

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 25, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a ministerial statement. I would like to inform the House that this morning I announced the signing of a Joint Venture Agreement between Manitoba Housing and Ladco Company Ltd.

Our agreement is to jointly develop 476 acres of land into some 1,900 residential building lots over the next 10 to 15 years. The land is south of Bishop Grandin Blvd., just east of St. Anne's Road and the Seine River. Manitoba Housing and Ladco own adjacent lands there, and we have agreed to join our parcels into a large subdivision, thereby allowing the most efficient community planning.

Both parties will share in development costs, according to the amount of land each owns. Profits will also be shared, with the province expecting to net close to \$10 million. That is money that will be used to support housing programs for all Manitobans.

We look forward to a very exciting year ahead as the development work gets under way, and we look forward to the first lots coming onto the market in the fall of 1990.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time table a copy of the agreement.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, about six or seven months ago, we had a management consultant's report. One of the recommendations that they had considered or had made was the divestiture of our land banks. We look forward to finding out what the actual policy of this Government is on the divestiture of the land—(Interjection)—well, no, I am afraid it is more than that. We would like to know in terms of how much of the divestiture they are looking at. Are they looking at divesting of all the MHRC lands and so forth? At this time, I believe we should be having a copy of the deal to see what type of things we have given away.

\* (1335)

Another question would be, has the city been consulted on this matter? I anxiously look forward to reading what information the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) will be supplying myself and look forward to asking some questions pertaining to the divestiture of this land, and would like to see some type of policy direction taken by this Government in terms of the long-term effects of the divestiture of the land-banking system.

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** I am afraid I cannot be as congratulatory on the announcement as was the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) because this announcement does, in fact, give rise to some very serious questions and some very serious concerns on the part of the New Democratic Party Opposition, Mr. Speaker. We will be asking those questions today and in days to come as to the actual cost of this project to the Province of Manitoba, as to the risk which the Minister has put—

**Mr. Ducharme:** I will be glad to.

**Mr. Cowan:** The Minister says he will be glad to answer questions and he will have that opportunity. We will see if he is as glad after he has to give the answers, Mr. Speaker.

We will be asking questions about the cost, about the risk. We will be asking questions as to why this Government has chosen a route of privatization in this area, when there are some very crying needs in the Inner City. There are some very crying needs in northern and rural areas for housing that should be dealt with by this Government before it goes about setting up lots of this nature, and entering into agreements of this nature that will not bring benefit to those most in need.

Those are the types of questions which have been given rise by this announcement. Those are the types of questions we will pursue and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we will be advocating on behalf of those families who are most in need, who need public housing, who need help, who do not need this type of privatization that will do them no service at a time when we know that the housing market in Manitoba is in a slump since this Government took office.

We know that housing prices are going down instead of up. Now we have a glut on the market being created because this Government has an ideological bent that ignores all the realities of the day, and ignores those realities which they themselves have caused because of inappropriate housing programs and policies, and also ignores the very pressing needs of Manitobans who require housing to meet their own personal needs and need the help of a caring and compassionate Government, not a Government that cares only about privatization and their friends.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### BILL NO. 2—THE LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 2, The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le louage d'immeubles.

**MOTION presented.**

\* (1340)

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, if I could be given a couple of minutes, in September of 1985, a committee was struck to look at and improve The Residential Rent Regulations Act and The Landlord and Tenant Act. In February of 1987, after hundreds of hours of work, the review committee made some 139 recommendations. I believe that this report has to be acted upon and taken off the shelf. For this reason, I will be putting forward a Bill that will address the largest number of complaints brought forward to the Rentalsman's office. I look forward to all Parties supporting this amendment. Thank you.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

### **BILL NO. 17—THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 17, The Employment Standards Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les normes d'emploi.

**MOTION presented.**

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, as is permitted under our rules, I would like to provide a brief explanation to Members. Last year I introduced a Bill on behalf of the NDP Caucus which pointed to the need for greater protection for laid-off workers, workers affected by major layoffs and plant closures.

I pointed out at the time that there was a worsening economic situation in Manitoba and I point to the fact that has since been proven over the last several months where we now find that here in Winnipeg, for example, we have very close to the same rate of unemployment as St. John's, Newfoundland. I pointed out at the time, as well, that there will be need for this type of legislation because of the impact of free trade.

In the first few months that we have had free trade, Mr. Speaker, we have had continuing layoffs, major layoffs and plant closures, including right here in Manitoba.

This Bill will provide for extended layoff notice. It will provide for severance pay in statute for the first time. This Bill will provide for job search leave and an opportunity for the employees to buy the plant. It is part of the NDP's commitment to raise issues of concern to workingmen and women and their families, and I would hope that in this Session of the Legislature, unlike the last one, both the Tories and the Liberals who both opposed this Bill last time will recognize that it is needed for workers in Manitoba, needed as soon as possible.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Ashton:** What about you guys, why do you not support it?

**An Honourable Member:** They do not care about workers.

**Mr. Ashton:** You guys are the same as they are on this Bill.

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

**An Honourable Member:** I think you have got a little squabble in the family, who is going to be the head of the household.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to the start of oral questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have from the Country View School—I would like to apologize.

### **BILL NO. 18—THE OZONE LAYER PROTECTION ACT**

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 18, The Ozone Layer Protection Act; Loi sur la protection de la couche d'ozone.

**MOTION presented.**

**Mr. Harapiak:** Mr. Speaker, as allowed by the rules, I would like to make a few comments about this Bill.

A few years ago, the Brundtland Commission had set out a goal for reduction of CFC use. But since that time, there is information that has come forward from the scientific community which shows that the depletion of the ozone layer has been much greater than what they first suspected. So it is now necessary to eliminate the use of CFCs.

The Ontario Government, had last year passed a Bill in their House which eliminates the use of CFCs, and I think that we have to start looking beyond our own community and being concerned about what we can do. It is a global issue but each one of us can do something about the reduction of the use of CFCs. I believe that Governments of all levels must put research dollars in place which would put dollars towards researching material that can be used to replace CFCs, so I would urge all Members of the House to support this because I think it is an issue that faces not only us as Manitobans and Canadians but the entire world. I would urge all Members of the House to support this Bill.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

\* (1345)

### **INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to oral questions, may I direct the Honourable Members' attention to the public gallery where we have from the Country View School seventeen students from Grades 6 to 9 under the direction of Brian Reimer. This school is located in the constituency

of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz).

We also have in the gallery from the R. D. Parker Collegiate twenty-two Grades 10 and 11 students under the direction of Linda Bass. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Also with us this afternoon in the gallery we have from the Baldur School and exchange students from Quebec, fifty Grades 10, 11 and 12 students under the direction Mrs. Anne Hanks. This school is located in the constituency of the Speaker.

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

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### CSIS Agreement Records Security

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). It is the Minister's job to protect Manitobans' privacy, particularly in information which he authorizes to leave this province but, Mr. Speaker, in the past he has said no, we can provide that information to CSIS, we have trust in CSIS.

The committee responsible for reviewing CSIS does not have the same level of confidence in their activities. They say in their annual report that CSIS cannot fully account for where information gathered is going, information gathered under an already weak agreement signed by this Minister.

Given this direct indictment by the Security Intelligence Review Committee on the activities of CSIS, will this Minister stand up to his federal cousins and suspend this agreement until he has guarantees that CSIS can account for where the information goes?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** It is easy to tell, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) is picking up where she left off last Session and really has nothing new to raise in this House at this time.

The fact is, the Leader of the Opposition is the person who refuses to stand up and protect the safety of Manitobans and Canadians from the activities of terrorists and others who would do harm to our national security.

### Renegotiation

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** What a blatant example of an unwillingness to stand up for the privacy rights of Manitobans. The annual report says CSIS needs to be more attentive, in general, to keeping records of its activities for the sake of its own monitoring as well as ours. We wish to see a specific policy with guidelines and auditing procedures developed for the release of any information on a Canadian citizen. Why is this Minister unwilling to renegotiate a bad agreement?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** The agreement is a good agreement. The agreement is there to protect the interests and the privacy of Manitobans. Why would I want to open up a good agreement? The answer is, I would not want to open up a good agreement and make changes to it.

### Records Security

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** They speak about being open and accountable. CSIS, by its own monitoring procedure, says it is not accountable. It is not accountable to anybody. Will this Minister undertake to contact the Solicitor General and request a full and complete report to this Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) as to exactly how information will be handled when it is received from Manitoba?

\* (1350)

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** We are monitoring the requests coming through to our Government from the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. There has been no indication there is any need for me to be in contact with my federal colleague.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) says I should stand up to the federal Government on this issue. I am quite prepared to stand up to the federal Government on issues where people's protection is at stake. Exactly what we did was to sign an agreement to protect the privacy and to protect the rights of Manitobans.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** With shades of Rafferty-Alameda, do not believe it until it hits you flat in the face.

