

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 13 May, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, I beg to present the First Report from the Committee of Seven Persons appointed to prepare a list of members of the standing committees as ordered by the House.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Special Committee of Seven Persons, appointed to prepare a list of members of the Standing Committees ordered by the House presents the following as their First report:

Your committee prepared the following list of members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House:

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: (11)

Hon. Messrs. Desjardins, Penner, Uruski; Mr. Brown, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Kovnats, Nordman, Santos, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Walding

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: (11)

Hon. Messrs. Kostyra, Mackling, Schroeder, Storie, Hon. Ms. Wasylcia-Leis; Mr. Blake, Mrs. Carstairs, Messrs. Johnston, Manness, Santos, Smith (Ellice)

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES: (11)

Hon. Ms. Hemphill, Hon. Messrs. Kostyra, Parasiuk, Schroeder; Messrs. Dolin, Driedger, Enns, Manness, Mercier, Santos, Smith (Ellice)

AGRICULTURE: (11)

Hon. Messrs. Bucklaschuk, Harapiak (The Pas), Harapiak (Swan River), Plohman, Hon. Mrs. Smith (Osborne), Hon. Mr. Uruski; Messrs. Baker, Cummings, Findlay, Mrs. Oleson, Mr. Rocan

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS: (11)

Hon. Messrs. Bucklaschuk, Desjardins, Doer, Evans; Messrs. Ashton, Baker, Downey, Ducharme, Ernst, Maloway, Pankratz

LAW AMENDMENTS: (30)

Hon. Messrs. Bucklaschuk, Doer, Evans, Harapiak (The Pas), Harapiak (Swan River), Harper, Lecuyer, Penner, Plohman, Schroeder, Storie, Uruski, Hon. Ms. Wasylcia-Leis; Mr. Birt, Mrs. Carstairs, Messrs. Connery, Derkach, Dolin, Ducharme, Ernst, Findlay, Maloway, Mrs. Mitchelson, Messrs. Nordman, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch, Santos, Scott, Walding

PRIVATE BILLS: (11)

Hon. Mr. Cowan, Hon. Ms. Hemphill, Hon. Messrs. Harapiak, (The Pas), Schroeder; Messrs. Baker, Birt, Blake, Dolin, Driedger, Ernst, Santos

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: (11)

Hon. Messrs. Cowan, Doer, Lecuyer, Mackling, Hon. Ms. Wasylcia-Leis; Messrs. Ashton, Brown, McCrae, Mrs. Mitchelson, Messrs. Orchard, Smith (Ellice)

STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND ORDERS: (11)

Hon. Mr. Evans, Hon. Ms. Hemphill, Hon. Messrs. Harper, Penner, Storie; Mr. Derkach, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Kovnats, Maloway, Orchard, Scott

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: (11)

Hon. Messrs. Kostyra, Plohman, Parasiuk, Schroeder, Hon. Mrs. SMITH (Osborne); Messrs. Ashton, Connery, Downey, Johnston, Maloway, Roch

RULES OF THE HOUSE: (9)

Hon. Messrs. Cowan, Penner, Hon. Ms. Phillips, Hon. Mrs. SMITH (Osborne); Messrs. Ashton, Enns, Mercier, McCrae, Santos

All of which is respectfully submitted,

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, I would like to table the Final Report of the City of Winnipeg Review Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my privilege to table a number of annual reports: the Annual Report of the Public Schools Finance Board for the year ending December 31, 1985; the Annual Report for the Universities Grants Commission for the year 1984-85; the Financial Statements of the University of Winnipeg for the year ending March 31, 1985; the Annual Financial Report for the University of Manitoba for the year ending March 31, 1985; the Annual Financial Report of Brandon University for the year ending March 31, 1985; and finally the Brandon University Pension Fund Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the year ending December 31, 1985.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, I have a number of reports to table.

The Return under Section 54.4 subsection 3 of The Financial Administration Act; a Return under Section 30.2 of The Law Society Act; a Report of the Provincial Auditor to the Legislative Assembly for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1985; the Public Trustee of Manitoba Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 1985; a Return under Section 20 of The Public Officers Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I have a ministerial statement.

The Garrison Diversion Reformulating Act of 1986 has been approved by the U.S. Congress and signed by President Reagan. I take great pleasure in noting this new legislation which marks both an ending and a new beginning, ending of the conflict that has existed for too long between Manitoba and North Dakota, and between the state and major environmental organizations. This is a new beginning of cooperation, friendship and joint efforts by all to ensure that North Dakota receives the benefits it deserves while, at the same time, ensuring the protection of the environment and the adherence to the provisions of The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

The new Garrison will provide irrigation to 130,940 acres of North Dakota farmland, all drained to the Missouri River basin. It will provide municipal, rural and industrial water supply systems to much of North Dakota, including a flow of about 100 cubic feet per second to meet the needs of the cities of Fargo and Grand Forks. The small amount of water from the Missouri that is transferred to the Hudson Bay basin for municipal, rural and industrial purposes will be treated to ensure that it contains no biota.

The Lone Tree Reservoir is not deauthorized by the legislation, but is replaced by the Sykeston Canal. This canal is the means by which water is transferred from the McCluskey Canal to the James River area to meet irrigation and municipal, rural and industrial water needs. The Lone Tree Reservoir can be built only if there is a proven need for its construction to meet authorized irrigation, and only after consultation with Canada and the United States Environmental Protection Agency determines that its construction and operation will result in no violation of The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

Manitoba still has some concerns with the new project, but they are concerns that we believe are technically resolvable. Manitoba is prepared to work closely with Canadian, U.S., Federal and North Dakota officials to ensure that these concerns are properly met.

The legislation fully acknowledges the necessity of ensuring that the provisions of The Boundary Water Treaty of 1909 are met. Manitoba relied in the past, and will continue to rely, on this treaty to ensure that our waters are protected.

North Dakotans have been worthy and patient opponents as they sought to maximize benefits from the Garrison project. I feel that this new beginning will see full cooperation by all to ensure that North Dakota can now secure the benefits of the new legislation.

Manitoba will participate in any and all discussions that are required to meet these needs while providing the protection of Manitoba's waters required by The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I would like to convey the sincere gratitude of the Government of Manitoba to the many Manitobans, particularly farmers, fishermen, Native people, students and naturalists who gave unstintingly of their time, and at great personal expense, aided our campaign of successfully defending our freshwater heritage.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to convey our thanks and appreciation to the Minister for the statement here.

I'm sure the Minister probably hasn't had time to go into the total background of what has all been involved in terms of the Garrison project in the States.

I find it interesting that he makes reference to this as a new beginning of cooperation, friendship and joint efforts. I find that very amazing because, when we look back over the many years, I can recall that the then Minister of Natural Resources, Brian Ransom, played a very key role in putting forward our concerns at that time, and many other people have been involved, many meetings took place and the reference to a new beginning of cooperation, we always thought we had it with our American neighbours to the south.

If there was some concern, possibly by this Minister, that it wasn't there before then maybe he could check with his colleagues and we'll advise him as well; but all in all I want to indicate that we are happy the outcome is proceeding as it is and we will also continue to watch what happens with the further developments across the line.

I'd just like to indicate to the Minister that, in view of the statements that he's been making lately, I'm still waiting for some kind of a statement that will give some relief to our flood-damaged areas in the province so we can deal with that as well.

Thank you.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, I'd like to draw the attention of members to the gallery where there are 26 students of Grade 9 from the General Byng School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Valerie Birch and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

I'd also like to draw the attention of members to 23 students of Grade 5 from Centennial School. They are under the direction of Miss Rosemary Martel and the school is located in the constituency of Seven Oaks.

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

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd also like to draw to the attention of the House that I've been advised that, due to production difficulties at the typesetter, Hansard will be a little late in arriving from the printers today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Tax credit abuses - Ministers of Crown

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Premier, in view of the new-found powers of recall of the Minister of the Environment who Friday revealed his participation in an SRTC tax scam investment.

I'm wondering whether or not the Premier could indicate to the House whether or not any other elected members of his administration have invested in an SRTC tax avoidance investment.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Not to my knowledge, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Premier has received, in writing, assurances from every member of his administration that they have not participated in such a scheme.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I have the confidence in the word of individual members of my Cabinet who have indicated that they have not.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Premier has given us that confidence before; in fact, Friday in question period he said, and I'll quote: "... let me indicate to you" - and this is with reference to questions about the Minister of Energy and Mines - "... let me indicate to you that none of the Ministers on this side have ever intentionally misled anyone in respect to their own affairs are concerned." Whereas just a few minutes later, outside of this House, his Minister of Energy and Mines clarified the question that I had been asking the Premier throughout the question period, and said, "I do have a \$35,000 tax credit, but I also have other tax benefits which in total add up to \$57,778", which indicates that, in his first statement to the people of Manitoba indicating his investment in the NERC'85 investment, the Minister of Energy and Mines misled the public. Now in view of that, Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is: will he seek the assurances, in writing, of every member of his administration that they have not participated in similar schemes, since the credibility of the Minister of Energy is obviously in doubt?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the credibility of the Minister of Energy and Mines is not in doubt. The Minister of Energy and Mines has not intentionally misled anyone, as alleged by the Leader of the Opposition, and has been in fact quite forthcoming in respect to the information.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, further with respect to statements made, direct statements made on this

subject by the Minister of Energy and Mines - I'm quoting from an article in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 27th, in which it indicates that the Minister of Energy and Mines during the election campaign was asked the direct question about whether or not he invested in an SRTC tax scam and he responded, "I haven't made out my income tax form this year, I'll have to talk to my accountant about it." At that time further evidence has indicated he had already invested in the SRTC tax scam. This is deliberate misinformation, Madam Speaker, and I ask the Premier whether or not he will now demand the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines because he misled the people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, unfortunately some of the activities across the way are. Madam Speaker, the question that was posed on the date in question dealt with the Morris plant and the Minister of Energy and Mines answered in respect to that context.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the question, as referred to in the newspaper, says "whether he had bought into the type of quick profit tax shelters being denounced by his colleague", not the Morris scheme. The Minister has obviously misled the people of Manitoba and his Premier and he is not fit to continue to serve, given the doubt on his credibility and his integrity; will the Premier now demand his resignation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is repeating himself. The article in question and the reference with respect to a particular situation that was being discussed during the election, the Minister of Energy and Mines has not intentionally misled anyone, including the Premier of this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question to the First Minister is, in view of the fact that this Minister of Energy and Mines is going to be charged with the responsibility for entering into major agreements on behalf of the people of Manitoba, how can he continue to serve in that capacity, given the fact that his credibility is in question and, indeed, his integrity is in question; and given the fact that the people of Manitoba have reason to doubt whether or not he places his own self-interest over the interests of the people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, one of the results of the March 18th election is a clear indication by the people of Manitoba that they had confidence in the work that has been done by the Minister of Energy and Mines in respect to the successful completion of hydro contracts which indeed has meant large benefits to the Province of Manitoba, both now and in the future.

Madam Speaker, there is no lack of credibility in the Minister of Energy and Mines, the people of Manitoba have spoken, and certainly, insofar as this government is concerned, we are pleased with the results achieved by the Minister of Energy and Mines. It may very well be that honourable members across the way would like to discredit the efforts by the Minister of Energy and

Mines to bring economic activity to the Province of Manitoba but, Madam Speaker, we have no doubt as to the capability and efficiency as expressed by the concrete results on the part of the Minister of Energy and Mines over the last number of years.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition that deliberately misleading is one of the phrases that Beauchesne has ruled as unparliamentary and I would hope that he would be assuming that all members of this House are honourable members and he is not intentionally trying to use an unparliamentary phrase in respect to any honourable members in the Chamber.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I think that if you will check with Hansard, you will find that I used the word "misinformed" and not "mislead." We'll have that matter looked into when Hansard is published.

But my final question to the Premier is, does he not believe that it is absolutely essential for every member of his government to tell the truth publicly when they are dealing with any issue?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Mines. I ask him, will the Minister now tell us exactly how much money the Government of Manitoba lost, and he personally gained, in the tax avoidance scheme that he participated in? Was it the \$35,000 that's been referred to, or the \$58,000.00?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Obviously, on a point of order, the question as phrased . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: On a point of order.

HON. J. COWAN: . . . by the member opposite, the Member for Lakeside, is out of order and does not fall within the ministerial responsibility of the Minister to which the question is asked, and I would hope that you would rule it out of order on those grounds.

MR. H. ENNS: Surely the question of integrity and credibility of any member of the Treasury Bench is always a question within order in this Chamber; it is the central question.

Madam Speaker, an issue has arisen. My leader attempted to ascertain that information yesterday, fairly straightforward information. Documents that have been published by the Free Press indicate that the purchase of x-number of shares in this tax avoidance scheme nets the purchaser \$58,000.00. The Minister to this day still maintains it is \$35,000.00. Outside of the House he says he has other tax avoidance schemes that come close to \$58,000.00. I'm simply asking: how much

money did the people of Manitoba lose by his participating in the tax avoidance scheme, and how much did he gain in this particular scheme? Was it \$35,000 or \$58,000.00? Now goodness sakes we can expect to get a straightforward answer.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I did presume that the member was rising on the point of order, not to restate his question. On the point of order, I would bring the members' attention to Beauchesne Rule 359(6) which says that a question must deal with matters within the administrative competence of the government. So if the member has a question to the Minister of Energy and Mines relating to his department that would be in order. The question that he posed is not in order.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

Health staff - delay in postings

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I would like to address my question, Madam Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Health. Is the delay of posting with regard to the four home economists and the two secretarial staff of one week an indication that this valuable service may be retained?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order, I presume.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Madam Speaker. I apologize to the Member for River Heights but I was trying to determine, Madam Speaker, did you rule that the question from the Member for Lakeside was not in order?

MADAM SPEAKER: It was not in order to the Minister of Energy and Mines, you are right.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. G. MERCIER: With all due respect then, Madam Speaker, I would like to challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. All those in favour of the ruling of the Chair please say aye; those opposed please say nay.

