiscal body of this province and to ask members on any side, any political party, to come up with an instant solution to the tremendous curse that these members opposite have directed to the finance of this province is almost impossible at this time.

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As is tradition, I would certainly like to offer my salutations to all members opposite; to you, Madam Speaker, for the difficult task you have in front of you and I think for the commendable job that you have done in the previous Session. I think you have managed to establish a reputation for maintaining decorum and all of those other wonderful things that Speakers are supposed to do.

Madam Speaker, I should also welcome the new Lieutenant-Governor. Mr. Johnson obviously also has an important task in front of him. I think we can say that he fulfills his first responsibility to the Legislature in the reading of the Throne Speech with a great deal of aplomb and he's to be congratulated and wished well in the coming few years. I know that he takes on that challenge with a great deal of enthusiasm, and as a man of principle and character, will carry out his duties faithfully to this Assembly and to the people of Manitoba and to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker, the Throne Speech Debate is one where an individual MLA customarily pays tribute to those in his constituency, his constituents, and I would not want to miss this opportunity of thanking my



constituents for the past year and the next year. I certainly have received the support and encouragement from every quarter of my constituency, and I know that it is difficult for them to have a member who lives and works a long way away from the constituency and it is trying for them from time to time to reach me and to have the kind of contact with myself, as an MLA, because of the distances that separate us. I want to thank them for their patience, for their encouragement and support and I want to publicly re-commit myself to serving their interests in every respect and to serving Northern Manitoba along with my other colleagues on this side of the House.

Madam Speaker, I suppose part of the responsibility of speakers on the government side is to listen to the subjective analysis of the Throne Speech and to listen to what constructive suggestions they make and, as well, to reply to those suggestions and those comments which do not seem to be as constructive as they might be.

I have read some of the speeches that members opposite have made; I've had an opportunity today to listen to some further speeches and the speeches that we've heard so far today from the Member for Arthur and the Member for Morris, I think, were quite instructive and perhaps not as inflammatory as some of the other speeches we've heard from time to time by members on both sides.

Madam Speaker, I don't intend to be particularly inflammatory or derogatory or any of those other "tories." I simply wanted to -(Interjection)- or suppository. That suggestion was made by one of my colleagues. You can't reform a Tory. That's the other part of that. The Member for Brandon West suggests a reformatory for me, but I know that's impossible.

Madam Speaker, I digress, and I beg your indulgence. I would like to get back to the topic at hand, which is the Throne Speech, and my analysis of some of the comments made by members opposite. I wanted to start off with one that was critically important, I think, as far as the government is concerned, and certainly as far as I'm concerned as Minister of Education. That was a comment that was made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech which suggested, or attempted to suggest, that this government had actually cut spending on social programs as a percentage of total expenditure. I was fortunate to have a colleague with the capabilities of my colleague, the Member for Thompson, who quickly stood to the government's defence and corrected the record and indicated that, in fact, was not the case.

It is perhaps an unfortunate error in research, but I would not want the record to indicate anything other than the fact that this government has maintained its commitment to social programming, that it has maintained its sacred trust with the people of Manitoba in maintaining essential services. I think the record should be clear on that and the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite should, I think, refrain from parroting that particular part of the Leader of the Opposition's speech.

We, I think, Madam Speaker, are sensitive to the concern that I guess besets many politicians, and that is living up to our political commitments. I know that, going into the election of 1986, we expressed our, I think, pride in the fact that we had lived up to our

electoral commitments in 1981. In fact, 20 of our 21 major commitments had been fulfilled.

Madam Speaker, I know that while we made substantially fewer promises than members opposite in that election campaign, we as a government intend to fulfill those commitments as we did in the 1981-1986 period, and as previous NDP administrations have done in Manitoba, in Saskatchewan, in British Columbia and the Yukon. So that was the first issue I wanted to make sure members were clear upon.

The second one was the issue of agriculture, and we've heard considerable discomfort on the part of members opposite about their suggestion - there was a lack in the Throne Speech to deal with agricultural issues. Madam Speaker, I think the Minister of Agriculture did an exceptional job in outlining the history of this government's support for agriculture. It has been second to none and it followed a government from 1977-1981 that sat on its hands. It refused to deal with the real problems that were becoming apparent in agriculture. They undermined many of the constructive things that were done in agriculture in the early Seventies, including the establishment of stabilization programs.

In 1981, after our government was elected and we recognized - and many of the farm communities recognized the need for stabilization programs - we were chastized by members opposite who said there would be no support for a Beef Stabilization Program; we wouldn't get 15 percent of the producers to enroll, and of course they were proved wrong and we were proved right, which substantiates, I think, the claim that this Minister of Agriculture and this government understands agricultural problems and we've shown it time and time again.

I won't bother - although I'm sorely tempted - to get involved in fodbashing, in getting involved in criticizing the Federal Government for many of their failings, in terms of dealing with the problems of agricultural communities. So, Madam Speaker, I'm encouraged by members opposite that I should do that. I know they would love to, but it really seems to be impossible for them to take any kind of objective, non-partisan stance. They can't review the Federal Government's actions in any non-political way, so it falls unfortunately to us to make the constructive criticisms that we feel necessary, but I'll leave agriculture to later in my speech when I have some other things to say about it.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition decried the fact that there wasn't more in the Throne Speech, and I can assure the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite and those who have legitimate concerns in rural Manitoba, that this government will be addressing their issues in the Budget and in programs that are going to be announced, and initiatives of the Provincial Government over the next year.

I can say with a great deal of certainty that it will be received well by the farm community, and the erosion of support for members opposite as is happening in rural Manitoba will continue, to no one's surprise perhaps, but it is going to be a fact of history.

The Leader of the Opposition spent considerable time talking about the massive losses and continuing losses in our Crown corporations. The Leader of the Opposition and some members opposite, indeed, the Member for Arthur in his speech referenced it again, the massive

loss of \$33 million in Manfor. That loss occurred in 1985 - in 1984-85 actually - because it was a 15-month period. The 1986 period, which we'll be reporting on, there is no massive loss; and in the 1987 period, there will certainly be no massive loss.

