

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 4 March, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General

**HON. ROLAND PENNER, Attorney-General (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the Tenth Annual Report of the Manitoba Police Commission for the calendar year 1981. At present there are only three copies made available to me and I will endeavour to make sure that there are copies for all members as soon as they are available from the printer.

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

**HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS, Minister of Health (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I have a statement that I wish to make. I felt it was important enough and there are copies for all members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 1st I read a statement in this House respecting the impasse between the MMA and Government concerning the issue of binding arbitration. I stated that, whereas the MMA was demanding binding arbitration in connection with fee negotiations, the government could not accept this proposal under the threat that current negotiations would not succeed without binding arbitration. At the same time I reported that we were prepared to enter into serious discussions with the MMA regarding this issue but asked them to advise their negotiating team to return to the table and to bargain in good faith respecting the 1982-83 fee schedule. On Wednesday, March 3, 1982, I received the attached letter from Dr. Frank Pearson, President of the Manitoba Medical Association. Here's the letter:

"Dear Mr. Desjardins:

In response to your demand that the issues of fee negotiations and binding arbitration be separated, I wish to advise you that the Association's Executive Committee has adopted the following position.

### **MMA Executive Policy Statement on Compulsory Binding Arbitration**

"Whereas the Minister of Health has instructed the Manitoba Health Services Commission to cease all further negotiations with the Manitoba Medical Association, thereby violating the current MMA/MHSC contract,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

."1) That there be an agreement that all future negotiations and contracts between the Manitoba Government and the MMA provide for compulsory

binding arbitration to settle impasses.

"2) That the MMA's other collective bargaining principles, which require legislative action, be subject to immediate serious review by the Manitoba Government. Furthermore, that meaningful discussions take place with the MMA to determine when legislation can reasonably be introduced.

"3) That further fee negotiations with the MHSC be conditional on the above two principles being met.

"4) That the MMA's Job Action Committee organize and carry out a progressive work-to-rule campaign throughout Manitoba in support of principles one and two, above.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Pearson, M. D. President"

Mr. Speaker, I'm very disappointed that the Executive of the MMA have seen fit to reject my offer to resume negotiations in good faith. They know, as we all know, that the issue of binding arbitration requires changes in legislation — changes that will require much debate by a variety of groups including the Manitoba Government, other Provincial Governments, the Federal Government, the College of Physicians and Surgeons and certainly 50 percent of the practising physicians in Manitoba who have either rejected the principle or have yet to be heard. This being the case one can only assume that the MMA Executive have decided that it is not in their best interests to resume negotiations on the 1982-83 fee schedule but rather intend to lead their membership astray by suggesting that binding arbitration and the resulting changes in legislation are achievable without the normal debate and consideration that such an important issue deserves.

Furthermore, as indicated in Dr. Pearson's March 3rd letter, it appears that the MMA has already set up a Job Action Committee to organize and carry out a progressive work-to-rule campaign throughout Manitoba — a campaign that can only result in a deterioration of relationships between physicians and their patients.

It is with the foregoing in mind that I have now written the attached letter to the Manitoba Medical Association.

"Dear Dr. Pearson:

"This is in response to your March 3rd letter advising me of the MMA Executive Policy Statement on Compulsory Binding Arbitration.

"It is with extreme regret that I note the policy that your Executive Committee are supporting, however, before commenting on the four issues included in your letter, may I once more attempt to set the records straight insofar as "who" is violating the current MMA-MHSC contract.

"I'm fully aware that there is a contract in existence

between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the MMA that calls upon each party to enter into negotiations within a given time frame with the objective of arriving at a fee schedule that is acceptable to both parties. I had, and continue to have, every intention of honouring that agreement. May I point out that the MMA are neither bargaining within the intent or spirit of that agreement, in that they are now interjecting new conditions into the existing agreement that did not form part of the agreement that was signed a year ago. I refer specifically to your current demands for binding arbitration. If indeed, we are negotiating under an existing agreement, then let us abide by all terms of that agreement without either party interjecting new conditions.

"With respect to the four points included in your letter, please be advised of the following:

"(1) While you are resolved that all "future" negotiations and contracts between the Manitoba Government and MMA provide for compulsory binding arbitration, you have made no reference to "current" negotiations. Am I to assume, therefore, that this resolution refers to negotiations that may be carried out under future agreement, or am I to assume that you wish to reply to the existing agreement?

"(2) Regarding your request that other collective bargaining principles which require Legislative action be subject to immediate serious review, I have already given you a commitment in my February 25th letter to the effect that I was prepared to discuss the concept of binding arbitration with you and with my Cabinet Colleagues, and further, that I was prepared to enter into these discussions as urgently as possible. You will also recall that I provided you with a similar commitment in my February 24th letter, as well as a verbal commitment at our two previous meetings.

"(3) Regarding the resolution that future negotiations with MHSC be conditional upon the above two principles being met — again, if this refers to negotiations under a new contract, I'm prepared to consider this along with my colleagues. If, however, it refers to fee negotiations for 1982-83 which are to be conducted under the existing agreement which does not terminate until March 31, 1982, then I cannot agree with this principle.

"(4) Respecting your advice that your Job Action Committee has been organized to carry out progressive work-to-rule campaign throughout Manitoba — that, of course, is your prerogative, but I can only assume that your Executive is prepared to accept the responsibility for such advice to your membership — advice that can only serve to drive a deeper wedge between your Association and Government. I have great respect for the physicians who practise medicine in Manitoba and I do not feel that they will take any action that will be detrimental to the relationship they have with their patients nor will they in any way jeopardize the health requirements of their patients.

"In closing, Dr. Pearson, I am extremely disappointed that you have not enabled your negotiating team to return to the table and to negotiate in good faith under the terms of the existing agreement. e, however, I realize that the existing agreement runs until March 31, 1982 and I remain hopeful that you and your

Executive will, on reflection, permit a normalization of the negotiating practise under the existing agreement."

As indicated by the last letter to the MMA, Mr. Speaker, I remain hopeful that the current negotiations will be resumed before expiration of the current agreement and it is my intention to keep the public, the press and the practising physicians fully informed. Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his statement and to assure him that it is received on this side of the House with great concern. It is regrettable that there appears to be a situation building in which innocent victims will suffer the consequences of a situation over which they have no control and, in fact, about which they have never really been fully informed. I refer to those patients who will suffer inconvenience, indisposition, perhaps worse, as a consequence of the response that may be forthcoming from some practitioners in the province — and I emphasize the word "some" — to the instructions that have gone out from the President of the Manitoba Medical Association to invoke a work to rule strategy in the present circumstances.

I think we should not lose sight, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that it is the patients of those physicians who will suffer. It's not us in this House and it's not those of us who are fortunate enough to enjoy relative good health but those patients who require and depend on medical service are going to be seriously affected by any such tactic or strategy. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Minister, of course, and indeed I believe upon everybody in this Chamber to ensure that the impasse is broken and that a work to rule strategy, a work slowdown does not take place.

I have one other regret that I would express at this juncture, and that is, that it seems to me that the language of debate which had been relatively temperate and restrained up until a few days ago, now seems to be undergoing escalation on both sides. I would hope that all parties on all sides can revert to the most temperate language possible so as not to exacerbate the situation.

Lastly, may I urge the Minister, Mr. Speaker, because it is his responsibility in the final analysis to instruct the Manitoba Health Services Commission forthwith to make a counter-proposal on the fee schedule to the MMA in keeping with the clause in the existing contract. One may argue that is merely semantics because the 30 days have passed. Well I would accept that criticism, Mr. Speaker, but semantics or no, I think it is valuable to make every effort to undertake every initiative to resolve this situation before it worsens. I very strongly urge the Minister to instruct the Manitoba Health Services Commission so to do so that, in fact, negotiations and proposal and counterproposal, as an exercise in a mechanism prescribed under the existing agreement, exist de facto.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member of Community Services.

**HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, with leave I beg to Table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1981. Further, I am advised that copies of this report have been distributed to the Members of the Legislative Assembly in October, 1981.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. PENNER** introduced Bill No. 3, an Act to amend An Act Respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act in Regard to Statutes. Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'application de l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba aux textes législatifs.

**MR. PENNER** introduced Bill No. 4, an Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act.

**HON. EUGENE KOSTYRA** (Seven Oaks) introduced Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Arts Council Act. (Recommended by the Honourable, the Administrator of the Province of Manitoba): and Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the Gallery where, in the Speaker's Gallery, we are honoured to have with us the Speaker of the Ontario Legislature accompanied by Mr. Bob Fleming, the Director of Administration, and Mr. Tom Mitchenson.

On behalf of all the members I bid you welcome this afternoon.

Also in the Gallery, we have a group of students from Rosenort Collegiate, 21 students of Grade 11 standing under the direction of Mr. Bjarnson. This school is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

We have a group of 12 students in Grades 7, 8 and 9 from Glenboro School under the direction of Mr. Hudson. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

There are 26 students from Murdoch McKay Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Schroeder. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

On behalf of all the members I welcome you this afternoon.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) Mercier, (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that the Province of Manitoba is the implementing jurisdiction under the Core Area Initiative for the Logan Industrial Park?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, the Province of Manitoba is the implementing jurisdiction on behalf of the three parties to the Core Area Initiative Agreement with respect to the expropriation of land for the Logan Avenue Industrial Park.

**MR. MERCIER:** Can the Minister confirm whether or not the Provincial Government is funding a citizens group in the Logan area to make a presentation to Mrs. Shapiro's inquiry into the expropriation and if so, in what amount?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, this government on being sworn into office, was made aware of the fact that expropriations were proceeding in the Logan Avenue area with respect to the Logan Avenue Industrial Park, and we had been informed that the previous government had waived the right of inquiry under The Expropriation Act sometime last fall. On receiving this information it was felt that one of the aims of the Core Area Initiatives was to allow the citizens of the core area of Winnipeg to have a say in what would happen to their area. As a result of this information, the government appointed a Commission of Inquiry under The Inquiry Act to do what should have been done under The Expropriation Act, and to that end the Government of Manitoba is giving funds to the Logan Community Committee in the neighbourhood of approximately \$39,000 in order to make meaningful representation to the Commission of Inquiry so that the citizens of the area will have the opportunity of having their say in the plans for that area.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable Minister inform the House whether or not individuals who are being expropriated are receiving a form of salary or wages from this fund?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, the grant was made payable to the Logan Avenue Community Committee, in trust, I believe, and it was up to that group of citizens and their elected officials to spend the money as they saw fit in order to make adequate representation to the inquiry.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that apparently there is to be no accountability for the funds, can the Minister advise whether or not this grant is being cost-shared with the City of Winnipeg and Federal Government under the Core Area Initiative Program, or is it a unilateral action on the part of the province?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier in response to the first question, the Province of Manitoba is the implementing jurisdiction with respect to the expropriations on behalf of the three levels of government and as such, the costs of the assistance to the citizens of the area is being charged against the expropriation.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister confirm that he refused to allow his Deputy Minister, Mr. Sanders in Urban Affairs staff to make a public presentation before the inquiry, and instead has cast all the burden of making the presentation upon the City

of Winnipeg, its administration and its elected officials.

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, I made representation as the first person to the Commission of Inquiry last Monday evening and made a statement to the Commission of Inquiry which I am prepared to table for the information of the members opposite. The Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs has made a submission that has been tabled with the Commission of Inquiry, giving the objectives of the expropriating authority and I am prepared to table a copy of that for the members opposite and for the House. The Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs on behalf of the Province of Manitoba will be making representations to the Commission of Inquiry; I believe, it may be as early as tonight, it was scheduled for Tuesday night but he was not able to appear because of other witnesses. The City of Winnipeg was asked by the Commission of Inquiry to be the first agency to provide information to the Commission of Inquiry and the Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs and the Government of Manitoba be the second party to provide information to the Commission of Inquiry.

I have indicated in my presentation to the Commissioner that the province is prepared to co-operate in any fashion as need be and as requested by the Commission inquiry, in order to carry out her work to bring recommendations for it to the Province of Manitoba which will be discussed with the other two levels of government once they are made.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise this House how he hopes to attract private sector to not only the Logan area development, to the whole Core Area Program when he has undermined its whole credibility on its first major project by abandoning the whole operation to the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, the Core Area Initiative Agreement as I understand it, is to provide for major renewal of the core area of the City of Winnipeg, to attract new industries, to present a better climate for citizens to work and to live in the core area of Winnipeg, and we are certainly co-operating with all levels of government to achieve those aims.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House when he will find the time to meet with the Mayor and Mr. Axworthy to appoint a general manager so that the plan can get under way?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, I am able and willing to meet with the Mayor and the Federal Minister at any time. I have met with them on a continual basis at least once a week since assuming office. I met with the Mayor and a representative of the Minister a week ago last Friday, and spent some 10 hours interviewing candidates for the Core Area Manager outside of the time I had to come back into the House. I then again met with the Mayor and a representative of the Federal Government last Monday to review the applicants again for the core area manager, and I have agreed again, on request of the Mayor, to meet next Friday I believe, to again review the Core Area Manager. I am prepared to meet at any time to select a Core Area Manager, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye:

**MR. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister and would ask the Minister to inform the House whether or not his Legislative Assistant is acting on behalf of some of the people in the Logan area expropriation.

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

**HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY, Premier, (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that Mr. Corrin is, in his legal capacity, acting on behalf of some of the property owners in the Logan Industrial Park area.