I rule that the ayes have it.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour, please rise.

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

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Carstairs, Cowan, Desjardins, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak H., Harapiak

L., Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith H., Smith M., Storie, Uruski, Walding, Wasylycia-Leis.

NAYS

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 30; Nays 24.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion to sustain the ruling of the Chair has been carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

Health staff - delay in postings

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. We are now getting to the delay - the delay of the posting of the four home economists and the two secretaries from your department in the Financial Resources and Financial Management section; is that an indication that this valuable service will indeed be maintained?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The actual service was provided by the people in the . . . (inaudible) region under the Minister of Agriculture who is now investigating the possibility of . . . counselling and the advice in developing of the programs as . . . (inaudible) and I imagine that he should be reporting to the House fairly soon.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. Why did your ministry reject the Cabinet interdepartmental committee which in fact said that this service must be enhanced and become a major priority?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, this is being studied, as I said, by the Minister of Agriculture. This was an internal department that doesn't obligate anyone; it is an advice by the staff to the government, and that is being looked at at this time.

Tax credit abuses - Ministers of Crown

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Minister most directly responsible for the collection of tax revenue

in the Province of Manitoba. Has he been able to confirm whether or not the Manitoba tax revenue his department lost \$58,000 or \$35,000 in the tax avoidance scheme that his colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines, participated in?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. No, I do not have the specific information that the member requests because it is not legal for a Minister of Finance to look at the individual tax records of any member of the public. I can say that this government has been concerned about the present situation that exists with respect to income taxes and taxes in this country. We have indicated that there is a need for major reform to deal with the kind of situation that is dealing with the situation that gave rise to the question.

I might also point out that I think it's even been further highlighted that there are problems with the income tax situation when you see what was reported in the Winnipeg Sun of last weekend where you can have an individual like the Leader of the Opposition making \$20,000 more than the Premier of this province, yet paying less income tax, so I think that's an indication that our income tax system in this country needs a major overhaul, Madam Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. It is my understanding that this government, along with many other provincial governments, participated in petitioning Ottawa to drop that ill-advised Liberal scheme to avoid taxes and, indeed, indicated that there could be a potential serious loss of tax revenue. So I think, Madam Spaker, it's entirely within his competence to ask him, how much revenue did his department lose as a result of the tax avoidance scheme that his colleague was involved with?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, I have already indicated that we are aware that there has been a considerable cost to the province because of situations that were put in place by the Federal Government. I don't have any specific figures on the total amount that has been lost, but I presume at some point that that information will be available.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Falling upon the Minister's confession of May 6, 1986, I would like to pose the question to the Minister of Environment that, given his perfectly clear memory of his 1985 income tax statement where he assured, in Cabinet discussion, no participation in a tax avoidance scheme, and given his selective memory loss of the 1984 tax year wherein he generally was aware, but not of specific details, and had conveniently forgotten about a \$20,000 loan that he made to take advantage of a tax avoidance scheme, could the Minister of Environment indicate to the House whether the tax avoidance scheme that he participated in in 1964 was a quick-flip?

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe the member well knows that is out of order for the very same reason that the former question was out of order. I think you should check Beauchesne, 359(6): "A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government." The Minister to whom the question is directed is responsible to the House for his present Ministry.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: What is your point of order?
The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Cabinet, according to the confession of the Minister of Environment, has discussed this tax avoidance scheme. Madam Speaker, when the Cabinet discusses the implications of ministerial participation in tax avoidance schemes, surely it is in the realm of opportune questions in this House to pose questions to Ministers as to how they participated in these schemes labeled as legalized theft by the former Minister of Finance.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on the point of order.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, not on the point of order, but on what I think is a misuse of the procedures of this House. You had made a ruling. I would hope that the honourable member is not reflecting upon that ruling. Your ruling was that the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. COWAN: Your ruling was that the question was out of order. Indeed, according to Beauchesne, it is out of order, and I think it is incumbent upon members opposite to either accept that ruling or exercise the parliamentary procedures which they know are available to them.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I presume that the Honourable Member for Pembina was making a brief explanation of why he did not agree with my ruling on the point of order, which technically he's not supposed to do. My ruling holds on his original question that, regardless of what was discussed in that particular situation, that it is not within the administrative competence of that particular Minister. That particular Minister is responsible for questions on the Environment, Workplace, Health and Safety, and those are the questions that I will allow to be put to him.

The Honourable Member for Pembina with a question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the First Minister. Given that the Minister of Environment is in control of a \$12-plus million budget in the Province of Manitoba, does the First Minister continue to have confidence in the ability of that Minister to carry out the spending on behalf of taxpayers of over \$12 million, when he has a selective memory loss as to signing an application for taking on

an SRTC for which he borrowed some \$20,000.00? Does the First Minister maintain that he still has confidence in that Minister's ability to supervise in an equitable way and in a fair way the spending of over \$12 million?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I find the question rather strange coming from a member who couldn't remember how he received a document last year, and ended up with three or four different versions as to how he got a document involving the Department of Health. The answer to the question is, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the First Minister's obvious attempt to skate around the issue of the credibility of his Cabinet and members of his government.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina, is this a supplementary question or a new question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: This is a supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question should have no preamble.

MR. D. ORCHARD: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker, with a statement of fact, as I did, I trust will not meet with your disapproval in the future.

Madam Speaker, can the First Minister indicate whether, in the Cabinet discussions of the SRTC tax involvement, that other Ministers did not indicate participation by the selective memory loss of the Minister of Environment?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. As you are aware and as the members opposite should be aware, according to Beauchesne 357.(gg), it is inappropriate for him to seek information about proceedings and decisions and discussions that are taken in Cabinet and, for that and many other reasons, that particular question should be ruled out of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader is quite correct, and I would refer the Member for Pembina to that particular citation in Beauchesne.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

Quarterly Reports - delay in

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Finance. Inasmuch as the Throne Speech was laden with undertones and warnings of dire fiscal circumstances of this province and, furthermore, as the Third Quarter Report indicated that the forecasted deficit for the province was some \$58

million higher than that projected in the Budget of a year ago, I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate when Manitobans will know and will be given an unaudited forecast of the deficit for the year-end, 1985-86.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In response to the question from the Member for Morris, the situation of the province's finances will be dealt with when the Budget is brought down on May 22nd.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm glad to hear that indeed the past practice of the government of beginning to push back these Quarterly Reports will be broken this time, and that we will have a full understanding . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Do you have a question?

MR. C. MANNESS: Yes I do, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it a supplementary question or a new question?

MR. C. MANNESS: I now have a new question, Madam Speaker, to the First Minister, if I may.

MADAM SPEAKER: Okay, the Honourable Member for Morris, your question.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, I have before me a detail of the published Quarterly Reports, provided by the Department of Finance, as to when the Quarterly Reports have been released over the last six years. Over the last two of these seven Quarterly Reports, the dates of release have been pushed back progressively. I will now ask the First Minister why the Third Quarter Report, released April 2nd, was some 90 days after the Third Quarter End, December 31st.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Quarter Reports have been prepared by staff of the Department of Finance, and have been available as quickly as the material has been made available. Because of the complex nature of the information, at times it has taken longer than in the past. The Quarter Report this time was some days later than the report in the previous year.

I would just point out, Madam Speaker, for the record that the Third Quarter Report in the year previous was tabled on March 22nd, which was only a few days - it was 10 or so days - earlier than the tabling of it this year. The reports are tabled as soon as the information is made available.

MR. C. MANNESS: Can the Minister then tell me why, the year previous to that, the Third Quarterly Report

was released March 2nd? Why now does it take an extra month to release these reports?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I indicated, Madam Speaker, it has taken longer to prepare the necessary information. The report was tabled on March 2nd two years ago, March 22nd a year ago, and beginning of April this year. The reports are tabled once the necessary material is prepared and ready for tabling.

MR. C. MANNESS: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Can the Minister indicate when the Fourth Quarter, the year-end review, unaudited, will be released for this House?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I can't give a specific date, but the date for the preliminary unaudited statement for the year end has traditionally been tabled during the months of July or even into August, so I would expect that it would be within the same time period.

MARN dinner - Deputy Minister of Health attendance at

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Could the Minister advise the House whether he requested his Deputy Minister, Mr. Edwards, to attend and bring greetings on his behalf to the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses' Professional Achievement dinner last evening?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes I did.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that Mr. Edwards expressed regrets that the Minister could not attend the dinner because he could not obtain a pair, and in view of the fact that the House was in fact not sitting, Madam Speaker, and adjourned in fact at about 4:30 p.m. yesterday afternoon - in view of the fact that obviously no pair was required nor was it even sought in any event - would the Minister agree to write a letter to the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses to correct the misinformation that his Deputy Minister gave . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll write all kinds of letters if it makes you that happy.

Madam Speaker, what I will do is I'll inform . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Sober up for a while there, eh?

Madam Speaker, the point is . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I'm sorry, I truly did not hear the answer of the Minister of Health. I certainly will look at Hansard and if there's anything out of order I will certainly bring it to the member's attention tomorrow.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I take it the Minister is not going to answer the question.

I'll ask the Premier, would the Premier instruct the Minister of Health to write to the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses to correct the misinformation that his Deputy Minister gave to those attending?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: What is important is that the rules pertaining to pairing be clarified because Ministers . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . are required to make their plans some time in advance and I believe it is a consequence of the inability to know in advance . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is absolutely right; I never asked for a pair. —(Interjection) — If you shut up, I'll tell you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What I did, they had requested somebody to bring greetings and I informed them that we could be in Session and that the policy of the Conservative Opposition would be that there would be no pairing.

Then I asked my Deputy Minister to be ready because I didn't know if there would be any sitting that evening. Later in the afternoon, it wasn't sure, it wasn't decided at that time, I phoned the Deputy Minister. I did not tell him that I'd asked for a pair, that I'd been refused. I told him that that would be go because it would be too late when I would find out, and that was it.

I found out today for the first time that he had made that statement and I'll bring it to his attention and he can do what he wants with it.

MTS - abuse of dial-up lines

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Recently I received a letter from the principal of Elmwood High School outlining his concerns regarding students' use of the Dial It 900 service.

Could the Minister indicate whether he has had any discussions with the MTS Board regarding access to this service?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: First of all, I would like to thank, Madam Speaker, the honourable member for giving me notice of the intention to put that question to me. I understand that he's had concerns brought to his attention and I want to confirm to the House that there have been concerns brought to me as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephones in connection with an abuse of the service.

The abuse centres on people learning that young people, very young people, are using the telephone service to dial what ostensibly is a sex distribution network located in the United States. These long distance calls are a concern to the users of Manitoba Telephone System. I've asked the board to consider that matter and to give me a report on what they propose to do with it.

Freedom of Information Act - projected proclamation date

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Attorney-General.

Now that the election is over, could the Attorney-General please advise the House when The Freedom of Information Act will be proclaimed?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, as I have advised the Member for St. Norbert on a number of occasions, we have an interdepartmental committee working on that matter, meeting virtually every week, sometimes more than twice a week, in order to cope with the tremendously complex problem of arranging the file schedules, from which thereafter the access guide must be prepared because without both of those, file schedules in each department and the access guide, the act cannot operate efficiently and the time requirements within the act - for example, the requirement of meeting a request within 30 days - simply could not be met.

We have in fact allocated resources in order to speed up that job. Just as soon as I'm able to give a definitive answer to this House, either I or the Minister of Culture, whose department is responsible basically for the document's process in the House, will do so.

I'd like to, Madam Speaker, point out that when in fact, in the previous Session, when the Opposition were government, when we sought to just refer the matter to a committee, that the Opposition led, among others, by the then Attorney-General, opposed even the reference of freedom of information to the committee.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. As the Attorney-General well knows, an answer to a question should be brief.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry, on the supplementary.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, could the Minister, now knowing the length of time that it takes to prepare the documentation to get the act in order, give us an estimate? Will it be in the 1990's or in the 21st century? I think the public has a right to know.

HON. R. PENNER: I look forward to being able to answer that question in the 21st century, if necessary, and I know the Member for Pembina joins me in that wish.

That information will be in fact supplied to the House, I hope, in this Session. I have every reason to expect that a proclamation of that act certainly is going to be within this current fiscal year.

Investment performance of government

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Finance Minister.

Can the Minister indicate Manitoba's investment performance over the term of this government?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: No, Legislatures come and go; this government goes on forever.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It seems that members opposite are not interested in the state of Manitoba's economy.

I am pleased to answer that question, the first question dealing with economic matters, which I think are the important issues to Manitobans with respect to jobs and the opportunities for jobs in the future.

I am pleased to note that over the past four-year period, five-year period, that Manitoba's investment has increased over 50 percent, which is higher than any other area of Canada. In fact, this is the best in all of Canada.

MR. H. SMITH: Could he indicate to the House what the investment outlook for this year is?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I am pleased to answer that question and to indicate that the various economic forecasts indicate that Manitoba is expected, over the next year, to have even improved economic prospects; and with respect to capital investments we are again expected to lead Canada with respect to capital investment which includes both private and public investment.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Technology. It was noted

and announced that Northern Tel in Winnipeg would be laying off, or have laid off, 35 to 40 people in the plant in Winnipeg. Has the Minister had discussion with them as to the reason why the layoffs occurred, and will there be more?