Madam Speaker, I have indicated to the Standing Committee in June what the projections were for 1986, but we continue to harp back to the past. The Member for Sturgeon Creek says that one loss is all right. I remind the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek how we got into this mess - the best of intentions, as the Member for Morris said.

The difference between a Tory Government and an NDP Government is that we are prepared to act. Members opposite still, in their literature and in their rhetoric, refer to Flyer. Which government in the history of Manitoba had the guts to deal with Flyer? Certainly not members opposite. It is no longer a Manitoba Crown corporation.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** It was still worth \$12 million when we had it.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek continues to accuse me of looking at the world through rose-coloured glasses. If the Member for Sturgeon Creek can say that in all honesty, he was wearing rose-coloured glasses.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I'm sure all members who wish to participate in this debate will have an opportunity.

**HON. J. STORIE:** I am not here to stand up and apologize or deny the fact that mistakes are made in Crown corporations, Madam Speaker. I am going to stand and say that mistakes are made in corporations, period. The fact is that we look around us and we can see that the forest products industry has lost money in the last decade, that the mining industry has lost money, that farmers are losing money. They are not all accused of mismanaging their particular enterprises.

No one is suggesting that HBM and S or that Inco or that Simpson Timber or McMillan Bloedel are losing money because they are managed incompetently. There are factors besides management which have a direct impact on their financial viability or financial success.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to say and put on record that this government, this government has attempted to deal with some of the problems that exist. It hasn't tried to sweep them under the carpet and for the Member for Sturgeon Creek who might want to get some of the Manfor board minutes from the 1977 to 1981 period he might be very much amused by the kinds of inaction, the kinds of completely unbusiness-like machinations of the board and the Minister responsible at that time which didn't show very much responsibility, in my opinion.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and some members continue to express concern about levels of taxation. Can the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I'm having trouble hearing the Honourable Minister with all the private conversations going on.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you Madam Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition in his speech referenced the fact - a believed fact, I suppose; he was obviously in error and had not done his research again - that even Newfoundland had a better tax regime than Manitoba's. He suggested that Manitoba's tax regime and tax burden was the largest and the heaviest in the country. And, Madam Speaker, I don't know where he gets his information, but any tax comparison, provincial tax comparison table that is presented in the annual budgets, presented in this House, any information that has certainly been presented to this House, indicates that we are in the mid-range and not at the high end. But yes, in some areas we have higher taxation than other provinces, but on average, the tax burden in Manitoba is the middle range. In fact, that particular challenge has been put forward to the Government of Manitoba many times and we know that the cost of doing business in Manitoba is among the lowest in Canada.

Manitoba, Madam Speaker, is not out of line in terms of its taxation and it certainly does not have the heaviest tax burden by any means. Even the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I think, will agree with me on that point.

Madam Speaker, the Opposition, quite correctly in my view, talks about spending and priorities, the concern they have for setting priorities in the right order, the concern they have for growing expenditures. There is no doubt that all governments need to be concerned about that.

Madam Speaker, what actions do we see from members opposite when they try to address the question of how money is spent and where expenditure reductions should occur? What do we really get from members opposite?

Madam Speaker . . .

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, I can only reference a number of incidents in the past few months in which members opposite have had an opportunity to comment on repriorization, on reductions in service, and what do these members opposite have to say about reductions in spending in the Department of Highways or the Department of Natural Resources? What did they have to say about repriorizing in terms of the Manitoba Development Centre? What did the Member for Portage say? What did the Member for Arthur say when we talked about repriorizing in reducing RCMP services? What did the former Member for Turtle Mountain say when we talked about restructuring the Land Titles Office and moving some staff from Boissevain? What were the reactions? Was there support for repriorization? Was there support for reductions of services? No.

So, Madam Speaker, we get some platitudes from members opposite about the need for spending reduction, the need for containing expenditure growth, but they don't have to deal with the problem, they don't have to deal with the reality that reduction in expenditure means the withdrawal of services to the people of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, we have always said that maintaining essential services and providing services

to Manitobans is a priority and we have certainly not been dissuaded from that and while the rhetoric of members opposite leads one to conclude that they would do something different, their actions, their concerns and the concerns that are expressed to them by their constituents indicate the course of action that this government is on is the right course of action.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech, "And what's happening in economic development?" Well, I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition has been for the last five years, but Madam Speaker, the Conference Board of Canada, all of the economic prognosticators, the Royal Bank, the Bank of Montreal, the Investment Dealers Association, have lauded Manitoba's economic growth over the last five years. Madam Speaker, no province, no province has the kind of economic record that Manitoba has over the past five years.

So, what can he be talking about? What can he be talking about, Madam Speaker? There is little doubt on the part of independent observers that Manitoba has done an exceptional job in creating economic growth and maintaining economic growth. And it has been done -(Interjection)- Madam Speaker, what members opposite are reluctant to observe and I believe an observation that is made by objective, non-socialist observers is that the things that were done in Manitoba like the Interest Rate Relief Program, like the introduction of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, are the things that any responsible government would have done. Madam Speaker, even the Royal Bank of Canada acknowledges the role of the Manitoba Jobs Fund in maintaining Manitoba's economic growth over an extremely difficult period.

So, Madam Speaker, the members opposite must feel a little frustrated because in economic terms this government has done an exceptional job. I did note and it was perhaps interesting that the Leader of the Opposition's speech in reference to economic development was fairly brief, because really he didn't have any targets. The fact is that we have the lowest unemployment, one of the highest levels of private investment, we have housing starts at record levels. Madam Speaker, economic development is a reality here. It's a dream in many other provinces across Canada.