### Manitoba Data Services Divestiture

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** With a new question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the Minister of Finance has indicated they are contemplating the possible sale of Manitoba Data Services. Can the Minister inform us today if he has received offers or are they prepared to receive offers as of this day on MDS?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, let me say for the record as I have previously, the Province of Manitoba has received an unsolicited offer of purchase for MDS. It is one of the reasons why the Government made the policy decision to consider the possible divestiture, possible divestiture, and I say that twice, of MDS.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Obviously everything is up for sale in the Province of Manitoba if all it takes is an offer.

### Confidentiality Guidelines

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** My supplementary question to the Minister of Finance

(Mr. Manness), in light of the fact that they have received an offer, will this Minister today table guidelines on confidentiality that must be met by any prospective purchaser of MDS?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** I will not table those guidelines today. As I indicated in Question Period the other day, those guidelines are being developed. Indeed they will be fully made public when they are fully developed.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** With a final supplementary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), will he assure this House that those guidelines will be tabled in this House prior to the signature upon any Memorandum of Understanding or agreement on the sale for MDS?

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, this is an open Government.—(Interjection)— Obviously, Members of the Opposition agree with that statement. Those are preconditions of sale which will be made public to the shareholders, i.e., the taxpayers who own MDS. It is their right to know what the conditions of sale are.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Before you sell it?

**Mr. Manness:** Of course.

### Health Care Funding

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** We have said consistently that the health care system is in a state of administrative chaos. We have situations where we have a combination of protests outside of this building, contrary to the predictions of partnership in the health care system, and another situation where administrators across the province are afraid to deal with many of the health care decisions because they do not know the direction and the decisions of this Government.

My question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). Can he please tell us today when or if we can have a final decision on the approval for Klinik, the Health Action Centre, Concordia Hospital, Grace Hospital, the Municipal Hospitals, the northern facilities and the funding decisions that are awaiting some kind of leadership in the form of this Government, in terms of the health care system that affects every Manitoban in this province?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, the Member knows full well that we are fully committed to providing the best possible health care system that this province can afford. We did so last year with the Budget increase of over 9 percent in our health care expenditures. We will continue to provide the innovative and the complete and thorough responses to the the health care needs of Manitobans as long as we are in Government, and that will be for many, many years to come.

The Member knows full well that information such as he has requested is provided when the capital program of MHSC and the Department of Health are

tabled in this House. When that happens, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) will be fully prepared to answer all of his questions about the capital programs and the budgetary commitments that we will be making to the many facilities that require expansion, adjustment and improvements, new construction, all those things that were neglected during the NDP term in Government, because they did not tell the people of Manitoba that they had frozen all capital construction in this province for almost a year before they were defeated. As a result, all the many requirements that he named are begging for attention, begging for assistance, begging for capital improvements, and we will get around to it as soon as we are able to and in a very prepared manner and in a very logical sequence of events that will be presented as part of the budgetary process of this province.

\* (1355)

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, we have a state of administrative chaos in the health care system, and this Premier (Mr. Filmon) is neglecting it. I will table a document today in this Chamber, and it is dealing with the budget of the Health Sciences Centre. It is not the 9 percent that was in the former NDP budget on health care. It says on the top of the document a distribution of any adequate available funds for the '89-90 year. It illustrates an \$8 million shortfall in the health care facility, and that is just one of hundreds of examples in the health care system where your indecisive Government is killing our health care system in terms of the people of Manitoba.

My question to the Premier is, when are we going to get the decisions out of this Government on all the programs that I have outlined, and when are we going to get decisions on the funding for our health care facilities that are labelled as inadequate for the 1989-90 year with this Government below the rate of inflation, below the rate of patient care, below the rate of standards for Manitobans? When are we going to get decisions from this Government?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) was so excited with his rhetoric that he forgot to ask the question. I am glad that he finally has a question there, but I will remind him that throughout the term of the NDP Government, the six-and-a-half years of chaos and hardship in this province, not only did virtually every major hospital in this city, in this province run up a deficit year after year after year, but after many, many years of deficits they came up with a brilliant plan that they would no longer fund deficits. So they forced hospitals to make all sorts of decisions to try and cut back because they refused absolutely to cover any deficits.

We will continue to operate in good faith, working with all of our health care providers who are very dedicated in this province—hospitals that are doing an excellent job in caring for people. Mr. Speaker, I have had some personal experience with those hospitals. I know of the care and the love and the attention that people get when they go into institutions like the Health Sciences Centre in Winnipeg. We will continue to provide for their needs, and all of that information, as I said in response to his first question, will be provided as part of the budgetary process when the Estimates of Expenditure are tabled in this House.

### Health Minister Accountability

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is not holding his Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) accountable. The Premier has allowed the Minister of Health eight months to establish a Health Advisory Task Force that he promised to the people of Manitoba. The Minister of Health has promised to deliver on those decisions that Manitobans have been awaiting for months within four to six months. We still have not received the decisions of that Health Advisory Task Force. Many facilities, many programs, many health care administrators, many health care professionals are awaiting the decisions. I ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon), when is he going to hold the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) accountable in his Government and come through with the needed decisions in our health care system, as is his responsibility in charge of this Government?

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

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

\* (1400)

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I assume, since unlimited preambles are allowed on second and third questions in the House, that I will have unlimited time to answer that question. The fact of the matter is that this Government is held accountable every day that it is in office. This Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is held accountable every day that we are in office and every day that he is here. If the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) is afraid to ask the question of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and has to try and make some grandstanding by asking the question of the Premier on health care, I will tell him that we stand by all of the initiatives that we take, all of the decisions we take, and we will be accountable to the people of Manitoba. They will not be very impressed with his rhetoric after six-and-a-half years of doing nothing.

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, in six-and-a-half years, we did not have 500 nurses out front of this building talking about the lack of partnership in the health care system.

### Health Advisory Network Concordia Hospital

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** My final question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in his capacity as leading this Government, Mr. Orchard on September 29 stated that the Health Advisory Network would report in six months dealing with the Concordia Hospital. Why has it taken almost 10 months, and when can we finally expect some decisions on all the health care initiatives that have been promised by this Government to have decisions long ago?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** We are back to the same question he asked in question one, and I repeat to him

that when the Estimates of Expenditure are tabled in this House it will have with it a capital budget for the construction plans of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. He can then ask his questions of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), as he should properly do.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

### Children's Hospital Staff Shortages

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). The Throne Speech indicated that the Health Sciences Centre will be upgraded to become the world's leading surgical educational services centre. The Children's Hospital is a part of this supposed to be world's best centre and that hospital is losing seven specialists in various categories. They are in oncology, nephrology, orthopedic surgery, pediatric surgery, neurology and respirology. Can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us what will be the impact of the loss of these professionals on the care of the children of Manitoba?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate receiving questions on the Department of Health and not the inability to pose questions that the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Doer) has demonstrated here today.

In the pediatric sub-specialist in training, there is a North American as well as a Canadian shortage of trained specialists. In Winnipeg at the Children's Hospital, we have some of the finest individuals in those pediatric sub-specialists, such fine individuals that a number of the seven who he has alluded to have assumed head of department status in other provinces and other institutions, a record of excellence that we have developed in Manitoba. In their professional career paths, a number of them have chosen—and it is not a monetary reason in a number of these instances. It is an advancement of their careers, to head oncology for instance in Saskatoon, to head other departments in Toronto. One of those specialists even decided to change careers completely and is now an MP for North Winnipeg.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister has failed to understand the question. There are seven people who are leaving and we are still short, the psychiatrists are short, the pediatricians will be short, and the training program is already under survey in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, my question is, can the Minister of Health tell us what steps he has taken to correct the academic brain drain from Manitoba?

**Mr. Orchard:** You know, Mr. Speaker, I cannot force a sub-specialist who is very, very competent in their discipline from accepting a promotion to their professional career out of province, particularly when in a number of instances it was not monetary drive that caused them to make that decision, it was an advancement to their career.

Now, Mr. Speaker, throughout North America we are going to experience, in the sub-specialties of pediatric

medicine, raiding by other provinces and indeed by institutions in the United States. My honourable friend has indicated where seven specialists have been enticed out of the province, but he fails to also at the same time indicate that at St. Boniface we have enticed to Manitoba from Ottawa a Head of Pediatrics who is going to be dearly missed in Ottawa.

That is an ebb and flow of professional expertise which happens to be in short supply. We will make our recruitment efforts successful, as we have in the past. I cannot stand in the way, although I regret the loss to Manitoba of those specialists who are very expertised, but when they have the opportunity to advance their careers and become heads of departments in other institutions in other provinces, surely my honourable friend is not saying we should prevent them from doing that.

### Health Care Education

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). We have a general decline in the training of specialties in Manitoba. The number of post-graduate training has decreased by 20 percent for the last two years. What step has this Minister taken for the last one year to correct this error of erosion in the health care education system of Manitoba? Does he know what is happening?

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

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education):** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the Member does not know that the education of post-secondary people, especially at the universities, is largely in the hands of an autonomous body at each of the universities, and certainly they determine the course and the kinds of programs that are going to be provided at the universities.

That does not say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not participate in a lot of dialogue with the universities through the Universities Grants Commission. I think an example of the support of this Government toward university education was made when we announced the university funding for this year, and that level of funding has surpassed the last several years of funding to the universities at a level of 7 percent.