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

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. That is a serious problem, it is one that is facing us, Northern Tel and other companies, not only here in Manitoba but, as an example, Northern Tel has also had to lay off many more people in other parts of the country. The Minister of Labour is meeting with them. I understand that officials from my department have already met with them and certainly I would be most pleased to meet with them as well.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: In the same report, the vice-president of Northern Tel, I believe the vice-president in Edmonton, was asked if the layoffs would occur all the way across western provinces or in other plants, or would they be mostly in Winnipeg. I believe his answer was that he was not sure. I ask again, have they checked with the vice-president of Northern Tel to make sure that the layoffs will not be in Winnipeg in preference to other parts of the country.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: My understanding is that there are many more layoffs in the rest of the country than in Winnipeg, but I will take the question as notice and get the specifics back to the member.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ellice and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition standing in the name of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I helped lead you to your Chair last Thursday. I know that you will be fair and evenhanded, and should you be called upon to keep order, I pray that you do it with authority of voice and manner. I have every confidence in your ability and it pleases me to see you there.

It is with a pride and a sense of history that I take my seat in this Assembly. Fifty years ago this year my father took his seat for the first time in the Legislature of Nova Scotia and began a career spanning 45 years of service to his province and to his country. I do not intend to have a career of 45 years but I will challenge my children to carry the torch.

Because of my tradition, I have great respect for all members of this House and I am loath to heap ignominy except those who do dishonour to their portfolio or to their constituency. We must all be careful to judge

personal decisions lest our own be questioned and, therefore, matters of no concern to this House should be left outside of this House.

Ma mère est née aux Etats-Unis, cependant, mes grand-parents étaient Acadiens et leur langue maternelle était le français. Ils ont émigré aux Etats-Unis parce qu'ils ont cru qu'ils n'y aurait pas d'avenir pour leurs enfants au Cape-Breton. Mais dans leur nouveau pays, seul l'Anglais était acceptable. Donc, ma mère n'a jamais appris le français, la langue de ses ancêtres. Je suis heureuse de pouvoir vivre dans un pays et une province où les deux langues sont appréciées et où autres cultures sont encouragées à préserver leur langue et leur héritage. Ce ne me froisse aucunement que d'autres aient leurs droits et je considère même que la protection de leurs droits rehausse la valeur des miens.

English translation

My mother was born in the United States although my grandparents were Acadian and their native tongue was French. They emigrated to the United States because they believed there could be no future for their children in Cape Breton. However, in their new country, only English was acceptable. Therefore, my mother never learned to speak French, the language of her ancestors. I am happy to be able to live in a country and a province where the two languages are appreciated and where other cultures are encouraged to preserve their language and their heritage. I do not take umbrage that others have their rights and I even consider that the protection of their rights enhances the value of mine.

I want to thank the people of my riding of River Heights who had the confidence to elect me to this Legislature, and I want to thank the Liberal Party who chose me as their leader expecting me to lead them from this House. I want to promise my constituents, my party, and you my colleagues, that my most fundamental responsibility will be to bring my full capabilities and energies to do what I can to improve the quality of life and the quality of government in this province.

The Liberal contribution to this Session of the Legislature will be a positive one. I will keep my criticisms constructive and alternatives and suggestions will be offered, not kept secret to be unveiled only at election time. An opposition that merely opposes does not make a full contribution to the Legislative process. The Liberal approach will indeed be to criticize but, more importantly, to contribute. When we have good ideas, we will tell you. And, if our good ideas find expression in government policy, the record will be there and our influence will be noted. If the government takes credit due to us, that is a small price to pay, indeed, it is the right price to pay for being an elected member without sufficient confreres to be the government.

In fact, in a more perfect system, our 14 percent of the popular vote would have seen us with seven or eight MLA's.

If we press the governing party with our good ideas in the next election, we will once again increase our vote and perhaps we'll be drafting the laws and seeking the assistance for those who now temporarily governed, and those others who seemed doomed forever to oppose.

This curiously understated Speech from the Throne sets its measure from something that is only alluded to in the most bureaucratic language. When the government says it will provide for clear establishment of public priorities on expenditure and taxation, they are really talking about money - or more accurately - the lack of it, and how they are hobbled in responding to new problems by a \$554 million deficit. That is a central and glaring contradiction in the Speech from the Throne, in the last four years of NDP Government and in their plans for the future.

How did it come to pass, in the strong economy spoken of in the Speech from the Throne, that the government could create such a deficit monster. Yes, the fall off in the growth of Federal transfers had something to do with it, but the essence of democratic institutions is that they must be responsible institutions, and it is irresponsible not to face up to the problem of government financial management in a more forthright manner. To me, this must precede discussion of government priorities. The speech is silent on this most central issue. Hopefully, the upcoming budget will not be.

What of the government's agenda expressed in the Throne Speech. There are some positive proposals and I pledge my support to them, but there are a great many issues that this speech does not address, and frankly, I was surprised by their absence.

This government has introduced and enhanced many good programs - Legal Aid, the Ombudsman and the Human Rights Commission. It has given Manitobans a sense that they can, if they wish, fight the system to ensure the protection of their legal rights, the right to redress against improper government action and, most important of all, the right to live in this province without discrimination. Sadly, over the years, adequate funding has been denied to these agencies so that the dreams and opportunities Manitobans thought they had do not exist. For me, this is worse than not having taught them to dream. We must keep faith with those we represent. While the Throne Speech speaks of vision, it is sadly lacking in this vital area of human rights.

The government has mentioned little of the age of new technology. It speaks of an industrial strategy, but where is the recognition in our education system of the demands for our children to be prepared with new skills and attitudes, to reach out to grasp a world of new conquests. It is not a question of money. It is a question of whether government resources are used to perpetuate the mistakes and outdated solutions of the past, or whether they are used for the challenges of the future.

This government has rejected, for example, the need for a Native school in our core area, and yet we know that our present system is failing these children. Surely a school which enhanced their self-image while emphasizing learning in essential skills will help them adapt, provide them with future jobs and allow for their full participation in our society.

Politicians of all political parties speak of our farm crisis but where are the programs necessary to ensure that our farmers remain on the land? Farm Aid and Farm Start are woefully inadequate. When this government suggests debt moratoriums, I ask them to remember the dearth of a relationship between farmers and bankers during the forties and the fifties. Hopefully

this crisis will be short-lived. Do not burden our farmers with economic difficulties that will last their lifetime. For now, they need relief from the burden of input costs by property taxes and taxes on chemicals and fertilizers and help for the young people in the way of student loans and bursaries which do not penalize because of the value of land. In essence, the farm family is cash poor and that must be the basis upon which bursaries are granted.

They need cheap money because we will not, as a country or a province, forsake our cheap food policy. They need a government that recognizes that now is the time to help because a poor agricultural economy means a poor Manitoba economy. The stimulus must come now from the Provincial Government who cannot ignore our responsibilities by foisting it all on the Federal Government. It is dishonest to insist that only the Federal Government must aid in this crisis.

What of our young people, our children who got nary a mention? Our education system is not adequate. The burden has been placed on school divisions to be innovative and my school division is offering adult education, inner-city education and education for the gifted through the International Baccalaureate Program, but instead of these programs being funded primarily on the broad tax base, they are financed by the division leading to a 14 percent increase in property taxes, an unfair burden on many of the citizens of Winnipeg School Division No. 1. Some rural divisions have raised taxes by 25 percent in order to meet parental expectations.

The government makes much the failure of the Federal Government to meet its obligations. What of this government's failure to meet its obligations to the school divisions and municipalities of this province? Of this we hear nothing. Where is your integrity?

The Throne Speech contains references to enhanced home care and I congratulate the government for realizing that the elderly and the handicapped will live longer and more satisfied lives in their home environment. However, that does not provide relief for the hundreds of chronic patients presently occupying and receiving inappropriate care in acute hospital beds. It does not give answers to those seriously ill patients whose surgery which, while once was elective, has now become emergency because there is insufficient beds. Cancer patients cannot expect enhanced and more efficient care as a result of this speech.

Parents will continue to explain to children that yes, they must have an operation but there is not room at the present, so they will have to be ill a few more times before they will get better. The system is not working and I challenge the government to recognize the urgency of this problem.

The Throne Speech calls for jobs, but for whom? Defeated members have skills and talents to sell in the open job market. What of our young people whom the education system has cheated? They have no skills and have no developed talents. Where are the jobs for them? Where are the jobs for the increasing number of Natives who live in this city? Will the Core Area Renewal provide a higher percentage for human aid, or will we do as so many cities have done before us, build with brick and mortar and ignore our social fabric? Of course, we could be physically beautiful. What of the human spirit? Will that also be allowed to become beautiful in this city and province?

It would be wrong to speak today without mention of our mega projects. The NDP Government would liken itself to the Loughheed Tories and fashion a heritage fund called the Manitoba Energy Foundation. It would take a make-believe profit from a hard-to-fathom project and create an imaginary fund whose use would be diverted from source to create mythical jobs, perhaps for more defeated politicians, a grasping for a sense of entrepreneurship. Perhaps this government should have stood by its original refrain that mega projects were not feasible for this province, but now that it is here be honest and forthright, give Manitobans the real facts on profit and loss.

We must keep our Northern Natives employed on this project and I pray don't drop the preferential clause at this time, the height of the employment pattern; don't weaken on this the most significant social benefit of this project. If we do not learn from our history, we are doomed to repeat it.

It is time to change the structure of decision-making on these major projects. The Legislature must have a greater overview of these essential economic matters. The depoliticization of Hydro will be the only means by which decision-making is made in the best interests of the citizens of this province. If there is any money, and I have strong doubts, these monies must be invested into long-term provincial growth and should primarily be focused on the North to develop long-term social development of our Northern residents, particularly the Natives who are the original owners of this land and who have received few benefits. The Legislature must approve the long-term investment policy. The use of these monies for political gain must not be permitted.

Sixty percent of the people of this province live in Winnipeg and yet our capital city was not mentioned at all other than in a passing reference to The City of Winnipeg Act. The quality of life in this city, including our universities, our cultural and our recreational activities, can be used to keep our whole province vibrant. Our city is one of the most attractive in terms of lifestyles in this country and yet there is no comprehensive strategy to develop and emphasize its strength. The economy of this province is dependent upon this city. To ignore Winnipeg is to ignore all of Manitoba. I will support changes which bring into play the participation of citizens in the planning and development of their city.

I agree that we must turn our faces toward our river banks, one of our greatest resources, but let us not allow its development to become the focus of political activity. We need a strategy for development and authority representing cities and municipalities as well as the province that will enhance long-term development. A series of nice projects does not make for effective planning.

I would like to support the Opposition Leader's motion because this government has failed to address the significant social issues. The speech has ignored the plight of our farmers. Tragically, yet once again, the Opposition has had to include a narrow, self-serving personal issue in its motion. This government has failed to show vision. Using the word 23 times doesn't replace thoughtful policy. The Official Opposition, however, cannot rise to the occasion to leave aside petty bickering and to speak to issues.

I, therefore, take my seat with heavy heart wondering when dignity will return to this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is indeed an honour for me as a newly elected MLA to speak in this Assembly as my first time. I'd like to also join with others who have congratulated you, Madam Speaker, on your election to the highest office in this Assembly. As a former colleague of yours, I know that you are a leader, you are competent and you are very fair and I feel that you will be an excellent Speaker in this House.

I feel that members opposite will regret the petty behaviour that they displayed a few days ago in terms of your election to this fine office in this House.

I would also like to pay tribute to the former Member for Concordia, Peter Fox, an MLA and a former Speaker in this House. He is indeed a fine man. He brought many improvements to the riding of Concordia through the government and through his work with our caucus: The development of our health care facility in the community, of the Concordia Hospital, with the \$2.5 million construction program; the introduction of the personal care homes, the Bethania Nursing Home that is now being completed, with 50 additional beds; the housing starts; the job creation projects in the constituency of Concordia. But much still has to be done in our riding. The growth in population in the northeast section of the city requires a continued and planned approach to the infrastructure in the riding of Concordia and in the area of the northeast section of the city. I find it regrettable that other members from that riding, or in this general area, are not in the House at this point because I think we must improve the health care facility to deal with the challenges of the health care, growth in population and in terms of the home care situation, and the traffic population.

The members opposite have talked about honesty. I want to talk a little bit about honesty in terms of the doorstep during the last provincial election. Members opposite should know that there was literature distributed in our constituency under their letterhead stating that this government would introduce an equity tax on homes, if sold. I find that very dishonest and I would like to say that it was very dishonest at the time and certainly it was never a policy of the government, nor does it continue to be a policy of the government to do that. To project that as one of our election promises, I would say, is extremely dishonest.

I am also very proud of coming from the trade union movement and the traditions of the trade union movement in this province. Manitoba has had, in the most recent period of time, the last four or five years, one of the best, if not the best records of cooperation, one of the best records in terms of person days lost due to industrial disputes, and in fact last year Manitoba was second only to P.E.I. in terms of days lost per capita in the country, and the longest situation in that period of time was in fact in a legal lockout that was rendered by the Labour Board to be illegal.

This cooperative environment has been demonstrated at the summit in Portage la Prairie that was begun in

1982 — the Economic Summit in 1982. It was continued again two years ago in the Brandon Economic Summit. It continues on an ongoing basis with the Economic Advisory Council of Manitoba, where members of the business community, the farm community, the labour community, members of the government, sit down on a regular basis to deal with the collective problems facing us.

As a former member of that Economic Advisory Council, I say that that's the model for the country to go in terms of solving our problems collectively with consensus and dealing with our problems on a very objective basis instead of the shrill rhetoric that is so typical of our North American society.

Everywhere you go, and you don't need the antiseptic statistics, you can see the evidence of the results of that economic cooperation and environment. If it's in the north with the development of Limestone, whether it's in our rural communities with the Main Street Manitoba Projects and the other developments in Main Street Manitoba, you just have to walk two blocks out of this House and look at the development of the North Portage, or look down the street in terms of the construction, the new construction going on, or go into the suburbs with the rapid construction of homes. You don't need the antiseptic statistics to show that the province is back on its feet and moving forward like it should.