Madam Speaker, the Throne Speech did also mention the importance of balancing social progress with economic progress. Madam Speaker, we did introduce the small business loan bonds.-(Interjection)- Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition also referenced some rhetoric that is used in some quarters about Manitobans or Canadians being buried in a sea of bureaucratic red tape. Madam Speaker, I was Minister of Business Development and Tourism when we initiated a study to review regulation in Manitoba, to review the consequences of government regulation for small business. Interesting results, Madam Speaker, which apparently the Leader of the Opposition is not aware of.

Madam Speaker, which level of government creates this bureaucratic sea of red tape? Is it the Provincial Government? No, Madam Speaker, the businesses in Manitoba indicate quite clearly that 75 percent of the bureaucratic red tape comes from the Federal Government, not the Provincial Government; 17 percent

comes from the Provincial Government, Madam Speaker. That doesn't mean there isn't need for improvement. But let the record be clear that Manitoba's businesses are not suffering from any burden any greater than any other jurisdiction, and that all jurisdictions suffer the same burden and that comes from the Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is alone I think in the speeches that I've heard so far in referencing the North. Madam Speaker, what were his comments on the North? Well, did he stand up and say that the Limestone project was a tremendous boon to Northern Manitoba? Did he acknowledge that 80 percent of the labour and the supply contracts and the involvement has come from Manitobans? Did he talk about the monumental achievement that represents? Did he talk about the commitment to employing Northerners and northern Natives? No, he simply said, well, this was all very nice, but we had all kinds of other important things to do. Madam Speaker, did he recognize . . .

**A MEMBER:** . . . hydro contracts.

**HON. J. STORIE:** We have a fairly large hydro contract. Did he talk about the significant role that the Minister of Energy and Mines played in terms of getting an economic spinoff from the contract that was awarded to Canadian General Electric? Did he talk about the significant business opportunities? Did he talk about the significant benefits that those spinoff benefits represent to northern people?

Did he talk about the investment that was made in Manfor to maintain opportunities in The Pas, Wanless, Cranberry Portage, Snow Lake, Wabowden and Thompson? Did he mention that, that the government had made that commitment?

Did he talk about the benefit that \$20 million from the Jobs Fund flowing into hundreds of communities across this province and in rural and Northern Manitoba had in creating employment, in creating assets, in creating recreational opportunity? Did he talk about those things?

Did he talk about the role that the Community Economic Development Fund plays in supporting the business aspirations of northern Manitobans? Did he talk about the advances that have been made in delivering education to northern Manitobans? Did he talk about the benefits that Northerners have experienced because of the activities of the Limestone Training and Employment Agency? Did he talk about the hundreds and hundreds of people who have been trained?

Madam Speaker, does the Leader of the Opposition know where Northern Manitoba is? Is there anybody in his caucus that knows? Talk about giving short shrift to two-thirds of the province, the Leader of the Opposition did it and does it consistently.

Madam Speaker, I want in my all too short a time to move to another topic which is of great concern to members opposite and to members on this side, to the public of Manitoba, and that is a question of fairness. Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talked about fairness in his speech, and he talked about his view that somehow that the actions of this government were robbing the children of their future.

Madam Speaker, I know this is an awkward topic for the members of the Opposition and I referenced it earlier, but I want to ask members opposite, if they had been in government - if, that's a big if - if, for example, they had been in government, would they have had the courage of a Mr. Getty, to stand up and say, you know, some of the things that this Federal Government are doing are wrong? Would they have had that kind of intestinal fortitude?

adam Speaker, the Member for Morris, to give him his due, acknowledged as an individual that the CF-18 decision did cause him some turmoil, some anguish as a Manitoban, and I acknowledge that. Many members of the Tory caucus were caused some moments of anguish by that decision. I'll acknowledge that. But, Madam Speaker, there are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of other issues which affect Manitobans directly, which members opposite have failed to address, have been reluctant to address.

Madam Speaker, I believe that part of the job of the Provincial Government, certainly it is viewed as part of our mandate, is to stand up for Manitobans. Madam Speaker, where are members opposite in dealing with the established programs, financing cutbacks, reductions? Where are they?

I remember a very honourable member on that side several years ago attending jointly with the current Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, a meeting in Ottawa, to discuss the reductions that were going to occur, to changes to the established programs, financing and equalization payments, Madam Speaker, and he and he alone, to my knowledge, came back and said, yes, Manitoba has a case.

Last year the federal Parliament changed a federal statute which has grave implications for Manitoba. It has grave implications for our health care system and our education system. Isn't it an issue of fairness? Don't we have a legitimate right to make our point, and to continue to make our point that it isn't right? I will certainly deal with that.

Madam Speaker, the issue of deregulation is another issue which causes many Manitobans, including some of the largest, national trucking firms in the country major problems. Deregulation is a fine buzz word, Madam Speaker, but it has consequences. If you talk to the national trucking companies who are established in Manitoba and ask them what they think of it, they will tell you.

Madam Speaker, what about fairness in taxation? What about fairness? What about the need for tax reform? Where are members opposite on the issue of tax reform? Madam Speaker, members opposite will be well aware of the fact that over the last few years individuals have been the benefactors - and that is a sick work - of tax changes on the part of the Federal Government. A 48 percent increase on the part of individuals over the past few years, and what's happened to corporations? A 3 or 4 percent increase.

Madam Speaker, what about all of the loopholes? What about all of the loopholes, like the \$500,000 capital gains exemption, which drains money from the Province of Manitoba, which drains money from the Province of Manitoba to do all of those wonderful things that the members of the Opposition want us to do? What about that, Madam Speaker?

What about regional development? This country was founded with an understanding that all regions of this

country should be able to provide relatively equal levels of service. That's in our constitution. This Federal Government has no appreciation whatsoever for what regional development means. Their incentive programs, their ideological commitment to deregulation is so evident of the fact that they have no appreciation for what they're doing to the regions of this province.

