

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 13, 1990.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** I have reviewed the petition, and it conforms with the privileges and practices of the House and complies with the Rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** To the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba, the petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Manitoba humbly sheweth:

WHEREAS the residents of Transcona are firmly opposed to the establishment of "adults only" video stores and stores that deal exclusively with pornographic material in their community; and,

WHEREAS said residents are concerned that the ready access to pornographic materials contributes to the degeneration of the moral values and quality of family life that the community attempts to promote; and

WHEREAS the residents firmly believe that the establishment of stores dealing exclusively with pornographic materials would be disruptive to the existing goodwill of business dealings in Transcona;

THAT this Legislature Assembly urge the province of Manitoba to consider the use of all available means to oppose and restrict the establishment of adult only video stores and all stores that deal exclusively with pornographic material.

AND as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**Mr. Helmut Pankratz (Chairman of Committees):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Seventh Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as their Seventh Report.

Your committee met on Wednesday, March 7, 1990, at 8 p.m. and on Monday, March 12, 1990, at 10 a.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred.

Your committee received representation on Bill No. 74, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (7); Loi no 7 modifiant le Code de la route, as follows:

Written Submission:

Mr. Chris Lorenc - Private Citizen

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 73 - The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (6); Loi no 6 modifiant le Code de la route;

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill No. 74 - The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (7); Loi no 7 modifiant le Code de la route;

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

#### MOTION:

THAT subsection 6(7), as proposed in section 4 of the Bill, be amended by striking out "furnished by the registrar" in clause (a) and substituting "required under this Act".

#### MOTION:

THAT clause 31(3)(b), as proposed in section 7 of the Bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"(b) in the three month period immediately preceding the application, the applicant held a valid driver's licence issued by a competent authority in a province or territory of Canada, and the authority confirms that the applicant is eligible to apply for and hold a driver's licence and to operate a motor vehicle in that province or territory."

#### MOTION:

THAT the following be added after section 11:

#### "Clause 122(1)(q) added

11.1 That subsection 122(1) be amended by adding the following after clause (p):

- (q) on a highway from 11 o'clock in the evening of one day until six o'clock in the morning of the following day, where stopping during that period is prohibited by by-law of the appropriate traffic authority and subsection 90(5) does not apply to such a by-law."

#### MOTION:

THAT section 12 be struck out and the following be substituted:

#### "Section 126 repealed and replaced

12 Section 126 is repealed and the following is substituted:

#### Manner of hand signal

126 When a driver of a left-hand drive vehicle or an operator of a bicycle, mobility vehicle or

moped gives a signal by hand and arm, the driver or operator shall do so from the left side and shall signify

(a) a left turn, by extending the left hand and arm of the driver or operator horizontally from the vehicle;

(b) a right turn,

(i) by extending the left hand and arm of the driver or operator out and upward from the vehicle, or

(ii) by extending the right hand and arm of the driver or operator horizontally; and

(c) a stop or decrease in speed, by extending the left hand and arm of the driver or operator out and downward from the vehicle.

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 147(2), as set out in proposed section 16 of the Bill, be amended in the English version only by adding "or her" after "his".

**MOTION:**

THAT clause 319(1)(www), as proposed in subsection 45(2) of the Bill, be amended by adding "for" before "light reflection".

**MOTION:**

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**Mr. Pankratz:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Chairman of Committees):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Committee on Municipal Affairs.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs presents the following as their Third Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, March 6, 1990, at 8 p.m. in Room 254, and Monday, March 12, 1990, at 10 a.m., in Room 255 of the Legislative Building, to consider Bills referred.

Your committee heard representations on Bills as follows:

Bill No. 61 - The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg

\* (1335)

Mr. Greg Selinger - Private Citizen

Bill No. 62 - The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg

Mr. Greg Selinger - Private Citizen  
Mr. David King - Private Citizen  
Mr. Trevor Thomas - City of Winnipeg Law Department

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 61 - The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg;

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

**MOTION:**

THAT the Bill be amended by adding the following after section 2:

**"Subsection 41(2) amended**

2.1(1) Subsection 41(2) of the City of Winnipeg Act, as enacted under The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, S.M. 1989-90, chapter 8, is amended by striking out "determine", and substituting "make rules, not inconsistent with this Act, determining the procedures under which the residents' advisory group shall operate, including".

**Subsection 41(6) amended**

2.1(2) Subsection 41(6) of The City of Winnipeg Act is repealed and the following is substituted:

**Role of R.A.G.**

41(6) A residents' advisory group shall

(a) advise and assist the members of the community committee for which it is established; and

(b) be entitled to notice of, and the right to participate in, the meetings of the community committee.

**Subsection 41(8) added**

2.1(3) Section 41 of The City of Winnipeg Act is amended by adding the following after subsection (7):

**Financial support for R.A.G.**

41(8) Where council passes a by-law under subsection (7), council shall provide funds to each residents' advisory group to enable it to operate effectively."

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 44(1), as proposed in section 3 of the Bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

**"Council may employ and set terms**

44(1) The city may employ such officers and employees as it considers necessary in the exercise of its powers and duties, and council shall by resolution, by-law, collective agreement or other agreement fix the remuneration and other benefits for employees, their hours of work and other conditions of employment,

**Tuesday, March 13, 1990**

---

and the manner of their appointment, promotion, suspension and dismissal.”

**MOTION:**

THAT clause 51(1)(c), as proposed in section 3 of the Bill, be amended by striking out “charge” and substituting “charged”.

**MOTION:**

THAT section 4 of the Bill be amended by striking out “Sections 74 to 79 are repealed” and substituting “Sections 74 to 79, except sections 75.1 to 75.9 (ombudsman) and section 78.1 (pensions), are repealed”.

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 75(21), as set out in proposed section 4, be amended

- (a) by striking out “and” in clause (e);
- (b) by adding “and” after the semicolon in clause (f);
- (c) by adding the following after clause (f):  
“(g) any other board, commission, corporation or other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated, established by council or under this Act;”

**MOTION:**

THAT section 78, as proposed in section 4 of the Bill, be amended by striking out “subsection (1)” and substituting “section 77”.

**MOTION:**

THAT the Bill be amended by adding the following after section 4:

**“Re-numbering of provisions**

4.1 The following provisions are re-numbered:

- (a) sections 75.1 to 75.9 (ombudsman) are re-numbered as sections 65 to 73;
- (b) section 78.1 (pensions) is re-numbered as section 79;
- (c) section 80.1 (records) is re-numbered as section 80.”

**MOTION:**

THAT the amendments to subsection 456(4) of the Act, as proposed in clause 13(b) of the Bill, be amended by striking out “In conducting a hearing under subsection (3), council or a committee appointed or designated under subsection (1) has” and substituting “In conducting a hearing under subsection (3), the committee appointed under subsection (1) has”.

**MOTION:**

THAT the Bill be amended by adding the following after section 23:

**“Transitional re section 48 & subsection 49(4)**

23.1 Notwithstanding the repeal of section 48 and subsection 49(4) under section 3 of this Act, those provisions remain in force until a proclamation is issued under section 16(4) of Bill 32, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act.”

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 24(1) of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted:

**“Coming into force**

24(1) Subject to subsections (2), this Act comes into force on the day it receives royal assent.”

**MOTION:**

THAT section 24 of the Bill be amended

- (a) by adding “and (3)” and “Subject to subsections (2)”;
- (b) by adding the following after subsection (2):

**“Proclamation**

24(3) Section 2.1 comes into force on the day that section 41 is proclaimed under section 15.1 of The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, S.M. 1989-90, chapter 8.”

**MOTION:**

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill No. 62 - The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg;

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

**MOTION:**

THAT the following be added after section 5:

**“Subsection 212(1) rep. and sub.**

5.1 Subsection 212(1) is struck out and the following is substituted:

212(1) Notwithstanding sections 772 to 777 of The Municipal Act, council may by by-law prescribe the rate of penalties to be added to taxes remaining due and unpaid.”

**MOTION:**

THAT the Bill be amended by adding the following after section 6:

**“Subsection 364(5) added**

6.1 The following is added after subsection 346(4):

**Special assessments under old agreement**

346(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Part, where before January 1, 1972 an area

municipality entered into an agreement with owners, or persons entitled to be owners, of land within an area municipality that provided for the construction of a local improvement, and for a manner of levying special assessments in respect of the local improvement that was different than the manner required under this Part, but which would have been valid if The City of Winnipeg Act, S.M. 1971, chapter 105, had not been enacted, the city may, to the extent necessary to comply with the agreement, levy special assessments, including interest at a rate not exceeding the rate levied by the city in respect of other local improvements during the year, for the local improvement in the manner provided by the agreement; and the provisions of this Part that are not inconsistent with the provisions of the agreement apply, with such modifications as the circumstances require; and the city is deemed to have had this power from the date of the agreement."

**MOTION:**

THAT Bill 62 be amended by adding the following after section 34:

**"Section 624.1 is added**

34.1 The following is added after section 624:

**Buildings spanning water courses**

624.1(1) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act or The Rivers and Streams Act or any by-law, resolution or regulation, no permit shall be issued by or on behalf of the city or council under this Act or as an authority under The Rivers and Streams Act for the construction or placement in the city of a building or structure which would span a water course, other than a highway, a utility or a building or structure exempted from this section by regulation.

**Regulations by L.G. in C.**

624.1(2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations exempting buildings and structures or classes of buildings or structures from subsection (1).

**Retroactive effect**

624.1(3) Where, before the coming into force of this section a permit is issued and is subsisting for the construction of a building or structure which spans a water course, other than a highway, a utility or building or structure exempted by regulation from subsection (1) the permit is deemed to be cancelled and compensation shall be paid to the holder of the permit according to law."

**MOTION:**

THAT section 44 of the Bill be amended

- (a) in the proposed section 686, by adding "but subject to sections 687 and 688," after "Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act,";

- (b) by adding the following after the proposed section 686:

**"Winnipeg development plan continued**

687 Notwithstanding the repeal of provisions in this Act relating to the additional zone, the Winnipeg development plan, as defined in Part 20, is deemed to be a development plan adopted under The Planning Act in any part of a municipality that was in the additional zone, and is subject to the provisions of that Act.

**Development permissions**

688 Where, before the repeal of provisions in this Act relating to the additional zone, council grants under section 637 a development permission that is subject to conditions, the development permission is deemed to be a conditional approval under subsection 64(2) of The Planning Act, and is subject to the provisions of that Act."

**MOTION:**

THAT section 45 be struck out and the following substituted:

**"Coming into force**

45(1) Subject to subsection (2), this Act comes into force on a day fixed by proclamation.

**Retroactive provision**

45(2) Section 6.1 is retroactive and is deemed to have come into force on December 22, 1989."

**MOTION:**

THAT the motion to amend section 45 be amended

- (a) in subsection (1), by deleting "subsection (2)" and substituting "subsections (2) and (3)"; and

- (b) by adding the following after subsection (2):

**"Royal assent**

45(3) Sections 5.1 and 34.1 come into force on the day this Act receives royal assent."

**MOTION:**

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**Mr. Helwer:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**TABLING OF REPORTS**

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to

table the 1988-89 Annual Report for the Department of Education and Training.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the Seventeenth Annual Report ending March 31, 1989 for Legal Aid Manitoba.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have from the Riverside School, fifteen Grades 8 and 9 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Tom Wiebe. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Decentralization Teacher Certification Branch

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, in letters sent to Government employees, the rationale given for decentralization was, and I quote, decisions were accepted on the basis that it was logical to move closer to the client group to be served.

Can the Government explain how the client group, in this case teachers, will be better served by the department of teacher certification, when 35 of them live in the community of Russell, Manitoba, and 9,100 of them live in and around the City of Winnipeg?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to see that the Liberals do not believe in serving the communities outside of this city. In today's age of technology and science and today's age of instant communication around the world, there is no reason why services which are provided by means of telecommunication, by means of computer, by means of telephone and fax, cannot be provided anywhere within this beautiful Province of Manitoba. Our objective is to try to ensure that communities outside the City of Winnipeg have the availability to serve Manitobans regardless of where they are.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** I am glad the Minister raised the question of technology, because with respect to teacher certification, many teachers who go to the certification office are immigrants. They are asked at that moment to present in person their original documents. They are not allowed to give teacher records and certification, fax documents or in fact xeroxed documents.

Can the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) tell the House if he is now prepared to change the rules, or if all of these teachers are now going to be asked to visit his constituency?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of my constituency and I would welcome anyone from the

Province of Manitoba to visit the beautiful area in the western side of this province.

Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) that where there is a need to accommodate those individuals, especially the immigrants who perhaps need to be accommodated, every effort will be made by the Department of Education and Training to ensure that we are flexible and that we are capable of addressing the needs as they arise.

\* (1340)

## Hiring Policy

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) tell this House what search has been conducted in his constituency for clerical employees to staff this transferred position, in that all of the present employees, because of either family obligations or marital status, have indicated they cannot accept a transfer?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that at this present time there is nothing official as to which people are going to be prepared to move and which ones are not.

I might indicate to the Member opposite that indeed there are very well qualified people outside the City of Winnipeg who would welcome the opportunity for employment in some of the communities where there is perhaps a lack of available employment opportunities. That is the whole thrust, to ensure that there is equal access of opportunity right across this province.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) seems to understand that decentralization can indeed occur through the use of staff vacancies and through attrition, and we congratulate the Minister. We hope he will teach that lesson to his Premier.

## Management Notification

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Government yesterday told the House that management was involved in the decision-making process. Can the Minister of Education explain why the director of teacher certification learned about the move of his own job and that of all of his staff only five minutes before the announcement to staff, and his immediate superior learned of it only one week before?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, I have to advise the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) that at the present time we have an acting director of the Administration and Finance Branch. It is up to my Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Ministers to advise the staff as to decentralization. That was done in accordance with the procedure that was set out. Certainly nothing was hidden from staff. As soon as we were able to, everyone was notified so that the information would be made available to everybody as soon as possible at the same time.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, so obviously in this Government management is only considered at the deputy and ministerial level.

Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). Can the Minister of Education, or any other Government Member, explain why an individual hired in August to be a library consultant, hired away from the City of Winnipeg, was not told at the time that her position was subject to be transferred, has now been transferred, if this Government had any long-term program for decentralization?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, I believe if an individual, any individual, takes a position with Government, it does not guarantee that individual will be working in a particular place for his or her life. Let me indicate very clearly that in every case if there was knowledge that particular position was going to be transferred at that time, that individual would have been told or asked whether or not he or she would be prepared to move. We did this as a matter of practice.