The Leader of the Opposition, during the election campaign, produced two mega documents, Programs for People, and the Economic Solutions for the Province, and I think it's rather ironic that the promises contained within that document — and I wonder how many members of his caucus supported the \$800 million deficit that would have been produced with the combination of promises and tax cuts by those two documents if they had ever been elected before. Thank God they had to have somebody from Ontario come in, Mr. Lashinger, wait two weeks for the caucus to get out in their constituencies, to return to get re-elected, and develop the programs and proposals that would produce an \$800 million deficit in this province. I wonder if their caucus will endorse those policies contained in that \$800 million document. We should have a thermometer placed outside of the Tory caucus room that goes up every time they promise something without balancing the books for where they're going to get the money. That's what we should do.

In terms of the private, public, farm, business, government cooperative approach, I think that is the finest way for us to deal with the issue of free trade. We sat down with business leaders, labour leaders, farm leaders, government leaders, talking about all the issues at stake for Manitobans. We took a pragmatic approach and we continue to take a pragmatic approach. What will happen to the brewery workers if we get a deal on the hog producers? What will happen to the poultry workers if we get a different kind of deal on agriculture? Can we get rid of the subsidies, the major subsidies produced by that alleged free-enterprise country, the United States, in the agricultural sector and still remain competitive?

Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand on this issue? Do you believe in unfettered free trade, or do you believe in taking a pragmatic look at the specific issues and what they mean for Manitoba? I think that's

a lot better way of developing an approach to free trade than just going yes, on the one hand, or no, on the other hand.

When Brian Mulroney and Ronald Reagan are cutting up the cake in terms of the free trade deal, at least Manitobans will know what is at stake for each and every one of us and what will that mean for the future of our province. I say that enhanced trade and intelligent trade, better trade for Manitoba is all very well and good but we had better be careful when we go to the bargaining table when we now have a \$22 billion surplus with the Americans. We had better be very careful when we go to the bargaining table that we come back with a deal that is not only better than \$22 million but also better for Manitobans.

I was also pleased that at the Western First Ministers' Conference last year, instead of talking about the black and white philosophy of free trade, our Premier came back not only with a position that we would enter into pragmatic trade, but that people, and the displaced people from free trade, would be an important part of any discussions and relationships we would have in the whole trade debate. Thank God one Premier in this country was talking about the human aspects of trade negotiations with the United States.

I think that approach, taking it sector by sector and knowing where we are going before we're going, is a lot more intelligent than the MacDonald Commission's Report that says, "We must take a leap of faith before we can go into free trade negotiations." I don't want a leap of faith unless I know what kind of leap we are taking. I hope the members opposite study the issues on a specific basis and not just on a glib philosophical basis.

I would also like to echo the comments from the Liberal Member for River Heights in terms of the dignity that this House should bring. I think it is very important for the new members to reflect somewhat on the behaviour we have witnessed in this House in past years. New members should make a difference when they come into new caucuses. What is the sake of having new members who just act the same way as old members do? We came in with new ideas and new behaviour and we hope that that will show newness in terms of our ideas in this House.

The Leader of the Opposition has made statements that our Speech from the Throne is just a rehashing of our election promises. Thank God it is; thank God it is. What we don't want is a leader to promise one thing and come in with a Speech from the Throne with a whole different set of ideas.

Brian Mulroney promises jobs, jobs, jobs, and we have got tax, tax, tax. He had no mandate to do what he did to the Canadian people; he had no mandate to do what he did with the Canadian people. When he was asked the question of free trade during the August election campaign, Brian Mulroney said, "I won't change free trade. The last person that tried to change free trade with the United States lost his seat, lost the election." Three weeks later when he was sworn in, he's laying it holus-bolus with free trade.

Health care — he promised us in many meetings across this country that he believed in returning the health care system to 50-50 percent funding. By the year 1991, if Bill C-96 goes through, this province will receive less than 40 percent from the Federal

Government and we will have to make up the other 60 percent. That is an erosion, that is a breaking of the health care system and our medicare system through the back door, and he doesn't have a mandate to do it.

So yes, we are running on our record; we are running on our promises; we are running on the mandate we received from the public and that is the way we should be going. We're not running on 'we just want a change' as it happened in 1977 and then we had wholesale cuts in our social services in the health care sector. We ran on a dual economy. The two engines of our economy are necessary for a productive province: the engine in the public sector and the engine in the private sector. We ran on a dual-engine economy and we are continuing to do so. That is the mandate we received.

The whole area on the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition party developing documents that produced technically, \$800 million deficit for the Province of Manitoba, was what was classically labeled by former politicians in the United States as "voodoo economics."

I'd love to be witness to the discussions on what the other members, when they got back from the hustings, said with those kind of economic figures that they had produced from Mr. Lashinger and company when they came in from Ontario to produce the election promises.

Where do they stand on pay equity? I remember last year pay equity was considered — our proposal didn't go far enough. When we proposed to have a consultative process and proceed in the private sector over the next four years, it was called 'going too far'. Where is their program on pay equity?

I was hearing at the doorstep in the last election that the hydro development . . . what is the Tory policy on hydro development? We know you're in favour of a practical, logical approach to hydro development. What is a Conservative approach? I didn't know what it was. Maybe they could tell us in this House.

I read their core area proposal asking for future development of the river banks. Yesterday I heard the Leader of the Opposition criticize the development of the river banks. I don't know what their position is in terms of river development.

Madam Speaker, we have a fundamental issue to deal with in this House and indeed not just this House but the Houses of Canada. Not since the Rowell/Souris Report has been prepared in this country have we got a greater opportunity, in a negative way, to differentiate between the have and have-not regions of this country and, furthermore, to differentiate between the have and have-not individuals in our society.

With the reduction in our fundamental services — as I mentioned in the health care field — there will be less than 40 percent by the year 1991 if Bill C-96 is carried; and with the reduction in transfer payments to have-not provinces — not just Manitoba — but in Atlantic Canada where we run the biggest risk since 1939 and 1940, in the discussions of leaders of all political stripes, of further differentiating between the industrial rich centre of this country and the areas in the country that are disadvantaged and need our help. I think that's a fundamental issue all of us should deal with in a non-political, leadership way in this country.

Secondly, with the increased bites on the middle class, with the increased taxation of the last Federal Budget

and this Federal Budget, we are further exasperating with combinations of \$500,000 capital gains tax. We're further exasperating the situation in terms of individuals in our society; and I say that runs a risk for all of us of all political stripes, in terms of the individuals in this country.

We have some fundamental challenges ahead. Yes, the Speech from the Throne dealt with the fundamental areas of our promises in our election, as well it should. We have serious issues of funding of our services; we have serious issues of tax on individuals that require reform; we have serious issues of the transferring of taxes onto people and we have serious challenges ahead of us.

Not only can we call upon the Federal Government to return their fair share, but we also have to look at new ways of meeting our challenges in this House. As a new member, I look forward to the debate; I look forward to the challenges. I think we must find new ways of delivering our services. We must find creative ways of solving all the problems within our economy.

There's no question the Speech from the Throne deals with some of those; there's no question that as we sit as a House in the next four years we have many more challenges to meet, many more problems to solve, many more solutions to find and I look forward to participating in those debates with other members.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I almost feel like a rookie getting up here after having been out of the House for almost a year. It's almost like a strange experience to be able to get back in here and enter into debate.

I'd like to express a welcome and congratulations to all the new members in the House. There's been considerable change. I'd also like to at this time congratulate the new Ministers that have been appointed to the government side. I'm sure that they have quite a task ahead of them and we'll see what metal they're made of as time goes on.

I'd just like to indicate to the new Minister of Natural Resources that I will probably be spending most of my opportunity here today discussing Natural Resources so I hope he has the opportunity to take some of these things under consideration.

I'd also like to follow the normal tradition of complimenting and congratulating the Mover and Seconder of the Throne Speech. I find it always interesting to listen to new members, as I guess the senior members found it when we entered the House at that time.

I want to express some regret, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about some of the faces that are missing in this Assembly. First of all, members who are not here any more, who have spent a lot of time serving the province and the people of Manitoba, and I'd like to pay tribute to them for contributions they've made over a period of time.

I'd also like to welcome our new Pages. Each year we end up with a new group and they always find it quite an exciting time, especially the first time we have

a recorded vote. I want to compliment the lady who did a capable job today on that.

One other person I think we all will miss is the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms. We had a very colourful individual here for many years. You never knew what colour suit he would be wearing but it was always a very attractive type of addition to the House here. It's no reflection on the present Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, but I think we'll all miss Myron Mason. He was quite a flamboyant individual and I, at least, want to express my appreciation for his service over a period of years.

I want to actually express a few comments about some of the new members. From the few that have spoken so far, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they've been quite vigorous and have definite views and I think most of them when they come in here feel they can change the whole system; and the one thing that will ultimately happen to them, as I suppose it has happened to all of us, is that you gradually get into a mold and things just sort of keep on going, as they have for a long, long time, and I think that's a good thing.

I think their new views from time to time are something we appreciate and make us think a little bit. I just hope they don't get too carried away with the idea that they'll be able to change the whole system that easily, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because that's quite an undertaking.

The last speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs, indicated that things under this government had been so very cushy and things were going well in the city. Being a city member I suppose he has the right to indicate that. I would have to express some concern that things are not all that cushy in the rural areas. There are many problems facing the agricultural community — (Interjection) — yeah, we have that kind of thing coming normally. We are almost used to it already that this government feels a tendency to try and shy away from its own policy and blame everything on the feds, and I suppose we'll be going through that for the time that they will be government again.

I want to make a little reference to the Member for Thompson, who I've enjoyed in the last four years prior to the election, and made reference to him as "landslide" from time to time because of the big majority. I have to compliment him that he has done a good job, and he got himself re-elected with a good majority this time. But some of the comments that he made about so many years of the NDP Government having been in power and the tremendous job they've done and that they had the mandate, I just wanted to maybe correct him on a few of those things a little bit.

Maybe people in Thompson are very happy and maybe that shows the priorities of the spending of this government, because the people in the southern portion of the province in the agricultural community are not that happy. In fact, there are major problems there. So maybe it establishes that a lot of the tax money from the south is going north to keep the Member for Thompson happy. And he says, look at the great job we've done; look at the mandate we have.

Well in 1981, the NDP had a mandate. Our government got defeated at that time. But what has happened since — if the Member for Thompson feels that this government has a mandate and a majority, maybe he should check the figures. See, that's the thing we have in politics. We all have our own options of looking at things, you know, a perception matter.

He feels great, you know. They are back in government. We will be assessing how they got there over a period of time and the things that were so important. They did everything to get back in government, bordering on dishonesty in some cases, and we will try to raise some of those things.

So when he says that this government has a mandate and has such a majority of the popular vote, maybe he should just check his figures because the popular vote was very thin between the PC's and the NDP. When you consider the fact that the Liberals picked up 13.5 percent, where is your majority government really in a sense, in terms of a popular vote? Because of the distribution of seats, you ended up with a few more seats at the present time. Maybe that isn't that bad, because I've said to my people, yes, we wanted to be government. You know, the will of the people has spoken, the numbers are there, you are government.

I maintain, it's just a matter of time. You will be digging your hole. You will fall into it, and it won't take four years because already we can see the disintegration of this party. It's starting to develop. What the people in the last election have expressed and, I think, all 57 members here plus the ones that did not make it, all those who ran in the election must have questioned the Premier's calling of the election in the middle of winter. You know what? He was lucky, lucky on two fronts: first of all, that he didn't hit a stormy day; and that, because of circumstances, he happened to form government again. He might rue that day.

But certainly the popular vote is not in favour of this government. When you combine it with the Liberal support that was there, the other parties and the Conservative Party, you do not have the mandate of the people in terms of the majority of the popular vote. That makes it interesting.

I might make some mention later on of the consternation that has been created on that side by the fact that we have indicated that we will not be pairing just at any given time. There is some rationale for that too, and I will just express part of that. The Minister of Agriculture was one of the culprits over there last year who got himself paired almost on a daily basis, and went out and campaigned all the time. These are the kinds of things that have finally brought it down to this point here where we are going to reconsider that position.

It's funny that the Minister of Agriculture over a period of time was always lauded before the election, after the election. We spent more money in agriculture than anybody ever has. Isn't it surprising, when you do an assessment, that the majority of the rural seats, agricultural seats, didn't vote NDP members again with the exception maybe of the Minister of Agriculture? Now why is that?

A MEMBER: What about Swan River?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Oh yes, Swan River, oh yes. And we have the new member from Lac du Bonnet — okay, all right. But, you know, out of the whole bunch that's what we got. This is a government that has been lauding the fact that they have spent more money in agriculture. Why can't this government gain the confidence of the people in the agricultural community? Because they

don't trust you. They don't trust you. How can we bear that out?

I just want to give a few examples because I want to direct most of my comments in the Department of Natural Resources. But, for example, the dairy farmers — in my area there are a lot of dairy farmers — why are they unhappy with you? The Minister of Agriculture decided that there would be no more transfers of Class 2 quotas. Now for those people who don't know what that means, that means that a farmer who has a dairy herd, he cannot take and sell his dairy herd without a quota. There is no transfer there, unless he sells his total farm operation. That creates a big hardship for the man that wants to scale down. It creates a big problem for somebody wanting to get into a farm operation, and I can go on. We'll cover a lot of that during the Department of Agriculture Estimates yet.

I found this interesting in the last little while. There has been a major concern expressed about the agricultural community. More than three months ago, many of the farmers were anticipating there would be a reduction in the price of grains. It was anticipated, not pleasantly, but people sort of felt it was coming. That is why, in our election platform, we already were bringing in certain provisions that would take and ease the input costs of farmers. We talked of taking up some of the education costs of farm property; we talked of a direct fuel tax rebate. We were trying to make some of those provisions already so that, when it happened, it would be a little easier for the farm community.

What have we heard from our Minister of Agriculture? He has been screaming about the Federal Government should do something but, as our leader indicated yesterday, the feds have put in a portion. It would never be enough, and I agree, because I think our farm community is the mainstay and the backbone of the country. It has been; it built this country. The Federal Government has been putting in some; other provinces have. And what does our Minister of Agriculture do? He gets up and criticizes the Federal Government.