### Winnserv Inc. Staffing

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services):** Yesterday I took as notice a question by the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) respecting adjustments to the Department of Family Services' universal base funding to community residences serving mentally handicapped adults. During the last quarter of 1988-89, the universal base operating rate was adjusted to reflect requirements of the labour regulations and to provide a 4 percent price increase on operational expenses. These rate adjustments were provided retroactively to

April 1, 1988, and resulted in an increase to 90 percent of all the residences, which amounted to \$1.2 million across the community residences. It resolved the critical financial position of many of those residences. Some of them, a few of them, incurred a loss because of this, because they had incurred surpluses over a period of time.

Winnserv was not one of those that had had a surplus. It was not affected by this. It did not receive a decrease; in fact, it received an increase. We did not reduce staff or staff ratios at Winnserv.

Now, the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) was referring to a letter to me from the organization, Winnserv organization, which has 12 community residences and I would like to note that all the 12 residences run by Winnserv received rate increases under this new basic operational rate which amounted to \$149,000.00.

I would also note that additional care and support was given to them as well, and my staff continued to negotiate with that organization. They have some difficulties, and my staff continued to negotiate with them to overcome their difficulties and have them operate as other institutions do. We are still remaining . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for Ellice.

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and we thank the Minister of Family Services for her answer. In fact, the communication with Winnserv was so good, that is why they felt it necessary to come to the Liberal Party and raise their concerns because they were not getting any answers from the Minister.

The previous NDP Government created an administrative nightmare in Winnipeg region when they totally dismantled the Health and Community Services region. I find his questions on administrative chaos very interesting. There is a chaos and a reduction in services to the community, and we had a campaign promise from this now Tory Government to rectify this intolerable situation, to restore services to the public and to eventually save taxpayers money.

\* (1410)

### Health Care Administration

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** My question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). The Minister has had over one year to rectify this situation, to restore organization to Winnipeg region. Why has the Minister not accomplished this task?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I respond to this question about administrative chaos in the Winnipeg region because my honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Doer), is very flippant in his comments about administrative chaos in the Department of Health.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in Winnipeg region I asked his Opposition critic two-and-a-half years ago of the then Minister of Health as to why he was amalgamating Winnipeg region into—or he was divesting it into three regions. The then Minister, because of administrative chaos, did not even know that process was going on.

Now, I tell you that we have inherited the three regions. We have a number of grievances filed by staff which were affected through red circling and other unilateral decisions by that divestiture of the Winnipeg region into three separate regions.

We have been working very carefully with the Department of Community Services, now Family Services, in terms of bringing together an administrative structure which will be effective in terms of providing quality service delivery in Winnipeg. The process is nearing completion. It took 12 months to do adequate discussion with staff to make sure the right corrective procedures were put in place, and I think that my honourable friend will be pleased with the solution.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Ellice, with a supplementary question.

**Ms. Gray:** Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the same Minister, the Minister has indicated that, in fact, there are grievances filed by 50 percent of the managers in Winnipeg region, not because of reclassification but because of a review which was ordered by his administration. Over 50 percent of the managers have filed grievances.

Can the Minister indicate to us—he has done the impossible. No one thought it possible that what the NDP did could actually become worse in Winnipeg region which services over half the population in Manitoba.—(Interjection)— You have achieved the impossible. The situation has festered, it is worse. We have total chaos, total inaction.

My question to the Minister is, can he indicate to us what leadership he has provided with the Department of Health to rectify this situation, because clients are not receiving service because of his lack of leadership?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There is a question there. The Honourable Minister of Health.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Speaker, now we have got the ultimate. We have got really the ultimate. The chaos that was created by the NDP two-and-a-half years ago is now alleged to be worse today than it was a year ago. That is absolutely false, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely false because that Member has no longer been part of the management team for the past year.

**Ms. Gray:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) on a point of order.

**Ms. Gray:** I take exception to the Minister's comments. I would be very glad to have a review of all the staff who worked for me when I worked for the Department

of Health and Community Services as to the type of manager that I—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) with a final supplementary.

### Services Delivery

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** A supplementary to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), can the Minister indicate to us what specific steps he is taking to put Winnipeg regions back into order so that we have effective service delivery and we do not have a waste and squandering of money? What is the Minister of Health doing in this regard?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I can provide those details to my honourable friend.

### Ladco Land Development Deal Cost Factor

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** My question is to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) and follows upon his announcement earlier today. Can the Minister indicate how much money the provincial Government is going to invest in this project over the course of the lifetime of the project, how much the province intends or anticipates a return on that investment, and how long it will take before the return on the investment starts to create surplus revenues for the province based on their initial investment?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** It is funny, Mr. Speaker. The critic, first of all, if he looks through the agreement he will see that the province over the first five or six years gets the multiple of money to recover its costs. That cost had been accumulating over those years. The maximum amount the province will have to guarantee at any one time will be \$2 million. The reason for that is, as anybody who knows anything about the development business will know that development goes in phases. As each phase accumulates and as the expenses occur and as we receive profits, then you pay for the next phase.

Our anticipated amount of profit in this particular venture over the next 10 to 15 years, depending on marketability, would be approximately \$9.7 million in net and probably around \$13 million to \$14 million in gross. The real problem is that if he looks at it, the present market value of this particular piece of land is \$3.5 million if we sold it today. So unlike the previous Government, we decided we would not sit on this land. We decided we will make some profits and put it back in the coffers of the taxpayers.

**Mr. Cowan:** Mr. Speaker, whether or not this project will make profits remains yet to be seen.

## Housing Market Declining Demand

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** I would ask the Minister if he can reconcile the statement in the Peat Marwick Report which was done in the Department of Housing, which says that the overall housing market for the next little while will remain essentially flat and I quote, "essentially flat if not declining overall demand for new housing in Manitoba." Why is the Government going into a project of this nature at a time when his own consultants are telling him there is a flat if not declining demand, when he could be taking that money and investing it in infill housing, investing it in public sector housing, investing it in northern housing, investing it in social projects that would benefit those most in need, rather than investing it in a commercial activity of this sort when there is no need?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, it is ludicrous for the individual from Churchill to get up and say after all these years in the House, that particular New Democratic Party has always been complaining about developers making profits. Now he says, will there be a profit? Which side is he coming from? I cannot understand it.

He also mentions the Peat Marwick Report. If he reads that report, it does make an exception to this part of the land bank. It says of all your lands you are going to get rid of or you are going to put on the market over a period of the next several years, they made an exception to this piece of property. That is exactly what we have done. We started this procedure long before the Peat Marwick Report, and our procedure was also recommended by that particular Peat Marwick Report.

**Mr. Cowan:** If the Minister would read the full quote from the Peat Marwick Report on this property and I will do that, he would understand that they have failed to live up to the recommendations of the Peat Marwick Report. They have sold out the province on this particular giveaway, Mr. Speaker.

What the report says: "The major exceptions to this general divestiture thrust would be MHRC land holdings in south St. Boniface, central St. Boniface and Winnipeg core area. In these cases, significant opportunities exist for the department to develop public-private sector partnerships to advance the twin goals of increased access to affordable housing in urban and neighbourhood revitalization." We see nothing in this agreement, nothing in this contract except for one very vague statement. That second goal which is—

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

\* (1420)

## Housing Programs Initiatives

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the Honourable Member kindly put his question now?

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** Where in this contract, which is the guiding framework for this deal, is there

any mention of the second goal of secure treatment of those individuals who need housing, the second goal of affordable housing for those who are in need? Mr. Speaker, if you read through the document, you will find that nowhere in the document is there any guarantee that will be followed. I am asking the Minister if there is a side agreement, if there is any other sort of agreement that would identify that second goal, which is so sorely missing from their negotiation?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden the province has gone into a joint arrangement with the private developers, which was recommended in the Peat Marwick study. It also said to dispose of surplus land. How come all of a sudden is it a shame to now put that money back into the taxpayers' pockets, unlike the previous administration who sat on this land and missed the peak period of the market situation, who did not have the credibility to do so and they failed to meet that?

To the Member on the other side of the House for Churchill, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference between us going into a joint venture with a developer to make money than them to be or ourselves being in the liquor business? I cannot believe you people.

## Drought Assistance Federal Funding

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** I think it is clear even to a casual observer that communication and cooperation has broken down between the federal Government and this unholy alliance between the Tories and the socialists that is now trying to operate this province. Mr. Speaker, that is unfortunate, but it is criminal when you have a situation where there are victims and the victims of that are the farmers of western Canada.

My question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). When Charlie Mayer was politicking before the federal election, he indicated there would be \$850 million made available for a disaster fund. The leaky Budget which just came out of Ottawa recently said there was \$425 million.

My question is to the Minister of Agriculture: who is going to pick up that difference? Is Manitoba going to be sucked into that or are the farmers the ones who are going to have to suffer?