I might also indicate that in every case we cannot hold back hiring of people because a particular division may be transferred at some point in time. Positions have to be filled when they become vacant or as soon as possible, because I know that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) would be criticizing us for not filling positions if in fact those positions would be transferred.

### Decentralization Wrongful Dismissal Analysis

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** The corporations and most Governments make it a policy to plan for the long term and allow their employees to know what those long-term plans are.

Can the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) tell this House what analysis has been done by his department with regard to the number of wrongful dismissal suits that will be launched against this Government because of transfers of major lifestyle, which is now considered to be the basis for wrongful dismissal?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member's question is quite hypothetical. The question of decisions being made has been addressed by the task force, by the people involved with putting together the package, the program for decentralization and all considerations have been taken account of. I can tell the Honourable Member that she would do Manitobans a favour if she would try to be the Leader of the Opposition for all Manitobans.

\* (1345)

### Private Schools Funding Withdrawal

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** My question is to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness).

Mr. Speaker, last week the Government refused to withdraw the cap on Medicare and we are pleased on the one hand in terms of the fiscal situation the Government has withdrawn the cap in the proposed doctors' dispute. The Minister of Finance indicated that they will be reviewing all budgetary items in terms of the lack of funds in the Province of Manitoba and that they will be reviewing many programs and withdrawing many funds for many programs in the Province of Manitoba.

My question to the Minister is: Will he now reverse the position of the provincial Government and now withdraw the funding proposed by the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) for the private schools in the Province of Manitoba and not only prevent a costly exercise, but the Americanization of our school system?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) that in fact one of the major portions of the announcement on independent schools was the accountability issue. The accountability issue has been before this province for some time. It did not just come before the province in the last year and a half. For the first time in the history of this province, independent schools will be accountable for the monies that they receive from the provincial Government.

Additionally, for the first time in the history of this province, independent schools will be obligated to offer a program that is the same that is offered in our public school system. Additionally, they will have to comply with the administrative handbook that all public schools have to comply with. These are elements of the accountability issue that are very important to us as Manitobans, meanwhile providing choices for families and for parents in this province to send their children to the school that they see best fits their needs.

**Mr. Doer:** Yesterday the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) could not give us any financial numbers on the costs of this proposal. My question was a question dealing with the 80 percent funding and my question again is to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). Last evening the school trustees and school teachers and school superintendents of this province said that the potential impact on the financial resources available to education in Manitoba would be horrendous with the proposed changes from the Government.

In light of the fact that we have tight money, in light of the fact the Government is now establishing in a much more accelerative way an elite school system, my question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is, why is he taking on nurses in the public sector and not cutting back and withdrawing money for the private school system?

**Mr. Derkach:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) was not at committee last night, but I can tell him directly that it was not the school trustees or the teachers society who quoted a figure on what it might cost the province. It was his critic of Education who blurted out a figure of some \$100 million to the cost of this province. That figure is completely—

it is horrendous—and that cost to this province over the eight-year period will be less than half of that. So indeed I would suggest that the Leader of the New Democratic Party should ask his critic of Education to do his research more accurately so that he can present more accurate facts to this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Honourable Member for Concordia.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, we already have it up to \$50 million and will keep examining the Minister of Education.

My question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is, can this province afford an additional \$50 million under the proposed elite school system of the province, given the fact that school trustees in this province have said, and I quote, this will be horrendous? Will the Minister of Finance now do what he did with doctors and withdraw the money for the Americanization of our school system?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, let it be known that not only did the New Democrats oppose choice for Manitobans, they also ignored accountability questions. We are not going to do that. We faced the issue of funding to independent schools head-on.

We have reached an agreement whereby over the next eight years we will extend funding to independent schools to a level of 80 percent of what public schools are getting, but more importantly we have addressed the whole issue of accountability to the province so that indeed independent schools will have to operate under the same guidelines, the same umbrella or criteria that all public schools do in this province. I am proud of that particular initiative.

\* (1350)

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, when Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan want to justify one system for the rich and one system for the rest of us, they use the example, oh, we are just providing choices. That is the example they use, the same kind of right-wing Conservative agenda that this Government has.

My question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is, why does he not take control of other Ministers in his Cabinet, withdraw the \$50 million which we believe will grow to \$100 million with a change in the enrollment and save the money for the taxpayers and put it back into the public school system where it belongs rather than squeezing every part of the system and Government to provide money for elite schools?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) has repeated his question three times now. Perhaps he should try a new question soon.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell him again that by providing additional funding to independent schools does not make it an elitist system. An elitist system is one where only the rich can afford it because there is no assistance given to it. By providing assistance ordinary Manitobans can access those independent schools now.

Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate that 85 percent of children attending independent schools in this province are attending those schools because of religious or ethnic reasons. I think the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) should perhaps take that under consideration as well.

### Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement Forks Renewal Corp. Funding

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** My question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). Mr. Speaker, just over two weeks from now the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement will expire. There have been various figures used about how much money will be directed towards The Forks through that agreement. Some say that \$2.8 million will be used to build the boat basin. Others say that \$4.8 million will be used to construct a tourist centre at The Forks. Could the Premier please tell the House, now that we are within two weeks of the expiry of the agreement, how much money will be directed towards The Forks?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

### Forks Renewal Corporation New Development Moratorium

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there has been an undermining of the confidence in the mandate of The Forks Renewal Corporation. This has happened in large part because of insufficient public consultation. As a result there is not the kind of support for projects being announced by The Forks Renewal Corporation that would give those of us who are watching it a degree of comfort.

We in the Liberal Party about two months ago called on a moratorium of all new developments at The Forks pending another round of consultation. The Planning Committee at Winnipeg City Hall yesterday said very much the same thing. My question to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) is, does he now support a moratorium of any development at The Forks?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, as I explained to the critic during the Estimate procedures, my people are instructed to take their time with The Forks project. There has been no drastic development of The Forks at this present time.

For the Member to get up and say no consultation, maybe I would like to review for him that in the year 1989 The Forks had 145 meetings with different individuals. In the short period of January they had 19 meetings. For him to get up and mention that there is no consultation with The Forks people and with the public is completely irresponsible.

### Accountability

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I think it was particularly significant yesterday that Members of The Forks Renewal Corporation met with the Planning Committee of City Council. We, the legislators of the Province of Manitoba, had no such opportunity. Will the Minister of Urban Affairs request that the chief executive officer and staff of The Forks Renewal Corporation appear in front of a legislative committee so that the MLAs in this Chamber can ask the questions that city councillors have a right to ask, but we do not?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we have a different form of Government in this Legislature. The Member is quite aware that I instructed the chief executive officer to invite him and his caucus and the other caucus to come forward and give the briefing.

First of all, we mentioned that the City of Winnipeg at this time wants to have more consultation. The boat basin alone, Mr. Speaker, was approved on December 4 by the Downtown Design Board. On January 12, the Manitoba Environment Control Service approved that. Then on January 22, the Riverbank Management Committee, Rivers and Streams, City of Winnipeg approved that particular project. How much more do they want to receive information when it comes forward from The Forks?

\* (1355)

### Pembina River Diversion Federal EARP Request

**Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley):** Mr. Speaker, we in this province are only too aware of how the Saskatchewan and federal Tories flaunted the Canadian environmental laws with Rafferty-Alameda. Today we have the announcement that another federal court has forced the Alberta Government to submit its Oldman River Project to a federal EARP. Three times now the federal courts have reaffirmed those 1975 environmental regulations.

Mr. Speaker, can this Tory Environment Minister (Mr. Cummings) explain why his Government has not made application for a federal EARP for the diversion of the Pembina River into Pelican Lake?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have been most cognizant of in this province is to make sure that our process deals with environmental issues in such a way that we can answer the questions that are raised regarding both federal and provincial jurisdiction.-(interjection)-

Well, obviously, it amused your Leader.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) does the Clean Environment

Commission no credit when he consistently raises the credibility, the quality and the independence of this panel to be able to deal with environmental issues and independent manner in this province.

The issues will be brought forward at the hearings. Both sides will be fairly heard. The information will be analyzed, and a decision will flow from that. Certainly, not only in the relationship to this project but all projects across the province we have a very good working relationship with federal authorities and attempt, at every turn, to make sure that we have correctly answered the questions that are raised.

**Mr. Taylor:** If an environmental project involves federal lands, federal money, is an international waterway or has fisheries implications, by definition, a federal EARP is required. Mr. Speaker, given that federal lands in the form of an Indian reservation are involved, the federal Government is contributing a third of a million dollars, there are fisheries repercussions and the river flows into the United States, why has the provincial Government, as proponent of the project, not applied for that federal EARP?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, essentially that is a repeat of the first question. We have made sure that - (interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Minister.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, it certainly is no intent to by-pass that process. We want to make sure that we have a clear environmental hearing process that answers those sorts of concerns, and that is the direction that we are taking.

**Mr. Taylor:** Given that this Minister has clearly not learned the lessons after the procedural disasters surrounding Rafferty, Repap, the Charleswood bridge, The Forks, and now the Pembina River diversion, when will the Government choose to advance properly through the environmental review channels instead of continuously trying to avoid those channels?

**Mr. Cummings:** There is a large preponderance of people in this province who say that I do anything but avoid environmental intervention. Mr. Speaker - (interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, as I said the last time this Member raised this question, all of the projects for which he references are now on hold—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Minister.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, there will be every effort made to make sure that this is a clean environmental process.

I think the Member is hoping that he can raise the federal boogeyman in order to increase his support from those people down stream.



## Transport Canada Service Reduction

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, we have recently learned that one of the impacts of the federal budget brought down a few weeks ago, in addition to massive cuts in transfer payments that will be hurting our province, will be a 19 percent cut in Transport Canada's air services budget in the central region.

\* (1400)

I believe this could have a devastating impact on safety, on unemployment, on jobs and services in various communities in this province. I ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) for the province whether he has been in contact with the federal Department of Transport to determine what the impact of these cuts will be? Does he anticipate the province having to pick up any of these services and costs that are being offloaded by the federal Government?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Mr. Speaker, we have also become aware of the fact that there could be some pending cuts, but Pete Proulx, Director General of Air Navigation Services, said last night no decision has been made on whether the division will suffer cutbacks.

I know a directive apparently has gone out to regional directors and they have been given up to the end of this month to try and propose ways to reduce duplication of services in their area. I have to indicate I am concerned when I hear these kinds of rumours. We are trying to gather the information at the present time. As soon as we know what effect it will have, if any, then we will take appropriate action.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, the people have been getting their phone call notices on this. There has been confirmation of a 19 percent cut, not a rumour.

Can the Minister confirm that such cuts that will result in the removal of flight services from various communities and air traffic control in communities such as Dauphin, Lynn Lake and Brandon will impact on safety in those communities, will impact on jobs, and will not be tolerated by this Government?

**Mr. Albert Driedger:** Mr. Speaker, when we talk of a 19 percent cutback that is across Canada. It is our understanding that it could affect Manitoba to the point of \$1.9 million if these things come into effect.

The one thing that we are concerned about and are investigating right now, because we have raised and are going to raise very seriously for the Transport Commission, is the fact that it should not affect safety in the Province of Manitoba. That is our key concern at the present time.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister agree that, when flight services are cut, it does impact on safety as evidenced by the Dryden commission that was inquiring into the crash there? Will he also immediately seek a meeting with the federal Minister to express his

strongest objections to these cuts that will impact on safety and employment in the small communities in this province? Will he immediately seek that meeting and ask for assurances that these cuts will not take place in this province?

**Mr. Albert Driedger:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, we are trying to find out exactly what information is available. Once we have that information a decision will be made, and if it requires going to see the federal Minister of Transportation we will do that.

## Pharmacare Deductible Increase

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Health. With the recent announcement by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that Pharmacare will increase by almost 5 percent, and this Government again has shown lack of concern for our seniors and people who are less fortunate, can the Acting Minister tell this House what action this Government is taking to lessen the impact of this increase on Pharmacare to the seniors and those who are on fixed incomes and those who have chronic conditions?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) that this Government has every intention to pay attention to the needs of our senior citizens in terms of health, in terms of social needs, in terms of all areas. I can assure the Member for Kildonan that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) will take every precaution to ensure that the seniors in this province will receive the kinds of services that they require and need.

## Pharmacard System Implementation

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us why this Government has not implemented the Pharmacare card, which is a very economical, very sensible and very practical solution?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has indicated on several occasions the steps that he has taken with regard to the question that the Member poses. Indeed I will take this question as notice for the Minister and ensure that he gets back to him with the update as to what has been done since he first posed the question.

## Ophthalmology Program Implementation

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us, for the last six years in Manitoba we did not have an ophthalmology program—and the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) have been unable to make a decision who is finally responsible for this program.

Can the Minister of Education tell us when he is finally going to establish this program?—because if you start too late it will take at least three years for that program to start, and we have already an ophthalmologist shortage in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. At least 50 percent of them will retire in three years time.

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** I can indicate to the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) that over the last several months we have been in consultation with the Department of Health and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) with regard to the ophthalmology program in this province.

Indeed, as the Member indicates, there is a growing need for ophthalmologists in this province, and for that reason the Minister of Health, along with my department, have been in consultation over the last several months to try and address this issue which has been outstanding, not just for the last year or so, but has been outstanding for some time. Progress is being made toward arriving at an approach which is going to be reasonable and which will address the issues that the Member raises.

### Manufacturing Industry Economic Growth

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** I would like to address the question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) about the decline in Manitoba's economy. The Statistics Canada figures from the latest survey for the month of February show a very serious decline in the number of manufacturing jobs in this province. As a matter of fact, Manitoba has lost 9,000 manufacturing jobs in one year, Mr. Speaker. That is a decline of 14.3 percent.

On top of that, there has been an increase in bankruptcies of manufacturing industries. We had 14 bankruptcies in 1988, and this increased to 19 in 1989, with total liabilities increasing by fivefold from \$2.6 million to \$12.9 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), can he explain to this Chamber and to the people of Manitoba why we are experiencing this serious decline in manufacturing industries in this province?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I sense that the Member must be reading from some information that must be horribly outdated, maybe even by many years.

My information shows that new capital investments spending in Manitoba is expected to increase 9.2 percent in 1990 to \$4.5 billion. Indeed, this past year the growth was in the area of 7.4 percent, stronger than the growth rates projected for all provinces to the east of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I think this province has done extremely well in '89 and has postured well for significant capital investment in 1990.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** We have heard this story before from the Minister of Industry (Mr. Ernst). Tell that to

the 9,000 people who are no longer employed in manufacturing.