**MR. BANMAN:** A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether or not the Premier's Legislative Assistant has access to files in his Department?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**MR. KOSTYRA:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister of Government Services absence, who is responsible in the Manitoba Government with regard to land acquisition, I wonder if the First Minister could inform the House whether or not his Legislative Assistant has access to files within the Department of Government Services, namely, the Land Acquisition Branch?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** No, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. It has been brought to light today, by senior members of his staff, that significant poaching and bootleg trading and selling of commercial fish is taking place in the province, and my direct question to the Honourable Minister is — the report referred to this morning was a specific report — would it be his intention to make that report public?

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

**HON. ALVIN H. MACKLING, Minister of Natural Resource (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I understand the poaching of fish was going on during the term of the previous administration and that some investigation has been made of this and the investigation is ongoing.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, let me then assure the honourable member that poaching of game and the illegal sale of fish has been going on since game have been caught and since fish have been caught in this province. It's a question of its significance and what this Minister, who is now responsible, is doing about it.

The question is, will the report that has been referred to in the media be made public?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I thought if the honourable member was listening he would have heard my answer. I said the investigation is ongoing and at this stage the report will not be made public.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I did not get the answer. I was asking about whether a report, whenever it is available, will it be made public, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, there's no question that once the investigation has been concluded and we decide whether or not either criminal proceedings are warranted, or whatever, then the report would be made public.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for that answer. Mr. Speaker, would he perhaps also assure the many hundreds of thousands of serious and dedicated Manitobans, who are concerned about the welfare of the game, that he will not use his influence, as he suggested it might have been used on another occasion in the early 70s when cattle rustling was a particular problem to the cattlemen, and he espoused that rather informal and unique policy that perhaps the first one should be on the house; would he indicate some support for his law enforcement officers, game wardens, that he intends to use his office in a diligent, responsible manner in reducing the amount of poaching that is going on in Manitoba?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I like the tone of the honourable member's question. He wants to draw some fire and I choose not to lower myself to the level in which he asked the question. I would just like to indicate to the House —(Interjection)— You know, I was always told by people that good things come in small packages and if we want to compare stature I certainly would not draw any reference to the Leader of the Opposition but I would think that your remarks might be better directed towards your Leader.

However, in answer to your question, certainly there was as much rustling took place under my honourable friend opposite as ever went on in Manitoba before, and we are still concerned with that issue and I hope that we'll have even greater success in addressing that problem than my honourable friends did.

**MR. ENNS:** I have no further questions but I rise on a matter of personal privilege. I appeal to you, what hair shirt, what sack of ashen clothes do I have to don before I can ask simple questions of this House without being accused of being mean and dirty and nasty. I'm honestly and genuinely trying to be a Mr. Nice Guy for a change and I need some co-operation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. I doubt the honourable member had a matter of privilege for the House. The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that the increase of \$46.5 million she announced yesterday, in her Edu-

cation Finance Program, was only the amount required by Statute under the legislation and regulations of the Education Support Program passed by the previous Provincial Government?

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

**HON. MAUREEN HEMPHILL, Minister of Education (Logan):** I am glad to be able to inform the House that the \$469 million announced that we have put in an additional \$12.2 million other than that required under the legislation that they brought into being. We did that for the purpose of meeting the deficiencies that were in place with the existing program, and that was the inequities and the disparities caused by disadvantaged Divisions.

We brought in a special program; we put in extra money.

**MR. FILMON:** I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister can inform us whether or not a portion of the \$12.4 million in supplemental grants, which she's just referred to, is derived from the Foundation Levy portion of the property taxes throughout the province?

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** A portion of the money, the derivation of the \$12.2 million, is coming from the Education Support Levy, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. FILMON:** So, Mr. Speaker, it's not really \$12.4 million additional of direct provincial funding then. Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether or not it is her intention to increase the Foundation Levy mill rates throughout the Province this year?

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** It has not been finally determined and, the information that he is asking for, the Public Schools Finance Board will be communicating with the municipalities by the March 15th deadline and he will have that information at that time.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, in view of the fact that last year only 5 out of the 57 school divisions in the province were required to have an increase in their Special Property Tax Mill Rate for school purposes, how many school divisions does the Minister expect will have an increase in property tax mill rates as a result of her new program?

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** That information is not available since the budgets have not been finalized yet by the School Divisions, so that information will be coming out in a week or two also. What I can tell you is that we are absolutely certain that the impact of the new program money that we have put into place is going to reduce the mill rate impact on the most needy divisions.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education, I wonder if she could inform me whether or not she is satisfied that the Consumer Price Index formula used to calculate the increase in education financing

which she announced yesterday accurately reflects the increase in operating costs at schools which she estimated range from some \$2,100 per pupil to \$3,200 per pupil.

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Consumer Price Index alone is an adequate amount of money to make up for the increased cost. I will say though that the figure we are using for the Consumer Price Index is the Canadian figure, not the Manitoba figure, and that gives them an additional 2 percent there, so we are giving additional leeway there. But apart from that we are recognizing that it does not quite make up for all of their increased costs, and we have increased the existing grants in areas where we have been told the needs are the greatest. And this information came from superintendents, from school trustees, from principals; everybody agreed to the same thing: they needed increased money in transportation, they needed increased money for books and because the needs at the individual school divisions vary, we increased the basic operating grant \$10,000, which means for every additional 50 students they have, they get an additional \$10,000.00. That they can apply to the areas where the needs are the greatest.

It's a four-point package, Mr. Speaker, and it's the combination of the Consumer Price Index, the increases on the existing components within the program, the additional money put into the hands of the school divisions that need it the most through the supplement program, and the money that is going in to help those also who need help the most — small schools — that gives us the package that is going to give them the help that they need.

**MR. MERCIER:** I thank the Minister very much, Mr. Speaker, for that thorough answer. Could she inform the House whether or not the increases in education financing include any increases in the per-student grant for independent schools?

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** No, it will not, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MERCIER:** I have one further supplemental question, Mr. Speaker, which I almost hesitate to ask in view of the applause that the previous answer received on the other side of the House. However, I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether she is prepared to give an undertaking to the House to review the funding of independent schools in order to provide a fair increase in the per-student grant to them and to review putting the whole funding of independent schools also on a formula basis which would reflect the increase in cost of living.

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that, as you have probably heard, we are undertaking a major educational finance review and all components of education finance will be considered during that review.

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

**MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie):** Thank you,

Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Community Services and Corrections. Notwithstanding the Minister's comments yesterday with respect to the proposed recreational swimming complex at the Manitoba School for Retardates in Portage la Prairie, can the Minister assure this House that no decision has been made up to this point to alter the design of that project?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday the entire matter is under review so that should give the honourable member the answer to this question as well.

**MR. HYDE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that does give me the answer that I'm looking for. However, I have a supplementary question to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell this House whether any officials or building contractors in Portage have been advised by his department or by Government Services that the design is to be changed?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the preceding answer should also apply but let me take this matter as notice — (Interjection) — the member asked some details and I — (Interjection) — would suggest that I'll take this as notice and advise the member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections. Could the Minister tell this House what the average waiting time is for prospective adoptive parents in Manitoba to receive a child for adoption? Would it be about two years?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, again, Mr. Speaker, to answer the honourable member precisely, I'd have to check into that matter and, indeed, I will.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the fact that if the Minister checks his records, I think he will confirm that it's roughly in the neighbourhood of 24 months or slightly more than 24 months, and would the Minister also confirm that the waiting list for adoption is fairly extensive in the province? Would it be fair to say that the waiting list comprised of prospective adoptive parents is substantial?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a suspicion that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has a fairly good feel for this particular subject having been previously responsible in this particular area. But again I will take that as notice and assure myself and the members of the House of the facts.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's efforts in this respect but in view of the fact that there's no specific answer at the moment, and proceeding on the basis that the waiting list is substantial and I think that investigation will bear that out, can the Minister of Community Services and Corrections advise this House why it is that the provincial Child Welfare Service is promoting the export of parentless

Manitoba Native children out of province and out of state over the prospective adoptive parents who are assembled on the waiting list and desirous of adopting Manitoba children, regardless of the fact that some of these are children who could be put in the category of special-needs children.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member that the procedures followed by the appropriate officials in the Department of Community Services are virtually the same, thus far at least, as those followed when the honourable members opposite were the Government of Manitoba. There's really been no change in these procedures.

With regard to the problem that the member alluded to, the question of children being placed for adoption out of the Province of Manitoba, I can advise that there is a lengthy process that is undertaken. A very great effort is made, I'm advised, to place people in homes of Manitobans and, failing that, in other homes in the rest of Canada; the very last resort, as I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would appreciate, the very last resort is a placement in a home outside of the country. I might add that the people that are placed outside of Manitoba are often in groups of two or three; they're children that come from broken homes and are often groups of two or three, sometimes four children. Very often they have additional problems such as physical problems, perhaps problems of mental retardation, other difficulties. It's only when they cannot be placed anywhere in Manitoba or where there's no suitable home in the rest of Canada, I'm advised, that then a home outside of Canada is considered.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Minister saying that the several dozen Manitoba Indian and Metis children that were exported to a private adoption agency in New Orleans in the course of the past year were all children that could not be placed in Manitoba homes; that had special needs that could not be accommodated in Manitoba? That appears to be what he is saying in his answer.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the whole procedure, I repeat. The procedure followed, as I understand it, it's the same one that's been followed for some time. I might remind the honourable member that various efforts are made to advise people in Manitoba of children that are available for adoption; if the particular agency cannot find a home within its own resources the child is listed in the Manitoba Adoption Bulletin which is published by the Child Welfare Directorate twice a month. I might also add that if this is unsuccessful then, through the courtesy of the newspapers of Manitoba, an ad is placed with no charge — it's called *A Child Who Waits* — which has wide circulation throughout the province, again advising Manitobans of the availability of certain children. I might add that this information is made available to various reserves including the Dacotah-Ojibway Child and Family Service Agency and the Southeast Tribal Council. In other words, there's a large extensive effort made. I repeat this is a procedure that has been in practice for some years.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister rescind or has the Minister rescinded a letter from a Mr. Richard Zeilinger of the United States soliciting Manitoba Native children, which is not in conformity with practice in previous years but appears to be reflective or representative of a somewhat new approach and a somewhat new policy, has the Minister rescinded that letter which appeared in the Manitoba Adoption Bulletin, or will he rescind that letter and ensure that social service agencies in this province are not solicited by means of that letter to transfer Manitoba children to points in the United States?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure whether the honourable member's suggestion is one that is appropriate. I don't know exactly what he means by rescinding but I would like to repeat that we're reviewing the matter and when a policy decision is made it will be announced in due course.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister undertake to advise those social service agencies in the Province of Manitoba — and he's got a list of them — who receive the Manitoba Adoption Bulletin and who got a bulletin that contained a letter from an agency in the United States urging them to make available Manitoba Native children for adoption through that agency in the United States, will the Minister contact those social services agencies and simply tell them that that letter is not consistent with the policy of his department and that it is to be ignored?

**MR. EVANS:** As I said, we're looking into the matter and we will make a decision on this in due course.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. STEVE ASHTON (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines. My question is in regard to the review of the proposed aluminum smelter which has been undertaken between the Province of Manitoba and Alcan. I'm just wondering if the question of location will be raised in that review?

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

**HON. WILSON PARASIUK, Minister of Energy and Mines (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, the joint review is under way and the question of site selection is one of the matters being looked into.

**MR. ASHTON:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Thompson has a number of economic, geographical and environmental advantages as a possible site for industry such as aluminum smelters; in view of the fact that we have accessed land water of Hydro and plenty of space in the City of Thompson, I was wondering if the minister could indicate whether the City of Thompson will be one of the locations which will be raised in the discussions with Alcan Aluminum?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, we are going to be asking Alcan to tell us about all the sites they have looked at and we are going to be asking them, as well, to look at a number of sites which we're asking people within the various departments of Manitoba to come out with as possible sites for an aluminum smelter, which would dampen any possible environmental impacts and I would assume that in that course Thompson would be one of the sites that is being put forward for consideration and discussion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** I have a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Recently I have received a number of enquiries from people west of The Pas indicating the re-occurring dead fish problem in the Birch River-Bracken Dam-Carrot River areas and I think members who were in the House last year will recall that the Member for The Pas had brought this question up a number of times last year, I'm wondering if the Minister can advise as to what information he has with respect to this problem and what his staff are doing about it?

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

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, that's the second fishy question from across the way and I don't think they're fishing in troubled waters because those waters have existed for some time. I don't think there's been any change brought about by my staff in any arrangements in respect to that system. However, if the honourable member is suggesting that the system that they had under their administration lacks something I will certainly look into it.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the Minister got the point of my question. I have asked the Minister to report to the House if, in fact, there is a lot of dead fish as a result of going up the Birch River and getting trapped in some of the smaller creeks and rivers in the Saskram area. This apparently has happened a number of years in the past, is it in fact actually happening at the present time, how bad is it and what is his staff doing about it?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I have been getting a lot of gratuitous advice from that side of the House but I would like to inform the House that that question had already been put to me by the Honourable Member for The Pas and I indicated to him that I would look into that matter and I will inform the House.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thank you very much for that answer. I was not aware that question had been brought up. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs, I was pleased to hear him remark yesterday that negotiations were going on very well in the new Northlands Agreement between the federal people and the provincial people. I wonder if he can advise the House as to when the signing of that new agreement can take place.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. COWAN:** I would like to thank the member for that question. It is a matter of great interest to all persons who are concerned with northern development and for that reason I have met with the Honourable Minister Pierre De Bane and the Honourable Minister Herb Gray over the past number of months for the purpose of discussing the continuation of the Northlands Agreement. As a result of ongoing consultation which has taken place throughout the province and as a result of those meetings, just recently the Honourable Mr. Gray and myself directed our respective staff to begin active and intensive negotiations for the purpose of bringing that agreement forward for signing with the least possible disruption in existing services and ongoing programs under the Northlands Agreement. So I can indicate to the member at this time that those negotiations are proceeding and I will be providing further information to the House as those negotiations continue along their way.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. GOURLAY:** I would like to thank the Minister for that answer, we would be very interested in knowing a specific date when that will be available. A further question with respect to the Special ARDA Agreement which, I believe, will be expiring the end of this March, I'm wondering if the Minister can inform the House as to what negotiations are going on with respect to a new Special ARDA Agreement at this time?