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

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

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, on November 10 of 1988, the federal Government simultaneously made the announcement in four different provinces that \$850 million would be made available for a Canadian Crop Drought Assistance Program. Since then their Budget has come out and, as the Member has noted on the particular line, \$425 million has been announced. How the federal Government plans to fund the rest of that announcement is up to them, and all provinces are



expecting them to fulfill their commitment of \$850 million to the drought-stressed farmers of western Canada, particularly those in Manitoba.

### Provincial Contribution

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry, with a supplementary question.

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** My question still stands, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister telling us that the Province of Manitoba is going to stick with its conviction and not provide that shortfall? In addition to that, can he confirm today that farmers can still expect to get the \$40 or \$45 an acre that was announced by Charlie Mayer?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of elements of discussion between the federal Government and the provinces and between the different provinces. We have been of the opinion that we need an adequate program in place to deal with future droughts, and on that basis we want an improved crop insurance program. We are prepared to help fund that crop insurance program in terms of helping farmers pay premiums but we are unable at this time to help to pay the drought payment program that the federal Government announced for 1988.

### Interlake Compensation

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Laurie Evans), with a final supplementary question.

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the Minister's stand on taking a tough stand with Ottawa on this. I think it is critical that Ottawa be forced to come up with the bucks that they say they are going to provide. My supplementary to the same Minister is, what is happening to the compensation to the farmers in the Interlake? It is almost five years now and every Tory in this province has promised compensation. Is somebody going to provide it eventually?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion between the farmers of the Interlake involving Keystone Agricultural Producers with us, with the federal Government. That agreement is in place. We are waiting for the federal signature on the agreement to forward it to us.

It is in that position of we are waiting for the federal Government to forward the signed agreement to us at this time, and I can tell the Member that the previous Government chose not to act on it. That is why there was the delay of the first four years. We have been acting on it and have the agreement in place. We are prepared to fulfill our part of that agreement.

### Manitoba HydroBonds Status Report

**Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa):** My question is to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). Mr. Speaker, there has been a tremendous amount of interest in my constituency and I believe in all of Manitoba in the new HydroBonds.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Could the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) give us a status report on this new initiative?

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

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

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am delighted with the question. I can tell that Members of the House are as delighted with the question as I am. Manitobans have rushed to demonstrate their pride within their province, indeed the confidence within their Government, by purchasing \$80 million as of Tuesday. That was three business days after the announcement was made. It is obvious that Manitobans today want an opportunity to invest within their province when it is well managed.

### Fort Garry Casino Gaming/Security System

**Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan):** My question is for the Minister responsible for Manitoba Lotteries Foundation (Mrs. Mitchelson), and concerns the establishment of a year-round casino to be run out of the Fort Garry Hotel in Winnipeg. Supposedly this is to increase revenues for the Lotteries Foundation and to increase the amount of money that is going to the organizations that it funds by making the casino a major tourist attraction.

Can the Minister tell the House what type of a gaming and security system the new casino at the Fort Garry Hotel will have and what criteria and investigation was done to make that decision?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act):** I will be pleased to answer that question for the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) and, unlike the Liberals who have been on both sides of the casino issue, I know that the questions that are being asked right now are questions that warrant clear answers.

Mr. Speaker, the very best of security systems will be put in place at the casino at the Fort Garry Hotel because we want to assure that those who are visiting our province to play at the casino, those who are coming from outside of Winnipeg and those from within Winnipeg who are going to be going to the casino at the Fort Garry Hotel will have the assurance that security will be in place for them.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired. Order, please; order, please.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**  
**THRONE SPEECH DEBATE**

**Mr. Speaker:** On the adjourned debate of the Throne Speech, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), the amendment thereto, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) who has 28 minutes remaining.

\* (1430)

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne delivered by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Johnson), on Thursday, the 18th day of May, was a statement of the way things are today in Manitoba, the way things will be in Manitoba, and this Government's vision of the future of Manitoba for the '90s and beyond. I think it is an excellent summing up of the hopes and the aspirations of the people of this province and represents very well the wishes and the hopes of the people of this province for themselves and for the future performance of this Government for a good long time.

I began my remarks yesterday, Mr. Speaker, by making reference to the reaction of the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) to the initiative referred to in the Speech from the Throne respecting the Keystone Centre in Brandon, the centre of southwestern Manitoba, and the agricultural and economic hub of that area of our province and indeed Manitoba's second city.

I would like to restate my pleasure at that particular announcement and my dismay at the reaction of the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) with respect to that announcement, and her disdain for the City of Brandon and for the surrounding area, for the people of that area in the way that they view their Keystone Centre as a meeting place several times a year for several very important functions. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) can do a lot better than she has done and should reverse her stand on funding for the Keystone Centre and throw her support behind all of those people who are involved in their communities in the Brandon area.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in speaking today also as Manitoba's first Minister of Justice. It was quite an honour for me and a great pleasure indeed to have been in Brandon, Manitoba, and welcomed the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Johnson) and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of Manitoba for the swearing-in ceremony at the newly opened regional Cabinet office in the City of Brandon. I think people in the area think it is entirely fitting that the Minister of Justice should be sworn in at that location.

I should like also to thank the staff of the Clerk of the Executive Council and his assistant for the assistance provided that particular day.

While I am on the subject of justice and justice issues, I think these few moments that I have available afford me the opportunity to do a review of some of the things

that have been done in the Department of Justice over the past year or so that we have been the Government of Manitoba. Taken in the context of the election commitments made by the Government during the 1988 election campaign, I think when I am finished only a partial list of some of the achievements of the very fine people in the Department of Justice led by the Government of Manitoba, I think you, Sir, will agree that in the space of one year the achievements in that department are little short of fantastic, considering the time that we have had in which to do the things that we have.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that as the Government of Manitoba, the present Government, came into office, we were in the throes of an unfortunate situation which developed in the justice system relating to ticket fixing sometimes referred to as the Ticketgate affair.

Shortly, one month or so after my appointment as Attorney General, the Dewar Review was commissioned. Former Chief Justice Archie Dewar kindly agreed to assist the Government of Manitoba in reviewing the whole Ticketgate matter. The fact that we were able to secure the services of former Chief Justice Dewar was a message to everyone that this Government was serious about putting behind us, once and for all, the Ticketgate affair and finding out what happened, why it happened, what can be done to ensure that it will not happen again. The fact that Mr. Dewar accepted the job lent great credibility not only to himself and to the exercise upon which he was embarking, but also credibility on the Government for having chosen Mr. Dewar to do that task for us.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when we came to office, delays at the Land Titles Office for registering titles and mortgages, certainly for titles, was 43 days, a totally unacceptable situation, a situation we addressed on the 24th of June of 1988, where we announced that we would be taking steps to cut the backlogs in half or the delays at the Land Titles Office in half. As you know, through last summer and into the fall, we made great progress to the point where now we have far less than half the waiting time that we were facing at that time. It was a matter of having the will to put the resources into areas where we knew we could achieve some results. Resources were made available through the good graces of the Government and my colleagues and the Government of Manitoba. The problem at the Land Titles Office was brought under control. Work continues to bring that waiting period down to even more acceptable levels. Indeed, great progress has been made.

During the Session last year, you will recall that the Access Assistance Program was debated, passed, with the help and support of Honourable Members opposite and put into practice earlier this year—the Access Assistance Program. The Access Assistance Program is one step which follows upon the Maintenance Enforcement Program brought in by the previous Conservative administration in this province. Now with the expansion of the Unified Family Court in the province, throughout the province and beyond the City of Winnipeg, we have rounded out our Family Court Services to the point where we have the best Family

Court system in the whole country and that is something we can be exceedingly proud of. Families and children in this province will benefit from that. I think that is another step in the right direction.

You will recall also that during the 1988 election campaign, the previous Government passed an Order-in-Council appointing a judicial inquiry, a Commission of Inquiry into Native Justice issues in Manitoba. This Government took that initiative and went with it, continued with the initiative, beefed up funding for the Commission of Inquiry, provided funding for Native groups to prepare presentations for the inquiry. We fully expect that inquiry will complete its work and that Native Manitobans and all Manitobans will ultimately benefit in the future from a better and improved justice system for all of us.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that there were moves made previous to the 1988 election to make changes to the Independent Law Reform Commission of Manitoba, changes which were not greeted with enthusiasm or support. It was felt by many, many Manitobans that the independence of the Law Reform Commission was vital so that we could be assisted now and in the future to keep our laws in Manitoba up to date with changing times, and also to be there as a resource to assist Governments in the future and now to ensure that we have a body of law in our province which is second to none in the rest of the country.

On August 5, the Law Reform Commission was reconstituted, an independent Law Reform Commission was reconstituted under the chairmanship of Mr. Cliff Edwards and in this Session, as announced in the Throne Speech, legislation will be forthcoming to ensure the continued existence and the continued independence of the Law Reform Commission of Manitoba.

It was with considerable pride on the 26th of August of 1988, Mr. Speaker, that I was able to announce the appointment of Alex Morton as the first female Registrar General in the province's history. That was a matter that came at a time when the Land Titles Office in Winnipeg was undergoing problems but in the process of solving those problems, and Ms. Morton, I am pleased to say, has played an integral and important part in the continuing resolution of those problems.