### Labour Reduction

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, the figures show, the statistics show fewer people working in manufacturing today than at any time in the 1980s under the previous NDP administration. As a matter of fact, two years ago in early 1988 there were 4,000 more people working in manufacturing than there are today in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, my question, with the continued erosion occurring in our manufacturing sector, which will continue I am sure because of the free trade deal that this country has entered into with the United States, can the Minister tell us how many more manufacturing jobs will our province lose in the next year?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I question the source of the Member's figures, because I have capital investment in the manufacturing sector and last year, 1989, there was an increase of 83.8 percent over 1988 within the manufacturing industry. Obviously, that is going to bear fruit with respect to productivity and new jobs coming in to the future.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Member opposite, if he has chosen to judge and to read his numbers in a way that is in the most negative, then I say to him he should look at it in reality and he would see that things are well on course for expansion within that sector.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** The people of Manitoba do not know what expectations of investment intentions are, but they do know when they lose a job. The fact is, we have lost thousands of jobs, 9,000 jobs in one year in this sector.

### East-West Packers Ltd. Closure

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, my final question is, East-West Packers has been placed into receivership throwing 105 people out of work. Is the Minister, is the Government able to do anything to help rescue the East-West Packers plant or do we have to simply accept the fact that Manitoba has lost another 105 jobs in this industry?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, certainly the situation of East-West Packers is very unfortunate. It has been known for some time that there was difficulty in the way that plant was being operated. Some financial difficulties were in place.

Certainly the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism and the Department of Agriculture analyzed the situation and there really was no ability with existing programs to do anything for the plant. A lot of discussion occurred, but no resolution occurred that would allow the plant to continue, and the bank has chosen to do what they did.

\* (1410)

### **POWA Agreement LynnGold Workers**

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). The program for older worker adjustment came into place in this province some short time ago. It has been suggested by members of the Minister's department as well as members of the department in Ottawa that it takes some time to do the study of a workplace before an agreement can be signed and put into place for the workers who fall under this program.

Can the Minister indicate when this study is going to start for the LynnGold workers, given that their UIC is going to run out probably in October or November? When is the study going to be started? How long will it take to complete?

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice and get back to the Member.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat distressing that the Minister would have to take notice of that, seeing as she brought it in with high accolades. I would like to ask the Minister to act on that as soon as she can.

### **Mining Reserve Fund Totals**

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, with another question to the Minister, can the Minister tell the House what the present balance for the Mining Reserve Fund is in this province and what interest it is earning on an annual basis?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice, but it seems to me, as I try and pull a number out of memory, there is somewhere around \$9 million or \$10 million. The rate of interest that it would be earning would be the market rate in which we have it invested.

### **Mining Reserve Fund LynnGold Workers**

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, given the answer from the Minister of Finance, again to the Minister of Labour, why has this Government not seen fit to use any of the monies in the Mining Reserve Fund to assist the workers at LynnGold? What is that Reserve Fund for if not to help the workers at LynnGold who are now going to get this settlement which is nowhere near what they should get under the contract and subtract from that what UIC will take and what the tax department will take and what this Government will take—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The question has been put. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, this Government has gone further than any

Government has ever gone in getting money for workers who have been in a bankruptcy situation like this. We have gone after severance pay and succeeded in getting a settlement that they would never have had before. So on the matter of LynnGold, we naturally would have liked to have had more for the workers, but we have done very well for them. We are still helping them relocate and still helping the town get on its feet.

### **Pembina River Diversion Federal Jurisdiction**

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns). The Clean Environment Commission held hearings last Thursday in Ninette and Brandon dealing with the Pelican Lake enhancement project. I attended the meeting at Brandon and there we received information that the project clearly falls under federal responsibility because there is federal funding involved, federal Crown lands involved and at the International Boundary the water flow affected another country.

As the proponent of this project, would you approach the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) and ask him to invite your federal colleague and hold clean environment hearings? Clearly it falls under his area of responsibility.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence in the Clean Environment Commission's operations in this province and in its integrity. They will come to the necessary conclusions that will, I am sure, satisfy all interests in this instance.

### **Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corp Mandate**

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings). The Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation was established to find a site, develop and operate a hazardous waste corporation -(interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for The Pas has the floor.

**Mr. Harapiak:** Some of your colleagues are under the impression that the only responsibility was to find a site. Is the Minister still committed to the principle that the corporation will develop and operate a Crown corporation?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that that question is somewhat convoluted, I will attempt to put the record straight. Before any construction of a site of any type, be it a transfer station or an organic treatment station or treatment for inorganics, a site has to be found. During that siting process, obviously I think every Member in this Legislature as well as almost everyone in western Manitoba is well aware there have been some considerable difficulties in achieving the welcome mat from communities where they have asked to have an opportunity to look at siting process.

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

If the Member is asking, has the commitment somehow changed in terms of this province dealing with its hazardous waste, that commitment has not changed. The fact is that the Hazardous Waste Corp is going to have to develop a system for a transfer site, as a matter of fact, before they may be able to develop a treatment plant. To that extent our commitment is certainly not lessened.

### Privatization

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, with the appointment of Don Vernon, there are many who are concerned that the Minister will follow his privatization path that he started with ACRE's consulting.

What comfort can the Minister give the employees of the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation that this will remain a Crown corporation and will not be privatized the way he privatized the handling of the pesticides in this province?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I take considerable umbrage at the reference—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe I should say I am disappointed, upset, forlorn.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Environment.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, I am truly disappointed by the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), aided and abetted by the Liberals to his right, who will try to put on the record that ACRE is somehow an affront to the Hazardous Waste Corporation.

**An Honourable Member:** It is.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, now we have a confirmation.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.- (interjection)- Order, please.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** We have a ruling for the House.

On December 14, 1989, during debate on Bill No. 67, the Deputy Speaker took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) respecting words spoken by the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) which, it was alleged, maligned and attributed unworthy motive to professional administrators and municipal authorities.

I have reviewed Hansard, and what occurred was clearly a dispute over the facts which, as Honourable Members know, is not a point of order.

I must therefore rule that the Honourable Member for St. Norbert did not have a point of order.- (interjection)- Order, please.

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Gimli, with his committee changes.

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Pankratz for the vacancy that we have.

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed.

The Honourable Member for Inkster with his committee changes.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, this is to confirm a committee change earlier today in committee.

I move, seconded by the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) for Ellice (Ms. Gray).

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### HOUSE BUSINESS

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills in the following order: 63, 103, 102, 99 and 100?

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae)—the Honourable Member for Thompson.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader):** When the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) planned on the scheduling of further committee hearings—there are a number of committees that are in the process of deliberating on certain Bills. I am wondering if the House Leader can indicate when he would be scheduling further committees, for example, tonight?

\* (1420)

**Mr. McCrae:** I would hope, following further consultation with the Honourable Member and others, that I would be able to make announcements later this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader.

**THIRD READINGS—AMENDED BILLS**

**BILL NO. 63—THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT (3)**

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 63, The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson). Stand.

Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Agreed.

**DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS**

**BILL NO. 103—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT, 1990**

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice, Bill No. 103; The Statute Law Amendment (Re-enacted Statutes) Act, 1990; Loi de 1990 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives (Lois réadoptées)—the Honourable Member for Osborne.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader):** Stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Stand. Is there leave that this matter remain standing? The Honourable Minister of Justice.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** If I understand what is happening—I was engaged in a discussion—Bill No. 103 has been stood by Honourable Members and it had been my proposal. I had called for Bill No. 102 as well and it had been my proposal to move both those Bills into Committee of the Whole at the same time, but if it is not the will of Honourable Members to pass Bill No. 103 at second reading at this time then we should just skip ahead to Bill No. 99.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock)? Agreed.

The Honourable Government House Leader, do you want me to just—No. 99? Ninety-nine.

**BILL NO. 99—THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989**

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 99, The Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation de crédits, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson), who has two minutes remaining. Stand.

Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Agreed.

Also standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray), who has 21 minutes remaining. Stand.

Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Ellice? Agreed.

**BILL NO. 100—THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1989**

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1989; Loi de 1989 portant affectation supplémentaire de crédits, standing in the name of the Honourable Member of Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger), who has 10 minutes remaining. Stand.

Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik).

**Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet):** Thank you. I note the applause from the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) and it is certainly appreciated as I rise today to speak on this—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**Mr. Praznik:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate this opportunity today to take some time out from the very hectic legislative schedule that all Members of this House are now participating in and very much involved in with the committees and general debates, et cetera, to take up an opportunity to reflect upon some of the financial plans of the Government and the financial situation in general that our province currently faces.

Mr. Speaker, debates on Bills such as this give all Members of this House an opportunity to address in the large perspective the funding and finances of our provincial administration. Today I would like to use the time allotted to me to put on the record some of my observations as a Member, albeit a Government backbencher, on what I hear and see every day that goes on in this particular Chamber, what I hear and see as it goes on from the perspective of the media, and to reflect on the financial operations of our province and the state of the finances of our province that we as legislators find ourselves in.

Mr. Speaker, what disturbs me perhaps the most about being a Member of the Legislative Assembly, and perhaps it is a reality from which all of us may never be able to escape, but that is, as I sit here day after day through Question Period, as I sit through committees, and it is a fascinating experience, what I continually see is this almost sense of unreality in which many in this Chamber, indeed many in the media, many in the public live. I find that very disturbing, because what we are here to do, at some \$8,000 or \$10,000 a day that this particular Chamber costs the taxpayers of Manitoba, is to establish priorities for what is in reality the meagre resources of our province. We spend now on behalf of the people, and we all take some responsibility for that in this Chamber, some \$4.8 billion approximately, and with approximately a million people in our province, that works out to about \$4,700-\$4,800 per man, woman and child in our province. That is a lot of money. It is a great deal of money.

**An Honourable Member:** A million people times \$4 is \$4 million.

**Mr. Praznik:** Four and a half billion—billion. The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) attempts to correct me from the seat. Obviously, he has not quite heard what I have said. Perhaps it is a faulty sound system. Perhaps the Member is not using the sound system. It is billion with a "b," Mr. Speaker, to which I am referring.

We spend that money, and we come into that Chamber as if often we can fulfill every demand, every request on the provincial Treasury. The reality of it, Mr. Speaker, when you go into my constituency which is not a wealthy constituency, indeed there are very few constituencies in this province that have a preponderance of wealthy citizens, we hear over and over again that there is no more room, there is not another nickel, not another dollar that we can take out of the average taxpayers in this province.

\* (1430)

Yet we come into this Chamber day after day and group after group with very legitimate concerns and demands to make upon the Treasury, put forward proposals where we are asked as a Legislature, because ultimately we as legislators have the responsibility to approve the expenditures of this province. We come here each day and we hear these demands. Members of this Assembly take up those causes and those demands, not in the sense of trying to stretch a dollar further, not from the sense often of trying to reprioritize expenditures to meet current demand, to meet updated and ever evolving need, but rather to gain very short-term political favour with the groups that come to their door as legislators or to their caucus doors or this Assembly asking that their very specific needs be met.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a university student at the University of Winnipeg a short distance from here, I happened to be privileged to have as a professor a gentleman named Emmett Mulvaney. Mr. Mulvaney, whom I came to respect very highly, had served the people of this province in a capacity in the Department of Labour for some years in the '60s. What I appreciated so much about Emmett Mulvaney was that he was a professor who not only challenged you to question the way things were, to break them down and be critical, but more importantly Professor Mulvaney challenged his students to put the pieces back together at the end of the day into a workable whole, a whole that made some sense and could work.

Emmett Mulvaney had an observation about this place for which I have come to appreciate that there was a great deal of truth. Emmett Mulvaney used to say it appeared that Members of the Legislature had a packet of arguments on their desk, whether they be in Government or Opposition, and that following an election when there was a change of administration, that often a defeated Government would fold its packet of arguments; the Opposition would fold its packet of arguments. They would cross the floor and then reopen the files in front of them and carry on as if there had really been no change.

There is a great deal of truth to that, because the realities of Government, and I, Mr. Speaker, have been privileged in my short political career, whether it has been as an assistant to a federal Cabinet Minister or as a Member of this Assembly, to have always been on the Government side and have always been in the operations of Government. I have not had the experience of being in an Opposition role and inevitably in the course of provincial history, if I survive as a Member for Lac du Bonnet long enough, I am likely to some day be in that role, I hope in the distant future as opposed to the immediate future. But in Government you realize very quickly that you are extremely limited in your actions. You are limited in how much change you can actually effect in the expenditure of provincial or federal dollars or in the setting of policy, and of course there is the human limitation of just time and energy.

So, Mr. Speaker, for those who find themselves on these benches and our colleagues in the New Democratic Party just two years and some months ago were on these benches and there are Members of the Liberal Party of whom have had to sit in some Government role, whether it be in city Hall or in the case of the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), as an assistant to a federal Minister, they too realize very quickly the limitations which having executive authority give to those who possess it.

What disturbs me so much is given those realities, what we hear day after day after day from those in Opposition and perhaps I would make similar arguments if I were there, although I would hope that I would be more innovative, is not to deal with those questions of priority from I would think a realistic sense, but the arguments of often very short-term political gain. I do not blame Opposition Members entirely for that stance. I do not because one of the realities is when you are not in Government you do not have access, of course, to the mechanisms of research. You do not have access to the planning, the policy information that gives you a—

#### POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, on a point of order.

**Mr. Ed Mandrake (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the Member for Lac du Bonnet talking about everything else but Bill 100. I would hope that you would call the Member to order and bring him down to the relevancy of the Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), and I would remind the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) that the question before the House is—order, please—Bill 100, The Supplementary Appropriation Act. I would ask the Honourable Member to keep his remarks relevant to the question.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Praznik:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your general caution, but for the benefit of the Member for Assiniboia this is a Supplementary Appropriations Bill that - (interjection)- no, I am—the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) shouts out, challenging the Chair. He should be the last one to know when to challenge the Chair or what is happening in this House.

Mr. Speaker, Supplementary Appropriations deal with all the financial dealings of the Government. As a Member of this House I am allowed, I believe, 40 minutes to speak on this Bill. I am trying to set a context for my comments on the appropriations that the Government has requested.

I would hope the Member for Assiniboia would do me the courtesy of appreciating that I have the right as a Member to deal with the principles of expenditure in this province and to put it into a context. If he is - (interjection)- well, the Member for Assiniboia makes comments about me "being a young kid like me." Well, I appreciate his comments about my youth. I am sure the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) is perhaps somewhat envious of the youth of myself, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and others, but that is something that he will have to deal with and I do not choose to comment on further.