The Throne Speech indicated there were going to be major changes made for the agricultural community. We would like to see what they are. We will be watching very carefully, because I suspect that it's going to be the same thing as we've had a lot from this government — a lot of words and very little action.

Now I would like to touch just briefly on — you know, that kind of thing creates a problem with credibility. The member that spoke just previously to me indicated a quorum in the House and giving the right image. I think that he will probably learn, like many have in this House, that you get up and you make a pretty fancy speech and you say we are going to change all these things. It's a matter of credibility. We just had an experience today during question period about credibility. The credibility of this government is a reflection on the lack of leadership that they have because, when we asked questions, and I think the people of Manitoba — maybe members opposite feel they are a selective group, that they do not have to be forthright and honest with the people of Manitoba. They haven't been with other cases in the past. It has been bordering on deception in many cases, and we had it illustrated again today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the credibility of this government. How dare you?

The fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Member for Transcona and the Member for Radisson have gotten

their fingers caught in the cookie jar is something that should be a matter of major concern to the members opposite, to the government, because now it is a matter of credibility again, morality. Just yesterday, at the federal level, the fourth Minister stepped down and resigned . . .

A MEMBER: Fifth.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Fourth or fifth, whatever the case may be, because of moral and honour, and what happens here . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Just a minute, I've got the floor now. It bothers me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the federal level, their counterparts federally are the ones who have been screaming for resignations all the time because of moral issues and honour. Here we have them caught in the same dilemma and the leader - and that shows lack of leadership because I don't think that a Minister necessarily always resigns. I think he is asked to resign. In this case, we've been asking the leader of this government to have his Ministers resign because of the morality of it, the hypocritical aspect of it. When they got out and they were speaking about tax reform, then turn around and do exactly what they say should not be done. That is a credibility factor. I dare say to the members opposite, if we would have an election today based on morality and credibility of what your people have done, that majority, that vote of confidence would go the other way. You know it is a little early to start this kind of thing, but we'd be prepared to try that on anytime right now.

I still think the honourable thing that should be done is that especially the Minister of Energy and Mines should resign. Because what that will do, it will give all of us credibility. The last speaker who spoke spoke of dignity in the House. That would give all members dignity if he stepped down from his position because here is a Minister who has his hands in the cookie jar. He is negotiating the biggest contracts for Manitoba, trying to sell for 20-30 years, and we're supposed to accept the fact that he is dealing in the best interests of Manitobans when he himself bilked us out of money.

You see, it is a credibility factor, and that is why, new members, please let's talk about decorum in the House, dignity, morality and honour. Let's do that, but let's talk to members like the Minister of Energy and Mines because he is putting all of us in a precarious position. All our credibility is being affected by this kind of thing.

I want to talk just briefly about the priorities of this government and I'll touch on Highways now and Natural Resources a little later. But Highways, what has happened over a period of years? You see, this government has different spending priorities and that comes with the position and the responsibility. But I disagree with that. Because, for example, in Highways, we have the Minister of Highways and the pre-tendering that took place. I believe the majority of the pre-tendering projects were all designated in his own riding. Check it for yourselves. How many of the pre-tendering jobs were done in the Dauphin constituency and how many were in the rest of the province? I fortunately

got one of them. I did. But this obviously is not a priority. Obviously Highways is not a priority with this government. If the public becomes aware of where the pre-tenders took place, it is again a credibility factor.

This government has got so many of these things happening and I think it is a direct reflection on leadership. I think it is a reflection on leadership. You have a leader who can't say no to anybody. He is a flip-flopping type of leader who wherever he goes he is wringing his hands and he is trying to give a good image and it just isn't selling any more. That is why you do not have a majority in the popular vote. You are on trial right now like you have never been and what is happening? You know in the benches there are too many people who should be listening to some of these things - but everything is going on as usual.

We don't have that many changes. We have three new Ministers added, but other than that, we have had a few shuffles. We've had shuffles in the area of Finance because the past Minister of Finance was in deep trouble and his credibility was at stake. The Minister of Education had created many many problems so there had to be a few changes made. But basically, we are looking at the same crew. Just because you moved a few pawns doesn't change it and that is why we are going to be very critical of the performance of this government because if you are going to keep on operating the way you did, the public is not going to accept that very long. There is a very big problem in that respect.

Little things that came out during the campaign, and the Minister of Urban Affairs made reference to many of these things, you know, little things that happened in the election. It is like when the Winnipeg Bible College, which is located in my area, wrote to the Minister of Finance. A Private Member's bill was presented last year, the Minister of Finance says, no, the government would not support the Private Member's bill for aid to some degree for the Winnipeg Bible College because he says we will review the whole thing and we will be responding. That was a year ago. To this day, they still haven't received any correspondence from the past Minister of Finance. I don't know whether we can expect much more just because you do a little shuffle. Of course, a new Minister comes in and says, well I don't know anything about this. We've got to start all over again.

Madam Speaker, I would now like to spend a little bit of time on the Department of Natural Resources. It is unfortunate that the Premier isn't here because what he has allowed to have happened in the Department of Natural Resources is that he has allowed it to be raped and pillaged like I've never seen anything done economically.

A MEMBER: . . . raped and pillaged by the Minister.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It's tragic.

A MEMBER: I'll ask you to reconsider those words.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: No, and I will explain exactly what has happened.

When we consider, Madam Speaker, that in the last a little over a year we've had four Ministers in the

Department of Natural Resources. It has been like a revolving door - in and out. What has happened as a result of that is there has been a deterioration of services throughout.

I want to give the new Minister a little bit of background as to exactly what happened. A little over a year ago the then Minister of Natural Resources, the Member for St. James, had finally created a chaos within the department to the point where a lot of problems were developing. So he gets moved out and we have the Member for Lac du Bonnet moving in as the Minister of Natural Resources. Well, that lasted so and so long. The chaos continued to be developed, major problems developing, and I remember the Member for Lac du Bonnet got appointed as Minister of Natural Resources just shortly before the Estimates. Of course I had geared myself for the Member for St. James because he was a bit of a feisty individual. He was very opinionated and he wasn't prepared to change his opinions either. So I had to change my tact and the Member for Lac du Bonnet always had my respect - not always but he had it to some degree. We had a very good, interesting debate during the Estimate period. He basically agreed with many of the comments that we had - I was going to say agreed on many things. Lo and behold he steps down and what do we get? We get the Member for Brandon East who had as much interest in that aspect of it — my criticism is that the Premier at that time treated the Department of Natural Resources as a dumping ground for Ministers, they had to have a portfolio and, bang, we'll put them into there. I'll go through all this and that's why I say, now we have a new Minister, a rookie Minister in the Department of Natural Resources. I want to be fair to this new Minister.

That is the reason why I will be highlighting many of the concerns because they will be doing that again when we get into the Estimates and I'll be raising these questions in the House from time to time, things that are a matter of concern. What I'm doing, I'm forewarning him because I still feel in spite of the fact that he is the fourth Minister in a little over a year that, I don't know, maybe they'll dump him again in six months and put somebody else in there. But what has happened, my feeling is, Madam Speaker, that the Premier appointed a rookie Minister into the Department of Natural Resources, because this is a department that has been basically thrown to the wolves. It's been cut back every time there's been anything going on. It's so easy to cut back in Highways and Natural Resources. When it comes to cutting, let's cut those two departments and, I daresay, I suspect that we'll have major cuts again in both those departments. So he puts in a rookie Minister who will then not have a big fight in Cabinet, and the money is going to go elsewhere.

Now we're going to get to the meat of the matter. Madam Speaker, I was very very upset this morning when I heard this Minister of Natural Resources on radio saying that there would be no compensation, no money available for the flood people, the municipalities. He says, we will give you — I'm trying to recall exactly — engineering assistance or technical advice. That's what we'll give you, but there is no money. That is what the radio quoted him on CHSM, and he can go and ask for the tape if he wants to. That is exactly what I'm saying. We're back to that same kind of thing again.

You know, use the Department of Natural Resources as a garbage bag, and this poor Minister is going to have to take the flak. I'll tell you something, he's going to get lots.

I raised a question on Friday, Madam Speaker, about 22 people that had been hired under the Silviculture Program, and rightfully so. The Minister obviously didn't know, because many things could happen to that department that he doesn't know about, and we'll try and make him aware of some of that.

So he checks it out and he comes back, and gives me a bit of a case history on tree planting. I know how the system works, but these people were hired, 22 of them. To them, those jobs are very important in the southeast area where jobs are very limited. They were hired with the understanding that they would be hired for 20 weeks. They got a paper to that effect, the hourly wage in there and 20 weeks and it says, if funding available. Last year, they worked 30 weeks.

But on Monday, they were hired; Tuesday, they got the paper indicating that they would be hired for 20 weeks with the wages and everything on there; and Tuesday evening, before they went home, they already got their termination notice. And then I hear the First Minister get up and say, jobs, jobs, we'll create jobs.

Mr. Minister, you look to your department because they're going to cut you right out of it, you know. In fact, I sometimes wonder why we even need a Minister of Natural Resources the way they're being changed. The bureaucrats are running it and fighting among themselves. I want to make reference to this Minister that he should check in his records, because there was a major harangue within his administrative people last year to the point where they went to the Ombudsman, and we still haven't had the final report on that.

Do you know why it is that way? Because a Premier that has always treated the department as garbage has put in people who haven't got the guts to stand up and fight for their department, and I hope that this Minister will — (Interjection) — the Minister nods his head and he says, yes, Madam Speaker, I will fight for the department. Then get those 22 jobs back there that you deked them out of — and you did — you promised them one day and a layoff notice the next day. You know, if you want to fight for the department, then straighten out those kinds of things, because things are happening behind your back that you are not aware of. And clean up the administrative end of it. There are many problems in there.

Madam Speaker, there is so much that is going on in there that it just — then I hear the Throne Speech, and then you hear \$100 million is going to be spent on cleaning up the banks of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. Madam Speaker, for the last three weeks, I've been up to my eyeballs in water with mad farmers, and I'm sure the Minister of Natural Resources knows about it too because I've been trying to get an appointment with him on some of these issues. I'll tell you something. If some of that money was going to be spent on major projects in my area, in the Emerson constituency and the Rat River and the Portage area and the Ste. Rose area, if these capital projects had been undertaken over a period of years, we wouldn't have these kind of flood problems now. But instead we talk of spending \$100 million cleaning up the banks of the Red and the Assiniboine.

You know, you have to get your priorities straightened out, and it is high time. Just look back over the history of the capital projects that have not taken place. I'm sure if the Minister, Madam Speaker, is going to go through all the projects that have been designated, where there's a crying need for water conservation, for drainage, he'll be pulling his hair out.

Now, Madam Speaker, I'm not laying these blames on this Minister yet. I'm just making him aware of the problems. For example, how about the Whitemud Watershed district? This government just lost a court case to a farmer about the drainage aspect up there, and there are 200 of them lined up. I want to tell this Minister, make yourself aware of what's happening and do something with it, because every one of those 200 farmers out there — the first one has won — are going to take you to court. I don't know what those costs are going to be, and I want those figures when we get into Estimates exactly what the costs are of that court case and how much is pending in other court cases. These are things we have to look at. I raise that.

For example, in the Portage area, I attended a meeting — unfortunately, none of the government people could attend so they sent an engineer down — major problems, roads cut. You know what we're talking about? We're talking about a highway — I'm sure the Member for Morris and the Member for Portage are going to raise this as well — a proper highway built there, so that drainage could be tied in. It would make a big difference; it would be a big asset. Then we talk of the overhill drain. I don't know whether the Minister knows about the overhill drain — (Interjection) — all right, we're getting somewhere; he at least knows of it. Does the Minister also know that for years the R.M. of Portage was trying to get that designated as a third-order drain? It is a third-order drain but to get it designated. But last fall, government in their wisdom and Natural Resources and Water Resources — I don't know who to blame for this — decided, Madam Speaker, that they will not accept any more third-order drains unless they are built up to the expectations of the Water Resources, which is a total abrogation of responsibility. You are passing the buck to the municipalities, just like you did when you were on the radios, indicating that there was no financial assistance available; that municipalities and farmers are stuck with this thing. Well we'll discuss that, and there are many things that we will be looking at in that regard.

You see, what makes me aggravated is that we have just finished an election and the Member for Springfield lost, and then we make work for him for \$55,000, and it is a make-work project. You know what bothers me? That ex-Minister of Municipal Affairs — he's in the House but I don't mind, I'll tell him anyway — made a commitment to the Falcon Ski Resort during the election that they would receive funding. After the election, that funding has been terminated. We're talking of maybe \$20,000 that would keep the Falcon Ski Resort going, and that has been cut now. Check your department. It takes very little to keep that going, but the Premier's priority is, we've got to look after the ex-Minister of Municipal Affairs. These are the kinds of things — (Interjection) — well the member takes a bow. If I got a \$55,000 job after getting the can knocked off me, I'd probably bow too.

But it is this kind of thing within the Department of Natural Resources that I want that Minister to check,

Madam Speaker, the correspondence that took place, where a commitment was made to the Falcon Ski Resort that has now been reneged and cut again. Your department, Mr. Minister, is going to be the one that's going to be cut to shreds. They'll cut it to shreds, because they figure that you will not stand up and fight for it. We're going to go through some of these things.

See, what happens when you have that many Ministers is no Minister even gets his feet planted before you have another one in and, as a result, this thing goes all cock-eyed, and everybody runs their own show. For example, I want to make reference to the TIP Program. The TIP Program means, "Turn in Poachers," which I think was lauded by all the CO's, the Conservation Officers. I think all the conservationists lauded that as a potentially good program. It was in place last year. My understanding is that if you phoned the tip number now, you get an answering service. Is that a priority? An answering service where the message will come across — if you phone in, somebody's poaching, it's supposed to turn in a poacher — they phone in, it's taking place — the answering machine answers and says we'll be referring it to the necessary authorities within a period of time.