\* (1440)

On the 26th of August, also of 1988, Mr. Speaker, the guidelines on sexual assault investigations were released by the Manitoba Police Commission. On the 2nd of September of 1988, we announced that a new remand centre would be built in the City of Winnipeg to replace the facility at the Public Safety Building, a facility which I had the opportunity to tour and others have had opportunities to comment on in the past. Conditions there are such that they are so inhumane and so crowded that the time had come when this announcement had to be made. I am pleased to say today that the matter will be well on the way after the end of June.

On the 2nd of September, our Provincial Court got a new chief judge in the person of Chief Judge Chris

Stefanson. Since that time, Chief Judge Stefanson and myself and others involved in the justice system have been working very hard to make the justice system more responsive to the needs of Manitobans.

Later on, in November, Mr. Justice Dewar, former Chief Justice Dewar, released his report on the ticket-fixing matter and made some recommendations which our Government and our department has been working very hard to act on. We accepted the recommendations as being positive ones and recommendations which, if adopted, would lead to a better criminal justice system in our province.

In that connection, as recently as yesterday, the announcement was made about changes in the Crown office, announcements that had been speculated on for several weeks, but as of yesterday we were able to make it clear what direction we were going in and also to announce that the serious backlog situation in our courts was being addressed in a real way, in such a way that, come July 3, Mr. Speaker, if you—and I am sure this is never going to happen—should become involved with the law and come before the justice system as of July 3, for you there will not be a backlog.

There will still be a backlog though which will be worked on, on a parallel basis, and which we hope to reduce to zero by the end of the year, but as of July 3 when you come before the courts you will be given a speedy trial date, if that is your wish, and you can be given your day in court at an early opportunity.

I am sure Manitobans will appreciate the fact that this Government recognizes the principle that justice delayed is justice denied and so we are doing something about that delay to make sure that we reduce that delay and, once it is reduced to acceptable levels, to keep a backlog from developing again.

In December, it was with great pleasure that I was able to announce with the support of the Government of Manitoba that the Unified Family Court system, the Family Court system in Manitoba, would be expanded beyond the borders of the City of Winnipeg and the Town of Selkirk.

Those people who are involved in the family law system were not only involved in the development of the proposals which led to that announcement, they are and will be involved in the program in the future. I think northern Manitobans, western Manitobans, Manitobans wherever they might happen to live outside the City of Winnipeg and indeed within the City of Winnipeg and the Town of Selkirk will now have available to them a complete range of judicial and mediation services to help resolve disputes, family disputes, so that the children of families will suffer less as a result of marriage problems.

As I said earlier, that combined with the best maintenance enforcement system in the country and now the pilot Access Assistance Program, in effect we can truly say we have the best system of family services in our courts anywhere in this country. That for me is something I am very proud of.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, to help us with the ongoing job of delivering criminal justice services and

also to help us with the job of reducing court backlogs, we were able to announce the appointment of Judge John Guy and Judge Judith Webster to the Provincial Court of Manitoba. In that regard, we have the support of the Manitoba Bar Association. The Law Society of Manitoba was consulted with respect to those appointments and others were consulted as well.

The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) seems to think that his opinion is the only one that counts in this province, but I am here to tell you that Manitobans disagree with him when he takes personal pot shots at newly appointed members to our judiciary in this province, especially members with such backgrounds and qualifications and talents as the ones who were appointed on May 12.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to—not finally because there are a number of matters I have not mentioned because of the shortness of time—but finally we have announced, and we have asked Honourable Members on all sides of the House to come to the aid of Manitobans who are at risk on our highways and our streets in this province. The early indications are that perhaps Honourable Members will come forward and support people's rights to life, liberty and security of the person in this country. There may also be an indication that they wish to come to the support of those whose privileges we would like to remove, those people who are suspected of impaired driving or suspended driving.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we understand what we are weighing here when we are talking about rights and privileges, similar to the issue raised today in Question Period by the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) with regard to the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. The Leader of the Opposition would rather put the convenience of terrorists ahead of the safety of Manitobans and Canadians. I say that is the wrong kind of priority. It is not a new kind of priority for the Liberal Party but it is the priority we have seen over and over again.

Then there are indications they would put the privileges of suspected impaired drivers ahead of the rights of men, women and children in our province to life, liberty and security of the person. That is something that disturbs me as one who is standing up for those rights in this province. When we are comparing rights and privileges and safety matters, I think it behooves Honourable Members to remember who they are supporting and to whose aid they are coming when they take part in debates in this Chamber. I am sure I am wrong in my comments. I am sure everything I have said is totally incorrect and that all Honourable Members will be on the right side of this issue when it comes time to debate the Bill, to put the proposed measures into effect.

So giving myself that assurance, although maybe I should not take too much comfort—I could be wrong. Honourable Members opposite are the only ones who can show me which direction they are going. There again, they are not always quick to take positions. I know in one case the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) did not have an answer. He said I am going to wait and hear what the Minister has to say

before I take a position. It tells me, when an Honourable Member in the Liberal Party says something like that, they are up to a little bit of politics. I see the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) beginning to smile when I talked about politics. The fact is there is a time for politics and there is a time to do what is right.

I ask Honourable Members opposite to remember what is the right thing to do when you are making your pronouncements publicly. Is it the right thing to do to wait and see what the Minister says so that you can disagree? I do not think that is the right thing to do. I think the right thing to do is to search your hearts, to consult constituents, consult others in the larger community, and then ask yourself what is the right thing to do. Then vote with that kind of conscience, with that kind of background, rather than just quickly rushing to find out what a Minister says so that you can disagree with it at the first opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I know Honourable Members opposite have made statements both before and after the Throne Speech about their lack of support for it, but I am saying Honourable Members opposite should search not only their hearts and their consciences but check around this province, check around, ask people, what do you think about the Throne Speech? Do you think there is enough reference there about the things that matter to you? Do you think the Government is headed in the direction you want the Government to go in when it comes to health care, when it comes to education, when it comes to those matters that are important to Manitobans. If Honourable Members opposite learn that consultative process, that process of finding out who they are representing, why they are representing them and finding out what those constituents really want, do they really want just straight politics every day, day in-day out, do they really want to hear threats of elections day in and day out? No. Manitobans want some stability in their day-to-day lives. That is what this Government has been providing to Manitobans.

Honourable Members opposite have their own agenda and they seem to be sticking to it but it is very often hard to tell what it is. You can be sure it is a political agenda. It has more to do with the political future of the Liberal Party than it has to do with what is good for Manitobans and what Manitobans really want to see.

I ask you and all of our colleagues in this House to give this matter some sincere thought, some sincere and statesmanlike thought, and judge accordingly and cast their votes accordingly. I know which way I am going to vote. The Throne Speech is a document that sets out an excellent profile of where we are now and sets out also a vision for the future which I think all Manitobans can support. Thank you.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

\* (1450)

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** I appreciate being able to take part in the Throne Speech debate this afternoon. I want to indicate to the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures (Mr. Albert Driedger), who I

understand is at this point in time outside the Chamber announcing the compensation program for victims of the disastrous fires that have plagued not only the Interlake region but the northwestern region and the northeastern part of the province and a number of municipalities and Local Government Districts in Manitoba, I want to thank him, his colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), and all their staff for the many hours of work that have been undertaken to try and keep in check the kind of volatile situation that the area was in, in the last several weeks.

I can indicate today that our portion of the Interlake where I live is happily enjoying in excess of one inch of rainfall and that at least will put many people at least at greater ease. However, I again, as I did yesterday, would like to pay tribute to all those Manitobans. I spoke about those in the communities yesterday, those many men and women who took time from their jobs, from their livelihoods, to assist in whatever had to be done in providing for those who are fighting fires—some in fighting fires, some in doing the backup work—because it had to be a total community effort.

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

As well, I would like to thank those from outside those communities who have opened their hearts and their wallets in provisions of clothing, of food, of cash donations; and precisely I think the Consumers Bureau who undertook to set up a fund for those fire victims; a group that is always there with a helping hand regardless of where the disaster hits, and that is the Mennonite Central Committee. They are always there assisting people of this world in whatever form of assistance that is needed, whether it is carpentry, whether it is clean-up, whatever the assistance is needed.

I want to pay tribute to those involved in the Central Committee and all Manitobans and Canadians who may have donated in any way to this disaster that will, I am sure, plague many of those who have suffered severely in terms of the loss of their homes, property and the nature around them. That heartache and that trauma will face those people for many months and many years. In fact, probably for those who were active, it is something that one can never forget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Albert Driedger) is announcing the assistance program and he gave me a copy of the press release. I would hope that there be no question that items which would normally not be insurable or covered by insurance as a result of these severe fires would be covered, that there be no question through the Emergency Measures Organization, so that there are no wrangles with the citizens of the area, that those items will be covered.

As well, the agreement or the announcement indicates that private claims are allowed to a maximum of \$30,000.00. That \$30,000 limit was announced some five years ago so there probably are losses that go beyond that today. I would say to the Government and to the Minister that this may be a time, once their

assessment is there, to review that limit because it is five years there now, and five years in terms of inflation alone would look at least at an additional \$10,000 in terms of clear inflation over the five-year period, so that there may need to be some adjustments on that announcement.