Madam Speaker, they're centralists. They're mired in the - no, that's not the right word, I shouldn't say that. That would be offensive perhaps to our sister provinces. But they have an undue reliance on an ideological principle that competitiveness and deregulation and all of the buzz words that were made famous by our American cousins are the prescription for all of the ills that befall the economy in Canada.

Madam Speaker, this government doesn't believe that that's true. If we have any evidence that that isn't true, you only have to look at the Canadian job strategy, and I'm not going to criticize all of it because much of the intent I think has merit. But the impact on small provinces, those provinces with a small revenue base, with lesser financial means, the impact is going to be crippling. Madam Speaker, part of the Canadian job strategy saw the removal of direct purchase of spaces from our community colleges, and we're left with nothing but a wish and a hope that that money is going to somehow find its way back into either private sector training or corporate training or industrial training with no real direction.

Madam Speaker, what's happening is that a system which has served Manitoba well for almost two decades, even more than two decades in some cases, is being sacrificed, is being sacrificed with no understanding of the options that are left and available to small provinces. It may work in Ontario, although I've heard from the Minister of Advanced Education in Ontario that it isn't working there either. But it's simply a callous disregard for the realities of small provinces, a callous disregard for the needs of our young people, a callous disregard for the fact that provinces have the jurisdictional responsibility for education.

Madam Speaker, what about other concerns in terms of regional development? What about the National Research Building that remains empty, when every other province has a National Research facility which is funded by the Federal Government for legitimate research purposes? Madam Speaker, at the same time that this building is left open, one is opening in Alberta, one is opening in Quebec. Where is the commitment to regional development? Do the members opposite not realize how important this particular component of our industrial base is? Where are they, Madam Speaker?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** You whine too much.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, that's the problem. The Member for Brandon West says, "You whine too much." Madam Speaker, if members opposite had their way, they would sit like passive little puppies while the ideologues in Ottawa went about, in a very consistent and I believe unthinking way, and undermined everything that this country has done, every politician has done, every party has done to build up this country. What would be the purpose of that? They don't believe there's any consequences to all of those things.

Madam Speaker, there are consequences. There are consequences in terms of our economy; there are consequences in terms of our social services, in education and health care and they're there. The consequences are there.- (Interjection)- Well here we have - if we don't want to govern. Madam Speaker, part of the responsibility of governing is to make sure that Manitobans are treated fairly. I don't think they care about fairness. I don't think they care. They would rather hide under some kind of umbrella and say, well this isn't our fault and we have no obligation to talk to our colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I had to chuckle when the Member for Morris told his small story and it was an amusing story and the moral of the story is, of course, that sometimes the best of intentions, the results don't work out in the best of effect. Madam Speaker, that's quite true and I think we have a perfect example, a perfect analogy in the road that the Federal Government has chosen to take. They have, and I think most people will agree, good intentions. But, Madam Speaker, the consequences of their actions are going to be not only disruptive, but they are going to be destructive in the long term for Manitoba. They are going to be destructive.

Now, Madam Speaker, there is some hope that with the Federal Government at its lowest ebb in popularity of any government in history I gather, they will begin to be a little more sensitive to the concerns we have in Manitoba, that Newfoundland has, that Alberta has, but it's only a hope. If they remain as ingrained as they are right now in their philosophical approach to governing this country, the news is bad.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition spent some time talking about the failings of the Throne Speech and the failings of the government and I suppose that's a legitimate task of the Leader of the Opposition. I think it's also fair to say that there are some failings on the part of the Leader of the Opposition in his response to the Throne Speech and there has been some inadequacy in some of the responses of members opposite. I don't think they have taken their address to the Throne Speech as an opportunity to stand up for Manitobans. I don't think they have been particularly constructive.

Madam Speaker, I certainly drew from their comments the fact that they have little appreciation for the role of the Federal Government in Confederation and I think that's a serious flaw.

Now, Madam Speaker, what did the Provincial Government say in its Throne Speech? What did the Provincial Government say? Putting aside all of the concerns I have about what the Federal Government is or isn't doing, the fact is that we manage the economy of the Province of Manitoba and we manage the delivery of the services to people of Manitoba.

What did the Throne Speech say? The Throne Speech said that we would not hack away at essential services as has been done in every Tory province in the country. Madam Speaker, we said that we were going to maintain essential services, maintain our commitment to education and health and we've done that.

Madam Speaker, we said we were going to continue our support to the elderly and the aging. We said we were going to continue our support of youth, both in terms of employment and in training. We said we were

going to expand our economic horizons. We said we were going to continue to provide a range of services that Manitobans have come to expect. We said that we were going to continue to work for fair and just and equitable treatment on the part of our senior level of government. Madam Speaker, we've said that we are going to continue to work to make sure that those who are not currently part of the mainstream of Manitoba's society will be part of the mainstream.

Madam Speaker, finally I'd like to say, how are we doing. Madam Speaker, 60 percent of Manitobans, approximately, say we're doing pretty good. I would hate to grade members opposite.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

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

Firstly, I'd like to add my congratulations and good wishes to the newly-appointed Lieutenant-Governor. His past contributions to this Legislature have not gone unnoticed. His years of public dedication in this, our Province of Manitoba, deserve recognition. I do not need to remind those who served with him, but I know those of us who have been recently elected should know and be proud of his achievements for Manitoba.

I would like to welcome back all members of the House to this Second Session of the Thirty-Third Legislature and wish them continued health and the energy required to fulfill the many duties of this office.

I want to especially thank my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative caucus for their guidance and their support this past year. They have helped me to grow and to learn and to understand the legislative process.

I'd also like to thank the members opposite who have also played a role in my development as a new member in this House; and to you, Madam Speaker, I wish you a Session filled with new challenges and the wisdom to be impartial and fair to all members of the House.

It's been almost a year since my constituents in River East expressed their confidence in me and elected me as their representative here in the Legislature. I want to let them know, Madam Speaker, that I have not forgotten why they elected me and I will continue to serve them to the best of my ability and continue to make myself available to represent their wishes. We must all continually, however, remind ourselves that we must ensure to go beyond our constituencies to provide fairness and equal representation to all Manitobans.