**MR. COWAN:** Well, to provide a more specific answer which the Member for Turtle Mountain requested from his seat, in respect to the Northlands Agreement, I can only indicate to him that the Northlands Agreement will be signed much sooner as a result of the new government being in place than if the old government had been in place.

In respect to the Special ARDA negotiations, I am pleased to inform members of the House that negotiations have proceeded very well and I would hope to be able to provide a specific answer in regard to when that agreement will be signed in the very near future to the member.

**MR. GOURLAY:** I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs could indicate whether the new agreement will allow Special ARDA funds to be used for capital construction or improvements on fish plants in the north?

**MR. COWAN:** As the member, Mr. Speaker, is aware the Special ARDA Agreement has been negotiated over the past few months and, as part of that process, there has been a Special ARDA Committee which has been developed and has been meeting; that Special ARDA committee has addressed that issue and made certain recommendations to those parties involved in the negotiations and I can assure the member that those recommendations have been taken into due consideration and I would expect to be able to provide him with the specific details as to what will be contained in that agreement when we, in fact, are able to



table that agreement. However, I believe it would be inappropriate, on my part at this time, to discuss the specific details without allowing the parties most interested and involved in the negotiations an opportunity to review them in detail. So, in short, I can answer him that I would not rule out that possibility and I would hope to be able to discuss the matter in more detail with him and others I know who are interested in that Special ARDA Agreement and negotiations which are ongoing in the very near future.

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

**MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the fact that the First Minister promised the agricultural people of the Province of Manitoba a Beef Income Assurance Program or a support program, immediate relief to their industry prior to the election last fall, I wonder if he could indicate to the farm community and the people of Manitoba when that announcement will be made.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this government has been most concerned in respect to the state of the beef industry in the Province of Manitoba and it is for that reason that my Minister of Agriculture has been meeting on a continuous basis with various beef producer organizations and beef producers in Manitoba and he has been working with them in order to bring forth proposals and plans in order to ensure that there is a level of assistance provincially. At the same time that he has been doing that he has been making representations to Ottawa for a Beef Stabilization Program and is still awaiting some response from Ottawa as he works on the provincial front as well. Specifically, my Minister of Agriculture will be making I'm sure in the not too distant future further announcements to this.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat concerned. I thought probably, in view of the fact that the First Minister had committed himself, and in fact I could ask him the question; what is his definition of immediately, because there is a press report out, prior to the election, that in fact there would not be any dragging of the feet but he would, in fact, introduce a program immediately. Is that sometime in the next month or two months or on until a lot more beef producers have disappeared off the scene as far as production of beef is concerned.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, let me assure the honourable member that our definition of immediately is much less time spacewise than indeed was the definition of immediately under the previous government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed Motion by the Honourable Member for The Pas and the proposed

Amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs has five minutes.

**MR. COWAN:** You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that as I was concluding my remarks yesterday afternoon I had indicated to the Member for Emerson that I would be providing more detail to him in respect to his question on the possible location of a waste disposal site in Kitson County by the Minnesota Government. I can inform him at this time that the Minnesota Government has formed a Minnesota Waste Management Board as a result of their Waste Management Act of 1980, and the purpose of that Board is to develop a hazardous waste management plan for that State. They have undertaken two specific objectives in that regard. The first is to locate a site for a landfill operation, and the second is to locate a site for a chemical processing plant. As a result of that process they have selected 20 candidate sites throughout the state. One is in Kitson County and nine are in the Red River drainage basin area, so those are the ones with which this Provincial Government and the people of this province are most concerned.

I can inform him that the one that is being suggested for the Kitson County site is a landfill operation only, and is not the chemical processing plant, as well as, that being the case in respect to the others in the Red River drainage basin. There is no plan for the chemical processing plant in the Red River drainage basin area at this time.

Even although that does allay fears somewhat, the Provincial Government has been in contact with Mr. Robert Dunn who is Chairperson of the Minnesota Waste Management Board over the past number of months and, as a result of that, there was a meeting held in mid-December in Manitoba between representatives of the Waste Management Board — Mr. Dunn himself being present — and environmental management division staff. According to correspondence which Mr. Dunn forwarded to the First Minister, after that meeting it was suggested that meeting resulted in protracted and productive discussions, so I can assure the Member for Emerson that we have discussed this in detail, and we have advised the Minnesota Waste Management Board of our concerns. We have been given a commitment as a result of that meeting that there will be continued close communication with Manitoba's environmental authorities in respect to the operation or the possible location of that plant.

I hope that information is of some value to Member for Emerson, and if he should have further questions, I would invite him to either give me a call or to maybe step over after my speech and I can go over some of the details with him if he's interested.

The reason I welcome that interest on the part of the Member for Emerson, on the part of all the members in the Chambers, is that we, too, are going to be faced with that sort of a process in the near future, because there are hazardous wastes. There are more and more hazardous wastes being generated, and as a Provincial Government, we are going to have to develop a comprehensive hazardous waste management plan. So we are going to look forward not only to the interest and respect of the Kitson County proposal but, as

well, in respect to any hazardous waste management plans which we may develop.

Now I want to give this commitment at this time, because this is an extremely important area and an area of great concern to many Manitobans. That commitment is we will conduct that program, that process, in the open and with an ongoing and continuing dialogue with the people of this province to ensure that their concerns are taken into consideration, and to ensure that, in fact, the development of that plan will be done so in the best interests of not only the whole province but in the best interests of those individuals who may be located in close proximity, if that is the case, of any such hazardous waste management site.

So that is an issue that was addressed in the Throne Speech and one which I wanted to clarify at this time. There were other issues respecting acid rain and some other environmental concerns which we will address over the next few months and, indeed, over the next few years. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to have provided that bit of information to the Member for Emerson.

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

**MRS. CHARLOTTE OLESON (Gladstone):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for the privilege of addressing this Assembly. I would, before commencing my remarks, like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment, and I would also to congratulate all the Members of this House from both sides on their election to this Assembly.

At this time, I would also like to pay tribute to Mr. Jim Ferguson, the former Member for Gladstone, for his faithful representation in this House. He left the constituency in good order I am happy to say, and it will not be easy to fill his shoes.

In this, my initial address to this House I will not only be introducing myself to you, but I will also be introducing to you the Constituency of Gladstone as it now stands after redistribution.

Of myself, I will say little, except I bring to this House a sincere desire to serve the people of Gladstone Constituency and the people of Manitoba. If my desire to serve my constituents brings me into conflict with the present Government, so be it.

The Constituency of Gladstone as it now stands, encompasses most of the old constituency plus part of Rock Lake, Souris-Killarney and Portage. With these new boundaries, the constituency covers a large expanse of farmland, parkland, towns, villages and hamlets, beginning in the centre of southern Manitoba and stretching north to Langruth on the shores of Lake Manitoba. It covers seven municipalities, and takes in the major trading centres of the Town of Gladstone, the Village of MacGregor, the Town of Carberry, the Village of Glenboro and the Village of Treherne, as well as numerous unincorporated centres. Therefore I am vitally interested in small communities and their growth and development.

The constituency includes a wide range of soil types suitable for growing a wide variety of crops and suitable for livestock operations of considerable size and variety. Therefore, I am vitally interested in grain

prices, the livestock industry, the Crow rate and other matters pertaining, in fact, all matters pertaining to agriculture.

Straddling the southern part of the constituency is a large tract of so-called marginal land which contains the Spruce Woods Provincial Forest and the Spruce Woods Provincial Park. One of the citizens who worked very hard to promote the creation of that park often remarks that there is no marginal land. All land is good for something. This park has certainly proved him right, as citizens from the immediate area and from all parts of Manitoba and beyond enjoy camping, desert hiking and beach facilities in the summer, and skiing, snowmobiling, hiking, skating and curling facilities in the winter. How wise we Manitobans are, now that we have decided to enjoy Manitoba winters, not merely endure them. This park has truly become one of the playgrounds of Manitoba. Properly maintained and husbanded, this fragile, sandy so-called marginal land can serve us well for many, many decades to come.

Further to the north in what is probably the geographic centre of the constituency, is the Manitoba Agricultural Museum at Austin. This large and expanding facility is a fitting tribute to the pioneers who built this fine province, who worked the land and built the agriculture heritage to what it is today. If you wish to catch the spirit of early Manitoba, be sure to attend the Threshermen's Reunion held annually at the museum. Last year approximately 40,000 people attended the reunion and a further 4,000 visited the museum during the year. The Board of Directors of this fine facility are to be congratulated for their work in preserving the history of Manitoba.

Austin, of course, is not alone in working to preserve the history of Manitoba. Most of the centres in the constituency have or are planning to create museums and compile books of local history to keep permanent records of their past. Many of the communities in the constituency have celebrated or about to celebrate their 100th birthdays. The Town of Gladstone recently held a very successful centennial concert and dance to kick off their centennial celebrations for this year. Other communities such as Rathwell, Holland, Carberry and McGregor are busy planning homecoming weeks and various other events to celebrate the fact that their community is 100 years old this year or next, a wonderful opportunity to reflect on the past as we look forward to the future.

In the last couple of months I've had the privilege of attending several Agricultural Society meetings throughout the constituency, at which Century Farm Awards were presented. These have been very interesting evenings. It has been fascinating to hear the history of some of the province's farms and to learn of the hard work that went into their creation. Truly our pioneers were of sturdy stock, or the farms and communities we know today would not be in existence. Sturdy stock it took to found this province and to bring it to the productivity of today. The sturdiness of us, their heirs, is going to be sorely tried in the months and the years to come.

As I listened with interest to the Throne Speech read by Her Honour The Lieutenant-Governor last Thursday, it occurred to me that perhaps the farmers of Manitoba should give up planting wheat, corn, sun-

flowers and such things, and perhaps they should plant money trees instead. That is what it's going to take to finance the intentions of the present government. We shall await with interest, the Budget, which will tell us just how many money trees to plant and how much money we will have to harvest to finance the proposed programs. In times when even the Leader of our Federal Government is telling us to slow down our spending, it seems rather imprudent to introduce programs which will cost the taxpayers even more money than they currently cannot afford.

I was disappointed to hear in the Throne Speech so much reference to that which the government intends to become involved in. To me, it said nothing to the investor wishing to invest in business in Manitoba, and it said nothing to the entrepreneur wishing to expand a small business or manufacturing firm.

It said nothing about real jobs within our communities throughout the province. It spoke of government doing for the people, that which the people with some initiative would very much like to do for themselves. Give us the climate and we'll provide the initiative to continue the well-being of this great province. Long-term, meaningful jobs are what we want for our young people and others in all parts of Manitoba, not patchwork short-term fillers, which bring only false hope.

Much has been made of the fact that there are seven women in this Legislature. It seems extremely sad that there should be need to be pleased when there are 7 out of 57 — not a particularly great record. One is forced to wonder what we women have been doing since we gained the right to be here. That, we all know, is a long story and a story that I will not go into at this time. The election of a woman is not new to the Constituency of Gladstone. Part of the southern area of the constituency was very ably represented at one time by Thelma Forbes, a former speaker of this House. Her able representation of the area certainly helped me as I campaigned in that part of the constituency. Mrs. Carolyn Morrison also ably represented the Rural Constituency of Pembina in the '60s. In fact, the Conservatives have been represented by women at various times and from various areas over the years.

In closing I'd like to thank the Constituency of Gladstone for electing me and I will certainly try to be worthy of the trust they have placed in me. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. ANDY ANSTETT (Springfield):** —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, with respect to the interjection from the other side, I'd like to start by saying I'm very happy to be back here, and very happy to be back here in a very different role. It gives me some pleasure to be here in that role.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that one of the members opposite may not share that happiness but I'm sure that you, as Speaker, know that I respect the office of the Speaker and the institution that this House is. I would like to begin by indicating my respect for you, and the choice of this House to place you in the Speaker's Chair, because having worked with you for many years and through many Sessions, I came to respect you as a man who not only knew the rules, but had a high respect for the parliament, the institution

that this assembly is, someone who will do his best to guide us in our deliberations. I trust, Sir, that despite my former career, I know that I will err and sometimes not always do those things that you would expect from me and I trust, Sir, that you will give me the guidance that I will deserve and I will give you my promise now, that I will do my best to heed that and always speak and act in the best interests of this Assembly and of its traditions.