I thank the Government for the announcement. I know that the people of the Interlake region, those especially in the communities of Ashern and Moosehorn and Camper and all the way north into the Anama Bay area, into the Lake St. Martin area and in my home area, from Poplarfield to Jackhead, in these communities that were threatened, there were outbuildings that were burnt. There were some homes that the fire came within closer than where I stand from you and the homes were protected. People basically stood their ground to defend the property and the homes of individuals, and I pay tribute to all those volunteers and all those who assisted in fighting those fires to protect the homes and property of citizens of this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now move to areas in which I believe—move from the disaster area to another kind of disaster that has been plaguing Manitoba, Canada and western Canada in particular over the last six to eight years, following upon what I would call the disastrously high interest rates of the former Liberal administration, and now again interest rates have started to spiral into the 12 percent-plus range under the Conservatives.

**An Honourable Member:** You had the lowest interest rates in a decade when you were Government and you squandered them.

**Mr. Uruski:** I am speaking specifically of the impact on the farm community and, you know, the Liberal Party here and one does not know from day to day where they stand on what issue. Mr. Deputy Speaker, one day they are going to give away crop insurance, the next day they are standing firm with the Government in terms of disaster assistance.

What really comes out very clear, in sitting in a chair where I started my career in this Chamber—in fact, in this seat and probably will finish it right in this seat—I guess the statement comes that how much things change and how little things change over a period of time.

What is coming clear from the Liberal Party when they talked about compassionate heart and caring and compassionate Governments and with—what were the words that they used?—competence with heart, I think those were the words that they were using. What is coming very clear is that the Liberal Party will attempt to govern at whatever costs to Manitobans. They will move in whatever way they have to in order to gain power. That is fine, but do not go around telling Manitobans how much you care for them when you are prepared to spend \$6 million to \$10 million with a whim in terms of having an election.

That is essentially what it is all about. That is exactly what it is all about and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should be telling your caucus Members that is what is coming through.

I listen to my constituents and many of them, I have to say, were very mad at me, particularly a year ago during Autopac period. A year has gone by and what has changed? We have a new board of directors, we have a new Government. Have they changed anything? They kept the premiums. The new chairman of the board came to committee and said the decisions that were made were right. He admitted that and the premiums stayed.

Nothing has really changed and the beneficiaries, Manitobans, are now asking themselves, gee, what did we do? I mean, what has really occurred in the past year? There were many fundamental changes recommended by Judge Kopstein and I would hope that the Minister responsible will be making some of those announcements to fundamentally change auto insurance in this province, which can have major savings to all of us who are motoring public who do pay the premiums.

\* (1500)

Cut the lawyers out, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Lay it on the line. Save yourself \$10 million a year minimum by going to a pure no-fault system. Ask the judge. Be prepared to stand up to the lawyers of this province and cut them out, because if you are going to save any money for Manitoba motorists, for all the motoring public, that is one way of doing it and you can increase no-fault benefits substantially.

I want to indicate that there will be some problems in an area that I think is always difficult when you move away from the tort system, and that is in the area especially with claims dealing with whiplash, because pain and suffering will always be difficult to determine on the system of pure compensation. I recognize that, but that will be a small price to pay in terms of injury that can be compensated without fault, without going to court and saving all the taxpayers, who are the motoring public, year after year after year millions and millions of dollars in legal fees that need not to be spent.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was asked, in fact just a week ago when I was on tour, by some of my constituents, did the Conservatives change anything in Autopac when they came in, in terms of premiums and that kind of thing? I said no. You know, in retrospect, and I said this to him, that sometimes it does not pay to listen to the experts in the corporation. Even though my inner instincts were telling me that if we implemented the surcharges that, in fact, you did not require the kind of increases that the experts were recommending. So we did implement the Rebate Program, the Safe Driver Program, and reduced the impact of the premiums and in fact in retrospect one could have even cut that increase in half, you would not have broken even, the Corporation would not have broken even. But it was not necessary in that short period of time when what has occurred across the country, in terms of increases of 15 percent to 20 percent over three or four years running, Manitobans were insulated from that through having their own insurance corporation.

So, in retrospect, one says, listen to your own instincts. Do not always listen to the experts who give

you advice. I guess one gets that message and learns about it the hard way and one has to lose an election and almost lose his own seat. In fact it was very close, it was the closest margin that I have had since I have been in this House, it was just under 400 votes. My first election was 400 votes so I had even a closer margin. But I can tell you that it will not happen again, I may not be a candidate. As I say, I may not be a candidate, but in that riding, in the Interlake, the margin for a New Democratic Party candidate will not be as low as the margin I received in a very negative term next election. I can tell you right now that will not occur.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to raise a number of concerns dealing with what I started out with, with the interest rates and the impact on the farm community. I believe, I think our Leader has said that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) today is a very fine individual and a very knowledgeable individual, but I want to say to him, and I say very clearly, you had better start speaking out because Manitoba farmers will only wait so long. He has to speak out on behalf of farmers. He has been silent too long.

Some of the media people have certainly given him a lot of credit, even though he is not around at the time they want to do an interview. They have been very charitable in the farm papers to him. I mean, read the articles. They give him good headlines, even though they never even talked to him.—(Interjection)—No, no, no, just look at some of the articles. I look at them and they give a good headline, but the Minister was not available for comments, and yet his comments are there in the articles as if he was in the office.—(Interjection)—No, no, I do not begrudge the Minister. I just say that the Minister had better start speaking out, and there are a number of ways, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are a number of ways. I mean, there are so many issues that are there, and I believe that the Minister's silence—I will not even say "silence," quietness, because he has not been totally silent—quietness over the last number of months in an endeavour to be cooperative, and he is a cooperative Member.

He has to start speaking out with the federal Government. I will go through some of the items we have, and the Opposition critic raised it today with respect to the drought payments. How long do farmers have to wait? How long do the Manitoba farmers have to wait for a drought payment? We are into the second crop, and there have been no payments.

To bring out a program where you cannot even get an application form for a producer, unless you are on some kind of a list, does not make any sense. To use—and maybe the Minister will get up and correct me—the bureaucracy, as the federal Government has done, as being at fault in terms of the data base or the lack of data base for this program, I find reprehensible because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba himself by press releases has said that the turnaround time in the payment of crop insurance has improved and continuously improves so that the data from crop insurance, instead of in the cases of where the losses occurred—and recognizing that not all farmers are in crop insurance, having that data base

yet last October, because most of the claims would have been paid by October, only there may have been a small percentage that were under dispute, very small. I bet you less than 50 claims would have been under dispute by the corporation. So the vast majority of claims—what was it, \$180 million paid out?

**An Honourable Member:** \$130 million.

**Mr. Uruski:** Ah, \$130 million was paid out in claims, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and yet the federal Government comes and says, look, we have no data base in which to make this program go ahead. I find that unexplainable, and yet this Minister is sitting quiet. Maybe he is doing something behind the back rooms, but clearly the farmers of Manitoba are not seeing those results. They are getting very frustrated.

The other area, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Minister has to take action on is the dispute they are having now over the Feed Security Program. Who is going to pay those additional claims in which there has been a reassessment under the Drought Program and now the Drought Program is saying, yes, under the Feed Security Program, you are eligible for this kind of a payment but under the Feed Security Program, no you are not. You are going to have a lower level of payment, because the federal Government says we are not paying.

\* (1510)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there should be no question that those claims ought to be paid when a reassessment is made, and they ought to be paid on one level. There should be no fight if there is an acknowledged reassessment of an area. In fact, the now Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) when he was in Opposition said we need better monitoring. The very kinds of issues that are now at issue were raised by him with full agreement by myself and when we were in Government, that there were teething problems under the program. They had to be worked out, but there should be no dispute. Farmers should not be held hostage as a result of bickering on a program that is established, on a program that is announced and established. So there are two counts that this Minister has to take an active, a public and a demanding role on behalf of Manitoba farmers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are a number of other areas dealing with farmers in financial difficulty. This federal Budget has cost western Canadian farmers more than anything that this Government could ever do to assist western Canadian farmers—anything. We have not heard—we had heard virtually a whimper from this Government protesting the kind of changes in this Budget—a whimper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fuel tax rebate, it is going to cost I am sure many farmers a loan in excess of \$1,000 a year—blanket. For those farmers who are in financial difficulty, the interest-free cash advance program that assisted—and I believe the maximum is \$30,000, I think it is \$30,000 or is it \$60,000? It was increased to \$60,000, would have gone a long way and provided the kind of cushion needed in terms of operating credit and has assisted especially those

farmers in financial difficulty. It has gone out the window. That is a major cost.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

You take, Mr. Speaker, \$60,000.00. Let us even cut that in half to \$30,000.00. Let us say the average take-up is \$30,000 and those farmers in financial difficulty and at the current interest rate on operating credit, 14 percent. Sure, 14 percent, which is \$1,400 per \$10,000.00. You are looking at over \$3,000 for a three-month period, over \$1,000 in interest alone for a three-month period. That would be a major benefit to those farmers who are in financial difficulty in western Canada, and we are not hearing anything in those areas from this Government.