In the opening remarks of the Speech from the Throne, Madam Speaker, reference is made to three of our recent Canadian heroes - Terry Fox, Steve Fonyo and Rick Hansen. The speech praises them, and deservedly so, for they, and I quote: "They have chosen lofty goals and have set about their achievement with a steadfast determination." I fear for the people of Manitoba, Madam Speaker, that the same will not be able to be said for the Government of this Day here in Manitoba.

It would appear from the Speech from the Throne that they, too, have set lofty goals; in fact, they would appear to pride themselves on it. But the question for Manitobans, Madam Speaker, for the people who will

be relying on for achievement of those goals is will the members opposite have the courage and steadfast determination to make them reality? Or will they end up as smoke and mirrors, as did the Premier's promises in the last election campaign?

This will be the question that will be answered in the days and months ahead. It will not be answered just by us, on this side of the House, but by the members of the press gallery and, even more importantly, by the people of Manitoba who elected the present government just one short year ago.

For my part, Madam Speaker, there are several areas which the people of River East and myself are greatly concerned about, concerned that the lofty goals or pronouncements of the government are not now being met, or will not be met in the foreseeable future.

The first of these is the health care system. The government refers continually to Manitoba's health care system as being one of the best in the world. They seem to make this statement over and over again, Madam Speaker, almost as if by saying it and repeating it often enough it will become the truth. Let us analyze, Madam Speaker, what is meant by the term "health care system." In my opinion, there are three major components to the health care system. One is access, one is delivery, and one is actual medical service provided.

The first of these components, Madam Speaker, is access. All levels of government must be congratulated, Madam Speaker, in their efforts to make health services available and accessible to all Canadians. The door is open, so to speak, Madam Speaker, and through our Medicare system all Manitobans are able to gain entry to the system. In this aspect, Madam Speaker, we are a world leader.

The second component is delivery. Delivery, Madam Speaker, is the ability of the system to deliver health care to those who can access the system. The Throne Speech says that one of the priorities of this government will be to provide better service to thousands of Manitobans through expansion of community-based services. I agree, Madam Speaker, that this is the route to go, and I agree with the Minister of Health when he states we must be prepared to be innovative; we have to find other ways to treat people outside of costly institutions. We have to develop ambulatory care, not for admission surgery, medical and out-patient rehabilitation; and for the seniors - respice care, home care, enriched housing, etc. However, Madam Speaker, these community-based services must be in place before institutional services can be cut back.

What is this government doing to ensure the transition from institutional to community-based services? Very little, Madam Speaker, except a lot of study and study and more study. The system is being studied to death, Madam Speaker, and all kinds of idealistic objectives and recommendations are being made, but little is being done in the way of action to implement these community-based services. Are we really allowing for transfer for community-based services when we are not creating an alternative, Madam Speaker, and putting in place alternative resources to make it work?

These are the questions that will have to be answered by this government, Madam Speaker, this government that has been in power in Manitoba 13 out of the last 17 years, but continues to lay blame for all the problems

elsewhere. This government accepts no responsibility at all for the impending collapse of our Medicare system; it is collapsing.

The third component, Madam Speaker, is the actual medical services provided. I must repeat, again, as I did last year, how can this government be proud of the fact that they boast of our so-called free medical service when it is substandard and often not available to all those who need it? In fact, Madam Speaker, it is a fact that the people of Manitoba are having to travel out of province to receive badly needed diagnostic services, transplant services, ophthalmology surgery.

Madam Speaker, when will this government realize that in Manitoba they are creating a two-tiered medical system, a service that is available elsewhere for the rich, and a substandard service here in Manitoba for the poor? Yes, Madam Speaker, those who can afford it can travel to the United States or to other provinces for updated medical services, while those who cannot afford it, the people of Manitoba that this NDP Government professes to support and represent, the poor and the underprivileged will receive substandard care here in Manitoba, if they can get in to get it.

How can they claim that we have one of the best health care services in the world? It's true. The rich can afford, Madam Speaker, to go to North Dakota for CAT scans; the rich can afford to go to other provinces for ophthalmology surgery not provided here, for transplant surgery; but those who cannot afford it will remain here in Manitoba and receive substandard care. Is this a government, Madam Speaker, that stands up for the people of Manitoba? Accessibility, Madam Speaker, means very little if the system you are accessing cannot provide the best available service.

I must go back to the question, are those lofty goals of the Manitoba Government being pursued with the steadfast determination that this government would have us believe?

The second area from the Throne Speech I would like to address is support for Manitoba families. Again, Madam Speaker, we are hearing lofty goals without seeing the steadfast determination that is necessary to achieve them.

I note with interest that the Throne Speech talks about a White Paper to be issued this year to initiate a consultation process respecting protection for vulnerable adults, particularly the elderly.

Many of us who have worked in the health care system have recognized that this has been a longstanding problem which has just recently come to public attention. Are we going to see just another study, Madam Speaker, or will the government have the steadfast determination to introduce an initiative that will realistically deal with the problem? Will it be more smoke or will there be a solution of some substance? Of course, only time will tell.

The child care services in this province are in a state of chaos, Madam Speaker. One must seriously question the basis on which foster homes are selected, the follow-up by social workers on conditions in the home, and activities of foster parents and the selection process in determining suitable homes and suitable foster parents.

I need not remind you, Madam Speaker, and members of this House, about the recent events, including the tragic death of a two-year-old girl.

Indications are that this child was not only placed in a filthy home, but was denied food, left in the care of other children, was sexually abused, ultimately resulting in a tragic, unnecessary loss of life. This case surely must indicate to all members of this House, and particularly to the Minister responsible, that the whole child care system needs immediate and thorough investigation and overhaul.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MRS. B. MITCHELSON:** This government's record, since it took office in 1981, is absolutely pitiful, Madam Speaker, with respect to implementing necessary reforms of the system that would result in reduction of child abuse.