I would like also, Sir, to acknowledge the fact that serving this Assembly and this province, we have, for the first time in this province's history, a female Lieutenant-Governor. I think that says something for the comment the Member for Gladstone just made about the progress of women in this province, and the fact that we no longer have to make special note of the fact that there are seven members or 20 members in this House. But certainly, Manitoba is only the second province in Canada to have a woman as Lieutenant-Governor, and I not only welcome her but I wish her well in her new role. To date she has not only been exemplary, but she has shown a great deal of ability and intelligence in addressing that job.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the new Sergeant-at-Arms and the staff of the Assembly for the tremendous way in which they serve the members here. I know that the job of serving members in this House cannot always be an easy one, so I would like to assure the members of the staff that we have their confidence as members and show some respect for the service that they provide to us.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great personal honour to serve this House. Although I've served it in the past in a very different role, I recognize that the role of a member is probably one of the highest honours that can be bestowed on anyone in the Province of Manitoba. I approach that role with some humility and some insecurity because I know from past experience what it takes, and the effort that must go into being a member on either side of the House, in any of the variety of roles in which members are called upon to serve. I know that all other members approach the task with basically the same perspective. With regard once again, to the question of the makeup of the present Legislature, I would like to suggest to the Member for Gladstone that I, too, share her concern that there are so few women in this Legislature, and I would like to suggest to her that I would support her in any efforts in which she intends to engage to ensure that in the next Legislature there will be 23 women on that side of the House. "There might well be 34 on this side," says the Member for Woleseley. I'm not sure I would welcome that with the same willingness that I would welcome 23 on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the Constituency of Springfield is historically one of the oldest constituencies in Manitoba. It dates from the immediate post-confederation period. It covers at the present time, almost 4,000 square miles, five different municipalities, four different school divisions and a large area of provincial forest and approximately 90 percent of the Whiteshell Provincial Park. It has been said by many in commenting on the riding in the past that in many ways it is a microcosm of the province. It has urban areas close to the city, it has a large farming component, many small towns and villages. It also has a resource-based extraction

area and a tourist industry in the eastern areas. So Springfield in some ways allows a member to have a perspective on the province which is not available to those who unfortunately, have the opportunity to represent a riding which is much more homogeneous. It is very different than a straight urban riding, or a completely rural riding, or a northern riding. On the other hand it means that one must seek to represent all those various interests, and that too can be an impossible task.

I hope over the next four years to do my best to represent all the constituents in my constituency, to speak for them with a voice based upon my own experience and my knowledge of their concerns by communicating with them, being available to them, and trying to understand their problems and their interest. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure as the member for Burrows said when he seconded this motion in reply to the Address from the Throne, is the objective of all members.

But I think at the same time, we must view our role here as that also of a representative. We can't perceive ourselves strictly as someone who responds to all of the interests in our constituency, because they will be divergent in every constituency, not just a widely diverse one. But you will have many interests calling upon you as I have on me, and we will have to make decisions and vote and speak in terms of the conscience we have, rather than purely responding to the views of our constituents.

When I hear the debate in response to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of an old story which was told in this House many years ago, I believe first by the member for Morris, although the past member for Inkster may lay prior claim. It involves the story of three envelopes. I am sure most of the members in the House have heard the story, but I would like to tell it again probably with near as much flair or ability as those who told it before. But I would like to tell it because it has something to say about the kind of Throne Speech Debate in which we have engaged in this Chamber the last several days. That's the problem, the Member for Emerson, that the envelopes appear to be opened in a very funny order, but on the other side of the House.

The story goes something like this, and it may well have happened to one of our new Ministers on December 1st. The Minister of Health may well have left three envelopes for the Member for St. Boniface. On top of the envelopes there was a note when the Minister went to his clean, desk and on those three envelopes this note said, "When you get in trouble in your new position and with your new responsibilities, either within your department or in the House when dealing with the Opposition, I'd like you to open the first envelope. Then if you get in trouble again and the answer that is provided in the first envelope does not provide the remedy which you seek — and only then — open the second envelope. Then when all else fails, and neither of those remedies work, no matter how much you switch back and forth between them, you decide that you must find another remedy, open the third envelope."

Well, most of you know the story. The new Minister opened the first envelope and it said, "Blame the previous government." So for some months going on to a

year, he blamed the previous government for every problem he had, and generally it worked. After awhile it failed, and I am sure some of our Ministers will encounter the same situation. After awhile it won't wash anymore, you have to accept responsibility for your own actions.

Then he opened the second envelope and it said, "Blame the Federal Government," and that works for awhile. But after that fails, the Minister, in desperation goes back to his office, takes that third envelope from the trusted drawer where he has had it locked for those several years, opens it up in furious haste, because he is really frustrated with not being able to handle all the opposition he is getting and press criticism and he finds inside a short note which reads, "Prepare three envelopes."

My problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Opposition appears to have the envelopes this Session. Now, I didn't believe that the Honourable First Minister of this Province left three envelopes for the Leader of the Opposition; I didn't think he would do that. I didn't think he was such a helpful, compassionate person, but it appears he has. On Monday afternoon I heard the previous First Minister of this province, the Leader of the Opposition, talk about — at great length — the evils of the Schreyer administration. I suggested to the Minister of Mines and Energy that perhaps when he spoke, he should speak about the evils of the Weir administration. I wasn't sure how far back we were prepared to go. —(Interjection)— The Member for Minnedosa is sensitive that we might enter into a debate on the Weir Administration.

For the same reason that a debate upon that administration holds no merit for the future of Manitoba, rehashing criticisms that are four and five years old of a previous government, holds no future for the people of Manitoba. If we are going to be constructive and talk about the economy of this province, the direction and the future of this province, then we should be looking at that direction and developing new ideas and providing constructive suggestions and criticisms with that in mind. Certainly, that's part of the role that we have as backbenchers to this government, and I am certain that most of the members opposite prescribe to that same philosophy. So I have to reject out of hand the suggestion that the only way to provide constructive opposition and constructive suggestion, regardless of where we are in this House, is to harp back to old criticisms and old problems.

The day of the Throne Speech I received in the mail a copy of a speech made by a former Sunday School teacher of mine, approximately 20 years ago he was a Sunday School teacher, the speech was just two weeks ago. He's now in a position where copies of his speeches are mailed out to people. He had something to say which I think is instructive for us in this Throne Speech Debate and in our consideration of where we should be going with the financial and economic affairs of this province.

I'm going to quote at some length but I think it's worthwhile in this case:

"It is instructive to recall that Americans and Canadians do not see eye to eye on the issue of the role of government in the economy. Americans demonstrate a widespread and amazingly persistent ideological commitment to free enterprise. In this context current

American economic policy is merely the contemporary expression of an historic faith in the superiority of a system based on limited government and untrammelled free enterprise.

"The Canadian approach is, and always has been, a little different; we are more pragmatic. In part this tendency to look at government involvement on a case-by-case basis derives from the sheer dimensions of some of the challenges we faced from the building of the railways to the James Bay project.

"In addition, the importance in our economy of the quasi-monopolies like electric utilities has justified an active role for the state. That role has been broadly accepted by all sectors of society. Such government enterprises as Ontario Hydro, Canadian National and Alberta Government Telephone are part of the Canadian social, as well as the economic fabric. The Canadian experience suggests in specific circumstances government in business can be socially and economically advantageous. We have neither the American's deep-rooted suspicion of government in business, nor the Marxist blind faith that government ownership is the magic key to a just society."

The amazing thing about this quote is it wasn't really made by a Sunday School teacher; it was made by the President of the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada in his address to shareholders in Waterloo, Ontario 10 days ago. When he made that address what he was recognizing, as the President of one of the most important financial institutions in this country, is something that the Leader of the Opposition and most of the treasury benches of the last administration of this province failed to recognize; we live in a mixed economy. And those people who fail to recognize that, and administered this province for four years, provided us not with a mixed economy but with a mixed-up economy. That was the legacy they left to us when we formed an administration.

There are some pretty substantial differences in the approach that the people of Manitoba can expect from an NDP administration compared to the administration we had over the last four years and, I think, perhaps some of the references that were contained in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition in reply to the Address from the Throne shed some light on the differences in that approach.

Those people who believe that the best kind of government that we can have is the absolute, minimal, least government available; that the best government is a government that has no business whatsoever in a mixed economy, assisting business, stimulating the economy, priming the pump; are the kinds of people who would argue that when the Province of Manitoba gives the City of Winnipeg the money they asked for to assist them in meeting their financial obligations in the coming year, but says a small portion of that must be used to freeze transit rates; that we have now trampled the rights of the City of Winnipeg, completely hamstrung the rights of the Council to make their own decisions when only a very small portion of their grant has now been made conditional; are those who believe that government has no place in developing the economy of our province.

Similarly, those who would argue that as part of the grant formula to be provided to the major post-secondary educational institutions of our province

will go one small condition, that condition being that there will be no tuition fee increases in this province in the next academic year, are faced with the same argument again that suddenly academic freedom has been trampled upon; that the universities are being denied the right to administer their affairs. Mr. Speaker, what has trampled the rights of the universities in Manitoba more, the New Democratic party saying there shall be no tuition fee increases in the next year or four years of academic spending increases that did not even match 50 percent of the rate of inflation. I don't think there is any question. The freedom of the universities to make their own decisions with regard to the administration of their programs and their responsibilities has been hamstrung far more by the lack of provincial funding and the lack of a willingness, on behalf of the previous administration, to provide the support that was required.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa has some concern about the nature of the debate in this House. I can only tell him that I will extend to him the same privilege that he has extended to me in commenting freely on his speeches and I must tell him that I consider it welcome because I think that's an important part of the debate in this House, that we can have that kind of exchange.

I also have some concern about the suggestion from the opposition that the present administration has been scaring capital away — I think that was the phrase that the former Premier used. He talked about this discredited administration of the early '70s having scared capital away and the present government doing the same. But I ask him, when investment in manufacturing and in virtually every other sector of our economy during the last four years was at record all-time lows, who scared the capital away from this province? That's the question that has to be asked and that's the answer this House deserves. Not chivalric tripe. Is that the phrase? Is that the right phrase? Chivalric tripe about scaring away capital when the record lows for private sector capital investment in this province occurred during the last four years. — (Interjection) — That's exactly right. And the Member for Minnedosa knows I'm right or he'd be up to ask a question providing the proper statistics if he doubted it.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other problems that we've had to face in the last few days is the suggestion that the politicization of the Civil Service of Manitoba has continued apace as it did over the last four years. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that they admitted that it was a continuation; I think they suggested it was a startup again. For those people who were in the Civil Service of Manitoba during the period of the previous administration — and I was one of them for at least part of that time — I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the degree of politicization of the Civil Service that was accomplished under the previous administration, not so much through hiring their own people or putting in place people who they considered to be their own, but through direct intimidation, through the suggestion that if you're not "fer" us, you're "agin" us denies the basic precept of a free parliamentary system which the former Premier enunciated just last Monday. He said, and I quote him "that the foundation of our parliamentary system is a neutral civil service." Yet for

two-and-a-half years I saw that Civil Service intimidated by the suggestion that if you don't agree with us you're "agin" us. —(Interjection)— That not only is true, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Minnedosa but I personally experienced it and so did many other civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, as well, there's been some suggestions, not only by the Leader of the Opposition but by other members opposite who were formerly on the Treasury Benches of this province, that we should have some concern about the amount of money that's being borrowed overseas — I think the term was in exotic foreign currencies. Mr. Speaker, I think we should ask the Leader of the Official Opposition to direct that same question to the Premier of the province immediately to the east of us who have made substantial borrowings in those exotic foreign currencies and handle them exactly the same way the present administration is handling them, by acknowledging the fact that we are faced with a foreign currency loss. No one questions that; no one on this side of the House questions the currency fluctuations have worked to the disadvantage of Manitobans. However, any Finance Minister worth his salt would be spreading those losses over as long a period as possible in the long term expectation that we can recover some of that loss or at the very least allow the interest cost per year to be reduced as low as possible. Anyone who suggests that we should refinance in North American currencies, whether they be U.S. or Canadian, and accept that loss is arguing that we should take our losses immediately and not spread those losses over the long term and possibly regain those dollars.

The Honourable former Minister of Natural Resources has a problem with that because he recalls that in June of 1980, I believe June 1st to be exact, his former Minister of Finance, the former Member for Riel, refinanced a \$25 million bond issue in Swiss francs into U.S. currency and cost the people of this province \$16 million when he didn't have to. That should be remembered —(Interjection)— No! I have a problem, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite — not the Member for Minnedosa because he has not made these suggestions yet in debate — that the state of the Manitoba economy, which was left to this present administration by the previous government, is in such sad condition that we're going to have to have tax increases. That's what the Member for Turtle Mountain said on February the 24th. It's quoted in one of the local newspapers as suggesting that because of the equalization problems, because of the large deficit which we have inherited from the previous administration, we could be looking at a deficit as much as \$500 million next year and that would be unacceptable, so we would have to have tax increases.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm having a problem here; I think the Opposition is trying to outsnooker us. I think they're trying to suggest that a very modest spending program — and I don't have the total figures here — the Member for Lakeside said they wouldn't do that. The Member for Lakeside is probably the fellow who thought it up. They're trying to suggest that because of some very modest spending increases — I don't have the total but I'm sure the Minister of Finance could tell me what the total cost of those spending

programs amounts to — but probably something less than one-fifth or one-quarter of the projected deficit for next year when we get to the Budget stage, we will be represented by a very modest spending program. The people of Manitoba didn't expect us to spend a lot of money; they knew the mess we were left; they knew that the province promised them four balanced Budgets, left them with four deficits including record deficits. They know, it doesn't take much to figure out that accumulative total deficit over four years in excess of \$400 million, approaching \$500 million will cost the Province of Manitoba at current interest rates over \$75 million just to service. Mr. Speaker, if we did the calculations, I think what we would find is that the former Ministry opposite provided us with a debt obligation which we must service next year which is greater than the cost of all the new programs we've announced in this year's Throne Speech. That's a very interesting observation. Mr. Speaker, that's part of the snookering process and I think the people of Manitoba should be aware that's part of the obligation that we've inherited.