There are other changes in this Budget that will impact on farmers in this province and across western Canada, but we are getting what I would call complacency, probably a lot of frustration. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) is very frustrated because they are trying to maintain their budget and they are trying to help out under the Farm School Tax Rebate a little bit. Here he can add a few million dollars. So he adds a few million dollars and he loses about \$60 million or \$70 million from under him with one fell swoop of the federal Budget. Talk about frustration. He has to show Manitoba farmers because he is their advocate that he is going to stand up for them.

There are a number of things he can do. I will tell him and I will give him some of my ideas because he will have to face them over the next number of months of this Session. On the interest rate side, it is becoming more and more clear that many farmers who were subjected to loans over the last decade are finding that banks who took promissory notes on a fixed rate of interest ended up charging the going rate. There are a number of cases now going to court but what is coming very clear is that under our Statute of Limitations Act, the six-year period, those challenges are being made on technical grounds.

I ask this Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and I look at my Liberal friends across the way that we should be looking at legislation—and I give him the opener—of opening up The Statute of Limitations Act in which most provinces have different rules than we have in Manitoba, to allow the farm community who are prepared to challenge the financial institutions, not to use the six-year limitation of action, but to use a clause that says from the time that it was known to the financial institution that the change was made, so that the farmer does not have to have the onus placed on him that he did not know this was happening. Let the institution show that it did it and they have to show why the farmer cannot go back to Day One when those promissory notes were signed, because what is happening is that they are using that six-year limitation as a bar to any actions.

There is one other area that we should be examining and that is the area of if the financial institutions are not prepared to cooperate, and I urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) to call in the vice-presidents. They are willing to come and meet, I met with them many times. Call them in and ask them to voluntarily

allow that, upon request, their books be open to any farmer in Manitoba to be able to examine all those promissory notes that, in fact, were at one rate, an interest was charged at a far higher rate, because we are finding more and more farmers have paid hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars of interest unknowingly, because they trusted their financial institution.

So I urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) to look at a cooperative approach, ask all the financial institutions whether they are prepared to allow this to happen. If they are not, then we should in this province look at the possibility of legislation that says that anyone who has an account with any financial institution will, in fact, be able to go in and have those documents made available to him or her so that kind of an assessment is made, because there is great reluctance on the financial institutions to deal with this question of finances because we are not out of the woods yet. There are thousands of Manitoba farmers, of western Canadian farmers in grave financial difficulty as a result of high interest rates, drought, and a number of other factors that have put them in that position over a number of years.

There are a number of other areas that I want to raise with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) here today, and one is the very fundamental area that deals with dairy policy. The Minister of Agriculture, in a very innocuous announcement, released in I believe it was February—and he did send me a copy of the agreement between the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board and the province, released an agreement in exchange, he said, for the lawsuit that was pending for a number of years against the province. I have said this publicly, and I will say it again, I consider that a very vexatious lawsuit particularly against a number of our staff that was undertaken by certain members of the Milk Board, and I will put it on the record, the former chair of the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board. It was almost a personal vendetta against some of the Department of Agriculture staff in the lawsuit that was put into place.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Day capitulated to the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board by allowing the full sale, the holus-bolus sale, of milk quota on the pretext that somehow this lawsuit that they had against the Province of Manitoba would succeed. Mr. Speaker, that is wrong, that is false. The Government knew and knows and the Minister knows that the information that the department had was not only strong, it was almost foolproof in terms of the kind of information that the Government had. There were additional witnesses, expert witnesses, who could corroborate the Government's position, but yet the Government went ahead and allowed quotas to be—(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister says we had six-and-a-half years. It did not have to be settled.

\* (1520)

I want to tell my honourable friend because in those six-and-a-half years the data that were produced out of the milk recording system were accepted. All the cheques that the producers received were paid on that

basis and so there was no need to settle anything. If there were going to be a court action, let the court action go, but to allow the movement of quota to be sold freely on the open market is an abdication of the responsibility and an undermining of the orderly marketing system of this province by this Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), who at one time sat as chair of the Natural Products Marketing Council and supported no value for quota. There he turned around and used the pretext of this agreement to open up quota sales.

I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that there has probably been some movement, a fair bit of movement, but what he is doing is placing the future of orderly marketing totally at risk in this province. In fact, it is being placed—maybe the horse is out of the barn now because you read the articles in the paper of what is happening in Ontario where the banking institution is now saying, well, free trade is here and there is going to be greater pressure on supply management, so we are now cutting back on what we will loan as collateral against quotas. We are now reducing our values on quotas so that those of you who were foolish enough to pay for quotas were now going to start discounting quota values.

What we are going to find ourselves—and you just watch—in the same situation that Ontario and the federal Government found itself with tobacco growers. They ended up ultimately compensating tobacco growers for quota because they were moving them out of the industry. That would be the height of stupidity but we are headed that way.

What you will see either way with the opening up of quotas in the dairy industry, putting them on the quota, we are, No. 1, saying to most people that the dairy industry is only available to those who have lots of bucks or to those who have relatives in the industry who cannot afford through existing collateral to get into the industry. That is essentially what we are saying in marketing of quota and putting it on the table and saying we will allow the wholesale capital gain of an item that was given away free by the public of Manitoba. That is essentially what we did. I have to say to the Minister that I share some of that responsibility.

I will agree that I share some of that responsibility by allowing the retirement fund to be put into place, but clearly the retirement fund allowed for more than half of the quota to be circulated and brought back in and given out free of charge to those who required it. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) said it was not working. I will tell him why it was not working, because everybody was staying in the industry when times were tough. Now that there is a capital gain on quota, why would I not get out? Why would I not get out and allow quota to be moved when I can pocket the money that I did not have to pay for, I did not have to invest in, I really did not have to spend a penny for?

I call that a blatant abdication of responsibility by this Minister in undermining orderly marketing when he of all people, I believed, knew better. He had the advice from his department that our court case, our court position, our legal position was not only sound, it was solid. If he stands up here and says it is not, I will challenge him to produce the kind of memorandums



that there are in the records, that he knows that they are there and there are even additional witnesses, I am certain, that will even strengthen the Government's case that there was no need to capitulate.

To have an agreement on a new milk recording system, on what I would call "frills," was in fact in the mill. It was happening. Those discussions were ongoing. There was no need, on behalf of the Government, to put in the court case as part of that agreement—none whatsoever.

So there are a number of other issues that this Minister is undermining orderly marketing, agreeing with the federal Government on the questions of oats, agreeing with the federal Government on doing away with the Beef Commission with the orderly marketing there. This Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) is in fact putting the farmers of Manitoba at far greater risk and sitting quiet and not speaking out on their behalf as he should be. Thank you very much.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of the Environment):** It is certainly my pleasure to have an opportunity to rise in the House to speak in response to the Speech from the Throne. I want to wish you and the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Chornopyski) well in your undertakings for the duration of the House and certainly, coming immediately on the heels of the former Agriculture Minister, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), Autopac years, I want to indicate that there is one thing that we can always count on in this House and that is that when he rises to speak that we know where he is coming from and that he at least has a clear understanding of agricultural policies and issues as he sees them. That does not mean that I agree with him, but I have to say that historically I have always understood where he was coming from, and I have to admit that at least he stays true to the policies that he has always espoused.

\* (1530)

The alternate agricultural critic for the NDP is making comment from his seat across there. I indicated to him earlier that I found out that he was also an advocate of oats. I happen to have had something come to my attention not too long ago. I do not want to start my speech off by deriding the Members of the Opposition, but seeing as how he happened to catch my attention at the moment I thought I would just point out to him that there is a letter here that was sent to local councillors in the Town of Neepawa, very influential people. I do not doubt that is a good place to go if you want to raise the level of an issue, but I find it a little unusual that the MLA for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), as he signed it at the bottom, was writing asking support and asking for signatures. He said sign this petition and send it in to me and I will take it to Ottawa, but do you know what he was asking them to sign? That was that oats be returned to the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board.

Now it seems to me, in the area that I grew up in, Mr. Speaker, that those people who were involved in the industry were generally the ones who should have the opportunity to speak out and the ones whose voice

should be heard from, so I have to tell you that when these petitions get to Ottawa, and knowing how they were probably being generated, I think they will probably be greeted with the same derision that I am about to give it.

The operator of the ambulance service in Neepawa and people of that nature, school teachers who are on the town council, I am sure their opinion is very important, but I do not think that they necessarily have a great understanding of the marketing of oats. The Member leads himself into an area that he really cannot defend.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the Throne Speech. I think that we have seen a document, despite some of the comments that came from the Members opposite, that we have laid out a reasonable course of action and that we have laid out a very long list of areas that we intend to move in and provide action and leadership for in this province.

A year ago, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in her reaction to the Speech from the Throne last summer—I guess obviously that is not a year ago—at that time her comments were, well, that was a very ambitious program. We said that is right, it is an ambitious program and that we intended to get on with the job of governing in this province. I believe that this past eight months have shown that we are able to lay out those goals and achieve to large measure a great deal of success in the areas which we intended to move on.