Mr. Speaker, back to the context of the debates and the direction that this House tries to give to expenditures in this province through the vehicle of the daily Question Period, through the vehicle of the news media, and to return to some of those observations and principles that I think are important to the people of Manitoba.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we hear again day after day through the media, in this House, in debate, in Question Period, demands upon the Provincial Treasury each and every time a group, organization or cause comes forward as I have said, often very legitimate, doing work in a specific area, doing good work, but come forward and ask this Legislature to provide them with more funds in the context of the work they are doing.

Of course the Opposition, in attempting to, I would think, just as we would in Opposition, gain short-term political favour, take up that cause and promote it. The news media having to meet deadlines and not having access as I have indicated to the kind of supports that Governments, Ministers do, not having access, the Opposition and the media, not having access to the kind of contacts, the information sources, the planning that Ministers and departments are able to have access to, do not always fully appreciate the context in which those requests are made, do not often appreciate that politics is a broader game, a broader business than just the politics of the Liberal, Conservative and New Democratic Parties, the partisan politics that we fight in this Chamber; and that there are politics, small "p" politics in that sense, that operate within organizations, within the social services sphere, within the agricultural sphere, within the business community, politics in the sense of human relations, as we each in our own way

or through the associations and organizations of which we are a part, struggle to obtain the priorities, struggle to get the dollars or the funding going where we think they should go.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, so each day in this forum we hear repeated demands as to where our provincial resources should be spent. If one were to only watch this Chamber or only watch the television news or read the newspaper, one would think that every service is on the brink of disaster and that a Government in power, whichever Party would sit on these Benches, is not fulfilling some sort of demand on the part of the public and that thousands, hundreds of thousands of Manitobans are suffering. I think, in all fairness, when one looks at Government's expenditures, it becomes very obvious very quickly that the vast majority of dollars spent by Government, approved by this Legislature on behalf of the people of our province are committed dollars that would be spent often in the same manner no matter who occupied these benches—dollars on health care, dollars on education, dollars on maintaining essential services, highway maintenance, et cetera would be spent.

\* (1440)

Yes, there would be perhaps a difference in those few priorities. There would be some difference in maybe being spent here or there, but most of those dollars would be spent. So what does that leave a Government or a Legislature in its expenditures? Quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, very little. It leaves very little room in terms of the overall expenditure at the discretion, the real, true discretion of Government or this Legislature.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the revenue side—we must also look at that for a moment—the maneuvering room of a Government to raise additional level revenue is almost entirely gone. Governments over the last two or three decades have found and attacked almost every conceivable source of revenue, so much so that a federal Government, and I say very honestly, whose own expenditures, its own discretionary expenditures are out of control, a federal Government whose legislative expenditures have grown at leaps and bounds that probably were never imagined by those who brought in that legislation in the '60s and '70s, has been forced, so they claim, to look at a goods and services tax.

We are not going to get into that debate today. This is not the forum for it, but it underlines how Governments everywhere, striving to find those additional nickels and quarters to meet the demands on their Treasuries, are forced into taxes that are extremely unpopular, forced to face the political attacks that result from that, because they have no other sources of revenue, or revenue expenditures from traditional sources are not sufficient to meet those demands on our Treasury.

We therefore can only conclude that quite frankly our population in this province, indeed across the country, has reached the saturation point. It is incumbent upon us as legislators, as my friend, the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), has said many

**Tuesday, March 13, 1990**

times on a variety of issues, to come clean as legislators and realize fully that there are no more sources of revenue that we can tap without creating great hardship on the part of the taxpayers of this province.

The only conclusion that can be left to us, as legislators, is that our responsibility is to make darn sure that the money we are spending, as legislators, is spent well and that we get \$1.25 worth of value out of every dollar we spend.

That is not always easy, because that means looking at how we spend our money with a very hard-nosed eye or a hard-nosed attitude. That means questioning programs and questioning expenditures that have become traditions as to whether they are still fulfilling the value or providing the value for which they were initially intended. That means looking again at our priorities and updating them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is never a pleasant task. It is always easy to create a new program or to add funding to a program that is fulfilling a new need. It is very difficult to go to a program or an agency, whose mandate was at one time a tremendous mandate but who has fulfilled it or the need has moved on yet the funding stays in place and yet the mandate or the purpose is no longer there, and say, it is time to reassess our support for what you do, not that you have not done a good job in the past but it is not our priority today.

Of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what underlines all of this debate is the selection of priorities. Any Government sitting here has to make choices. What Government is all about, what politics in our province is all about, is the choice of priorities. Where will we put that little extra 1 percent or half of 1 percent, here or there? Whatever Party sits on this side of the House obviously will try to accommodate as much as possible, but we really argue over very little when you come right down to it.

Coming back to my original comment, what disturbs me so much is that our politics in this province—we yell and we scream at one another, we argue and we make out as if the world is about to collapse when we are really arguing over a very, very small part of our total expenditure, a very small part of the issues. We do not come at it from the attitude of saying, let us really examine the priorities. Do we do a little bit more here or a little bit more there? No, we come at it from the attitude as if this is the whole focus of what we do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think the public debate is well served by that nor are the people of Manitoba well served by that kind of attitude.

If I may just digress a little bit on that point to reinforce my concern, I blame not entirely Opposition Members. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have sat in this Chamber now for two years. I have sat through Question Periods, budget debates, debates on Bills, sat through committee, and it never fails to amaze me that when that television camera peers through that curtain, this becomes a very different place. Comments, issues and debate that can normally be done in some sort of

civilized manner, all of a sudden this becomes a circus when that lens peers through those curtains.

**An Honourable Member:** A zoo breaks out.

**Mr. Praznik:** Mr. Deputy Speaker -(interjection)- exactly, as my colleague from Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings) indicates, the zoo opens up.

The best Question Period I have ever experienced, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or the best two have been the days that we bring down the provincial budget, because those are the days that all our friends in the media are locked up studying the budget document. They are not here in this Chamber. We get good questions, we get good answers.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I compliment you because one of the best questions during the life of this Legislature was from yourself on the day we brought down the first Government budget, when I believe you asked the Minister of Seniors some questions on the seniors' card, as an identification card or Pharmacare card. It was a very good question in which many people would have liked to have known an answer. I cannot remember if a forthcoming answer came from the Minister of the Day, but it was a good question, worthy of coverage in the media.

\* (1450)

If the media had been here I doubt if you would have seen the Member for Burrows' (Mr. Chornopyski) name in the newspaper, no, probably not. Perhaps that question would not even have been asked and probably not by the Member for Burrows because some other person in his caucus, who had to have greater attention from the front benches, any one of them, would have been given that question. The Member for Burrows, who is probably one of the most unassuming gentle people who has ever sat in this House, would not have been allowed to ask that question, quite likely, because he probably could not have created enough fire and brimstone to attract the attention of the press.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we see the media come into this Chamber and we see that television camera, this place turns into a circus. The electors from my constituency, the constituents from Lac du Bonnet, as I am sure from many other Member's ridings who sit in this gallery to come and see their seat of Parliament, the seat of their Government operate, walk away thoroughly, thoroughly disgusted, not with one specific Member or one Party, but with all of us, all of us in this Chamber. They leave here with a sense that their tax dollars, at \$8,000 or \$10,000 a day, or whatever it costs to operate this facility, are thoroughly, thoroughly wasted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we sit here in this Chamber and we debate the finances of the province. We ask questions as if we lived in a vacuum, that there was no real world out there, that there were not real people working hard to earn real dollars to pay real taxes so that we can provide them with real services.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are Members -(interjection)- The Member for Assiniboia (Mr.



Mandrake) says that is my perception. I have to tell you this about the Member for Assiniboia: I have a great deal of respect for the Member for Assiniboia. I know that he works hard in his constituency. I know that he keeps in touch with a lot of people in his riding and I give him full credit for that. I know he has brought legislation and amendments to Bills, some of which I have not agreed with, but they have been well intended. I would say that Member is trying, as I try, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet, to do the best job we can. But we do it in a Chamber and in a context that so often distorts those good intentions, that raises the debate and the questions to live or die, partisan issues that quite frankly do not mean diddly-squat to most people in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the most disturbing part of being a Member of this Assembly. I do not know if it will ever change, but I do know this: when that television camera peers through those curtains we all change. Every one of us in this House changes. I think we change to all of our detriment and to the detriment of this Legislature, in this Parliament and the process parliamentary system of Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have before this House, as I said, a supplementary supply Bill, and we have questions of finances. I would be prepared, as I am sure Members opposite would be, if given the chance to have some very serious debate on those priorities of Government spending with realistic information and facts and figures and priorities.

When I campaigned in two provincial elections, my main opponent, Mr. Baker, the former Member for Lac du Bonnet—I had the privilege, you could say, of losing to Mr. Baker once and he had the privilege of losing to me on one occasion. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we enjoyed the debates we had during those campaigns, because both Mr. Baker and I were candidates who had some knowledge of the operation of Government, Mr. Baker from his experience in the municipal politics and from his two years in this place, and myself from my experience of working for the Honourable Jake Epp.

So we were able to debate issues and priorities and direction with some knowledge of the realities in which Governments and Ministers have to operate. At any time either of us strayed off the path, off of reality, into some never-never world of cheap political shots, we were brought back very quickly by the other. It made for good discussion of priorities, good discussion of politics.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my regret again is when we debate these Bills; when we debate expenditure in Estimates; when we debate in front of that television camera, in front of that medium, we get down to some sort of unrealistic debate and discussion or argument often without any touchstone in reality.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, public debate is not well served by that kind of system. Our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)—I had occasion to hear our Minister of Finance speak last week at a meeting in the western part of our province. I heard him speak about the financial situation of the province; of our deficit; of our revenue projections; of our ability to raise dollars and

to spend them. I can tell you I was most impressed by his knowledge and understanding and control.

I say that as a Government Member, I do not have the opportunity every day to be briefed by the Minister of Finance. I can tell you there would be few Members in this House, few if any, who would have that knowledge, experience, that updated information to deal with the true questions facing us as a province. What I say to all of us as Members here is, we must have some responsibility to brief ourselves properly to deal with those questions, because there are questions that are worthy of differences of opinion, of legitimate differences of opinion. There are questions of differences of priority, but I never seem to hear real solid argument when we debate before the television camera in this Chamber in committee and perhaps that never will be. Perhaps the partisan nature of this place and of our politics will forever preclude that.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a challenge that goes out to those who are not in this Chamber today, those who report in our media, those who cover this place, that challenges to them is to raise the level of debate in this place on these issues by challenging politicians of whatever stripe when they put forward inaccurate or unthought-out positions, to challenge them by making themselves well versed in the facts in reality. I have no problem with debating with any media in my riding or any media when we are dealing with the facts, but it is difficult to raise the level of debate in this place until the media in this province and indeed across the country are able to rise to that challenge.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said earlier in my discussions, we as a province spend well over \$4,600-\$4,700 per person in this province. Where do we spend it? We spend over \$1,500 per man, woman and child in this province on health care. Almost \$1 out of \$3 on health care. We spend some \$880 approximately per man, woman and child in this province on education. We spend some \$600 per man, woman and child on servicing our debt, on providing tax credits, et cetera. We spend some \$330 approximately per man, woman and child on our social welfare programs, economic security programs, home care, child care, foster care programs, et cetera. We spend approximately \$102 on new highway construction every year. We spend approximately \$98 on maintaining our highway system. We spend, what, about \$200 per man, woman and child—I address this to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay)—in total on agriculture and agricultural programs.

**An Honourable Member:** About \$100.00.

**Mr. Praznik:** Pardon me, about \$100 per man, woman and child in the Department of Agriculture. Last year as an area from my constituency and a large part of this province who live off the forest industry, our total budget for fire suppression, a budget that has been in place for a number of years, was approximately \$6.90 per man, woman and child. When the fires got out of control we spent approximately \$80, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That gives you a sense, I think gives all of us a sense of where our dollars are going. By far the lion's share now goes to health and education.

\* (1500)

Health, education, debt, tax credits and social welfare programs consume almost two-thirds of our provincial budget. What leverage is there really for a Government in changing those priorities? Very little, very little indeed. You cannot go to the Department of Highways and take \$10 million or \$20 million out of new highway construction to put into health care; \$10 million or \$20 million out of \$1.5 billion. That is \$10 or \$20 compared to \$1,500—a drop in the bucket.

Our highways, goodness knows, they are run down enough in this province, and in need of further capital injection. The reality, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is there is very little room for changing those priorities. They are small changes that can be made but they are very, very small. The sooner the people of Manitoba, and we as their representatives fully realize and appreciate that and get down to the difficult work of stretching those dollars a little bit more in dealing with those small areas where we can make a difference, the better off I think debate in this province will be and indeed the province will be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) who I had occasion to visit in hospital as he recuperates from his most unfortunate injury and I am sure all Members share with me in our concern for him no matter what our partisan beliefs. We would never wish that kind of accident upon anyone. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), in looking in his own department, was able and is able to find areas where little changes can save those extra few dollars.

One example which the Minister of Health pointed out to this Assembly prior to his injury was in the area of laboratory tests. The fastest growing industry in Ontario today is medical laboratories. It is the fastest growing industry.

In our province, up to a year ago, a physician in ordering tests for a patient, had an order form that listed the 18 short list tests and had a little box that said, short list tests. With the stroke of a pencil the physician could order all 18 tests by checking that little box, that all-encompassing box. Whether the patient needed all 18 tests or not was a different question, and Don Orchard, as Minister of Health, a year ago changed the regulations to require laboratories to remove that little box off their order form so that they would actually have to check which of the 18 tests they required for their patient. If they only required five, they would check five. If they required 10, they checked 10. If they required all 18, they would check all 18. No longer would a lab do just as a matter of course all 18 tests. That one little change in the last year has saved the people of Manitoba \$1.2 million, that is now available for so many other needed services.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I see that you are indicating to me that my time is drawing quickly to a close. I would like to thank the House for the opportunity to address them on this matter. I would hope that my comments some day will have an effect, albeit it a small one, on the way we conduct public business in this province. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Environment.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my pleasure to put a few comments on the record. I think it is about time that we begin to clarify for the Opposition the fact that the Government is not a bottomless pit when it comes to financial expenditures. What you see before you here in Bills 99 and 100 is the hard dollars that we do have to spend on behalf of the public of this province. How those dollars are spent, how they are distributed, how they are controlled is fundamental to how we are able to deliver services to the people of this province.