The other part of the obligation relates to a drop that's somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$160 million in federal equalization payments. That, too, is going to be a burden on the people of Manitoba because unlike the previous government opposite, we are prepared to acknowledge that the revenues of this province must come from the people of this province, and we're not going to make loud noises, bashing the Feds over the head blaming them for every single thing that we have to do in this province. —(Interjection)—

The Honourable Member for Emerson suggests that we should make the rich farmers pay. I'm not sure that his constituents would appreciate that suggestion, but the next time I'm in Emerson I will pass it on to them. Mr. Speaker, there's no question as well that because of the total disastrous economic mismanagement of the previous administration and the national economic decline that coincided with that, that we've been faced with a very dramatic decline in revenues in this province. So when we're faced with the cost of carrying the previous government's deficit, the cost of carrying the changes that have been made in the Federal Equalization Formula which weren't helped by the fact that you people weren't prepared to co-operate but just wanted a Fed bash, and the fact that we have initiated some minor programs which were intended to redress some of the grievances which went unattended for four years means that there's going to be either a very large deficit this year or a Provincial Finance Minister looking for new sources of revenue. If you think you've out-snookered us by talking about tax increases, you haven't, because everybody out on the street knows that if a government is going to provide the services that they want and that they voted for on November 17th, it's going to cost money, and if the Federal Government isn't going to pay for it the people of Manitoba will have to.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Lakeside, who I'm sure knows the facts but would like to see them in the record, last year there were 43 wells drilled in Manitoba by private companies plus somebody from Saskatchewan, the name escapes me, but I think it has something to do with the government of

that — What did your Leader call it? Pretty little province west of us or something. Out of those 34 wells that were drilled last year, 33 were producing wells, 33 were productive, so when you talk about a Dry Well Program the Member should look at the records from his own Department, or Department for which he was responsible at one time in the past, and find that the records in Manitoba are actually very encouraging. In fact, your former Minister of Mines, former Member for Riel, went to great lengths in just the last Session praising the results of private exploration in this province. Now the Member for Lakeside wants to suggest that the people of Manitoba have no right to participate in that, and I deny that. The people of Manitoba have every right and should participate in the development of the natural resources of this province, and we intend to do it.

The Member for Minnedosa would like to talk about the Trout Lake Mine. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have, please?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has eight minutes remaining.

**MR. ANSTETT:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa wants to talk about how the previous Conservative administration in this province sold or gave away, and I'm not sure about the exact nature of it, it was either a bargain basement fire sale or it was a gift, to private concerns, one-half of the interest that the people of Manitoba had in a mine they helped discover. Now how can you defend that? I'd like the Honourable Member for Minnedosa to defend that sellout when he participates in this debate. I don't think it can be defended, I don't think there's any way.

The Member for Minnedosa suggests that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting would not be interested in smelting a high grade ore provided to them. They do it for Sherritt Gordon, they'll do it for another company that's prepared to extract that ore. Granges of Sweden would have been quite happy to be actively involved in the development of that mine. When the Honourable Member for Minnedosa makes his contribution I hope he will provide the facts that show why the people of Manitoba had to be denied half of their interest in that mine.

Mr. Speaker, part of the philosophy which pervades on the other side of the House is a philosophy of growth without control, a philosophy of growth at all costs, because the only way they can avoid the kind of restructuring and re-distributive forces which must work in our society is to increase the size of the pie. We've heard that argument before; in fact the former Member for Inkster and the Member for Lakeside used to debate at some length in this Chamber about the fact that economic growth, for its own sake, was the only way to provide to the people of Manitoba the standard of living and the benefits in this society that they wanted, and that whole objective seems to pervade the way they pursued, in some cases, with very ill advised notions of negotiating practises, four gigantic Mega Projects in this Province. Growth for growths sake; let's make the pie grow and then the benefits will filter down to everyone. In doing that and having that philosophy they forgot about the fact that the society has great wealth today and that one of the biggest

problems we have is not the creation of wealth but the distribution of wealth, and four years of neglecting that distribution has left on us the burden of setting some of those matters right in our first term in government, and that is going to be one of the main focuses, and that is why you did not see massive spending on social programs in that Throne Speech. So, Mr. Speaker, I have addressed myself to some of the concerns that have been expressed by members opposite about what was in the Throne Speech. They may not be entirely happy with my interpretation of their remarks or of their intent with regard to this speech, or of the suggestion that they must bear the largest responsibility for the economic position in which this province finds itself. However, I am not alone in expressing that opinion. The people of Manitoba rendered that verdict some three-and-one-half months ago. They expressed the opinion that the economy of this province and the government which had stewardship over that economy were both in pretty rough shape, and they were faced with a government that was prepared to deny that was the case. They were faced with a government that said, "Everything's rosy." At least we had the integrity to tell the people of Manitoba, not only during the election campaign, but ever since then, that times are tough and that it's going to take a while to set things straight.

I dare say to the Member for Lakeside, had you had the wisdom and the integrity to tell the people of Manitoba that, you would have had no problem on November 17th. The Member for Transcona said, shortly after the Election, the biggest problem with the previous administration in this province was that they were not prepared to tell it like it was, and the people of Manitoba expect that from their governments, they deserve to get it, and from this government they will get it for four years, for eight years, for twelve years, and if we're lucky, for a lot longer than that.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that new members in the House are expected to be nice and talk about their constituencies, I feel a kinship to many of the members in this House who were not first elected in this Legislature, because I've known all of the members for some time; many of them through seven Sessions and I felt that I would have freedom, and it obviously has been well received, by persons like the Member for Minnedosa, to be very specific and very direct in my first remarks in the Chamber, but I'd like very briefly to speak to the question of what this Chamber is and what it means to me, and I suspect to all the members here.

I commented earlier on the staff in the Chamber and on the confidence that I and I am sure most members have in them and how we come to rely on them. I am confident that the efforts of the previous government in the area of enhancing the facilities in this House and the staff of this House will not go unrecognized by members in this government. In terms of member services, in terms of additional staff — I think there are now two Clerk assistants, a full-time Clerk at committees and additional staff elsewhere in terms of the Chief Electoral Office — the former Attorney-General deserves the credit and the praise of all members for having brought in those changes.

Mr. Speaker, I have confidence that all members in the House share also my concern, not only that those

changes should continue, but that the only way we can make this system work despite our differences across the floor and despite sometimes the bluntness that we may provide in our debate. Sometimes even, I have heard it said, that we stoop to the middle road rather than the high road. The Member for Fort Garry suggested the other day that those kinds of suggestions will never be taken personally, because we all recognize that not only is this institution important and that we all come here to make a contribution, but more important than that each one of us, I am sure, recognizes the sacrifices that every other member of this House has made to be here; that we all come here in a spirit of public service to sit on one side or the other because we believe that the party to which we bear allegiance has a philosophy and a direction to which we hold and to which we think there is merit. I will never suggest that the Member for Niakwa or the Member for La Verendrye does not believe the things he says in this House, as I am sure he would not suggest the same of me. I respect all members in this House and respect them as men and women who are prepared to stand up for what they believe, hold those beliefs strongly and are prepared to make a commitment of time and a commitment to their whole life's career in terms of disruption that means that they are going to try to make this province a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am here, I know that all members are here for the same reason and I hope that when I err and sometimes get carried away in Debate, members will remember these remarks, that I respect the contribution that all members make and wish them well in the forthcoming Legislature. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. DONALD ORCHARD, (Pembina):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my personal congratulations to you on your elevation to the highest office in this Chamber. A number of people on both sides of the House have indicated that they trust in your ability and your integrity and from past experience know you to be fair and resolute and will be an excellent mediator in the House. I don't have the background from more than four years back when some of the members on this side of the House knew you as a fair chairman of committee but I do remember, Mr. Speaker, and I want to remind you of my confidence in you in that in the short term that I have been here and was a member of one standing committee, we had enough confidence in you, Sir, to make you chairman of that committee which I believe was somewhat unusual for a member of the Opposition to be a chairman of a committee of government. So, Mr. Speaker, I offer you my personal congratulations and best wishes.

I want to welcome back to the House a number of my former colleagues on this side of the House, as well as a few familiar faces on the government side of the House. I particularly want to welcome all of the newcomers here; there is only one problem with them, that there is too many there and not enough here, but those sort of things have a habit of being remedied and the remedy is only three years and nine short months away, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech to the Throne made, I thought, very excellent contributions in their moving and seconding. The Member for The Pas has a certain right to be slightly euphoric for the honour that his First Minister and his Treasury Bench awarded to him by asking him to move the first Throne Speech of the new government because, Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed that same euphoria when I moved into the Chamber. As a matter of fact — no, it wasn't quite the same seat but I had that honour — I enjoyed that same feeling of euphoria, that same feeling of good contribution that I was chosen to address the first Speech to the Throne. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind the Member for The Pas that he should enjoy that feeling of euphoria whilst he can, because after four years from moving that first Speech to the Throne, I am now on this side of the House as he may well be four years from now.

The Member for Burrows, in seconding the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, likewise made an excellent contribution to the seconding of the Throne Speech. I might remind him that in the first term that I was here, the gentleman on our side of the House that seconded the Throne Speech is no longer with them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the First Minister and his members of the Treasury Bench — (Interjection) — Yes, I'll do that and I trust the First Minister will pass along that congratulations. I had decided some time ago that I was going to offer a special congratulations to two of those members. But after the last several days in the House, Mr. Speaker, I decided to shorten the list to one, because one of the Treasury Bench appointees, whom I thought to be in my relationship with him to be both fairminded and a gentleman, has cast some doubts as to that in his recent few days in the Chamber. But, Mr. Speaker, the second person, the Member for Logan I think should contribute as did her predecessor in Education to the betterment of Education. I think the choice of that member for Minister of Education was well founded by the First Minister, in view of the fact that she does have considerable background as a trustee in the education system in the Province of Manitoba. That experience from a trustee point of view should stand her well to come to grips with the number of problems financially that school boards do wrestle with and the very real issues in Education. If only that Minister can resist some of the pressure that she will be put under by various members of the front bench to possibly bring in Deputy Ministers who will abrogate her feelings and her beliefs in the education system, she will do well.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has indicated that there is a temporary shortage of Cabinet Ministers, and I would think that he is using this first Session to determine who might move down from the expanded ranks of the backbench into that honoured Chair of the Treasury Bench. I can assure the Member for The Pas and the Member for Burrows that in what I've heard to date, they are still in the front running. Very little contribution from some of the other members is going to, I think, expand their esteem in the eyes of the First Minister and there might be one exception and that being my colleague behind me here from Flin Flon, who made what I thought was quite a good contribution.



The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is a very interesting one. I noted with interest the other day when a number of the backbenchers from the government side said that they participated in the formulation and the writing and the content and the facts of that Throne Speech; all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is shame on those backbenchers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we thought on this side of the House that it was the tired gang of five with previous Cabinet experience that had written that wretched document and here we find that the whole backbench had something to do with it; and what is alarming about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is alarming about that is the fact that we heard after the election of the new government that they had a wealth of talent to select from and if the Throne Speech and their obvious contribution by their own admission to the Throne Speech is an example of their talent and direction, then I don't envy the First Minister in his selection as to who moves up to the Treasury Bench. But then, of course, one must temper that endorsement of the newcomers to the ND Party Government and their recommendation as being full of talent by the nature of the writer who indicated that.

Ms. Russell has from time to time not been noted for her objectivity in presenting facts —(Interjection)— well, I realize that is an unkind thing to say about Ms. Russell, but I will offer you ladies and gentlemen one small shred of evidence to back up what I'm saying and that being that Ms. Russell has never yet condemned the Federal Government and everybody in Canada knows that's a terrible government, and that's the level of her objectivity.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will, of course . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I will of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, support the motion of non-confidence. I only have one reservation about the motion of non-confidence that was presented to this House and that is that it could have been much shorter. It could have said, "Whereas the Throne Speech offers nothing to Manitobans." But in the fact that it added a few words which are very worthy of support and I know, judging from the reaction to some of the members in the backbench, that the vote will be a very interesting one because some of them are tearing at their hearts right now not knowing which way to go on the vote. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I look forward to the vote on the non-confidence motion.

Now there were two bright lights in that very dim Throne Speech and I chastise the First Minister for placing Her Honour The Lieutenant-Governor in her first Throne Speech, as a matter of fact, in the first Throne Speech delivered by a lady in the Chamber of Manitoba to give her such an unenthusiastic and unimaginative Throne Speech. I chastise him for that. He should not have subjugated the Lieutenant-Governor to such a poor pickings in a Throne Speech. But, nevertheless, there are two bright lights. There is the mention of the centennials with Brandon celebrating

their Centennial and Selkirk celebrating their centennial and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the House recognized Brandon in a number of ways last year in advance of their centennial year which we are now in.