That kind of gets people upset. It gets the C.O.'s — it gets your conservation officers upset. It's how you set your — you know, the little things.

I raised the question of raising the wildlife certificates by \$2 last year. It was raised for last fall's hunting seasons and I questioned on January 30, I believe I wrote the then Member for Brandon East, when the Order in Council had been passed. A period of time went by, then I got a letter stating it was passed February 6 of 1986. So, actually, in a sense the department — there's been no administration; there's been just confusion in there. We have that whole year where you charged \$2 illegally, increased the rates, and you passed the Order-in-Council — after I made the inquiry on January 30, you passed it on February 6. These are the kind of things that happen when you don't have leadership.

At the present time, the waterfowl season, Madam Speaker, there are many lodge operators who are waiting for the waterfowl seasons to be announced. They usually book them already months in advance from the Americans and stuff of that nature. This is tourist business; this is keeping a lot of our lodge operators going. No season is announced; you are still checking it, or your department is.

Madam Speaker, I'll get on to a few other ones here. I had a press conference earlier this year when this administrative problem developed at the top level, and at that time I raised certain other concerns at that time, of course with the magnitude of having the charges brought to the Ombudsman, that the other things didn't get that much priority on it. In conjunction with that, we still are awaiting that report but I would suggest to the Minister that he check out some of those charges that were made and I'm sure he must have a list of those charges that were made.

I'll just make reference to some of them. These are allegations, and he is the one that can get the proof, not me. Misrepresentation of travel and expense claims over a long period; verbal and physical intimidation of staff; inconsistent and inappropriate payroll attendance; interference in court submissions of peace officers;

establishing policies that severely restrict the ability of conservation officers to perform their sworn duties.

These are serious allegations. The Ombudsman — I don't know how thorough the investigation, when we finally get the results of it — but I can indicate to this Minister that I will be looking for a lot of information in this regard and I expect to have answers at that stage of the game and that is why I am spending the best part of my Throne Speech Debate on bringing things forward to this Minister.

A MEMBER: He won't do anything, Albert.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I want to further illustrate some of the problems. Last year, the Minister, and I believe it was then the Member for Lac du Bonnet — I always have to sort this out, where all these things happen — the Member for St. James is the one that actually initiated most of the problems, you know, that's where it all started from. He was the one that started allowing barbecues to be smashed in roadside parks.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet initiated what they called a Liquor Surrender Program, unlegislated, a very unconstitutional program, one weekend. Everybody got into a quandary over it and it had to be withdrawn. If it had been done in a proper manner, there may be nothing wrong with it. But it is the sort of fly-by-night, off-the-cuff type of regulations and initiations that have created many of these problems, and that is why the Department of Natural Resources is in crying need of leadership. It's not going to be coming from the Premier because he doesn't know how to show that. I am appealing to this new rookie Minister that he assert himself in that regard with his colleagues, that the Department of Natural Resources is a very important department, that it needs funding, it needs development in there, and it needs leadership.

We had the Atikaki Park situation, the case of Abitibi cutting out there and the confusion it was creating. This government had the authority all the time to shift the cutting area from there to a different area, and the Premier gets up and he fudges around this thing and that is the tragedy of it. When it comes to Natural Resources, he first of all doesn't have a clue; and, secondly, he doesn't care, and somebody has to.

Now, the one issue that I'm just going to touch on a little bit is the area of elk ranching and I want to indicate to this Minister that we will spend a lot of time on this one. We will spend a lot of time on it. He comes from the area where it is a major concern; it is a major concern and I hope that he is prepared to deal with it in a forthright manner, which hasn't happened with his department and his staff. Many questions will have to be answered for the people of Manitoba and it is serious to the point where commitments have been made and we will want to find that out a little later.

Madam Speaker, can you indicate how much time I have?

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: The member has three minutes remaining.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Holy smokes! I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, that's most unfortunate because I haven't even started on — maybe with leave I can continue a little bit.

For example, I make reference to the Gimli fire bomber which they were going to move to Lac du Bonnet, and then the heat came on and then they backed off.

We have the Gay Rights telephone installed — we all know what that episode is. You know what this is? Lack of leadership.

We have the Bird's Hill tree nursery. Last year the Minister of Natural Resources during Estimates said it wasn't worth it; they cut it out and it's back on again. There have been statements made that are not factual.

There are so many of these things, Mr. Minister, that you will have to look into.

The Lake Winnipegosis Fishery — the closing of it. Then we had, of course, that notorious provincial bird committee that was set up to recommend a provincial bird. The committee spend all kinds of time and ultimately, Madam Speaker, the Minister overruled everything and made his own decision.

The things that I would suggest to the Minister as one of my last comments and this is, I wish he would announce to the people of Manitoba now whether he is planning to continue the late opening and early closing of provincial parks and which ones because the long weekend is coming; people are asking and there have not been proper announcements made.

I just want to indicate in closing, Madam Speaker, to this Minister and to the Premier, that if you will allow the Department of Natural Resources to be raped and pillaged as it has been in the past, that this will be the longest, hottest summer that you have ever endured.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the people in electoral Burrows who have continued to repose their confidence in me. I would like to thank the members of my election campaign committee and all the volunteer workers who helped in the last campaign and all the people in my constituency who I am proud to represent in this august Assembly.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about my understanding of the prerequisites, the perils and the promise of politics. — (Interjection) —

If a father said to his son not to embroil himself and stay out of politics because politics is dirty, the father is making an assumption. The father is using the term politics in its pejorative sense, in its derogatory sense that it is inherently dirty. If the premise is correct that politics is dirty, there will be an awful lot of people who would be dirty because they are engaged in politics whether they know it or not. Does politics have a meaning that is devoid of emotional connotation? Does it have a neutral meaning as a term to describe human activities? I think it has. Politics has something to do with all those human activities that are related to the maintenance and sustenance of ongoing human system of interactions.

Every social system needs to be managed and directed in order that the social system can continue and be maintained in order to achieve human purposes. If this is the meaning of politics, then politics is an

essential part of every ongoing human system of interaction from the very simplest of all social systems like a two-member family unit to the most complex of social systems such as a nation or state. It follows that there is politics in the family in the home even if it consists only of two members. You can attest for yourself the subtle competition taking place in the family home as to who would have the last say in family matters. That is politics.

There is also politics in the church among the members of board of elders, deacons, stewards, members of the congregation. They all are trying to determine how the church should be conducted. It's also a process of competition taking place in the church as to how the church shall be run. Therefore, there is also politics in the church.

Obviously, there is also politics in labour unions among the members of the officials of the union, the natural leaders among the rank and file membership, the old time union members, the new time, the newcomers who are new to the unions. There is that constant struggle as to how the union shall be governed. There is politics in the unions.

There is politics in the university among the high senior administrators like deans and vice-presidents and heads of departments, among those who are members of the teaching staff, those who are non-teaching members of the university. Even among the student body there is always that competition as to how the university shall be run, and that is politics.

If politics is present in all aspects of human society, I cannot accept the premise that politics is inherently dirty. It simply is not true. — (Interjection) — If politics then is a neutral thing and it is essential for the running of all social systems and for the governance of all human organization, then politics is an honourable profession if you stick to the rules of fair play and rules that are inherent in the running of every human organization. The rules are based on the conception of what is proper conduct, the conception of what is right, what is appropriate and the rules are fair because the rules are accepted by all the members of any given social system. By consensus they are agreed that the rules are fair, it's based on justice, equality of opportunity, as well as the rules of fair play.

Therefore, if we analyze situations carefully we could see that politics is essentially routed on ethical morality. Unless we are prepared to accept the opposite premise that human organization and human society is inherently immoral, I will reject that premise. I admit and I will accept that human society are organized for the good of all the members of society, for the good of all the members who are members of that social organization, and therefore it's inherently moral in its purpose and in its objectives. The rules that are evolved in this process of interaction in the determination of who shall govern a given social system, by necessity has to be just rules; rules of fair play, otherwise the system will be destroyed. Therefore, if we understand politics in its true nature, it is firmly rooted in ethical morality. It is the grandest and the noblest of all professions if people stick to the rules.

It is only when people violate those rules of behaviour. It is only when people circumvent those rules. It's only when people try to evade the rules that the practice of it becomes dirty in the eyes of people. It is not the

rules that are dirty, it's the circumvention of the rules. It's the violation of the rules. It's the breach of the rules. People who participate in politics may not be honest. Their participation may not be honourable but the rules of politics stay the same. It is based on the essential nature of what is moral, what is ethical, what is fair and what is just.

If we divorce politics from its essential rules of ethical morality and then substitute our own rules in place of the rules of fair play, if we substitute the rules of expediency and the rules of the paramountcy of self-interest, then we are creating a new system which is different from politics itself. It is an imitation of politics. — (Interjection) — I will call that system pseudopolitics, and those participants in it, I'll call them pseudopoliticians.

Therefore the person who participates in the act of governance, who refused to be governed by the essential rules of fairness and who refused to acknowledge that these rules are essentially designed by the social system for the common welfare and common survival of society, and who prostitutes the purpose of social organization in order to use them for their personal purposes, I will call them pseudopoliticians and they are engaged in pseudopolitics, the breeding ground of all forms of corruptions and all forms of misdoing in our society.

Now, what are some of the prerequisites? If we want to maintain the profession of politics as an honourable profession and if we are ambitious enough to be a participant in that process, what does it take for an individual citizen to successfully embark upon an honourable career in politics? What do you need if you are a young person, a young individual, who wants to contribute your effort and your talent towards the proper governments of the community in which you live? What does it take to be an honourable participant in this process of the governments of our community?

First of all, I would identify ability. A person must have at least some ability. Ability implies at least that you should have the ability to win friends and influence people. You must have the ability to generate a sense of support from your friends and to maintain and keep that support. You must have ability if you want to be a good participant in the process of politics. But ability alone is not enough.

A person with ability may accomplish nothing in his life if he is not ambitious. He wastes that ability; it goes to waste. He must be sparked by ambition in order to utilize his talent for the good of society and for the good of his fellow man. But a person with ability and with ambition may also fail in politics, sometimes simply because no one wants to trust him.

A person must also have integrity if he wants to be successful in this professional career of politics. Integrity means that you have basic honesty, sincerity and a high sense of responsibility. A person may be able and ambitious; a person may have integrity and he may still fail in politics, in his career, simply because he gives up too soon.

A person must have not only ability, not only ambition, not only integrity, he must have determination. He must have a tenacity of purpose, he must have perseverance, he must be a hard worker, he should not give up no matter how long it takes for him to get elected, no matter how many hurdles he had to overcome. He

should not give up until he achieves his purpose of being honourably elected to a position of public responsibility.

If successful, and a person becomes a person of public figure and he becomes successful enough to get elected to a public position of responsibility, what are the implications in his life as an individual? Can he complain that everybody's snooping at him, that everybody's criticizing him? Can he complain that he has lost his right to privacy as a citizen? The truth of the matter is that he decides himself to enter public life. It is a voluntary decision on his part.

Initially you might have been persuaded by your friends, but ultimately the decision has to be on yourself and once you have decided that you want it, you have surrendered voluntarily your right to privacy. You are now a person in the public eye. Everything you say, everything you do is seen by the public and you're closely scrutinized as an individual.

You have been invested with some measure of public authority and influence; you are accorded certain deference and honour in the position; therefore you have given up some of your right to privacy. Not only that, you are now occupying a public position, invested with a measure of authority and commensurate with that authority are, of course, the corresponding measures of responsibility and duty.

You are now a holder of a public position which is a position of public trust. Whether you like it or not, you are a trustee for the people, a trustee for the public, a public trustee, and like any other trustee you are subject to basic duties and responsibilities of a trustee. What are these duties? I see three important duties as a trustee of the public interests.

First, the duty of fidelity. The duty of fidelity to the public office that you hold means that you should never place yourself in a position where the exercise of your office will clash or conflict with your private interests. You can never voluntarily place yourself in a position where you have to choose between the appropriate performance of your public office and the pursuit of your private interests. If you place yourself in any position of conflict, then you have breached and you have violated your trust as a trustee for the public interests.

The second duty is the duty of probity. This is simply the duty of decency and honesty, fair dealing with everyone. As a holder of public position in public office you can never make use of information that comes to you by reason of the office that you hold and use that information for the pursuit of private gain. This holds particularly to some people who are holders of positions at the municipal level of government, municipal councillors. They want to be councillors all the time. Why? Because they have information as to which area of the city or the municipality will be zoned from certain categories of land, into commercial land or developments that they know well ahead of time will be developed. Armed with this information which they acquired by reason of their public position, they will directly or indirectly acquire those agricultural lands or waste land, invest in those lands; and when the development in several years comes around, they are instant millionaires because they make use of the information that comes to them by reason of their public office.

The third duty of a public trustee is the duty of prudence. It means that you have to be cautious and careful; you have to exercise your judgment, your discretion, your wise judgment, your circumspection in everything that you say, in everything that you do because you represent the government; you represent the public; you represent the people. Any breach of this triple duty of fidelity, of probity and of prudence is a breach of the public trust. Any breach of this duty converts the honourable profession of politics into a dishonourable profession called pseudo-politics.

Now while you are in public office, while you are in a position of authority and responsibility, you are always subjected to certain pressures and influences. Some of those pressures brought to bear upon yourself you know are unjust and unfair. Some of those pressures are legitimate, honourable, correct and right. You are continually bombarded with demands and claims by your constituents, some of them reasonable, some of them unreasonable.

In other words, you lead a life which is not really a desirable kind of life because you're always subjected to pressure. In this process you are almost always tempted by reason of the emotions and passions of weaknesses of mankind to do certain things which you otherwise would not do, were you not being subjected to those pressures.