So often day after day we are questioned in the House about whether or not the commitment of this Government is truly to people or if it is more along the line that the Opposition would like to portray us. Frankly, I suppose that in a backhanded way they have been paying this Government a compliment, because for the last number of months the questions have flown in the direction of whether or not we were providing services to people. That is one of the really important aspects that we have to make decisions on every time an expenditure is brought forward within our Government.

I guess I will get right into the context of what I want to refer to, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Part of it flows back to a decision that was made early on in the mandate of this Government, and that was the decision to put \$10 million into the Northern Flood Agreement. The Native people of this province have been negotiating for a decade on the Northern Flood Agreement with very little progress. The lawyers and the negotiators were doing well but not the people who were supposed to be receiving the benefits.

I would suggest to you that not only were the people who were supposed to be receiving the benefits not being well served neither were the taxpayers of this province and the users of Manitoba Hydro utility, because as those negotiations dragged on over the years there was a semblance of lack of good faith, certainly a perception of not caring, and more realistically I think there was a perception of avoidance of the reality of the situation that the people of that area found themselves in. That is an example of the kind of Government that I would never be part of.

The Government of the Day did not do a good job of, (a) moving forward with their responsibilities and, (b) acting responsibly on behalf of the people in the northern part of this province who were affected by the Northern Flood Agreement and had very little opportunity to do something on their own behalf in order to mitigate the affairs as they found themselves faced with after some of the construction, the Hydro infrastructure.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, leads me into a discussion of the management of Government affairs and how I believe these past two years, and particularly in reference to these Bills this last year, how this Government has acted responsibly, how the Government has put forward its concerns for the public of this province and how it has attempted—you may dispute the priorities that we have placed them, but you can certainly not dispute the fact that we have attempted to balance those priorities in our best judgement as to how to make the best use of the dollar

and have the most positive impact for the people of this province both in a social and economic manner.

We can look at the expenditures brought forward in Manitoba crop insurance and how it has been enhanced, Mr. Deputy Speaker. From the rural point of view—let me just deal with that for a minute—not only has crop insurance been enhanced, MACC has received a new mandate. There has been a continuation of the education tax reduction program for agriculture. The very fact that this Government was able to go ahead with the assessment reform is one of those situations that has created fairness and equity across the province, not only with rural but also with urban taxpayers.

Again, I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is an example of how we have tried to balance over the past number of months, ever since being given a mandate by the people of this province, to make sure that our priorities were straight, that we made decisions on the basis of what needed to be done for the people of this province, and we were prepared to take the fallout that came from some of those decisions. After all, for a number of years, all of us, including yourself, knew that assessment in this province was sorely out of whack. It was obsolete, it was not up to date.

We have numerous jurisdictions that were 10 and 11 years behind on being reassessed. We had jurisdictions where the shifts were not being mitigated, where the weight of education costs were falling on inappropriate areas for taxation purposes. We had examples of how it was most difficult for the province, the Government of the Day, to be able to justify how the taxes were being raised on real property across this province, but they were reluctant, in fact they were unwilling and unable to deal with the situations they were faced with.

\* (1510)

So again, not only were we faced with making some very difficult decisions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, decisions which in the long run were in the direction of fairness and equity, we were again charged with making decisions on expenditures of funds on a priority basis. That priority basis decision-making had to go back to the previous fiscal year, as well to put several hundred thousands of dollars into the development of the computer system so that the most up-to-date assessment could be brought forward for the taxpayers of this province. That ended up coming forward this year in the culmination and the development of the assessment reform package that was recently passed in this Legislature. At the same time, because we had jurisdictions that were badly out of whack and were going to be faced with a severe impact from education finances, we moved to put some dollars into that area to make sure that mitigation could be done with the least possible impact in a dramatic fashion, at least, for those ratepayers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we look across the whole face of how expenditures have gone in this Government, we can look in almost every department and see where we have been faced with similar types of decisions, decisions that have not been easy. One of the more

difficult ones for me personally was the day care workers and bringing the funding that was needed into place in order to fairly address the problems of day care. You know as well as I do there were some harsh words said on both sides as to how this should be finally settled, and what constituted a fair and equitable arrangement for that problem in the province. Ultimately we were vindicated in terms of having the majority of people who were involved in the problem say some positive moves have been made, and that we were moving in the right direction and that the dollars were going there—well, no one was ever satisfied they were getting enough, they were satisfied the direction was there, and they were satisfied that the needs were going to be addressed in terms of a long-range plan.

Look at my own department, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Environment received a pretty decent increase in the last budget in terms of a percentage increase in relationship to other departments. The simple fact is, in the Department of Environment, one of the things that we are going to be faced with more and more is the management of growth, the simple management of the growth on the demands on the Department of Environment. It is not a question of whether or not we pour more money in and certainly it will take more money, but it is a question of whether or not we can adequately supply the expertise to provide for proper evaluation under the control side of The Environment Act, whether or not we can provide the proper regulation on the side related to dangerous goods handling and transportation and to bringing forward, if you will, where it is warranted, prosecutions under violations of The Environment Act.

The simple fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have been able to manage the growth for the last two years in the Environment Department, and it has been expedient—I think there is not anyone within the department who would dispute that question. The attention that is attracted to this responsibility is enormous.

I have to repeat to you that the amount of money that is poured in there is not the only yardstick by which this needs to be judged. It has to be judged by what is done with that money afterwards, how the issues are dealt with, whether they are dealt with fairly, adequately, in a timely manner and if in fact all of the environmental considerations are being dealt with.

From time to time, there will be disagreements there as well I am sure. The fact is that the dollars that this Government has to spend will be restricted in the coming months and possibly year to come. My department and every other department of this Government is going to have to make sure it is getting full value for its dollar.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us not harken to some of the comments that come from my colleagues across the way, whose sole cry day after day in this Legislature generally is whether or not we are putting enough money into the programs. Why do we not spend more? Why do we not provide another service, no matter what it costs?—(interjection)—

The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) I think wants to disassociate himself from that policy. I am glad to

hear that, because it seems to me that in fact what we need is some fair and honest evaluation of what is happening in the provincial Government in this province and the fiscal management that is being applied.

I do not expect to stand here and have all of the Members across the way applaud and appreciate what I am saying, but at the same time, given parliamentary Rules I guess they will either have to leave or listen to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I look to other departments and my neighbour across the hall in Industry, Trade and Tourism, the responsibilities that he has to deal with and the manner in which he has dealt with them, again I want to put on the record that the decision-making process we put in place and how we manage the dollars that are allocated to these departments is a demonstration of how we believe this province should be governed and how we would like to be able to provide leadership for the foreseeable number of years.

We know that by careful management we can make those dollars go as far as we possibly can, sometimes further than they are expected to go to tell you the truth. In doing so, we can achieve results and growth for the people of this province.

I would point very proudly to the achievement of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) in the growth of tourism in this province this past year. By some very careful analysis of where our potential market is he was able to bring forward I believe a very positive result in terms of American tourism, particularly centered around the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, something that had not been exploited to the benefit of this province previously, an example of where some carefully spent, hard-earned dollars in the right time and in the right vehicle achieved some very demonstrable results for this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has always been discussion and I would suggest some strong disagreement over the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement, which was struck by the previous Government between the years 1985 and 1990, but nevertheless, we have followed through to be able to try and use the final dollars out of that program to the best advantage of the people of Manitoba, both within the city and outside. That is very important to make sure that what is one of the most vital and growing industries in this province is enhanced, is encouraged and given that opportunity for growth.

Certainly within that same frame, look at what has happened to the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission. I could not help—because I have some passing interest in this sport, given my rural background, my association with agricultural fairs over the years, that in fact there is all of a sudden a shortage of stable space at Assiniboia Downs. The growth and the demand that has been created there through changes that have been made both by the association and by the Government are compatible with that industry. They are going to attract tourism and they are going to attract growth within that industry.

You might not say that is comparable to Boeing, but believe me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the entertainment, the

enjoyment, the growth and the dollars that change hands in that industry are important to this province. They are important to that segment of the population, and it knows no barriers between urban and rural, because the sport of kings is very popular among the urban people. Many of the owners certainly are from within the city and are very, very pleased and very encouraged to see the developments that have occurred there.

\* (1520)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would go on and on through the various departments, but one area where I think I would like to spend some time and talk about a change that occurred is within the Department of Government Services and particularly under the Disaster Assistance Board. The manner in which that responsibility has been handled in the last two years demonstrates to me clearly that we have been able to carefully manage the dollars, husband the dollars that are available for our disposal, to help those who cannot help themselves or are in a position where they cannot be helped by normal means, and to deal with the situation that we were faced with upon coming into Government and then some of that flowing through into the next year. We were faced with flood and fire, and fortunately not famine, but flood, fire and drought all at the same time in the same province, a most difficult natural set of circumstances which all contrived to create considerable havoc across the province.

I can tell you as an example that even though the workload in that area is increased dramatically, and I took some umbrage at the fact that the Leader of the Opposition referred to Mr. Reimer as having had his experience in disaster assistance, because that is what he was doing again now, but somehow reflected upon the abilities of this gentleman, because up until the recent months, his main responsibility has been with the Disaster Assistance Board. He dealt with a tremendous volume of appeals, a very much larger demand for dollars, and did it for a third of the cost, administratively. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that demonstrates how good management and good people in the right place can better husband the responsibilities and dollars which we have to allocate across the province.

When we move into the Health and Community Services area, I guess again I would point to the fact that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) brought forward one of the most ambitious programs for capital development. I was disappointed, I have to tell you, to read the comments of the House Leader of the main Opposition (Mr. Alcock) when he referred to how the capital had been distributed across the province, when he referred to the fact that the Minister of Health was going to be building a lot of hospitals across rural Manitoba that would remain half full, and it was put in the context of the fact that was a foregone conclusion, and it therefore was undesirable to build those types of facilities. I would only reference the fact that I talked to the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) not less than a day ago and the hospital at Erickson is full and is operating to capacity. It is a hospital that many people, those who are in Opposition to us, said that

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

we should never build and that there was no reason for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that someone who lives alongside of the Riding Mountain has every bit as much of an opportunity to get sick as someone who lives within the perimeter. We have to be able to provide services equally in all parts of this province and that is the goal and I think a proper goal for this Government to be dealing with. We need to make sure that the major facilities in this province are upgraded. We need to make sure that they are able to deal with the voluminous numbers that come to them for treatment. There is no question that people all across the province have come to the City of Winnipeg for treatment because this is where the expertise, this is where the specialists have been. It has naturally followed that we have needed to provide those facilities here.

The fact is that as we now approach a new fiscal era in this province that we are going to have to make sure that we very carefully establish our priorities. I guess that is the reason that I rise to speak to these issues today because by outlining how we have dealt with the decision-making process and a number of other areas in the period of time leading up to this I think should demonstrate to you and to the people of this province that our decision-making ability is there and that we are willing to put priorities where the people of this province believe that they should be.

I am not at all surprised that the judgment that has been applied by this Government to the distribution of the very limited dollars that we have to spend over this past fiscal year has not been criticized in its priorities. It has not been criticized in the areas of where the expenditures have gone, but has been criticized largely in the extent that people have said there should be more; conversely they have said, well, you have not funded everything.

The fact is that unfortunately that comes down to where there has to be some decision-making about what services are treated as priorities within the responsibility of the provincial Government. We know that the federal transfers that are going to be coming to this province are not going to be enhanced. We know that in fact we will see a loss. We know that the agricultural community has not been able to carry its own weight this last couple of years, that in fact the revenues that come from agriculture in terms of taxation are going to be restricted unless we see a rather dramatic turnaround in the very, very near period.

We know that the demands that we have been able to fulfill upon revenues from mining taxation are not growing and are going to be restricted and of course, as they always are, controlled by external prices that our manufacturers are forced to take on world metal markets, but the simple fact is, we will manage. This province is pretty middle-of-the-road in terms of economic shifts that when one area starts to suffer very often we find that other areas will strengthen.

I can only tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the kind of basis we have built in this province by limiting the growth of personal income taxes, by limiting some of the expenditures of funds that would not reach a very high

level in priority for this province. We will be able to make the economy of this province function on behalf of the residents to the greatest advantage of each and every one of the people in this province.

In that aspect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will take the opportunity to turn to a couple of things within my own department. As I indicated before, Environment is not one of the larger departments, but it is one of the departments that does have to manage growth. At the same time, we have been able to embark on a legislative program without a lot of demands on funds to deal with environmental issues within this province.

If that gives me the opportunity to speak about ACRE for a minute and put on the record what I did not finish doing during Question Period, probably I should take the opportunity now. I take considerable offence every time the NDP Opposition rises to question whether or not ACRE is somehow a means for us to undermine the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation, which is a Crown corporation, which is under my responsibility.

The simple fact is that the Association for a Clean Rural Environment was established to deal with one particular issue plus bring forward a broader mandate when they were capable of handling it. Their first issue they must deal with is the responsibility of dealing with the disposal of pesticide containers across this province.

\* (1530)

It is an example of how, through good management and environment, we do not need to spend hundreds of thousands or millions of additional dollars of taxpayers' money in order to accomplish environmental goals. We can accomplish that through bringing together, through regulatory and legislative changes, the stakeholders in the various segments of this province who have environmental issues that they have to address. This is an issue that has been percolating on the back burner for the last half dozen years, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The chemical industry decided they had better move before Governments moved on them in order to control the proliferation and improper disposal of pesticide containers across this province and in fact across the West. The critics of this proposal said: You are being snookered, Cummings. You will never get all of the money they say they are collecting in this province. It will go into a deep, dark hole in eastern Canada and you will never see it again. They were putting aside what they said was the equivalent of a dollar a container.

Well, the fact is that in pesticide companies chemical companies do have some proprietary interest in how much they sell. They do not want their competitor to know precisely the volume they sell, so these funds were put into a blind trust under the control of an accounting firm that was centered in Toronto, because that is where CPIC has its head offices as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to put on the record here that I collected a cheque on behalf of the province, which I turned over on behalf of ACRE, for \$754,000.00. It was collected on behalf of last year's pesticide sales. Given there would be normal sales again this year, and

---

**Tuesday, March 13, 1990**

---

let us say there is only \$650,000 worth, we are still going to be looking at \$1.5 million for the 1990 season to clean up the pesticide containers across this province. It is going to cost the Province of Manitoba \$25,000 to run a program of \$1.5 million.