For instance, I would highly recommend that each and everyone of you in the backbench get a copy of the road map of Manitoba for 1981-1982. It features —(Interjection)— yes, my picture is on it incidentally. It's a very becoming likeness, I will admit, that took 101 poses, but we feature, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the beautiful east entrance view, an aerial photograph of Brandon and that's how we chose to recognize Brandon's Centennial. I only hope that the new government represented as it is from Brandon does a few things for Brandon in their centennial year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am shocked, dismayed and angered by the fact that only Brandon and Selkirk were mentioned as centennial communities. I can understand Selkirk because there is some parochial interest on that side of the House in Selkirk. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the First Minister was very remiss in that he didn't mention that Morden was celebrating its centennial this year and Morden is that bastion of good citizenry in south-central Manitoba and I can understand where it's forgotten by this government. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you and the members of the House that Morden on Wednesday night, the evening before the opening of the Legislature, undertook their first centennial celebration and what was that, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Well, I'm glad you asked because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Kinsmen Club of Morden in their first celebration of their centennial year honoured the senior citizens of the town of Morden, and some 525 senior citizens resident in the Town of Morden were treated to an evening of food and entertainment, compliments of the Morden Kinsmen Club. I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you and other members of this House will recognize that as a tremendous contribution by a volunteer organization such as the Kinsmen.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to take the odd moment if I might to talk about the election. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my estimation there were two very grave problems in the election. The first problem was that we lost; the second problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the ND Party won. Now, I think that bears some time in this House to try and determine what happened during the election, because bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that oppositions don't win elections, governments lose and I'm not certain whether that happened or not, but time will tell and in the ensuing months and it has already started, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that government is well on the way to losing the election of 1985.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had an election campaign that I have to give full credit to the Honourable Member for Transcona because I believe, and I may be wrong, I think he organized the ND Party campaign. Am I correct in that primarily? He kind of organized it. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't do it very often for the Member for Transcona, but on this occasion I have to admit that he did recognize issues and more importantly he recognized how to harness them politically to catch the fancy of the people of Manitoba and to garner the necessary votes to form the

government. He harnessed the political issues as he saw them and where he saw them he did change enough votes in the Province of Manitoba to win the election. Bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that he quickly — not quickly — he recognized the issues and he harnessed them politically and in that regard, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new government is facing a certain number of problems.

Number one, the new government is facing a Manitoba electorate who chose them because they promised and gave every indication that certain things would happen under their administration if they formed government. Now I will admit that the promise-a-day Pawley campaign was never designed to be put into force as government because they didn't expect to win. But now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have some very distinct problems surfacing and they will continue to surface because they promised interest rate relief; they promised stabilization to the beef industry; they promised rent freezing and rent controls; they promised a new growth in the province — a new wealth of jobs and experience.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to date we have seen an Interest Rate Relief Program, which doesn't have application forms; which when you apply for it you won't qualify; and we haven't even seen when we heard for the last two-and-one-half years from members of the Opposition who are now government, constant criticism that the business community was in trouble; that businesses were failing. They promised instant relief and that is the first promise to Manitobans that is going to dash upon the rocks of a bankrupt government. They will not be able to deliver the kind of relief — oh, it seems as if the First Minister is tweaked about bankrupt — I meant mentally bankrupt, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is the first promise that Manitobans one by one — Manitobans who marked their ballot in the faith that they wouldn't lose their homes; that they wouldn't lose their farms; that they wouldn't lose their business — when they lose them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're going to realize the tragic mistake they made in electing that government with that shallow promise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another promise that's going to come up, that is going to find very very great — oh, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the First Minister is chattering away about Walter Weir said that — I am not criticizing the people of Manitoba. They voted on the basis of a government that was going to do something positive for them. I am criticizing this government now and I will continue to criticize them for the next three years and nine months for not doing what they promised for the people of Manitoba; for not carrying out the faith that the electorate of Manitoba placed in them, and that is what I am criticizing. Make no question about it, Mr. First Minister, I do not criticize the wisdom of the people of Manitoba, given the facts and given the proof of what you will be able to deliver to them on the basis of your election promises, they will indeed have wisdom four years from now when they vote. They will decide, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as will happen federally, they will decide that the government in power didn't tell the truth during the election, just like the national electorate is going to decide that Mr. Trudeau and his Liberals did not tell the truth on energy prices. Remember the 18 cent election? That is first govern-

ment that is going to fall because they didn't keep their election promises; this will be the next one, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, getting back to the architect of this election, the Member for Transcona; he harnessed political issues. You'll recall very clearly that substantial debates and substantial discussion occurred on the so-called mega projects. One of those mega projects, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was singled out as a particularly good target politically by the NDP Party and that was the aluminum refinery which is to be located north and somewhat west of Winnipeg.

Now they chose the aluminum industry as a target and they dragged in during the election campaign all kinds of people who would organize a meeting saying what terrible pollution there was going to be. They had letters to the Editor that miraculously appeared the last week in all the papers in Manitoba — miraculously appeared — that this aluminum smelter was going to be similar to Kittimat and it was very adroitly and astutely done because there was no time to refute the very obvious unfactual statements made in that letter to the Editor. I give him full credit, he harnessed the politics of the issue. Then if we go through the number of concerned citizen groups that had their meetings which explained the dire consequences to the environment of the aluminum industry, all held without any expertise from the aluminum industry — be it Alcan or anyone else — all held strictly to harness a political mood that something may be wrong with the aluminum industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, now the chickens are going to go home to rest, because Manitobans after three months are starting to say to themselves and all First Minister has to do is go to Selkirk and pick up one of his local papers and he will know that the people of Manitoba now are saying maybe we bought a pig in a poke when we listened to the NDP propaganda in the last election on the aluminum industry; maybe there wasn't anything wrong with the aluminum industry; maybe that was a good deal.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Manitobans are now saying we want that industry for Manitoba and they are faced with a very serious problem because they in fact caused the defeat of a government that would have brought it to Manitoba and now Manitobans say do something about it and get us that industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, environment aside the one other thing that they did — and my colleague the Member for Lakeside described it very nicely the other day, he described it as the Big Lie Campaign and that is what the Leader of the Opposition at that time during the election did in terms of his hydro proposition in the aluminum industry. He said we were going to give Manitoba Hydro to a multinational. Give; that is the most blatant big lie that he perpetrated during the election, and now he's got to explain to the people of Manitoba just what is the matter with Alcan putting up \$600 million to advance invest in their portion of the next hydro station, and not have his Minister of Finance trot over to Switzerland — where I assume it's a very nice place to visit — and borrow that \$600 million and throw the province more to the vagaries of the international monetary market. Alcan would do that, and now Manitobans who bought the argument that we were giving our resource away are saying \$600

million was not much of a gift. I think that's a good deal; I think we should proceed with that.

But they harnessed the issue, Mr. Speaker, I give them credit. I give them full credit for harnessing the issue politically when they had to, to win an election campaign. But now, Mr. Speaker, they are government, and I notice that the Member for Transcona in the very first question period that we have had in this House, preened himself the next Monday when Hansard come out and he was sitting there reading his answers and he was smiling broader and broader because he thought he did a wonderful job. But, Mr. Speaker, here is what the Minister of Energy and Mines said, "Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not the intention of the new Manitoba Government to play politics with mega projects." And, Mr. Speaker, this is after the "big lie" campaign, the most crass harnessing of untruth in an election campaign by a political party outside of the Federal Liberals — this is what he said in a first question we asked him.

Later on in the question period Mr. Parasiuk says, "I think it would be premature at this particular stage to try and make a lot of politics out of it." Well, I will go on, because there was another question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the Potash Mine where once again during the election campaign they harnessed the "big lie" issue of "they are giving away the resources," and here, Mr. Speaker, is what baffles me. Here is a project in which their Throne Speech dwells entirely on government and public investment. Here is a project which we, the ideologues of right wing, private enterprise, Adam Smith, were going to joint-venture with a private company. We were going to put the taxpayer money into the potash development in western Manitoba, just the kind of project that they croon and rub their hands about and drool about, the exact project. And what did they call that, Mr. Speaker? They called it giving our resources away, selling out the province. Well, Mr. Speaker, here is what the Minister of Mines and Energy said about that. "It is not this government that will play politics with the future of hydro development."

And he says further on, Mr. Parasiuk, page 11, again, "We do not want to play politics with it, we aren't trying to play politics with it." Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the architect of the NDP Party's election campaign strategy which harnessed the political opportunity of telling the "big lie" to the people of Manitoba about resource ownership, about the Alcan Smelter, about the Potash Mine, saying in the first opportunity we would have to question this new government, "We shouldn't play politics with it."

Well, I can assure the First Minister and his Treasury Bench that this side of the House has every intention to play politics with the Alcan Smelter, with the potash development and with the Western Power Inter-Tie, and the politics that we are going to play, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the politics of people, because we want those projects for the people of Manitoba, for their jobs, for the future security of their families, their children and their grandchildren. That is the politics that this side of the House, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, are going to play with those issues.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is going to become increasingly embarrassing for the government that got elected by talking down those unprecedented

investment opportunities and those unprecedented opportunities for jobs to Manitobans. It is going to become increasingly embarrassing to them in their waffling and their inability to negotiate with them, and their probable loss of those extremely good opportunities for Manitoba, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, that will be the demise of that government. They won an election on the basis of the "big lie," that they didn't expect to win. Now they are going to have to deliver for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a couple of other interesting things in the Throne Speech. First of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will note — oh, to the to the member — where is he from now? — the Member for St. Johns, we are greatly interested in getting the translation of the speech you gave in Polish to defeat the Attorney-General. We'd like to have that. Then we'll talk about socialism. Then I assure the Member for St. Johns, we will talk about socialism.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech, you will note that there are 13 references — and anyone can count them — to public spending. There are two references to the private sector, and each of those references is made in a joint venture with the public. There is no recognition of the private sector and its important role in the economy of Manitoba, and this in the first Throne Speech from a government who espouses great belief in the mixed economy. Their mixed economy is mixed public and public investment, that is how they want it. That's how they want it, mixed public and public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other very interesting thing that came out of the Friday question period and it occurred again, Mr. Speaker, just yesterday with the First Minister. All of us recall yesterday when the First Minister was saying, "Well, that's an Order for Return. That's a federal matter. Well, I just don't know, please don't bother me with the question." Now, the First Minister — and he followed the lead of the Member for Transcona who gave him that lead on Friday, when our leader was very rightfully, very objectively and very correctly asking the Treasury Bench just what they were doing to advance the negotiations on the aluminum industry, and on the Potash Mine, and on the Western Power Grid. Now, the Member for Transcona astutely indicated, "Well, we have a negotiating team and we are doing this, that and the other thing." The First Minister asked the Member for Transcona as Minister responsible who is on that negotiating team. And to his embarrassment, the Minister of Energy and Mines was beginning to think, "Hey this is an attack; this has to be an attack." So he started to defend his Deputy Minister before he knew what to defend him against. Now, if he has some questions about the ability of his Deputy Minister to enter in those negotiations so that he is defensive before the question comes out, then I'm afraid that clearly tells Manitobans just what value that government places on the negotiations for the aluminium smelter and the other projects, and that Manitobans are going to lose them, because this Government doesn't care about them and doesn't want to negotiate them for the benefit of Manitobans; that they want to drop them because they would be an embarrassment to them because they would be our projects which were good.

The Member for Transcona got very defensive, and it was kind of interesting to read what he said here and I want to read it back to you, Mr. Speaker. He said, "Mr. Speaker, I think we are starting off on a very wrong track if the Opposition wants to do the personal character assassination that it likes to indulge in." Now this was simply, Mr. Speaker, after a question as to what background his Deputy Minister had that would allow him to have developed the expertise to undertake a \$600-million negotiation on a hydro plant investment sharing in a \$600-million smelter. A very simple question, because, you know, people who have dealt in that magnitude of investment are not very big and maybe the Minister of Energy and Mines is embarrassed that his Deputy Minister has only been a Research Director for successive NDP governments and doesn't have business experience. I don't know. That's certainly the impression he left, but he was defensive, Mr. Speaker, immediately. Here is what he said in the next line, "I thought, Mr. Speaker, that this new House would start off with some new ground rules and would not lower itself into the boorish type of behaviour that we find coming from the other side of the House right now." The "boorish type of behaviour" when you ask simply what qualifications a person has who is undertaking a \$1 billion, \$200 million investment in the Province of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that statement by the Member for Transcona is very indicative of what we may expect from him over the next four years, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as beauty is, Sir, in the eye of the beholder, quite possibly boorishness is in the personality of the accuser, and that is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, following off the Minister of Energy and Mines' attack on the Premier as being boorish when he had no provocation, no justification to do it, but he did it, Mr. Speaker, because the Leader of the Opposition was asking him questions which he did not want to answer to the people of Manitoba, and because the Member for Transcona appears to be one of the "super boys" in the new group, the First Minister decided, hey, this may be the way I can duck questions when I don't want to answer them. This may be the way I get myself out of a tight spot. So what did we see yesterday, Mr. Speaker? What did we see yesterday? When this government, whose Deputy Premier has said again we do not want to play politics, and do you want me to read them all again? I do not think this government will play politics with the future, et cetera, et cetera, that this Deputy Premier, the Member for Transcona, is talking about — (Interjection) — Oh yes, he is. No, the Member for Transcona is. — (Interjection) — but anyway — (Interjection) — Who is the Deputy Premier over there? Will you guys get your act together. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, regardless, I mean it will probably change seats a number of times — who cares?

But at any rate, the Member for Transcona is saying that we're not going to play politics, and then when we question the First Minister on the crassest political move that this government has ever made, in that now Information Services which the Member for Turtle Mountain asked the Minister of Highways whether they were going to use it as a propaganda machine, received the assurance it wasn't. Meanwhile it has been transferred — where? To the Premier's Office.

To report to whom? To report to his Press Secretary, a non-elected, political appointment responsible for propaganda in the Premier's Office is now over control of the Information Service. So the Premier was embarrassed about that. He didn't want to ask. He said, deal with it in Estimates, do anything, don't bother me, please don't ask me again. So what he did, Mr. Speaker, and this he picked up the lead from the Member for Transcona and he said, "I think that the Leader of the Opposition is engaging in character assassination." There was no character assassination. The Leader of the Opposition read his press release on the job description of Mr. O'Connor, and that was character assassination? When in doubt, when you can't answer the question, we can assume from on, ladies and gentlemen, that the First Minister is going to say, "You're character assassinating."