In fact, since this government has come to power, the incidence of child abuse has risen, and I implore the Minister responsible to see that all steps must be taken immediately to reduce and hopefully eliminate this most brutal, senseless and disgusting abuse of those least able to defend themselves, the abused children in our society.

I'd like to speak a bit about equality for women, Madam Speaker. I'll be watching with interest the legislation to establish the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women as a statutory body. Is this move being made because of a real need to do so, or is it just an attempt to give some publicity to the government, another piece of legislation with no substance?

I'd like to discuss child care for a moment, Madam Speaker. The Throne Speech states that the government will work towards a national day care initiative. Yet the Minister of Community Services has come closest to endorsing the policy outlined in the Katie Cook Task Force Report which has found little support in the public.

As well, the Minister of Community Services and her colleague, the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, held a press conference to criticize the statements made by our federal Health Minister, Jake Epp, regarding day care, while at the same time, when they were pressed by Donald Benham of the Winnipeg Sun, they said they did not agree or they did not disagree with Jake Epp's statements. I'd like to just quote from the Winnipeg Sun, and I quote, Madam Speaker: "Epp's comments showed he was out of touch with the changing reality of Canadian families," said Community Services Minister, Muriel Smith. "He's deflecting away from the important issue of day care when it's in such a crisis." "It was an irresponsible statement," added Status of Women Minister, Judy Wasylycia-Leis."

The cause of the Minister's outrage was a comment by Epp that parents, not day care workers, are usually the best people to raise their children. When repeatedly pressed on what was so wrong with Epp's statement, both Ministers admitted they agreed with him. We have a government that gives a lot of lip service, sets lofty goals, like promising to create 4,000 day care spaces and, in reality, delivered only 400 over the past year. Is this steadfast determination, Madam Speaker?

The working women in Manitoba need action. The private sector should be encouraged, not discouraged, from creating badly needed day care spaces; and

available funds should be targeted to those who can least afford day care, low income and single-parent families, and not for support of higher income families who should bear the full cost of child day care and not be subsidized by the taxpayers of Manitoba.

I might suggest to this government, Madam Speaker, that they should set up public hearings and consult with Manitobans and get the views of all Manitobans on this issue. They should never close the choice for parents to decide whether they want private or public day care. Manitobans who work shift work should be allowed to buy day care in their homes so their children can remain in their homes at night in their own bed with qualified, competent care.

Moving to agriculture, Madam Speaker, I couldn't believe my ears last Friday when members opposite got caught playing their cute little games, pretending to be concerned about the crisis in our farm community. Some of my comments across the floor last Friday prompted some snide comments from the members opposite, calling me the "Rural Member for River East." Well, Madam Speaker, I consider that a compliment.

Although I was born and raised in Winnipeg, my common sense does tell me that unlike some of our rural representatives opposite, I know that the farm community is the backbone of our provincial economy and our farm community is responsible for Manitoba's economic stability. Without farmers, we urbanites would not survive, including the Minister of Environment. The members opposite didn't fool us, I hope they didn't fool the media, and I know they didn't fool the farm community in Manitoba.

Yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture, in his response to the Throne Speech, expounded on the wonderful programs his government had introduced to aid the farmers in Manitoba: Farm Start, Farm Aid, Bill No. 4. Might I suggest, Madam Speaker, that along with Bill No. 4, The Family Farm Protection Act, you have brought into place higher interest rates for our farmers - something the NDP may be very proud of, but we're certainly not. We warned you, the banks and the credit unions warned you, and you didn't listen. The Minister of Agriculture and the NDP are ultimately responsible for the failure of many family farms because of The Family Farm Destruction Act.

I would like to discuss two local issues that concern my residents in River East. One area noticeably absent in the Throne Speech is a commitment to transportation, Madam Speaker, to roads and highways. Specifically, there's a six-mile portion of the Perimeter Highway in the northeast quadrant of Winnipeg that has yet to be completed; 20 years after the Perimeter Highway was started.

I'm sure the members opposite who represent Concordia constituency, Rossmere constituency and Transcona constituency share with me the need for the completion of this portion of the Perimeter Highway, to relieve the noise and congestion on Lagimodiere Boulevard. However, perhaps the Premier's lofty plan for a bridge from nowhere to nowhere, north of Selkirk, and the plans for the Selkirk-Winnipeg corridor in his constituency, and his steadfast determination to bring this about, has left our Highways budget empty, with only enough left, Madam Speaker, to hire consultants and hold public hearings, information meetings to discuss the possibility of starting construction maybe

10 years down the road. It makes little sense to me, Madam Speaker, to go through the motions now and raise the expectations in the minds of the citizens in the northeast area of Winnipeg, when the information gathered by both the consultants and the public meetings will likely be redundant and outdated if construction doesn't start before another 10 years.

This in itself, Madam Speaker, is not something new but is consistent with this government making campaign promises and raising people's expectations only to fall back on their lame excuse that all the problems we face are solely the fault of the Federal Government.

Would it not make more sense, Madam Speaker, to take the \$1 million that this government wants to spend to build a noise attenuation barrier for a few hundred feet in the Minister of Environment's riding, which is only a cosmetic solution, Madam Speaker, a cosmetic solution for a noise problem generated by excessive traffic. If they would only spend that money to begin construction to close to a mile of dual lane Perimeter Highway.

Would the Minister of Highways, Madam Speaker, not agree with me that a better solution to heavy traffic and noise would be to divert truck traffic off of Lagimodiere Boulevard, Madam Speaker, onto the Perimeter Highway and give relief to everyone along that route, not just to those in the Minister of Environment's riding?