Now tell me where else in North America you are going to get the administration for that price, No. 1, and get that kind of value for your dollar in order to clean up an environmental problem? It simply cannot be done. Even the supervisory costs of polluter-pay principle does not come anywhere near to that kind of a ratio, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is an example of where the stakeholders can be used to clean up their own problems, rather than have the taxpayer go in and do it and then try and collect the money back under some kind of another regulatory process. It is clean. It is simple, and the Governments cannot get their grubby hands on the money to squander it on something else. It will go toward the project for which it is designated. You are guaranteed that when you have the municipal people, you have the representatives of the urban communities, you have the representatives of the chemical companies, you have the representatives of Agriculture, Environment, sitting on the board to decide how these dollars can be best funded.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that is an example of how we can truly point to areas in this province through good management, how we have become, through whatever means you wish to credit it, but you cannot deny that we are now in a leadership role in how this matter is going to be dealt with across western Canada, because I can tell you two things. Number one, the chemical companies are very intrigued with this process. They are pleased, they think it is clean, and they were talking to the other two jurisdictions to the west of us to see if they are prepared to develop a parallel process.

Therefore, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and myself will, when time is available to us, be talking to our colleagues about whether or not there is some uniformity across the two western provinces to the west of us, the three in total, and hopefully, B.C. as well. Whether that occurs sooner or later, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact is that without very much expenditure of taxpayers' dollars we have been able to do what I think will be more than an acceptable job.

Yet we have people within this Legislature who would raise the issue that somehow we were taking the back door way of destroying, bringing down or reducing the importance of a Crown corporation. Well, the fact is that this Government does not believe that there needs to be a Crown corporation for everything that happens, but it does not lower our commitment to dealing with hazardous waste across this province either. This is simply dealing with one very small portion of the waste stream that could be generated within the province. It is the one in this particular case associated with agriculture.

At any rate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can go on to other departments and give you a similar demonstration. In the Department of Natural Resources, for example, the charges and the costs that they were faced with this year regarding the fire suppression and

simply firefighting and the protection of the people of northern Manitoba and eastern Manitoba where they were being threatened by what was I think aptly described as an inferno this summer, some expenditures in the neighbourhood of \$70 million which were unanticipated for the people of this province to have to pick up.

The simple fact is while you could not have eliminated or reduced those fires to the point where there would not have been massive damage, you certainly I think would appreciate, as I am sure the people across northern and eastern Manitoba appreciate, the fact that without the massive effort that was mounted we would have seen considerably greater impact on the personal lives of the people that were affected. We would have seen considerably greater impact upon the future potential revenue that can be earned for this province from one of its greatest natural resources, that being our provincial resource of forests.

Whether or not the people in this Legislature choose to agree that forestry is an honourable profession or whether it is a dishonourable profession and should be eliminated from the face of the earth is not the issue. If there is a sustainable industry in Manitoba—there are two sustainable industries that in my mind are undeniable; one is agriculture, the other is forestry. I am sure, Sir, that you would agree that fisheries ranks right alongside those. The fact is that these are the kinds of challenges that we are being faced, and how we manage those issues and how we control the dollars is all related to what you see in these documents that are before you here today.

I want to tell you that the other thing that I am very proud of and that I want to reference before my time runs out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is very simply the fact that I am exceptionally pleased and proud of the approach that this Government has taken toward fiscal responsibility on how we keep the books, because for far too long in this province we have assumed that Governments always cook the books, that they had imaginative ways of making the totals come out in a certain direction.

We can even look to one situation here that I will use as a demonstration of how I believe we have returned some fiscal integrity to the bookkeeping in this province and I refer to the Manitoba Hydro's rate stabilization fund. Certainly I would have to recognize the fact that it was put in place a number of years ago under a previous administration. The fact is now that the fund has been truly allocated where it should be, we do not need to have an expenditure line included under the Hydro rate fiscal stabilization fund recorded in the manner that it has been for the last number of years. While that has relative effects in other parts of the budget, it puts the expenditures where they belong.

When we came into Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were faced with the massive losses of MPIC which had to be written off and attributed to the proper time frame in which those losses accrued. Certainly in dealing with that there was a decision made that from now on those types of losses, God help us should they ever be perpetrated on this province again, must be reported in the years that they occur and not allowed to sort

of hang out there in nowhere's land without being acknowledged as a liability and responsibility of the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Province of Manitoba has been a jurisdiction that has more or less been on its own in terms of demonstrating restraint in growth in its total budget. I have to tell you, when I talk about fiscal integrity, one of the proudest times that I have had since I became a Member of this Government is when Premier Filmon was able to look the Prime Minister straight in the eye at the First Ministers' Conference and indicate that if all jurisdictions within this country were able to demonstrate the same restraint and control over the growth of Government expenditure that Manitoba has been able to demonstrate, then we would not be faced with some of the problems we are faced with today, including the GST.

\* (1540)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to reference a couple of other areas where I think there has been a demonstration of the willingness of this Government to deal with issues that far too long have gone unheralded, undealt with, ignored if you will, but in fact can be dealt with without having to spend enormous amounts of dollars dealing with them. I would reference the Surface Rights Board. The Member for Virden (Mr. Findlay) I believe would concur with me that it has now become, rather than a source of aggravation, it has become a mitigating body which is what it was intended to do in the first place.

We have also seen within the area of rural development the bringing together of a number of departments, parts of departments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that have some affinity and have some usefulness to be lodged together under the administration of one Minister responsible for the rural parts of this province. The Water Services Board which will have to deal with what is a continuing and ongoing problem, with the water shortage across this province; a board, a department that my Department of Environment has to interact with very often because they are involved in co-engineering and in some cases co-funding of waste disposal projects across this province.

**An Honourable Member:** How many want them?

**Mr. Cummings:** While they were supplying a large number of agricultural projects with their expertise, they were rightly lodged with agriculture. Now that they are moving more and more into dealing with urban responsibilities in our small towns they are rightly lodged with the Department of Rural Development, and they still handle the agricultural side of their responsibilities through liaison with the Department of Agriculture. They do in any event liaise closely with the municipal authorities wherever they have a project that they are responsible for, and it has been a fruitful and I think a very economically sound move to put that structure in place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I look at the budget of the Department of Rural Development and I see where under Research and Systems Services there is \$4.3

million of costs to that department. The fact is, as I referenced earlier, that is money that is being spent in order to make sure that there is an evenhandedness across this province on how the real property assessment is handled. The other very interesting part of that change is that the Rural Development Boards are now lodged in this department as well. Without any additional expenditure of funds we have automatically accomplished the credibility of having them associated with a department that works very closely with the municipal people to begin with, and therefore has access to those doors on a daily and ongoing basis in order to allow for them to be able to exercise their responsibility and help with the development across the province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I go back also to the Department of Environment and I would reference the City of Winnipeg and the fact that many times they have indicated that perhaps some of the environmental discussions that I have had with them are going to end up having an impact on their budgetary responsibilities. I would only want to indicate it in this context that in fact, yes, there are environmental regulations and improvements that are going to be required, but the one thing that we have been very careful to do and a message that I will take to them and to anyone else in this province when it comes to dealing with these types of concerns is that we will work with the jurisdiction to make these types of changes as painless as possible to make sure that they can be phased in, to make sure that they have an opportunity to use new technology.

Sometimes technology that works better and costs less can be brought in to deal with environmental concerns on a basis that might not otherwise have been conceived. That is why the Clean Environment Commission as well will be having hearings on the water usage within the Winnipeg region, the Winnipeg City itself, on how all of these things will be tied together to produce the most environmentally sound and economically possible solution to the problems that we have.

I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the basis upon which this Government makes all of its decisions, a basis which I am prepared to stand behind. I think that these Bills that you see before you are a demonstration of that type of thinking and action.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak on a number of issues this afternoon. I certainly enjoyed the comments of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) as he related the interdependence and the working together of our department and his department with a number of issues that are critical and must be dealt with. I think that is the kind of earmark that this Government has, that we have been able to work with the people, the citizens of Manitoba, to deal with the difficult issues in front of us.

We came into power with the idea that we would bring common-sense Government to the people of Manitoba. In many ways and means we have been able to accomplish that. We have by two budgets been able

to maintain the essential services of this province for the people of the Province of Manitoba in health and education and social services and many other areas. At the same time, we have done a very responsible thing in terms of bringing down the deficit expenditure per year from the \$400 million to \$500 million that was in existence through six and a half years of NDP Government to a more responsible figure of around \$100 million a year. We have clearly indicated we will not increase taxes for the citizens of Manitoba.

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you watch the reaction of people across this country, they are saying very clearly they do not want to pay more taxes, but at the same time they want to have the services maintained without an increasing deficit. That is a very difficult thing for any Government to be able to maintain. I think the Government of the Province of Manitoba has done an exceptionally good job in that responsibility.

I think the method of setting aside the fiscal stabilization fund that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) did in the past budget is certainly a very responsible move in terms of positioning the province to deal with some difficulties that obviously lie ahead for us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to just comment on a few things that have been happening with regard to the Department of Agriculture and our ability to work with the citizens of Manitoba to maximize what we can do in the way of programs and doing the sort of initiatives that they want to see done without having to spend an awful lot of dollars to achieve that. We in this Government have been very pro-active on the concept of sustainable development, the concept of being able to economically develop our resources in agriculture, forestry, mining and so on in this province and at the same time be able to deliver those resources to the future generations of this province in a form that they are able to at the same time be able to maximize the return from those resources.

In my department, when I came into Government back in 1988, we faced two horrendous situations. We had major, major water difficulties in the Swan River valley, serious erosion of agricultural land. Some 45 bridges washed out and in excess of 100 major I guess we would call ravines cut in fields through horrendous erosion. At the same time, we had massive wind erosion in southern Manitoba, a loss of top soil which will never come back distributed throughout some part of North America long gone from the productive areas of our fields. The farm community became very aware of the difficulties of erosion throughout the '80s and it was climaxed in the spring of 1988. A lot of representations were made. How were we going to deal with this? What should we do as farmers and as citizens of Manitoba to reduce the amount of erosion we are seeing because of the dryness that has occurred throughout the 1980s?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think anybody will question the fact that there has been a decrease in the amount of moisture that is available to us in this province. The events of yesterday hopefully rekindle a little bit of hope that it can still precipitate and rain in this province. The events of 1988 caused us to look at what can we do as Government to help the people and the citizens of Manitoba deal with erosion.

We formed a group that looked at the soil and water strategy for the future. We went around on the soil area. My department had some 24 meetings throughout rural Manitoba. We analyzed what programs we should have in place, what policies we should have in place to promote conservation without inhibiting the ability of farmers to farm and produce crops and livestock.

The message came back very loud and clear from the farm community that we should expend some monies to stimulate farmers in the way of incentives to create and do what we call erosion or conservation sensitive initiatives at the farm level. We then structured a discussion with the federal Government where we talked about the kind of method to be used to put that money in place. We signed the soil accord with the federal Government, some \$11.8 million available to the Province of Manitoba, 50 percent from the federal Government, 50 percent from the provincial Government.

\* (1550)

We set in place a series of associations throughout rural Manitoba to use that money. Those associations have been formed by work of my department over the past four or five months. I am pleased to report to you that we have at this time some 45 soil and water associations throughout rural Manitoba who are making the decision in the local communities as to what should be done in the way of using this money to stimulate conservation initiatives, whether through education or incentives to do certain kinds of practices over the next period of four years in rural Manitoba.

The response has been very, very positive, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The associations have been formed very quickly and the community leaders have come forward, gotten together and made the decisions as to what they want to do, whether it is planting of trees, promoting conservation tillage or whether it is seeding down to permanent cover some of our saline soils or more fragile soils. Certainly all these activities are wildlife friendly. They are promoting an interrelationship between wildlife and agriculture that is very positive for the conservation of our soil resource and the long-term viability of our industry.

These associations, as I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been formed. About 10 days ago I signed the first five agreements with the sum of \$1 million distributed to five of those associations with some very positive initiatives that they have brought forward from the grass roots in conjunction with my department technical staff to do the right things. I am very proud of what my staff have done. I am very pleased to see the input from the citizens and the councillors in particular in these various municipalities.

In many cases these associations are bringing together two, three and four municipalities in a particular unique area geographically or a particular watershed to do those sorts of initiatives. We are certainly very pleased to be able to demonstrate in agriculture that we can develop programs and initiatives that are very conservation conscious and moving towards a concept very definitely of sustainable development for the use of our resource.



I would just like to comment also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on some of the other activities that are going on in the province in the same general area of trying to promote conservation activities and wildlife habitat retention. In my home municipality about two years ago a program was initiated called Habitat Enhancement Land Use Program which is a program where monies from Ducks Unlimited, Natural Resources and Habitat Canada is used to give incentives to farmers to set aside certain kinds of non-productive lands for wildlife habitat.

I am pleased to report that some in excess of 7,000 acres have been signed up for that program in the municipality of Shoal Lake. Just this past spring, Ducks Unlimited put in place what they call the Prairie Care Program, again a similar kind of program to put in place in certain municipalities, I believe four at this time in the Province of Manitoba, two in the western side and two on the southern side, incentives to help farmers be more wildlife friendly and conservation conscious. We are moving very pro-actively in that direction.

When the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) talked about having to deal with flood, fire and drought, we certainly have had to deal with some very difficult situations in the past two years of Government.

I am pleased to report that in agriculture, I believe, we have started a very significant initiative here to try to reduce the amount of erosion that we have to deal with in the future and hopefully reduce the impact of future drought that we may face in this province. Drought certainly strikes fear in the heart of a farmer when he thinks that all his efforts and all his good intentions and all his expenditure that he puts into his land is not going to be returned to him in the fall if he does not get adequate moisture.

As I said earlier, certainly the moisture cycle has been on the deficient side for a number of years, and there is no clear signal at this point in time that this moisture cycle is going to turn around to any great magnitude in the coming year, 1990 or 1991. All kinds of predictions exist that it will and predictions exist that it will not, but there is no way to guarantee that it will not.

We have at the same time been cognizant of the difficulties farmers are facing with dealing with the uncertainty of the future, the risk of putting money into the land every spring and wondering if they can get it back. Farming has been known to go through cycles of ups and downs and good years and bad years, but with the kind of money farmers have to spend each year just to run their business, I do not think that they can put up with the eventuality of losing a crop year after year after year, because you are just not going to survive, you cannot pay your expenses, and how are you going to live.

The first line of defence that the farm community has is crop insurance, a program that has been very good in addressing those issues for the farm community over the past number of years. That program, certainly in 1988, there was identified that maybe it was not serving its need completely. We have together, the corporation has been working very effectively with the farm community in general through a series of public meetings to try to identify ways and means which the

program can be improved, to be more responsive to farmers' needs of protecting them from the risk of drought and other reasons for crop loss.