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does The Honourable First Minister have a point of order?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a Matter of Privilege, because the Leader of the Opposition is not present and I wouldn't want it to be suggested that the First Minister was engaged in character assassination, nor did I indicate that to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm certainly glad that the First Minister over there has provided that kind of clarification. That's going to be very interesting to read back.

Mr. Speaker, I have several minutes left unless I have leave of the House — (Interjection) — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I want to sum up briefly. The Throne Speech was very, very indicative of the next four years of this government, not from what it said, Mr. Speaker, but from what it didn't say. There are a number of members in that backbench over there who are going to regret over the course of the next several years that there was no mention, no reference, and no recognition of any private sector involvement in the Province of Manitoba. That is the first and the lasting failure of this new administration.

They are going to use taxpayer dollars to bloat the Civil Service as they already have done, to create Crown corporations, to get into business ventures, and they're going to do it, Mr. Speaker, because with the wealth of business experience they have on that side of the House, they know how to do it better than the private sector. Mr. Speaker, that I tell you is more important in the Throne Speech, not what it said, but what it didn't say, and Manitobans are recognizing that they did not elect a government that was going to simply spend money on losing government ventures. That was never mentioned in any of their election promises and that is the only one, Mr. Speaker, they're going to keep. The public sector will bring that government down because they are going to waste taxpayer dollars as they did in the eight previous years that they had control of this province; the province cannot afford it now as it could not afford it then. It will not create the necessary jobs now, as it didn't in the past, and that lack of recognition of the private sector and its important role will have the First Minister hanging his head lower than he's hanging it right now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

**MR. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the honourable member would permit a question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The member's time has expired. If there is leave of the House, it can be asked. Does the honourable member have permission? (Agreed) Proceed.

**MR. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, The Honourable Member for Pembina during his remarks made reference to a columnist in the Winnipeg Free Press. I'm wondering if the honourable member would consider and tell the House whether or not he considers the column of that same columnist which was in Tuesday of this week's paper praising his Leader's contribution to the Throne Speech Debate made on this past Monday as an objective column, or whether he considers that to be another one of those subjective liberal contributions that's been made.

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, from time to time, particularly in a very very I suspect tight job market, such as there is throughout North America and throughout Canada, that experiencing this tight job market and the fact that it also is very competitive in the newsprint and the newspaper business and that when a person's job perchance — I offer this only as a possible explanation — when a person's job may be in some danger, maybe that person is expendable, maybe that person will be replaced, if that is the case one does rather unusual things in strictly as a reaction of self-preservation because people have an ingrown desire to look after themselves first. I guess what I'm saying to the Member for Springfield is that in circumstances like that where maybe jobs aren't good and appointments from the Federal Government have dried up that maybe, Mr. Speaker, that individual is having a death-bed conversion possibly.

Mr. Speaker, I may offer another solution to that in that, you know, in the course of some four-and-a-half years or so and a column which might have been repeated I would guess — what? — every two days or three days in the paper, I'm not too sure, I didn't read it after the second one. I just heard about it that possibly there is a law of averages that does come in from time to time — like if you flip a coin there's a saying about flipping a coin and you can flip a coin and it'll come up tails and tails and tails and then eventually the odds get greater and greater that it's going to come up heads. So, maybe in strictly the odds of the number of articles that this person has written over the past four-and-a-half years, odds say that one of them has to be favourable. So, Mr. Speaker, in summation, it may well be that this is a death-bed conversion or it may strictly be the luck of the odds.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Questions occurring at the end of a member's statement are supposed to be strictly for clarification. It is not to be used as a manner of reopening the Debate.

The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. DOREEN DODICK (Riel):** Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my pleasure that a parliamentarian of your experience and stature has been elected to lead this House in its deliberations.

I am fully confident that all of us here, and particularly those of us such as myself, who are entering into the legislative arena for the first time, will be skillfully guided by you as we debate the issues before us, and I am sure that we may all rest secure in the knowledge that the fine tradition of this Assembly will be maintained by such an able and learned Speaker as yourself.

I would also at this time like to commend Manitoba's first female Lieutenant-Governor for her reading of the Speech from the Throne last week. As a woman, I found it personally satisfying to have Her Excellency present the Throne Speech, but the grace with which it was read made it doubly rewarding.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my gratitude to the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne for the inspirations provided to myself, and to all members of this House, I am sure.

I enjoyed their insightful remarks and share wholeheartedly many of the sentiments that they have expressed. As the Session progresses, it is my hope that the style and the breadth of vision displayed by the Mover and the Seconder will be emulated by all the members of this House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleagues, both on this side of the House and across the floor, who have been chosen by the people of Manitoba as their representatives. While being entrusted with this confidence is clearly an honour, it is also a very great responsibility and one that demands the full application of our collected talents and energies.

The administrations of the affairs of a vast province such as Manitoba is no easy task, but through the efforts of a dedicated and forward-looking government, under the watchful eye of a responsible Opposition, I am confident that the aspirations and the expectations of the people of Manitoba will be fully realized and the society in which we live will be, in some way, improved.

I would like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by telling you a bit about my constituency. Located in South Winnipeg between the Seine and the Red Rivers, Riel is a community of about 18,000 people. As you will find in almost any Canadian community of that size, its population is characterized by diversity; from manual workers to professionals, from housewives to students, from renters to homeowners, from pre-schoolers to pensioners, from new Canadians to first, second, third and fourth generation Canadians — all can be found in Riel and all play an integral part in defining its distinct character.

However, despite this diversity, there is a commonality linking each and every one of the residents of Riel and that is their hope for the future, their striving for a sound standard of living for their children and their children's children, and their willingness and their ability to work toward the achievement of their goals.

The people of Riel, and no doubt the people of Manitoba as a whole, are to be admired for their indus-

try and their energy. I am not speaking here of the industry you find in Ontario or the energy you find in Alberta. Rather, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the industry and the energy that can be found only in Manitoba, that can be found only in the creativity, and the talent, the drive and determination of the people of Manitoba. With the assistance and support of the Manitoba Government, that industry and energy can be harnessed and more secure for the future of all Manitobans can be guaranteed.

Unfortunately, in the past four years, Riel and other areas of Manitoba have witnessed a depletion of our province's greatest resource, her people. But I am confident under the present government, we will find that this is not an unrenewable resource; that people will once again choose to make Manitoba their home and in so doing will replenish our store of talent.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, with the assistance and the support of Manitoba Government, the people of Riel will go far toward improving their community and towards securing a better future for themselves and for their children. Between 1969 and 1977, Riel received such assistance and we saw the building of three new community clubs at Norberry, Glenlee and Greendale and the opening of the St. Vital Arena. We saw greater support given to the St. Amant Centre and the construction of the Meadwood Manor. We saw the development of the Louis Riel Museum and an experiment in French-English co-education at Lavallee School. We saw the planning of the Fort Garry Bridge, the Bishop-Grandin Highway and the St. Vital Mall. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but the point has been made. With the help of the Manitoba Government between 1969 and 1977, the people of Riel were provided with an opportunity, one which they took full advantage of, to improve the community in which they live.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, for the past four years the people of Riel have not been provided with an opportunity to grow and develop and they have not been given the chance to apply their industry and their energy to planning for the future. There has been very little activity in Riel in the form of government assistance and support since 1977.

The Speech from the Throne has indicated to me that situation will soon be changed. It has given me hope and my constituency in Riel that their future is more secure, that they may not lose their homes, that they may not be forced out of their apartments, that they may not see their sons and daughters move away to Alberta or British Columbia in search of employment. I must say that it gives me great satisfaction on behalf of the people of Riel to wholeheartedly endorse the provisions contained in the Speech from the Throne.

I made the point earlier, Mr. Speaker, that Riel is composed of a broad range of people with different needs and aspirations. I would like at this point to expand on this fact and to deal with these specific requirements of several groups of people located in Riel.

1982 is the International Year of the Elderly, and Riel is enriched with a significant senior citizen and pensioner population. This group of people is especially dear to my heart and as I look around me and I see the tremendous changes, and changes for the better I

might add, that this society has undergone in the past few decades. It is through the hard work and the selfless devotion and sacrifice of the people that we have so much today. They committed their lives to improving the world in which we live. They invested countless hours in our factories and in our businesses and in our homes in the hope of creating a better society for their children. Mr. Speaker, we are their children and today we are enjoying the fruits of their efforts. We are living in an improved society, an advancing society, and we owe it to the senior citizens, to the people who built our province, to carry on their tradition of hard work, devotion and sacrifice. We also owe it to them to ensure that they are not discarded because their productive years are over; to ensure that their retirement, their well-earned rest is as enjoyable and as satisfying as we can possibly make it.

That is why I am pleased to see the inclusion of several provisions in the Speech from the Throne that have provided assistance to senior citizens. For example, many of the elderly in Riel are on fixed incomes and certainly stand to gain from the extension of Pharmacare to hearing aids, dental service and eyeglasses and from the possibility of a pension reform. In addition, a number of Riel senior citizens, particularly in Old St. Vital, are fortunate to have their health and are independent enough to continue on in their own homes. With the passage of time and through the exposure of the elements some of these homes have fallen into disrepair. Through the revitalization and expansion of the critical home repair the necessary improvements will be made and these senior citizens will be able to continue living in their homes that many have occupied for decades.

For others, their health no longer permits them to live in their own homes and instead they are admitted to a personal care home. Unfortunately, we are faced with a dilemma in which many senior citizens require some medical surveillance, but do not require full care. In Riel we have a facility in the form of the Meadwood Manor which attempts to alleviate this problem. One building is a fully staffed personal care home and another attached by a walkway is a senior citizen apartment complex. Each of the apartments are equipped with a direct emergency line to the full-staff facility and the proximity of the two buildings makes it possible for immediate response. The result is senior citizen housing in which the elderly, despite their failing health, are enabled to live a dignified and independent life.

In addition to the senior citizens, Riel is also characterized by a large number of young couples and their families, as well as by single-parent families. For many of these families just starting out, the dire economic conditions demand that the parents work and where there are young children involved it is necessary to utilize the available day-care facilities. Most of us here, Mr. Speaker, have had the joy of watching our children grow and develop and I am sure that we can all attest to the importance of having your children reared in a healthy environment. In many instances, that environment can be the child's own home under either the mother or the father's supervision, but in others, as I have pointed out, circumstances demand that the child spend a good part of the day in a day-care facility while the parents are at work. Given the

necessity for day care, then I feel that it is imperative that government act to ensure the highest possible quality of these facilities and I fully support the passage of a Community Child Day Care Standards Act. What is equally important to me as well, Mr. Speaker, is that we recognize that the fundamental reality that day care services a need, that in most cases, parents resort to day care because they have no other choice. The exploitation of that need for private profit is basically immoral and the Government of Manitoba should act to ensure that all day-care facilities operate as non-profit organizations.

In addition to their need for day care, many of these young families have recently acquired a home and they are being hit — hard hit — by the excessive high-interest rate policy of the Federal Government. These homeowners facing mortgage renewals are joined in their plight by a large number of small business people in Riel; also confronted with high interest rates. Unfortunately, the situation has become so desperate for some homeowners and business people that they are presented with the real possibility of losing their homes and their businesses. The immediacy of this problem demands that the implication of our Emergency interest rate relief program to protect homeowners and small business people in Riel and homeowners and small business people and farmers throughout the province. But while this will not alleviate some of the hardships experienced in the short run, we must also look to the long-term. In a society as different as ours, every Canadian family should be entitled to purchase a home. But, Mr. Speaker, homeownership is becoming a dying dream for many Canadians and the situation is no different in my constituency of Riel.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the members of this House why can many of the people of your constituency and mine no longer realize the dream of owning their own home? Is it because people no longer desire to be homeowners? Is it because people do not qualify for financing for the purchase of their home? Is it because the original purchase price of a home is so high that people are unable to pay it? Are these the reasons that people can no longer own their own homes?

The answer to all of these questions is no, Mr. Speaker. People still desire to purchase a house, people are still capable of financing the original price and the original purchase price of a home is not so high that people are not prepared to pay for it. If people were not prepared to pay the price for housing then the market would decline to a point where they would be so prepared. That, Mr. Speaker, is simple economics. But what is not simple economics, what in fact, is not even simple common sense and what lies at the very heart of the inability of people of your constituency and mine to realize the dream of homeownership is the Federal Government's policy of insanely high interest rates. People are simply not prepared to pay two or three times the value of their home in order to finance its original price.

In Riel, the problem extends beyond homeownership to include small businessmen as well. Riel has always had a number of small businesses dotted throughout the area enclosed within its boundaries and with the rise of the St. Vital Mall and the develop-

ment of several other small shipping centres, small business is becoming a more and more important part of the constituency.

In order for these small businesses to operate they must borrow to cover the purchase of their building, to cover upkeep and renovations, to cover the cost of inventory and staff. Small business people rely on borrowed funds. At a time when interest rates are at a record high level many small businesses cannot make a go of it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the homeowner and the small business people in Riel, I see it as imperative that the Manitoba Government continue to put pressure on the Federal Government to change its present interest rate policy. In the short term, there is a definite need for an emergency program to prevent further foreclosures and bankruptcies but in the long term interest rates simply must come down.

In addition to all of these groups, pensioners, young families, homeowners and small businesses Riel is also characterized by a large number of individuals living in rental housing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 35 per cent of Riel population live in rental housing. For this reason the issue of rent control is one of the immediate concerns to me.

In most cases people living in rental housing cannot afford to pay unwanted increases in rent.