Also, Madam Speaker, my constituents in River East and myself are pleased to see that the Minister of Urban Affairs has included in his contribution to the City of Winnipeg, funding for property acquisition and engineering drawings, and has identified a genuine need for the Kildonan Bridge, linking East and West Kildonan. I hope this is an indication that this government intends to continue cost-sharing for this badly needed project in the 1988 Budget. - (Interjection)- I know. I would hope, Madam Speaker, I will repeat, that this government, even though the Member for Kildonan does not agree, I would hope that this government intends to continue cost-sharing for this badly needed project in the 1988 Budget, the actual year that construction will begin. The Minister of Urban Affairs has his priorities straight in this one instance, I must admit.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will see over the next few months that there are many questions to be answered and many issues to be raised. However, I fear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the qualities of courage and determination exhibited by Rick Hansen, Steve Fonyo and Terry Fox are not present in the members across the way - this present NDP government.

Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and participate in the Throne Speech Debate. I regret somewhat that the time of day is such that it will require me to complete my remarks tomorrow. On the other hand, I am reluctant to call it six o'clock, given the important discussion that has taken place in the House, and perhaps more importantly, some of the discussion that has not taken place.

I want to, before I proceed to address those particular issues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, wish all members well. We have a new Session starting; I must say that I enjoyed my first Session, it was a learning experience and I must again indicate that the learning experience, I hope, is shared by all members and that we contribute to the learning experience of each other.

The constituency that I represent, of course, is the constituency of Swan River, an agricultural constituency, a constituency built on agriculture and the other natural resources of the Province of Manitoba. We have, of course, in the central part of the constituency the primary grain producing of the area, very fertile lands and of course that area, given what is happening in the grain markets, is the area that is perhaps suffering the most.

In the outlying areas we have the communities represented by places like Pine River, Benito and Mafeking, where there is more of a mixed approach to agriculture. Those communities are fortunate in the sense that their agricultural efforts are more diversified. They are in many ways diversified today because of the initiatives of this government and the Minister of Agriculture on this side of the House in introducing programs, specifically the Beef Stabilization Program. It was that program which encouraged many people to stay in livestock production at a period in time when others were being encouraged to leave livestock production and specialize in grain production.

We heard reference earlier today to that program at the time that it was introduced, and there were members on the opposite side who indicated that the program would be of no value to the agricultural community. They indicated that there would be few participants. Well, let me indicate, as other members have, that some 75 percent, in excess of 75 percent of the beef producers in Manitoba and in excess of the 75 percent of the beef herd in Manitoba is now enrolled in the Beef Stabilization Program.

So I think it indicates clearly, despite the commentary from the other side, that they are the people who understand agriculture. It is the people on this side of the House who have brought programs into being which are accepted by the farmers of Manitoba and are helping the agricultural community deal with that very difficult situation they are facing.

I want to indicate as well the importance of agriculture to the constituency that I represent. We have some of the remote communities, communities like Camperville, Barrows, and Dawson Bay, where we have residents who rely more heavily on our natural resource base, forestry and fisheries, just to give an example.

I'm pleased to note that the Leader of the Opposition, with some seven of his caucus members, visited my constituency only recently. I am sure that they enjoyed their visit to the constituency but it represents I think some hope on their part that that constituency, which had never been represented in the House by a New Democrat, may someday return to their fold. I hope that they will be disappointed for some time to come.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** One of them told me they see me more than they see you, Leonard.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The Member for Sturgeon Creek indicates that they have seen him more often than me.



That may be true for a particular member of mine, but that may also define the places that particular member visits.

I want to indicate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I found it somewhat amusing on the Friday of last week to watch the tactics of the members opposite. I saw them somewhat opposite from the view that the Member for River East had. The Member for River East seemed to think that we got caught in our own playing of games, but it is really the members on the side opposite who got caught in their game.

They tried to convey a view that they were the ones who were going to speak to the crisis in agriculture, and there are members on that side who are concerned, as there are members on this side who are concerned with that very serious situation in the agricultural community. But the members on this side of the House spoke to that issue throughout the last Session. We did not have to be reminded of it. We did not have to try to cast a particular image on Friday of last week that all of a sudden we were aware of the crisis that existed in the agricultural community. The members on this side, this government, recognized fully the importance of agriculture to the economy of Manitoba.

Agriculture is the backbone of the economy of Manitoba and this government has indicated, by way of its previous commitments, that it will stand by agriculture. I am confident that when members, through the Throne Speech and through the Budget Debate which will follow, will again see clearly that this government represents the interests of agriculture. This government is sensitive to the needs of agriculture. The members on this side do not have to, fortunately, be apologist for what is happening at the federal level.

It was interesting to see today - and I must say to you that it was not my intention to feebash as some had indicated - but given that the Member for Morris participated in that exercise, and given that the Member for Arthur also participated in that exercise, the door has been opened I think for me to participate in that process.

It was obvious today in question period that the efforts of last Friday were simply grandstanding on the part of the members opposite. They said that there was a crisis in agriculture. If they believe that, and I'm sure many of them do, and given the announcements of yesterday that there was a suggestion that the grain prices would be reduced by a further 20 percent, we had not a single question on agriculture from that side of the House.

What did we have? We had members from that side of the House, the Leader of the Opposition in charge, following on the fixation of the Member for Pembina with telephones, coming up with a question on telephones. No regard for the issues of agriculture, none at all. And further, when then the Member for Lac du Bonnet indicated that there would be some opportunity, that it would be wise for the Leader of the Opposition to join in the support that the leader of the government, our Premier, had protested to the Federal Government as to what was happening, we saw no indication from the Leader of the Opposition that he was prepared to take part in that expression of concern for the farmers of Manitoba, indeed the farmers of Western Canada.

I must refer again to the exercise of last Friday, wherein the Member for Virten indicated that what we

should be having is a series of meetings throughout the rural area, wherein we would have the opportunity for people to address the concerns of agriculture. There are many in the rural area who could speak to that, but it was interesting to hear the Member for Virten list amongst the first of those groups, that he would have an opportunity for the Chambers of Commerce to address the concerns of agriculture.