Those improvements started in 1989, and further improvements are now in place for 1990 to give the farmers a better package of risk protection through crop insurance. Certainly, the kind of participation we have had in crop insurance in 1989 was much better than 1988. We actually had the 6.6 million acres signed up under crop insurance last year out of a total of some 10 million in the province, so we had about 66 percent participation. The previous year about 47 percent of the acres of the province were signed up for crop insurance. I have had a lot of people who at various times have criticized the Crop Insurance Program, and I have to think that by and large they are the vocal minority, because people do sign up for it.

Yesterday the crop insurance had their 30th anniversary in Portage, where they recognized the changes that occurred in this program over the last 30 years. It has been in place since 1960, so this is the 30th anniversary. I am pleased to report that the fellow that I now have as chairman of the corporation, Dr. Clay Gilson from the University of Manitoba, is really known as the father of crop insurance, because in 1959, when we had some difficulties with early snowfall and crop being left out, Canada and Manitoba got together and developed the Crop Insurance Program we presently have today. I am very pleased to say Dr. Clay Gilson has been the chairman again for the past two years to lead it into the next generation of crop insurance programs.- (interjection)- As Manitoba leads is right, as the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) says. Clearly, in crop insurance we have led this country, and we still lead this country. The present general manager, Mr. Hank Nelson, is known across the country as Mr. Crop Insurance of Today because of his knowledge of the insurance program and how it works for the farm community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to just let the House know that in this 30th anniversary booklet that was put out last night at the annual meeting, there are some 211 farmers in rural Manitoba who signed their first crop insurance contract in 1960, and they have been continuous crop insurance clients for 30 years in the Province of Manitoba. That is a pretty good testimonial to the ability of the program to deliver the kind of coverage that the farm community wants. When you think 30 years is technically a lifetime for many people in terms of their working days, and those people are still farming in the Province of Manitoba, and in some cases it is their descendants who are carrying on the contract.

Last night at the meeting we had five people whom we recognized as being the people who signed the original contract and are still farming and still have the contract. They are Stan and Carol Jackson of Russell, William and Doris Boychuk of Russell—the Member for Russell will be quite happy to hear those names—John and Lynn Millions of Waskada, Jacob and Justina Wiebe of Altona, and Ed and Irma Fehr of Morden, Manitoba. They were five of the 211 people. I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the way we are going

---

**Tuesday, March 13, 1990**

---

to recognize those people is we are giving them a licence plate to put on the front of their vehicle saying Manitoba Crop Insurance, 30 years of participation. You will see those around the province in the coming months. It is a clear recognition of their commitment to protecting themselves by entering a voluntary program that has done a very good job for them over a lot of years.

**An Honourable Member:** Great idea.

**An Honourable Member:** Maybe we should give Ed one, too.

**Mr. Findlay:** Way to go and they will keep them clean, too. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to say that because, as I said to the corporation staff last night, they have done a good job through difficult times when there has been a lot of critical people out there about what the crop insurance program is for. It is a risk protection mechanism to compensate them when they lose their production for reasons obviously due to drought. I think that recognizing there is a number of people through testimonial of 30 continuous years shows that there is a lot of people who support the program and think it does a good job.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1988 the crop insurance payouts in the Province of Manitoba were some \$130 million. The previous record before that was 1980 when the payout was some \$58 million. In 1989 we hit a new record again. It is going to be in the vicinity of about \$155 million to \$160 million when all the liabilities are finally paid out. In 1988 that payout in crop insurance of \$130 million represented 28 percent of the realized net income of producers in the grain and oilseed sector in the Province of Manitoba. In 1989 it was 40 percent of the realized net income.

\* (1600)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we realize that crop insurance that covers 70 percent or 80 percent of the long-term yield makes it difficult for the farm community to live on crop insurance year after year. We have to recognize that and at the same time have in place other risk protection programs, safety net programs that help the farm industry on a farm income basis from year to year. In that context, there has been a lot of discussion over the past two years of whether a safety net program needs to be put in place. It is better than what we have in terms of Western Grain Stabilization because that is the income protection mechanism we have for the grain sector in western Canada.

Western grain stabilization was put in place in 1976 and has paid out, oh, I would say, 6 or 7 times since 1976. It is a western Canadian based program. It has paid out for the producers that have enrolled in it right from the beginning, if I remember my figures, around \$6 for every dollar they have invested in premiums over that period of time. The participants have been very pleased with the way it has paid out over time. The way the formula of that program was set out, it did not trigger a payout in 1989 and probably will not in 1990, two years of which payouts should have been made, because the farm community needs it at this

point in time, but the way the formula was structured, the payout did not occur.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture Canada recognizes that shortcoming and a number of other issue areas we need to address in agriculture with regard to dealing with the future. We had a meeting in Ottawa back in December of 1989, where some 1,800 delegates from across the country came together, people from agriculture, farmers, people in the industry, people in Government. The vast majority of the people there, I would say a good 80 percent of them, were farmers from across this country who paid their own ticket to go to Ottawa to talk about the issues of the future for our industry.

It was a very good discussion, a very frank discussion, and out of that we formed seven issue areas to look at with regard to how we are going to address the future in western Canada, in all of Canada in fact. We talked about sustainable agriculture; we talked about market development, particularly the trade issues that we have on the international basis; we talked about farm finance; we talked about supply management; we talked about food safety and quality; we talked about the safety nets; we talked about transportation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture federally has now struck a task force on four of those issue areas. In transportation, he has Mr. George Leith, a retired Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Grain Commissions to chair that. Farm finance, Clay Switzer, a former Dean of the University of Guelph is going to chair that one. The value added is going to be chaired by Mr. Larry Martin, the head of the Department of Economics, University of Guelph. Another issue area we touched on at the same time was pesticides; Mr. Gisland Leblanc, the former Deputy Minister of Quebec is going to head that one.

We have all these issues we are addressing in terms of having task forces across the country. Every task force consists of half farmers, a quarter federal Government people and a quarter provincial Government people. They have a very large task in front of them to analyze the issues, receive producer input, receive industry input, and report back to the federal Minister in due course. The federal Minister has requested reports for many of these committees by the end of June of this year. Certainly, the provincial Ministers will be deeply involved in the final analysis of their reports and what action areas need to be addressed in the future. I think we are addressing all these issues because so many challenges have come before the agriculture industry in the past few years, challenges that are not easy to overcome.

We know in this industry, of this country, we have regional differences like we have on any issue that we deal with in Canada. We have eastern Canada that the primary production in the agriculture area really is potatoes in PEI. You get across into Ontario and Quebec where supply management, the dairy and the poultry and the hog sector are the prevalent areas of production. Western Canada, it is really the grains and oil seed sector that is the predominant kind of production.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, we in this country in agricultural production do an excellent job of producing very high quality products and have a very good reputation worldwide with that quality. We have always had that reputation of guaranteeing that quality wherever we sell it. We are producing for the export market in this country by and large, because over 50 percent of what we produce must be sold on the international market. Therefore, we must be competitive on the international market with regard to the countries we are competing with. It means we have to be very cost conscious in how we address our industry, and we have to remain competitive in every sense. That is the underlying issue all these various action committees must address. The area of risk protection for the farm community is one of the critically important areas that is presently getting a very prime focus in the purpose of this round of discussions that are going on.

Another area I would like to talk about very briefly is the transportation industry with regard to the grain sector in western Canada. Transportation is critical if we are going to produce grains in western Canada and export them around the world. We have to transport these grains to the tidewater either west or north or south or east. The primary direction we have hauled grain in the past has been east to Thunder Bay and out through the St. Lawrence Seaway or west through Vancouver or Prince Rupert or north through Churchill.

There has been a lot of debate in this House about the role of Churchill in the future. Certainly Churchill has been a part of the past. It has been able to do a good job of accessing the eastern Europe area. The people that buy our grain products and take them out of this country have a large role to play in which port of export is used with the various products that we export.

Wheat and barley and oilseeds are our primary grains of export. In order to access the export market, we have had in place in this country \$720 million of annual payment called the Crow benefit that has been paid to the railways to supplement the cost of transportation. What that means to the farm community is that they pay about three-quarters of the cost, the federal Government pays about three-quarters of the cost of transporting grain from their farm to the point of export, whether it is east or west or north.

There has been a lot of controversy over whether that benefit should be paid to the railways or to the producer. The federal Government has indicated that they want to analyze that question. They are prepared to open the Western Grain Transportation Act and look at different methods of handling that payment. The Alberta Government in conjunction with the B.C. Government has indicated very clearly that they want that payment to go to the producers of their province.

In order to have the producers of Manitoba understand what the issue is all about, I formed a Minister's Advisory Council last May wherein I had eight people, four producers and four industry people, look at that method of payment and whether it would be good for the Province of Manitoba. They hired a consultant and asked him a series of questions. From that three discussion papers came out. Those discussion

papers have been reviewed with the farm community through a series of public meetings. Some 11 public meetings were held.

The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) has often tried to politicize this issue. Just so the Member for Dauphin knows the sort of reaction that the farm community is giving to that process of looking at the method of payment and what is good for the Province of Manitoba, I would like to just read from an editorial in the Manitoba Co-operator of January 25 of this year. They say, the approach of the council, meaning the Minister's Advisory Council, and the reports have been praised in this paper before. Rather than coming to a conclusion, the authors have done an extensive analysis of the implications of changing the method of payment for this province, meaning Manitoba. There has been no hype around the issue of the report. Producers are getting a chance for direct participation in the discussion. The report's main author, Brian Kelly, has given detailed presentations at the annual meetings of Manitoba Pool, Keystone Agriculture Producers and he is now giving the same presentations to open meetings around the province. Those meetings are being structured as a way to allow as many producers as possible a chance to sit down in discussion groups and give their views, ask questions and to discuss the pros and cons of changing the method of payment.

Some of the report's findings might be open to question, but it would be a mistake to focus at any one item of disagreement. The point is that producers are getting a chance to ask questions, and most importantly the consultants have illustrated when you scratch this issue you would find this a lot deeper than you might first have imagined. We might be weary of this debate, but the real thinking on it has just started.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial ends up saying that the Manitoba process, the process that this Government put in place, cuts the cliches and sticks with the facts. That is something the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) has not realized in the way he has addressed his question over the questions he has raised to me in this House over the past six weeks.

The farm community needs to know what the real facts are in this issue, what the future holds with regard to our ability to access the export market with regard to transportation costs and what we have to do in terms of changing our industry—no matter whether we change the method of payment or not—how we change our industry to be able to effectively and competitively access the export market. I think the process that we have in place, that this Government has put in place, has gone an awful long way to being able to achieve an understanding in the rural community on the issue and what the questions are that have to be addressed in the coming years.

Certainly there are some tough challenges ahead and some difficult questions to ask. We are prepared, as Government, to deal with them in the most responsible manner.

\* (1610)

Mr. Speaker, the farming industry has faced a lot of challenges throughout the 1980s. As I travel around

and talk with the farm community they indicate very clearly that they hope things are going to be better in the 1990s. They need to have some major issues addressed to help them through this period of time.

We would certainly like, from an agricultural point of view, to see the interest rates in this country come down substantially. We would like to see the value of the dollar come down, because the more the dollar comes down the more value we have in grain that we export. It has been said that it very clearly can be found out, if you do the arithmetic, if the value of the dollar comes down about 10 cents, wheat is worth a dollar a bushel more. For many farmers that is really the difference between just being able to make it and being able to make it comfortably in the future years.

Mr. Speaker, one of the big issues that the farm community has faced over the past 20 years has been depopulation of rural Manitoba, a very significant and difficult issue for them to address. Our industry only has so many acres. We have to be able to maximize what we can do in rural Manitoba with those acres. I have been promoting as regularly and continuously as I can, through all the various meetings I attend and speeches I give, of the value of being able to stabilize rural Manitoba with regard to population and job opportunities.

We have to continue as much as we can to diversify the various types of products and crops that we produce and produce crops that are economical and that the farm community can do and increase the jobs out there. We need to increase the amount of value-added activity that is occurring in rural Manitoba. The oilseed crushing plants like in Harrowby and Altona are critical in that regard.

The Can-Oat plant that is going into Portage, which will open about a year from now, will create about 50 jobs in that community and will be able to take an agricultural crop produced here and process it here in the province before it leaves this country.

Granny's Poultry certainly in Blumenort is another example of an industry that is doing an excellent job in that regard. Instead of just selling turkeys as turkeys they are doing a lot of processing and sell that product to the consumer in this country and outside of this country as a product that has a lot of value added to it.

Mr. Speaker, the rural community has been very positively supporting the decentralization initiative that we have gotten involved in, because it creates jobs and puts jobs into rural Manitoba. We have to continue, as Government, to address that difficult issue in any way and mean that we can.

I am very proud of our industry of agriculture, what it has done for Manitoba over the past 110 years. I know that it will be a contributing factor to driving the economic opportunities of Manitoba in the coming years. We have a lot of good leaders in our industry, and I have had the opportunity to work with many of them through the various programs they have put in place.

They are always positive thinking, by and large, in rural Manitoba and look forward to bigger and better

days. They like the sort of initiatives we have brought forward as Government in terms of programs for the agriculture industry but particularly the common-sense relationship we have brought to Government in terms of controlling cost, controlling deficit and keeping the services up for all of Manitobans.

I am certainly not very pleased with the way the Liberals have approached the decentralization issue, because it means so much to rural Manitoba. You will not believe the kind of ecstatic response I have had from mayors, reeves and citizens of the various communities that I have talked to over the past few days with regard to what six jobs or two jobs or 10 jobs can mean in a community.

You know, when six jobs come into a town in rural Manitoba they look at it as, of a family of four maybe two kids per family going to school, and that means 12 more kids in the school. When they are struggling with classes of eight and nine kids per class they know there is difficulty ahead in keeping those schoolrooms open. Any people that come into the community with school age children are critically important to them. It means an awful lot.

I hope the Liberal Opposition will suddenly see the light and realize that rural Manitoba is the driving engine for this province and they must get the kind of respect they deserve in terms of keeping the population up, so we can have our schools, hospitals and recreational activities properly utilized and supported by people in those communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to put a few facts on the record, a few issues that I believe are important to the industry of agriculture in the future. I look forward to the continued rainfall we had yesterday all throughout this province. I had people phone in this morning and say they are snowed in and they never felt so good in a long time. A few years ago we would be complaining about it, but now we have quite a different way of looking at it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to add some further comments on the general appropriations Bill that is before us.