With rising cost of necessities, increases in the cost of housing often places an unbearable burden on renters. It is therefore necessary that a rent control act be passed to protect tenants from unfair rent increase.

I recognize that landlords, like tenants are also victims of today's inflationary spiral and I do not deny that the rent increase is necessary if landlords are to keep pace with inflation. The business of owning rental housing is exactly that, a business, and as is the case for other businessmen, landlords are entitled to a fair return on their investment, but there is an important difference that must be realized. Whereas the customer of a shoestore or a grocery store can easily take their business elsewhere if they are dissatisfied with the cost of a pair of boots or a loaf of bread, tenants cannot so easily pick up and move if they find that their rent is increasing beyond their means.

Therefore, while landlords are entitled to a fair return on their dollar, there must be some form of public regulatory body to determine what the fair return should be and the principal characteristics of such a system should be that the onus is on the landlord, rather than on the tenant, to prove that a rent increase is necessary. Such a system provides the necessary degree of protection to the tenant, while at the same time allowing the responsibility of investment return for landlords; it is fair to both parties.

A final group that I would like to deal with, Mr. Speaker, is the growing number of students that are residing in Riel. With the construction of the Bishop Grandin Highway and the Fort Garry Bridge, Riel is fast becoming a desirable residential area for students attending the University of Manitoba, and with the beginning of each school year more and more students are choosing to make Riel their home.

As the mother of three daughters, who have all been enrolled at one point or another in post-secondary institutions, I have a special concern for the operations of our province's universities and community

colleges. For me it is not possible to place a price tag on the value of education. The very future of our society, Mr. Speaker, depends on the capacity of your young people to deal with the myriad of problems they may be confronted with, not to mention the host of problems that we will, no doubt, leave as our legacy.

If they are to cope effectively with the many difficulties that they will inevitably face, our young people must be armed with a good education, they must have instilled in them the ability to recognize problems, to understand their nature, and to organize their actions to solve them in the most expedient manner.

I feel so strongly about this issue, Mr. Speaker, that I am not ashamed to say that I would like to see free universal education made available to all those who wish to take advantage of it. But while this is my dream, I do realize that the reality of free universal education is simply not feasible under existing economic conditions. The cost of attracting and retaining qualified, competent educators and administrators and the cost of maintaining the essential infrastructure, are too great for the state alone to bear.

It is necessary that students contribute directly to financing the cost of their education. But taking that as given, Mr. Speaker, I think that it should be one of Manitoba Government's top priorities to do everything in the power to relieve the burden borne by students. That is why I am especially pleased to see included in the present legislation program provision for such matters as rent controls, a freeze in transit fares, and of particular significance, a freeze in tuition fees for the 1982-83 school year.

The government now must direct its efforts towards identifying alternative sources of funding so that the high quality of Manitoba's post-secondary institutions can be maintained and improved, and so that the higher education can continue to be within the grasp of every Manitoban, young and old.

To this point, Mr. Speaker, I have addressed some of the major issues of concern to the people of Riel, and as the Session progresses, I will from time to time bring forward other matters pertaining to the needs of my constituency and to the needs of all Manitobans.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with my own personal philosophy on the direction that government in Manitoba should take.

I was born and raised in a small rural community in Saskatchewan. I first developed an interest in politics when, at a very early age, I had the privilege of hearing Tommy Douglas speak. The message imparted by Tommy Douglas and the experience of living through the Depression, the Second World War, and the formation in 1944 of the first CCF Government in Saskatchewan, have all had a profound influence on the way that I view society and the role of government in society.

Mr. Speaker, despite the glaring inequalities that presently exist in our world and despite the many atrocities that we hear and read about every day, I remain a firm believer in the fundamental goodness and equality of all men and I look forward with optimism to the day when men will fulfill their potential.

But men can only achieve this higher state of being if they are permitted to grow and develop in a healthy social environment, if they are provided with adequate supplies of food, medical care, housing, education

and training and other necessities — in short, if they are granted the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

This then, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of government; to draw on the collective resources of the entire population in order to ensure that each and every citizen is provided with the opportunity to fully develop his talents.

What I see in the legislative program presently before the House, Mr. Speaker, is a very good example of government fulfilling its principal purpose, of a government that is genuinely concerned for the welfare of the people that elected it to office, of a government of compassion. I am proud to support wholeheartedly the efforts of such a government and I look forward to a very bright future for the people of Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker; and also to the Member for Flin Flon on his appointment as Deputy Speaker. I can see that you have your work cut out for you in keeping order and helping the new members on both sides of the House, when needed. You have my best wishes.

I would also like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for taking time to hold a briefing session for new members. It was very much appreciated. My compliments to the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech for the quality of their speeches given last Friday. It was especially pleasing for a new member, such as myself, to hear the Member for Burrows lay down the guidelines for this Government. Mr. Speaker, we, in the Opposition can certainly rest more easily knowing that we will be dealing with a government that is full of integrity, public morality and, of course, virtue.

Now, kindness — may I express my sincere appreciation to those members on both sides of this House who have offered me their warm words of congratulation and welcome. In what I understand is a longstanding tradition for new members, Mr. Speaker, may I take a few moments to familiarize the honourable members with the constituency I represent.

I am proud to be the first representative for the new constituency of Kirkfield Park. Kirkfield Park, as a result of redistribution, is made up of part of the Assiniboia and Sturgeon Creek constituencies in the west end of sunny St. James. It is a lovely residential area consisting mainly of single-family dwellings, with apartments, some townhouses, condominiums and senior citizens' residences. It is an area with shopping centres, a museum, library and indoor arena. Between the Perimeter and Sturgeon Road, there is nearly every kind of store or restaurant or recreational facility that one could want. We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have Sturgeon Creek forming part of our eastern boundary from Saskatchewan Avenue to Hamilton Avenue and then flowing through Heritage Park past Grant's Old Mill and on through picturesque Woodhaven to the Assiniboine River, our southern border.

The Creek is a great recreational area, especially in



winter, where people toboggan, skate and cross-country ski. It forms a lovely park in the summer. With the exception of Woodhaven, the age of the majority of homes in the remainder of the Constituency is approximately 15 to 20 years. It was part of one of the fastest growing communities in Canada; the area is now fully developed with little room for expansion. My constituency revolves around three community centres; Heritage Victoria, north of Portage; Woodhaven and Kirkfield Westwood, both south of Portage. We are a busy community, family oriented. Some of us are involved in youth groups, some sports, some as in volunteers in our schools; still others are involved in Service Clubs such as the Optimists, who have just completed another successful International Band Festival; the Rotarians, who sponsor student exchange programs; and the Kinsmen, who raised funds to help build the Kinsmen Allard Indoor Arena.

With regard to the remarks from the Member for River East, and I quote, "School Divisions such as St. James and Fort Garry which are rich in business property and industrial parks levy much lower school taxes. In St. James, these businesses just didn't happen, but were a result of a concerted effort on the part of St. James citizens through what is now St. James-Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce. The development of the industrial area was spearheaded in co-operation with the then St. James Council. This, as the present Member for St. James would be aware, translated into thousands of jobs for Manitobans. Our Chamber continues to be a driving force in the community. We have many churches situated in the constituency, all with thriving congregations. Although our population changes frequently due to transfers and the mobility of the modern family, the values represented in our community remain relatively stable.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate that our constituency is served by a fine community newspaper, Metro One, that keeps us informed of day-to-day activities and concerns of our residents.

As for myself, I am a first generation Canadian, my husband were born and raised in Winnipeg's westend. Due to job relocation, we spent seven years in the east, but chose to move back to Manitoba. This is where we wanted to live and raise our three children. Manitoba has a quality of life second to none.

Community involvement has always been a priority in my life. I have been a hockey mother, an enthusiastic Jets fan, a volunteer in schools and have represented more than half of my constituency as a school trustee on the Board of the St. James Assiniboia School Division.

During that time we introduced the first before-noon-hour and after-school child care program in Assiniboine School in St. James. Also the first program in a Manitoba public school was implemented to meet the needs of autistic children at Kirkfield Park School in my constituency. This set the example for other divisions to meet the educational needs of our special children, omitting no one.

Subsequently, the Conservative administration saw fit to implement grants for high cost-low incidence funding for the handicapped. Also, at that time we instituted a program to conserve energy, which has resulted in a substantial saving, one quarter of a million dollars annually for the past four years.

Mr. Speaker, neighbourhood schools are an important part of Kirkfield Park. The green space that surrounds the schools, the activities that go on in the schools after hours. St. James-Assiniboia has experienced the fastest decline of any school division in Manitoba and consequently we are faced with the closing of a school, which is causing an upheaval in our community. Parents and residents alike are demanding a greater say in what happens to their schools. Some of my constituents, and I support them, are looking for a policy set down by the province that without taking away from local autonomy gives guidance to school boards on declining enrolment. This is not just a local problem, it is province-wide.

Another area of concern is the French programs. There are two programs available; one is French immersion, which in St. James is being run as dual-track, meaning English and French in the same school. The second is core French which will be introduced this fall in all our schools in St. James. This is a pilot project of the Department of Education which starts at the grade four level. For parents wanting their children to learn French but who do not choose the immersion option, grade four is not soon enough. I therefore urge this government to give strong consideration to beginning the core French program at the kindergarten level.

As the appointed critic for Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources, I am pleased to see that this government is committed to being accessible to Manitoba's cultural community. Cultural affairs and historical resources was seen to be of such importance that under the Conservative administration it was set up as a separate department.

The former Minister, Norma Price, was always accessible to our ethno-cultural communities getting to know firsthand their culture, but more importantly by meeting and getting to know the people.

It is my hope that this government will continue to encourage our cultural groups without creating an unhealthy degree of reliance on government for support that could jeopardize their independence.

Early in 1980, Mr. Speaker, The Public Libraries Act was amended making capital grants available for construction or renovation of library facilities. The result was improved library services in rural Manitoba. I would hope this government will continue the commitment of the previous administration to improve the quality of library services and to expand their accessibility to all Manitobans. Of particular concern, Mr. Speaker, are this government's plans, which will surely result in an explosion of public spending at a time when expenditures by governments at all levels are outstripping revenues at an alarming rate. This government seems willing to spend taxpayers' monies for all sorts of projects where the end result is an unknown quantity, while projects like Alcan, which could bring hundreds of jobs to Manitobans, are in jeopardy.

The Throne Speech stated that provinces such as Manitoba rely heavily on small business. I find this government's actions contradictory to that statement. The successful signing of an aluminum smelter agreement would mean more to Manitoba's small business than all the programs in the Throne Speech combined.

During my campaign one of my constituents, who along with his wife, runs a small distributorship selling fittings and valves out of their home, told me that if Alcan comes onstream he would be able to open an office and put one person on the road fulltime selling and another fulltime in the office. This is just one businessman. There must be hundreds out there just like him. For the good of our province's economy and more importantly for our young people to have the opportunities to prosper here in Manitoba, I urge the government to proceed with negotiations in a responsible manner.

The Speech from the Throne also referred to the current unhappy state of federal-provincial relations, a condition resulting from the 14-year reign of a Prime Minister who has so divided this country and whose attitude has soured relations with every provincial jurisdiction to the point where there are no longer any Liberal Provincial Governments left. This state of affairs is particularly evident in the West, where there is not a single elected Liberal MLA and only two MP's from Manitoba to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the First Minister does not believe he can win over the Prime Minister by approaching Ottawa on bended knee. Two lines in the Throne Speech caught my attention in this regard and I quote: "My government recognizes the vital financial support provided by the Federal Government and my Ministers remain hopeful that the new arrangements will provide sufficient funds for the maintaining of high quality help and educational services in all parts of Canada and will reflect a strong renewed commitment to equalization.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is not a charity case that we must go begging to Mr. Trudeau, cap in hand. Some of the money which the First Minister is hopeful of receiving was earned right here in Manitoba through the efforts of Manitobans. High quality help and education services are not a privilege to be granted, they are our right. History has shown us that the Prime Minister is unscrupulous in taking advantage of weakness where he can find it. I earnestly hope, after listening to the Minister of Northern Affairs, that this new government is taking a firm stand when dealing with the Federal Government but the times do demand firmness to deal with that government's attempts to put its own house in order by unloading an unholy financial mess on to the backs of the provinces.

Despite the recent lecture given to us on co-operation, Mr. Speaker, I doubt there is anyone in this Chamber who does not support the concept of co-operative federalism with a strong central government carrying out its constitutional functions in a responsible manner. But bureaucrats in Ottawa should not be involved in matters which are more effectively and efficiently attended to by provincial or local levels of government. The very nature of our federal system is supposedly designed to protect us from such actions.

In the same manner, I hope that this new government's commitment to co-operative federalism will extend to its own dealings with the City of Winnipeg, just as we have federal and provincial governments to manage affairs in their own jurisdiction, we also have municipal governments, which are charged with the running of our cities. Already this government has shown signs in the Throne Speech that it intends to

intrude into the policy making apparatus of the City of Winnipeg on the matters which are strictly local in nature. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker. Surely the matter of bus fares is a civic, rather than provincial concern. Where will it stop? This has to be a genuine concern, Mr. Speaker. What is the point of electing councillors and a Mayor if the province is planning to make all the decisions? I would suggest if this is the kind of strong local government that the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs is planning to give to the communities in the North, they had better get the ground rules in writing.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with members on both sides of the House in the months ahead and to serving my constituents to the best of my ability.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney General.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and the indulgence of the House I'd like to call it 5:30 and adjourn the debate on the Throne Speech until 8 p.m.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the will of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

That being the case I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8 p.m. this evening.