It is very natural and human for every human being, very natural indeed, to seek out and long for some kind of recognition. It is a psychological fact of human life that everyone wants to be recognized. This human urging and human instinct for recognition sometimes results in excessive pride which, if uncontrolled by any kind of self restraint, can degenerate into what I will call arrogance. That is one of the perils of political life. If you do not control your love for yourself, you will become excessively proud and boastful and you will become officially arrogant.

The second peril of political life is you expect to be treated equally. There is a human longing for fair treatment. You build up this expectation and then you are suddenly frustrated. So you become jealous of others who have received some rewards and you did not. This jealousy if uncontrolled becomes envy that could overwhelm your life and may lead you to things that you do not want to do were you not overwhelmed by envy.

The third peril of politics is the desire for human beings to control things and to control people. There is a desire to acquire things and control things. This is the lust for material things in life — lust for money, lust for wealth, lust for property. There is also a desire to control human beings, people, to control their behaviour, to control their fortunes, to control their lives. This is the desire for power.

Whether it be the desire for material things in life or for the desire to have power over people, we should be careful about this and constantly remind ourselves that a man's life consists not in the things that he possesses, whether they be material things or whether they be power over other people. We remember and remind ourselves all the time of what Lord Acton said a long time ago: "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

And when we tend to be proud and boastful of our public position of our measure of authority or influence

that we sometimes exercise, we have to remember the eternal moral principle that whosoever exalts himself shall be abased and whosoever humbles himself shall be exalted.

People in public office, whether they are in the government or in the opposition, should therefore guard against all these weaknesses of human nature. They should guard against arrogance, they should guard against envy, and they should guard against greed either for material things or for power.

If a person is able to withstand all the temptations of political life, to the fewer and fewer political people who live up to the noble profession of politics and who are yet able to withstand the temptations of perils of arrogance, of envy and lust for wealth, what are the promises of good participation in political life? What do you get out of life if you stay honourable, if you stay clean? I think you get something which is non-material. You get satisfaction, the blessing of satisfaction that within yourself you have stayed an upright individual. "He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully, he shall receive the blessings from the Lord and the righteousness from the God of his salvation." That is enough satisfaction for any human being.

Secondly, you will get peace in your life. You have no qualms of conscience, nothing that will bother you - no skeleton in your closet that will haunt you in the night. "The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord: and he delighteth in the way of the Lord. Though he fall, he shall not utterly be cast down: for the Lord upholdeth him. Mark the good man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace." He will be a peaceful, happy individual. What else can you want in life to be satisfied and happy as an upright, honourable, peaceful individual.

Finally, you find wisdom. You find wisdom in life, you find understanding. Everything will be pleasant and all your paths shall be the path of peace.

Madam Speaker, let me now conclude by summing up what I have said. I said that the true basis of politics is ethical morality; that if we depart and divorce politics from its moral contents, politics loses its essential nature, it becomes something else. It becomes the imitation of politics where public interest is removed and is substituted with self-interest. Then it becomes a breeding ground for all forms of corruption. They said that a political plum does not come from the seed; the political plum comes from grafting.

The prerequisites of politics, to be honourable, the person must have ability, he must have ambition and he must have a determination as well as integrity in order to succeed in the true profession of politics; that he comes to public duty observing the duties of fidelity, of probity and prudence; that his life he dedicates to serve other people, and he participates with honour in all the activities of political life, understanding that he can only govern well by serving people well, and in serving people he is practically giving slowly part of himself. As time and years go on, he gives his own life to others because he understands the true moral principle that it is in giving that we receive, that it is in trusting others that we are trusted, that it is in loving others that we are loved and that it is in serving others that we truly live.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I am wondering if there is any time left in the member's presentation and whether or not he might entertain a question.

MADAM SPEAKER: He does have time left, if he wishes to answer a question. He's not obliged to.

MR. C. SANTOS: Sure, Madam Speaker.

MR. C. MANNES: I just wanted to firstly thank the member for the speech. I enjoyed it. It had a lot of virtue in it. I'm wondering whether or not he had an opportunity to present that speech to his caucus, and if he did, how was it received?

MR. C. SANTOS: I intended this speech to be heard by all the members of the House in order to remind them about their responsibilities as servants of the people.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would also like to welcome all the new members to the House and offer them congratulations. I know that they are probably going to find it a very rewarding, if not different, experience. I am pleased, very pleased to see that we now have eight women members in the House. We're gradually getting there. We're going to have to move a lot faster than one extra a year if we're going to have equality in this House.

But I'm absolutely delighted to welcome our new member from River East. She was an excellent candidate and she's worked hard in numerous elections for others and when it was her turn, she was ready, worked hard and made it, and I know she'll be an excellent addition to our caucus and to this House.

I'd like to offer my congratulations to the members from Ellice and Kildonan for receiving the honour to move and second the Throne Speech.

I would like to thank the constituents of Kirkfield Park for electing me for a second time. I appreciate the honour and promise to continue to work hard on their behalf.

Madam Speaker, the Throne Speech, as has been mentioned before, was short and had very little of substance in it. There were many mentions of things just almost passing by and, very often, reading it, I had to wonder exactly what the government was planning or if they knew. It talked about visions and dreams and aspirations, and of course don't we all have visions, dreams and aspirations, but I think what we're really looking for are the day-to-day realities and the hope that something will come of this government and that they will do some of the things they talked about in the past four years.

All through the Throne Speech the government talked about federal support. On Page 3 it mentions that "My Ministers remain committed to negotiating an equitable

Canadian-Manitoba Industrial Development Agreement" and so on.

On Page 4 they talked about calling — they're going to have a resolution about the Port of Churchill — and calling on the Federal Government "to share our confidence in those people in the future of Churchill." On that same page further down: "Consultations will take place on further initiatives to complement our province's highly successful Careerstart Program. Members will also receive reports on the status of my Ministers' negotiations with the Government of Canada concerning a new National Training Agreement."

On Page 5, dealing with agriculture, it goes on to say: "Because this is a responsibility of all governments, my Government commits itself to do all within its power to deal with this crisis and pledge to continue its efforts on the national scene to ensure that the Federal Government joins in this battle" and so on.

Page 6, states that "The government will continue its efforts toward social and economic equality for women. My Ministers are committed to both an increase in day-care spaces in the current year and a medium-term plan for orderly expansion over a four-year period." Also, "Work with the Federal Government."

On Page 7: "A new ten-year River Renewal Program will focus, initially, on the clean up of the Assiniboine and Red Rivers." Now it didn't mention in the Throne Speech that they were expecting the Federal Government to participate, but when the Member for Ellice spoke about it, he said ". . . our re-elected New Democratic Government will, over the next 10 years, invest \$100 million in this program to clean up the rivers, and we expect the Federal Government to match that commitment and to participate as they have in other provinces." Now I imagine the other provinces negotiated before they said they expected the money, but not this government.

On Page 8 they went on to talk about, "Fundamental to a fairer Manitoba and a fairer Canada, is the reform of the national tax system;" and then went on to say that "Tax reform will be a major thrust of my government on both the provincial and national levels."

Further on the page, he went on to say that "My government remains convinced that intergovernmental cooperation is a pre-requisite for effective action in dealing with provincial, national and international problems and challenges."

This government has come full circle. They started off four and one-half years ago, by talking about cooperation. All we've had in the past two years is federal bashing. What kind of cooperation does this government expect to get after the kind of bashing that they have done at every level with the Federal Government, and yet, all through the Throne Speech it doesn't sound like they can do one thing without federal assistance. Now all of a sudden they're talking about cooperation. Well, Madam Speaker, I hope they get cooperation, but from their past actions they have done very little to deserve it.

On the top of Page 4, the government talks about introducing legislation, establishing the Manitoba Energy Foundation. I know many members are going to discuss this because it's almost unbelievable that one of their main planks in the Throne Speech, one of the main things they're going to do is make a promise

that there will be no fulfilment, if ever — it won't start until the year 2000. So, as our Leader said in his speech, 50 per cent of nothing is going to be of little comfort to the citizens of Manitoba. And then they're going to use the remaining 50 percent — I like this one better — of the profits to help ensure that Manitobans continue to enjoy the lowest electrical rates in North America. This government is almost unbelievable that they could even suggest that this would be a high priority program for 1986. Here we are talking about something that we have no idea what has happened; we have no idea what the sales are going to be like; if we're going to make any money at all, but boy, they're planning to spend it now as they've spent every penny that we have had and \$500 million more this year.

This brings me to the Minister of Energy and Mines. After the incredible performance by this Minister, as far as the SRTC tax scam is concerned and the government, this really does place the government's credibility and makes one wonder exactly how credible these energy sales are. Has this Minister told us the complete truth about the agreements? I don't imagine that he has brought anything to light, and yet we are asked to believe a Minister of the Crown — this isn't just the man on the street who is taking advantage of a tax scam, and this is one of the outstanding ones of our time. I don't imagine that, when the Liberal Government brought this program in, they ever dreamed that it was going to drain the economy of such money, but they did nothing to stop it until the Conservative Government came into power. That was one of their first dealings was to stop that drain on our economy. Here we have not just one member of the government, but we find we have two members of the government, of the Treasury Bench, who are taking money right out of the pockets of Manitoba taxpayers.

I had a phone call not long after that story broke in the paper from a constituent who had been turned down from the Department of Finance, because he had sold a van but he was two months late to get his rebate. Now he was talking about \$100.00. The reason he phoned me and was so incensed about it was because he sees a Minister of the Crown getting away — and he's talking about politicians. This is the worst part of it. We all get smeared by the same thing. But he's talking about this Minister. He's not looking for thousands of dollars; he's looking for \$100.00. But he gets turned down because he is a couple of months late, and he is incensed. He has written a letter and he has called his MLA, and he wants something done about it. Because if he sees the Minister of Energy and Mines getting away with this kind of money — "legalized theft" they call it.

A MEMBER: His own colleague calls it that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: That is what the former Minister of Finance called it, "legalized theft," and that's really what it was. I understand the man in the street taking advantage of it, but someone who is sitting on the Treasury Bench, who is part of this government, I think it is inexcusable, and I think it is inexcusable that the Premier of this province has not asked him to resign because that is what he should have done.

On Friday, we find that another Minister finally screwed up his courage to confess. I'm sure he didn't

want to tell the Premier that he too had dipped into the pot, and here is someone who went out and borrowed \$20,000 and couldn't quite remember that he had done it. Now not only is it incredible, it is plain stupidity. I consider it to be, if I can't say dishonest, it certainly was a devious way to make money off of the taxpayer.

I strongly feel that this government is in — not disarray. I'm trying to think of the word . . .

A MEMBER: Power.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, it is in power but, unfortunately for the people of Manitoba, it is in deep trouble when it can't realize what is wrong and what is right. There is a difference between people using tax benefits for businesses and for private. This was an altogether different thing, and it was treated as such by the Minister of Finance during the election.

The Throne Speech went on to talk about agriculture and the family farm. Now I'm not going to deal on this very long, but I was just watching the television the other night where it mentioned that this year alone there have been 14 new bankruptcies. This was a government that promised there would be no bankruptcies in farms and businesses. Here we have 14 new ones, and that probably was maybe up to, say, the time of March.

There was one program that could have helped the farm families, not a great deal, and that was the CRISP Program. This government changed the program so that it cut approximately 1,000 farm families from receiving any money. Now that's cash; that's what they need. For farmers today, that was a disgrace to cut that out. The money probably that the Minister of Energy and Mines and the Minister of the Environment probably would have paid for that program alone.

The government goes on in the Throne Speech to talk about the quality of life and health care, and the government promised to maintain health care. That was the one thing during the election when you knocked at doors that people talked about. There is hardly a family that hasn't had a horror story about trying to get into the hospital. What is happening? I have a letter from a constituent here. She went down and she recorded her whole visit to the emergency ward at Grace Hospital. It's almost unbelievable when she talks about people laying in stretchers in the corridors, when she talks about trying to get any kind of help because, of course, there aren't bells when you are laying in a corridor. The whole thing is really just a horror story about our hospitals. That is one area alone that this government has failed so miserably in. Our health care is the worst that it's been, and it has deteriorated unbelievably in the last four years.

What happens when the government promises to double the benefits under the Manitoba supplement for pensioners but then, on May 2, announces that there will be an increase in Pharmacare to our seniors, over 65. They give with one hand and take away with the other. Now this is disgraceful, because people who have paid their dues, our senior citizens over 65, all the screaming and yelling about the de-indexing, and yet this government the first thing we're back, and that's what they do is increase the Pharmacare deductibility for seniors, from 50 to 75.00.

Then on May 6, the Minister of Health went on and made another release. He was going to eliminate six staff positions in the Department of Health. I have a sample letter here that the Women's Institute put out, and I imagine that's the reason that today we heard that there is going to be a delay in the program. I'd like to read this into the record:

"The Manitoba Women's Institute was shocked to learn on Tuesday, April 29, that the Department of Health had already made a decision the previous week to dissolve the Family Resource Management component of the Home Economic Service and eliminate six staff positions, including the financial management specialist, the housing specialist, the training and programs coordinator and volunteer coordinator, basic living skills specialist, plus two secretaries. It went on to say that the elimination of these resource specialists has real implications for the programs and effectiveness of the rural home economists as well as women's institutes and 4-H who both use and provide services in rural Manitoba. We as rural women protest this move without any prior consultation and demand that the Home Economics Resource Program remain as is or the six positions with funding be returned to the Department of Agriculture from where they came in '74. Now that looks like what the government is planning to do under much pressure. But this is a government who professes to help rural Manitoba and not to harm the family farm, and yet all these programs are directly related to rural Manitoba and they are just whittling away, and whittling away, the very services that make the farm life in our community viable.

I had today a letter from a constituent of mine and I'll just briefly read a bit. It's an unemployed home economics grad. "The Home Ec. Directorate's Volunteer Program is very important to me in particular as it allows me the opportunity to gain invaluable practical experience and make contacts within the profession. This program also provides its volunteers with training and technical support which allows us to grow and further develop our skills as a central agency. The Directorate is also able to provide its volunteers with a wide range of volunteer projects. As a result, volunteers obtain a wide range of experience to make ourselves more marketable."