I wish to deal specifically with an appropriation that involved the Department of Natural Resources and more specifically the half million dollar special conservation fund that was, for the first time in the history of the department and indeed in the history of the province—that my Premier (Mr. Filmon) and my Government provided these funds which accrue solely from lotteries revenue for the purposes of various conservation measures in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the desire to do this grew understandably from the heightened awareness and heightened concern that all our citizens in Manitoba have about our environment, speaking, as Minister of Natural Resources, more specifically about our natural environment, our natural resources that make up the environment that this department and this Minister are specifically responsible for.

I want to acknowledge the appreciation of many, many Manitobans who have been able to participate in the

different programs this fund made possible, their appreciation to both the Minister responsible for the Lotteries Commission and the lotteries revenue and indeed the Government of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it was particularly timely that this fund be initiated. I did not have an opportunity during the course of the examination of my Estimates nor in general occasions, either through questioning by Honourable Members opposite to highlight the good works that I believe this special conservation fund was applied to. So it is a pleasure for me to put on the record some of the accomplishments, some of the improvements, I think, some of the enhancement of our natural environment that this special conservation fund made possible during the past summer.

\* (1620)

Mr. Speaker, many citizens, many people, many organizations have particularly in these last years come to Government, and have come to the department with ideas of their own. These would be individuals, these would be volunteer organizations situated across the width and breadth of this province. They have listened, they have become aware of the fact that our environment needs our care and attention from time to time. It needs the helping hand of Government and of themselves if we are in fact to preserve it, and in the embracing of the principle of sustainable development, if we are to ensure that those natural resources that we are appreciating to ever increasing levels of awareness that they indeed are there to be passed on to future generations for the enjoyment, for the enhancement of quality living throughout the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, shortly after coming into the Ministry, in April of last year, I had the opportunity of administrating this special fund which consisted of some \$500,000.00. Five hundred thousand dollars, I suppose, relative to some Government programming, does not appear to be an overly large or significant amount of money, but \$500,000, a half a million dollars is a lot of money and it was my responsibility, the responsibility of my department to see that we use it as wisely as we could. There will be of course full accounting made of the various projects that received assistance from this fund at some suitable occasion. There will be a report made to this Legislature likely this time next year and, or indeed it is certainly available to Members of the Opposition to when next we meet or in future discussions with respect to the appropriations and the spending Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources to deal and discuss and to inquire into greater detail how these monies were spent.

Allow me on this occasion simply to indicate in general terms the kinds of projects that we were able to support with this special conservation fund. Mr. Speaker, they arranged the whole gamut, and it was an arbitrary decision made on my part that in order to ensure that as many, many organizations would benefit that we placed a self-imposed arbitrary ceiling on the funding that would be provided on any one individual application. We set that at about \$25,000.00. It certainly was not a fixed level, but it was set there so that the

monies would not be spent on one or two projects which although individually standing alone may be extremely deserving, but the nature and the purpose of the fund, particularly in this introductory year, I am speaking of course of the summer season just passed, we wanted to make as many volunteer organizations, friends of the natural resources of our province take note of the existence of the fund and be able to participate in it.

To begin with, we set that as a kind of a cap on the individual applications, a cap of \$25,000 and, Mr. Speaker, in no time at all with the announcement made shortly after last year's budget was introduced to the people of Manitoba, a special reference was made to the first time special conservation fund. A brochure was made available through the Lotteries Commission that again highlighted the fact that this fund had been created because this was the first time that Lottery revenues were used in this manner.

Most Lottery revenues, as Members will be aware, are of course used to support amateur sport programs in the province, support the various cultural developments, cultural programs in the province and the substantive change made by this Government and one I think that most citizens would agree with and applaud was that my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) should receive a substantial amount of these revenues for medical research and he was provided with some ten millions dollars.

I do not think anybody in the Province of Manitoba would take issue with that decision in the slightest manner. Health continues to be the No. 1 priority of this Government, as it ought to be. With the growing complexities of delivering a modern health care system to our people, I think the decision, supported by all Members of this Government and certainly not criticized I might add by any Members opposite, was made to provide out of the Lotteries revenues a \$10 million grant for medical research to the Department of Health.

Along with that decision the decision was made to grant this half million dollars to the Department of Natural Resources, to the Minister of Natural Resources, to respond to those growing concerns about our natural environment that I mentioned in my introductory remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. That was the origin of these monies and as I started to say, the applications, requests for some assistance from this special conservation fund, took very little time to start rolling into my department. They came from all parts of the province. They came from the City of Winnipeg here. They came from the North. They came from the southern part of the province, from the western part of the province, and from the eastern part of the province.

I have tried as best I could to select the projects because—understandable, perhaps to Members—it did not take long and the fund was oversubscribed. I want to take this occasion, and put on the public record, to thank all those who did put in projects for consideration, made formal application, for accessing this fund for their interest.

I appreciate the fact that no doubt some were disappointed when their funding requests were turned

down at this particular time. I take this opportunity to say, should that fund be made available to the Department of Natural Resources for the coming budget year, and that is yet to be determined, I might say, but if that should be the case, then certainly I would be looking very favourably and seriously at some of those proposals that missed out on this first round in accessing this fund.

Mr. Speaker, let me describe again in a general way some of the kind of projects that were funded under the special conservation fund, for instance from a volunteer wildlife group up in the Thompson area, who had a particular concern and interest in maintaining walleye fish stocks in Paint Lake, a popular lake in the North, in the Thompson area, enjoyed by many northern residents. They felt with a bit of money they could improve some particular valuable spawning grounds of the walleye in that lake.

Mr. Speaker, they undertook to provide the labour, the material and requested from the fund some \$14,000 or \$15,000.00. That money was made available. They have carried out the work, and it accomplishes a number of things. The environment for that particular little lake, that particular species of fish they were concerned, about was improved.

It certainly met some of that desire that I am finding expressed by more and more Manitobans about doing something personally about our environment, not just leaving it to Government or to other organizations, but to be personally involved. This is where the fund became so valuable in meeting that need.

\* (1630)

Mr. Speaker, in the southern part of the portion, I had the opportunity of personally visiting with a group of young, aggressive, farmers who had banded together in the south central part of the province. They call themselves the Deerwood Land Association, soil and water association. It was just a pleasure, in fact gratifying, to spend an afternoon with these young farmers, particularly in view of the fact that nobody needs to tell all too many Manitobans about the fact that to be optimistic in an agricultural scene takes some courage these days, to face some of the setbacks that our agricultural communities have faced, not necessarily of their own making, made by nature, perhaps because of the drought years that we have suffered. This particular region was again impacted quite severely this past summer with drought, and of course the other problems of an international making, the ongoing subsidy war between the European nations and the United States that has placed our farmers in such difficulties.

Nonetheless, here there was a group of aggressive young farmers who have on their own acknowledged that things can be altered, things can be done to improve their natural environment. In this case they are talking about their land, not just the land that they farm, but the land that is part of the general area, land that comes off the estuary, land that is sensitive to erosion, land where water, when it comes, moves far too swiftly off the land. They have entered into a

program where they have undertaken to build a whole series of small earthen dams.

I am not speaking about the Rafferty-Alamedas of this world or anything of that kind. These are small earthen structures, sometimes just restricters, that will slow down the runoff of water that may run off after a heavy summer rain in 12 or 48 hours, slow that down so it stays for three or four days or maybe a week, thereby helping to recharge the area, recharge the aquifers in the area and generally help in creating a greener and a gentler environment, as I like to describe it, both in the form of retaining moisture, both in the form of reducing land erosion, as well as in so doing enhancing the opportunities for the various pieces of wildlife that fortunately still abound in rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it was an absolute delight to visit with them, to be able to indicate to them that this special conservation fund would have some monies for them that would allow them to complete their project in that specific area. They required some additional monies, again not a great deal of monies, but a \$15,000 or \$20,000 grant went a long way.

Let me tell you what I mean by that amount of money going a long way. Virtually in all instances a \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000 grant was matched in some instances by local organizations or at least added to, in some cases added to with perhaps a federal Government program that very often doubled or tripled their money, and then when you add in the care, by the concern, the labour, the material often put in by local organization, that \$15,000 or \$20,000 in real terms, had Government undertaken it, would have been a \$100,000 expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, while the special conservation fund was limited to half a million dollars, I am satisfied as I stand here and as I have personally been able to visit not all the projects but some of them, that in fact the people of Manitoba, more importantly the environment of Manitoba, received many, many more dollars of improvement in the fact that this money was often used as seed money and then was multiplied or added to. So often is the case that sometimes a good idea held by a volunteer local association needs the impetus of some seed money to get it off the ground and get it started.

Mr. Speaker, I feel no restriction for describing another project that I was pleased to help with this conservation fund. That happened to be in the constituency of Minnedosa, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) is well aware of. For some years now, that beautiful community of Minnedosa which I am sure Members of the House who have visited the community—it happens to be surely one of the most beautiful, delightful communities, nestled as it is in the Minnedosa Valley.

A group of local citizens came to the department seeking access to this fund to improve the recreational facilities and the natural environment surrounding the man-made lake that they have behind the Minnedosa Dam that has been in existence for many, many years. PFRA originally built the dam, but the reservoir, the lake, Lake Minnedosa as they refer to it, was silting

up badly over the years. Different refuse had gathered into it, fallen into the reservoir either deliberately or by accident, whether it was some used car bodies or some other unsightly and unseemly objects that detracted from the enjoyment of that lake, as they call it.

So a program was entered into with them which is not complete. I understand they will be carrying on different phases of it for a general improvement of the beach area, of the lake bottom itself. Being a man-made facility, there is the opportunity to draw down those waters which I understand they did this fall, and a considerable amount of rock and other material that was unsightly in the reservoir was removed, so that the citizens will enjoy a more pleasurable recreational opportunity in this coming summer season which is all too soon upon us.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this special conservation fund enabled a group of citizens, in this case the good people of Minnedosa, to do something for themselves that improved their local environment on a project of their choice, with but the slightest support from Government. I find that kind of encouragement particularly rewarding.

I say that perhaps not as an ideological Conservative, although I never apologize for being one, but I am always gratified when minimal Government help can be used to encourage people to do things for themselves that they can do. There are certain things we do and have to do as Government, but we should seek out more opportunities, particularly as tax revenue dollars are harder and harder to find for a department like mine, that we seek out that willing assistance that I genuinely believe is out there, if but given the opportunity to respond to, and that has been the role of this special conservation fund.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, some of you have heard from time to time of—

\* (1640)

## HOUSE BUSINESS

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance and indeed trepidation that I would ever want to interrupt the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) in full flight, because I know that he does tend to leave people spellbound when he makes speeches, but I would like to pause just for a moment to make a couple of committee announcements for this evening. I felt that, being this evening, it was important enough to get on my feet, even at the risk of interrupting my colleague, to make this announcement.

I would like to announce that the Industrials Relations Committee will sit this evening at 8 p.m. to consider Bills 31, 57 and 80. I believe that is in room 255. By leave, I would announce that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will sit

tomorrow afternoon at 3 p.m. to consider Bills 98 and 92.

I thank my honourable colleague and all Honourable Members, and the remaining questions is whether there is leave for that committee to sit tomorrow afternoon. Oh, and that would be in room 254, Mr. Speaker, to continue the Public Utilities and Natural Resources. The one for the Public Utilities and the Natural Resources Committee would, of necessity, be by leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would there be leave? Leave agreed to. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat hesitant to agree to the leave unless the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) can assure us that he has negotiated that with the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock), for the leave.

**Mr. McCrae:** I can tell the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that the request comes as a result of consultation with his House Leader and with the House Leader for the New Democratic Party (Mr. Ashton).

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave? Agreed.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed, as I am sure some Members are amazed, at the wondrous things this House can do. We can move time literally from 20 to five to six o'clock should we so desire, or indeed set it back. If there is any general disposition by Honourable Members that we ought now to do something like that, I am more than prepared to relinquish those penetrating remarks, those comprehensive outlines of what I had all intended to do with this special conservation fund and leave it for another day. I will perhaps allow for some additional committee changes to be made and then once again we will experience the power of the elected people in advancing this time forward to six o'clock.

## COMMITTEE CHANGES

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), with a committee change.

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations for the Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., session be amended as follows: Derkach for Pankratz, Connerly for Helwer, and Downey for Enns.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is that agreed? Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please.

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, it appears that I am going to be required to speak on something. Harry still has time? Do you still have time?

---

**Tuesday, March 13, 1990**

---

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Yes.

**Mr. Angus:** Well, we have to make a committee change, Mr. Speaker, and we just need a couple of minutes to organize our slate. So take the cigarette out of your—

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. Will the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) carry on with his remarks for a few more minutes?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Speaker, by overwhelming popular request I will carry on with a few more of these examples.

I was about to say before my House Leader interrupted me, I was about to tell you the story of the elk in the Duck Mountains and in the Swan River region generally. Although they are a blessed part of our natural resources and we are encouraged with their growing numbers in the Province of Manitoba, but particularly in areas where they are adjacent to lands upon which there is absolutely no hunting allowed such as the Riding Mountain National Park, they do present a problem when they come out in ever increasing numbers and help themselves to the farmers' alfalfa fields or grain fields and so forth. Those farmers in that area have dealt with this problem for a number of years. The problem is increasing as the elk herds increase.

Again, this special conservation fund, without employing the heavy arm of Government or without waiting for bureaucracy to have to intervene, they were able to access this fund for some special measures to help the elk depredation in that area. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### **COMMITTEE CHANGE**

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Inkster, with a committee change.

\* (1650)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, with a committee change, I move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) for Inkster.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is that agreed? Agreed.

### **HOUSE BUSINESS**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** I am in favour of course of calling it six o'clock at the appropriate moment. My concern at this point is that my honourable colleague from Thompson was not able to hear my announcement and may indeed have wished to have made committee changes to accommodate his Party's Members for the purposes of the committees that have been set. I would want to put on the record my willingness to allow through other means the Honourable Member to make a committee substitution.

Now, the Clerk of the House may well be in a position to advise on just how that substitution might be carried out in a committee, but since the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) cannot hear my voice just at this moment, I felt that should be put on the record that for my part I would not see any need to raise any technical objections, in fact would grant leave to the Honourable Member's Party to make committee changes, certainly for this evening's meeting, should that be necessary for the Honourable Member this evening.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader):** To accommodate both the Member for Thompson and the Government, we are quite prepared to offer the same willingness to grant leave for tonight's committee sitting.

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, it is agreeable as long as there is leave this evening to make whatever substitutions are necessary.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank all Honourable Members.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).