Let me ask the Member for Virten whether this is the same group, the same chambers who not so long ago told the government, with the exception of the chamber from Altona who said they were not part of it, those chambers said to the government, "You should not be putting anything further into agriculture." Here we have the Member for Virten saying, "I want the Chambers of Commerce to have the opportunity to speak to the government about the concerns of agriculture." I would suggest to the Member for Virten that there are other groups which are much more sympathetic to the needs of agriculture than the chambers were at that time.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Now, it may be that the Chambers of Commerce, like some other groups, have come recently to be aware of the crisis in agriculture. I would not be surprised if in fact the chambers have changed their position because it is not just a concern for the farm families. What is happening in agriculture impacts on everyone in the rural communities.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to indicate to the members opposite that clearly there is need for concern to be expressed in the rural areas by other than, or in addition to, those who are on the land, those who till the soil, those who tend to the livestock. Because what happens in rural Manitoba, what happens in those farm communities, will determine what the shape of rural Manitoba will be like.

So we want to hear from the various groups who are out there, and we have been sensitive to those groups. I think if you look again at the programs that have been implemented by this government, it will indicate clearly that there is support and a genuine concern for the well-being of agriculture, because on this side of the House we recognize fully the importance of agriculture to the well-being of Manitoba.

I've indicated the importance of the Beef Stabilization Program introduced by the Minister of Agriculture on this side of the House, a program that was scoffed at by members opposite, and what do we hear today, if there is a concern, they feel there should be more, the program should be expanded. The very program that they criticized, they now say should be expanded so that the benefits of that program can flow to more. I congratulate them for their new-found support for the Beef Stabilization Program in Manitoba.

One of the members opposite said they really have the opportunity to participate in the federal program. I would ask them, how many of their constituents who are in the Beef Stabilization Program would trade the benefits of the Beef Stabilization Program in Manitoba for the program at the federal level?

Again, on matters of concern to the members opposite, they speak of the cost in agriculture, and it is true that much of the crisis in agriculture is related

to the cost of production. What do we have from the members opposite? When they had the opportunity to address the question of interest rates, did they speak to the question of interest rates? No, not as it would relate to the Federal Government, but they said it should be the government through MACC that should be doing something about interest rates, and this government did address the question; but I think it is clear that there was much more of an opportunity to influence what was going to happen with the cost of production to farmers through influencing the interest rates and I do not recall hearing from the members opposite that there should be some kind of an initiative at the federal level to see the interest rates brought down. But this government did not ignore that situation and it did what was within its power to address the cost of funding to rural Manitoba, to the farmers.

MACC has expanded its activity at a period in time when the federal lending agency, Farm Credit Corporation, has been contracting its activities in Manitoba. Further, the rates available through MACC are more attractive than those available through the Farm Credit Corporation. We do not consider that all of the needs of agricultural borrowers can be met through MACC.

We have indicated our willingness to participate cooperatively, as is evidenced in so many of the other things that we do, to participate with the private sector, and what did we do? We introduced the Loan Guarantee Program which recognized that there were limitations on our own capital, but we said that we would make a guarantee available to the lending institutions if they were prepared to take on some of the additional risks that were associated with some of those farming operations.

The Interest Rate Relief Program was introduced. In addition, we had the interest buy-down and the interest reduction through MACC. I would challenge at any time for the members opposite to compare the benefits to the Manitoba farmers, in terms of agricultural lending, the benefits of MACC compared to FCC.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, would the member be prepared to answer a question at the end of his speech?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, I would be delighted at the end of my presentation to entertain questions for as long as the members are interested.

The Member for Brandon West raises the question of elk ranching. It's a discussion I'm delighted to participate in because though I was going to be touching on it later, as part of my commentary on other natural resource issues, it is interesting that the members opposite, when there was the debate on the question of elk ranching, tried to present the issue in a way which said that elk ranching will be the salvation of agriculture in Manitoba, a naive statement if I have ever heard one, Madam Speaker.

That is their view of agriculture, that you can counter the impact of low grain prices by allowing farmers to raise elk. If that, in fact, Madam Speaker, is the depth of their understanding of agriculture, I think their constituents have need to be concerned; but I am proud

to say that we did have the opportunity for debate. When the members opposite say that there was not the opportunity to have input, it is only because they did not avail themselves of the opportunity that existed, but I must recognize that were some who did.

The Member for Ste. Rose was present at a meeting that we had in Neepawa. We had a meeting at Ashern and people attended. We had a meeting in Swan River. The Member for Arthur suggests that we had secret meetings. The meetings were public; the meetings were advertised in the media. It is only, I think, that the members opposite - and with all due respect to the Member for Ste. Rose who had the courage to come - the other members were too uncomfortable to come. They did not know what their position was going to be.

It reminds me of the comment that was made by the Member for Morris when he was interviewed on a television program and he was asked by the person doing the interview, "What will your position be with respect to this issue?" And the Member for Morris said, "It will be the opposite of what the government's position is". That is the dilemma they were facing on the question of elk ranching. They did not have a position on the issue.

People on this side of the House showed courage. We resolved a difficult issue. It is certainly one where we saw and others saw that there was an opportunity to explore . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris on a point of order.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I would ask that the Minister withdraw the statement. I've never been on TV making a comment on elk ranching in my life, Madam Speaker.

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

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, let me correct the Member for Morris in his misunderstanding. If he had have been listening, he would have heard that I did not say it was in the context of elk ranching. It was in another interview that I heard, but I thought the parallel was there. It was not with respect to elk ranching.-(Interjection)- . . . if the member is prepared to enter into the debate.

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

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, I will conclude my comments on elk ranching indicating only that we took a difficult issue, we resolved it and we gave indication of direction for the future.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The hour being 6:00 p.m., I'm interrupting proceedings according to the rules. When this matter is next before the House, the Honourable Minister will have 19 minutes remaining. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. (Thursday)