This is a young graduate, hasn't got a job, is looking to the volunteer program to help her get out into the field, make some contacts and use her skills. This is what is happening with our young people today is that they're graduating with degrees. They want to work in a certain field but they're not getting the opportunity. I think this is just one instance of many where we have young people trying to succeed and this government impeding instead of helping.

The Throne Speech went on to talk about increased day care which certainly I support. It is something that is needed and with more women going out to work we need to expand day care. But I don't see and I have not seen from this government anything that helps shift workers or women that work part-time — and this is another story I ran into during the election. There was a woman, she was unemployed, her daughter was in a day care centre, but because she didn't dare pull her out during the time that she was at home because she'd lose that space. So here we have a woman at home, unemployed, she was on UIC, looking for work,

wanted to have her daughter at home, wanted to have her child at home, but because of the system there's no way. There has to be some flexibility in our system in day care that allows women, if they are only working part-time or something like this happens, that they can have their children in day care.

It's just sheer craziness to have a system that demands somebody have their children there five days a week or maybe four, but they cannot pull them out anymore often because they'll lose that space. So I think it is time that the government started looking at alternate ways of providing day care. Not everyone should be in an institution. The day care facilities are fine that we have but I think there has to be alternate methods of day care; and rural women now are crying for alternate methods when they get into time that they are farming, need to help on the land, they want to make sure that their children are safe. More and more are needing day care for just certain periods and that has to be looked after too.

The Speech from the Throne made reference, just in passing and has been mentioned before, to the City of Winnipeg and we will certainly be looking forward to see what the government is planning to do to protect the thousands of taxpayers who are going to face large increases. Just because they happen to live in the suburbs doesn't mean that they can afford giant increases. I think this government had better start taking a very good look at what they're planning to do to protect the taxpayer out there because even people in the inner city who think that they are going to get a tax cut, it looks as that probably is not going to happen. In some cases, there may be increases there too. So I think when that happens probably the government will take a closer look.

It also mentions in the Throne Speech that steps will be announced concerning the establishment of a crime prevention centre designed to facilitate the work of local citizens. Now practically every home you went to had a warning sign on their door. Most of them belong to Neighbourhood Watch. They may not talk about crime at the door but you can see that they're all planning to be well protected.

It concerns me that the government may be setting up some kind of another bureaucracy to try and do things that the people are doing very well themselves and could just use a small bit of help there. When I see a crime prevention centre, somehow I picture a building and with building there's lots of costs and we don't need that. What we need is help to the individual groups. Certainly not anything that's going to be very costly.

I'd like to mention education. I suppose it is mentioned in the Throne Speech but I somehow missed it. Oh, two words. Well that's how I missed it. The constituency that I represent is in the St. James School Division. Under the new formula they were left out. They are one of, I think, maybe 50 percent of the divisions that were left off the formula. They have been penalized for being fiscally responsible. Now I hope that the new Minister of Education will take a good look at the formula and try and get everybody under it.

In my constituency alone we've closed four schools and the English track and the dual track, so that's five. Essentially we've consolidated five schools in my area alone and that was just in the Westwood and

Woodhaven part. By exercising budget restraint programs, our division limited expenditure increases to 1.23 percent in 1985, and 2.23 percent in 1986 with no increase in block support in 1985, and a 1 percent increase in 1986. This results in a provincial funding cut of 2.46 percent that had to be passed on to the local taxpayers through the Special Levy; this from a government that promised to reduce taxes.

I think if we look back to 1981 when this government took office that we will find that the taxes have more than quadrupled. I think that's a shame and more to come. The government's out of money. I don't know what they plan to do except run to the Federal Government. I think it's time that they got their act together and instead of spending more and more and more, try to look at areas where they might be able to do other things, have other alternatives.

When the St. James-Assiniboia School Division complained, the former Minister replied, 'tell them to cut programs'. That was just a wonderful thought. We've cut all sorts of schools; 5 in my area; I think 9 in the division. Now she is saying tell them to cut programs. Well, I hope the new Minister will be more responsible than that. I hope that we all will be treated equally under the formula.

One has to question the priorities of this government. Fifty-eight million more — they have a deficit of approximately \$550 million this past year — \$58 million more than expected. The first thing that was done is they added three Cabinet Ministers, but the most glaring example is the contract that was given to the former Member for Springfield, Mr. Andy Anstett, \$55,000 for losing. Pretty nice. I don't intend to dwell on that appointment, but when I hear the federal NDP carry on, no wonder our constituents question the political process.

How many crisis shelters could have been supported with the kinds of money that the Minister of Energy and Finance, that the Minister of the Environment, the appointment for Mr. Anstett, the three new Cabinet Ministers, three new positions — how many crisis shelters could have been supported with that money?

Where is this government's priority? Obviously, they are starting all over again, only this time they are starting four years ahead to think about re-election. It is not going to work.

The NDP talks about pay equity, which we supported, but they are very sadly lacking in affirmative action and I don't have the figures in front of me but I know I can get them and they come from the Member for Concordia, actually, who had talked about affirmative action in the government. I imagine if I looked back that I would be able to find the figures. How many women have moved out of the secretarial jobs into managerial positions? Not many. After four-and-a-half years, when we were in committee last time, they were forming committees. They talked about women, and pay equity is going to be the big thing. I have a horrible feeling that this government feels that pay equity, that will satisfy the women, will give them more money and then they won't think about moving to higher paying jobs because they'll get more money for what they are doing right in that spot, and aren't we wonderful.

But that isn't going to be good enough because we're going to be watching to see which women move out of secretarial positions. That should not be an end-all.

For those that wish to stay, fine, but I know that there are women who want to move. We saw what happened with one woman when she wanted to move. It was the Department of Highways, the Honourable Minister, what he did. He moved in his executive assistant and the woman went out the door. I don't know whatever happened to the end of that; we'll find out in Estimates this year.

We intend to ask those questions of every one of the Ministers and just to see who has managed to move up in this government; how many women have been helped because I know there won't be much.

So don't start talking how wonderful pay equity is going to be. We have supported pay equity in the government, will continue to support it in the government, but what I want to see is movement for women so that they are in a position of hiring, not just men. That's the only way women are going to get ahead.

The last question I have to ask is why should we, as taxpayers, have to pay more taxes so that this government can continue to squander our money. There is only one pocket that you get money from and that's from the taxpayer; that's from you and me and from all our constituents and that's at the federal level, provincial level and the municipal level. It's about time you recognized that and when you're crying about federal money, you're crying about my own money and your money and your constituents'.

I suggest you start living within your means.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Madam Speaker, as is customary, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for being elected Speaker. I have full confidence in your abilities and know you will discharge your duties in a fair and impartial manner.

I think it is noteworthy, Madam Speaker, that you are only the second woman to be elected as Speaker. I look forward to the day when the fact that the Speaker is a woman is in itself not a noteworthy fact.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the Premier and other members of the Executive Council. I know that I speak for all members of this side of the House when I say that I have every confidence that your leadership and that of your Cabinet colleagues will provide Manitobans with a superlative government.

I would like to extend congratulations to my fellow backbench colleagues for being given the opportunity to represent their constituents in this Assembly. As members of the government caucus, we have a critical role to play in the development of present and future government policies.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the members of the Opposition for being elected to represent their constituents. Although I do not share the same political philosophy as the members of the Opposition, we do have one thing in common and that is, Madam Speaker, we are all elected members. We are elected to represent all Manitobans irrespective of their party affiliation.

As members of the Opposition, I know you will take your responsibilities seriously and I hope you will provide positive and constructive criticism.

Finally, and before moving on to the more substantive component of my reply, I would like to thank the voters of Elmwood for entrusting me with the task of representing their views and aspirations in the Legislative Assembly. I hope that the confidence you expressed in me on March 18 will continue over the course of the next four years. I can assure the people of Elmwood that I will work very hard to ensure that their views are represented on a full range of issues.

Madam Speaker, as we are all well aware, the early 1980's were difficult years as the world recession tightened its grip. Unemployment and inflation rates skyrocketed. Farm bankruptcies, business closures, and accounts of personal hardship were all too often the major stories in newspapers and on television newscasts.

Most governments responded by adopting various restraint measures; however, the New Democratic Party Government in Manitoba realized that restraint measures serve only to increase hardship and not lessen it. Thus, Madam Speaker, the NDP Government, rather than slashing government programs, as was the case in British Columbia, chose to be pro-active.

There were a series of initiatives worked out through consultation and cooperation with all sectors of Manitoba. The NDP Government was able to stabilize the economy and indeed bring about a period of growth and expansion almost unparalleled in the rest of Canada. Initiatives, such as the Jobs Fund, interest rate relief programs, increased spending on education and health, to name but a few, have meant that Manitobans not only survived the recession but that ordinary Manitobans are better off today than they were under the last Conservative Government.

Throughout the election campaign, our party outlined its platform. It was a platform that stressed fairness, fairness in terms of proposing programs to assist pensioners, small business owners, young people, homeowners and those wishing to purchase homes, and farmers. In short, it was a platform that recognized the diversity of the needs facing Manitobans.

In the Throne Speech read in this House a few days ago, this government translated the campaign promises into a plan, a plan that over the course of this Session will be translated into action.

I would like to take a few moments, Madam Speaker, to outline in a little more detail the actions this government will adopt.

It is an unfortunate reality that any society must experience a certain amount of crime. Recognizing this reality means that we must act accordingly, and therefore I support the government proposals to take positive action in the area of crime prevention and improved services for the victims of crime.

By making our community safer and providing victims of crime with support, we can make Manitoba a better place to live.

In an aging society, greater measures must be adopted to ensure that those people who have made substantial contributions to the development of our society receive adequate pensions. To meet this goal the government will introduce measures to double the existing Manitoba Pension Supplement and at the same time expand the eligibility criteria so that more people benefit from the program.

As a member from a constituency that has a significant seniors population, I give my full endorsement

to this plan. Unlike the Federal Government, this government recognized that full indexation of pension benefits is a necessary fact and will therefore ensure pensioners that their benefits will be fully indexed.

Madam Speaker, most people are well aware that small businesses as a group are large employers and it is estimated that small firms in Manitoba employ over 150,000 people. This government recognized the crucial role that small businesses play in all aspects of the economy and therefore will ask members to authorize the issue on some small business bonds to assist in the provision of affordable loans to small businesses. This will result in the creation of new jobs and therefore add to the government's longstanding commitment to job creation.

Madam Speaker, historically the NDP has led the cause for the expansion and enhancement of health care programs so that people, irrespective of income or status, will be guaranteed affordable, high quality health care. It is unfortunate however that the present Conservative Government in Ottawa does not share this commitment. Federal cutbacks in health care have reduced Ottawa's share of these programs from 50 percent to 43 percent and there's a danger that further reductions will reduce this share to 36 percent by the next decade.

These cutbacks seriously undermine efforts to provide quality, affordable health care. This government has led the way by introducing innovative measures to curb the increasing costs of health care. One such program is the Manitoba Home Care Program which this government will expand and thereby continue its leadership in the area of home care services.

Madam Speaker, it is the sad truth that women in this country, on average, earn 66 cents for every dollar that men earn. This inequity, grounded on gender discrimination, must not be allowed to persist in either the government or the private sector. Opponents of pay equity, especially those who disapprove of its extension into the private sector, are quick to invoke arguments suggesting that pay equity will ruin the business community.

These arguments remind me of the ones used by opponents of labour laws, designed to eliminate child labour and minimum wage laws designed to provide minimum salary. Opponents of these laws predicted the collapse of the business community. Well, Madam Speaker, history has proven them dead wrong.

I applaud this government's efforts to extend pay equity into the private sector and while I realize such plans require consultation and cooperation with a variety of sources, this consultative process should not be used to unduly delay the introduction of pay equity to the private sector.

Unfortunately, too many people who wish to buy their own home can not afford to do so. Young people especially are discouraged by the fact that they may never be able to afford to purchase a home.

In Manitoba we are fortunate in that we have a large stock of older homes. Many of these homes however are in need of repair and renovation to bring them up

to modern standards of energy efficiency. In the past, this government played a leading role in the area of housing programs. Initiatives such as the Affordable Homes Program, the Buy and Renovate Program and the Infill Homes Program assisted people in the purchase and renovation of houses.

In addition to providing people the opportunity to either purchase or upgrade houses, these programs provided a needed boost to the construction industry. These programs were so successful that Manitoba, in the period from 1981 through to 1985, had an increase in housing starts of 21 percent compared to a decline of 2 percent for the rest of Canada.

In keeping with its past commitment to assist people in the purchase and the renovation of houses, this government will provide a guarantee of mortgage interest rates at 2 percent below prevailing rates for people who currently do not own a home and for existing owners whose homes need renovations.

I support this program because it provides hope for people who want to purchase a home. Additionally, such a program will provide a necessary boost to the construction industry which will result in the creation of jobs.

At this stage in the 20th Century it's apparent that the traditional nuclear family is no longer the sole means for providing for the needs of children. For a variety of reasons there are now more single parent families and families where both parents are employed in full-time jobs. The result of this evolution is that there's a greater demand for child care services. Affordable, high quality day care services are necessary for a variety of reasons.

First, day care may be necessary because a single parent needs a place for his or her son or daughter to go while the parent works or goes to school. Second, many families have two working parents and therefore need a place for their children to go while they pursue their careers. Finally, some parents recognize that day care in itself provides a valuable learning experience for their children.

The interaction with groups of similar aged children is an exceptional . . .

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, perhaps if I could, to expedite House business, I would like to inform the House that the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will be meeting on May 20 and May 22, if required, at 10:00 a.m. to discuss the Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m. at which time the Honourable Member for Elmwood will have 30 minutes remaining.