We came a long way in indicating those areas—I notice there is a small guffaw on the other side - (Interjection)- a big guffaw, the fellow says. I was not referring to his stature, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to his voice.

Consider the financial situation of this province that we inherited and that we have now been able to bring together the action that we have and put the deficit situation in this province into a semblance of normalcy, after the six years that it suffered under the brutal tax load, the brutal expenditures and the brutal deficit that was imposed on the people of this province.

There are the only people over there that I have ever met who can raise the taxes, put an unconscionable tax burden on the people of this province and then have the ability to smile about it. Mr. Speaker, we should be embarrassed with the tax load that we have created in this province over the last number of years.

**An Honourable Member:** Do something about it.

**Mr. Cummings:** That is exactly what is happening.

First of all, you have to reduce the debt load in order to be able to reduce the demand on the income of the people of this province. We have arrested the debt load of this province so that we can now undertake some of the major problems that we were unable to undertake with the tremendous outflow of capital and dollars that were leaving this province simply to pay foreign debt. To repay debt of any kind, if it is non-productive, is simply not possible, considering the interest rates of today's world.

The people of Manitoba asked for a responsive and responsible Government, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that we have given them that. I believe we will continue to give them that in the light of the legislative load we have laid out for ourselves for the coming year.

I have opened my speeches the last couple of years in this House, Mr. Speaker, by saying when we were elected to this House we were given both an honour and a responsibility. I have always challenged myself and the other Members of this House to try and remember which is which. I think that unfortunately there are some Members who do not think that is a very laudable objective. I will put that standard up to the people of this province any day, because we do have to get on with the job of restoring the economic stability of this province and providing some leadership.

We have put ourselves, Mr. Speaker, on a path towards economic renewal, also working in the area—(Interjection)—yes, I am sure there are people here who bought bonds, but on the other hand they might not recognize a good investment considering the record we have had economically in this province. In our return to economic renewal in this province, we have to work towards that goal with sustainable development as one of our prime moving forces. We have to make a commitment to the environment of this province. We have to make a commitment to the renewal of the land in which we live, or certainly we will not be able to stand up and say we have left it in as good or a better condition for the generations that follow us.

If that sounds corny, I apologize for the corniness of it because simply spoken, Mr. Speaker, there is no way the people of this province, the people of this country should think we can continue with the consumptive society, without turning back to the people of this province, to the future generations, the opportunity to have the benefits of the environment, the benefits of the land, the water and the air, which all of us have inherited and have taken so matter of factly. I say to the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), he should breathe deeply.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Enjoy it while it is here.

**Mr. Cummings:** He says enjoy it while it is here. That is true because if that is a demonstration of a lack of accountability and a lack of willingness of the previous administration to deal with the real problems of the environment, then I think his comments are misplaced.

Mr. Speaker, let me digress for a moment. When we look at Shoal Lake, we have simply seen what I consider virtually one of the stupidest applications for development that could be brought forward, and that is to establish a gold mine on an island not very far distant from the intake for the waters of the City of Winnipeg. Quite frankly, there has been exploration going on that island for the last four years which I think a great many people in this—I am sorry, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) chose to leave at this moment. There has been exploration going on that island which apparently no one has taken a great deal of notice of, and in fact has not been brought forward as possibly being polluting in and of itself.—(Interjection)—

The water is still good. The exploration at that mine site is indicative of the way in which all of us have been negligent in the manner in which we allow exploration to proceed in this country. In many cases, exploration can be as damaging or potentially as polluting to the environment as the actual operation itself. I think if ever there was an opportunity for all of us to take a look at what is going on in this area, it has certainly been driven home to us by this example. I have to tell you there is nothing that has been brought to my attention or anything that I can conceive of that would indicate this should be or could be a safe operation to be taking place so close to the source of our drinking water.

\* (1540)

Mr. Speaker, in terms of looking at sustainable development, so often many of us take the idea of environmental commitment and sustainable development and we say this is lip-service to another buzzword or another catch phrase, that its time has come and its time will pass. I want to tell you, I think if the time ever should come that there are very many of us who are in Government who think that this is simply a buzzword or simply a situation or a thought that will pass and will pass quickly, then we are certainly not providing the kind of leadership or kind of direction that the people of this country and the environment of our country needs.

Frankly, even as Minister of Municipal Affairs, it became quite evident to me that we need to start thinking globally and not locally in how we deal with the problems of development. Certainly if you look at the planning process that is in place in this province and think of it in terms of environmentally sound development as well, you will realize that land use policies and land development are so critical to the future of this province and to the growth that we will be able to establish within this province.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of responsible land management, we have to be prepared to look at planning, planning districts and land use in a manner that makes sense for the long-term aesthetic values of the people of our country so that they have an opportunity to take advantage of the opportunities that are presented to us.

While land use planning is not very often a popular discussion, when you talk to municipalities and you talk to developers, the first thing that comes up is that this is some sort of a restriction on their ability to make a buck. Frankly, in the long run, well-planned areas, well-planned development appreciates the values of the developments in the area and does not depreciate them.—(Interjection)—

I appreciate the comments of support from the Members opposite, because environmentally sound development and environmentally sound developing industries have actually become the growth industries of this country. Industries which are moving towards environmentally sound products and environmentally sound activity have been growing at a rate of about 40 percent for the last number of years, and I think that clearly indicates to all of us how the future

generations of this country are going to deal with the matter of sustainable development.

When you talk about planning, Mr. Speaker, you have to consider the broad basis that includes transportation, that includes appropriate land use and includes the reserves of buffer zones and all of those things that planners hold so near and dear. I think that we have to take a very broad approach to the way in which planning is developed.

Certainly the planning area around the City of Winnipeg has created some controversy in the last year and I think that needs to be dealt with during this reply as well, because to simply say that the diminishing of the ad zone is inappropriate or that the planning jurisdiction of the city is being eliminated in favour of a freer or less competent planning jurisdiction is simply not true. It would appear to me, where those municipalities are controlled under provincial planning, they have a much more closely tied development of responsibility.

In fact, those who were proponents of having municipalities move into provincial planning as opposed to some of the restrictions that were controlled under the ad zone around the City of Winnipeg, may feel they are in the future in a much more restricted planning environment than the one they have just left. I am not sure that message has been clearly enough delineated by myself or by the municipal officials—that is the environment in which they will be working. As we move out into the more sparsely populated parts of the province and where the better agricultural land is, we certainly have to take into account that responsibility and maintenance of agricultural and recreational land, and all of the other adjacent planning responsibilities that come into play.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I have learned to think globally rather than locally. That does not mean, I guess, I am not an advocate for my own community and my own constituency when the need arises, but I think we have to develop a new attitude in this province. Probably Canada-wide, we have to develop a new attitude but we have to have a different approach in our communities. We have to lead the development of our communities with that different attitudinal approach, and certainly my intention in my new responsibilities as Minister of Environment is to work closely with other provinces and with the federal authorities in bringing forth legislation, regulation and attitudinal changes in how we deal with the environment.

I think, as I said earlier, we have a consumptive society that seems to have only one direction in terms of how it consumes and that is more. We have to learn to reduce. We have to learn to reuse and certainly we have to learn to recycle. That will be part of the responsibilities this Government will move forward aggressively to deal with those problems.

Technologically, we have to be very aware of those industries and those businesses that are environmentally sound. As we work to produce jobs through attracting of industries to this province, I wish to give you my assurance and the assurance of this Government that we will be seeking out those industries

that are environmentally sound, try to bring forward that type of development in our province, knowing full well that is probably the one area where there will be lots of competition from other jurisdictions to attract those industries as well.

Frankly, while the concept of sustainable development as put forward by Prime Minister Brundtland, I have to indicate that does not mean there shall be no development; it means there shall be sustainable development. That can only be profitable and of great source of compatibility between the industries and the people who live close to, people who consume from and the people who work in those industries will be able to profit from.

As we look at what are deemed to be environmentally sound industries, you can also look at the information and technology industries that are industries now where the ability to export information, the ability to provide research, the ability to provide people who are highly trained in the planning and development areas is also part and parcel of some of the sustainable industries we have in this province presently.

\* (1550)

I think it is probably very appropriate we now have attracted Wang Industries to Winnipeg. I do not think there is any problem with the type of development we will have from an industry where we become a developmental and informational centre for a worldwide organization, and certainly that is the type of development that can be seen to be environmentally sound and sustainable and provide high tech jobs and opportunity for the people of this province.

Let me pause briefly, Mr. Speaker, to talk about one specific item, and that specific item is recycling. Not only is recycling seen to be one of the important things that everyone in the environment wants to talk about these days, as I mentioned earlier, it can in fact also be profitable. I think it is one thing to say that we are going to recycle, re-use and reclaim and when you actually start bringing in the product for recycling you have to be prepared as well to deal with it at that stage. Once you have brought in aluminum and recycled it, it is readily marketable. When you have brought in glass to recycle, it is not as readily marketable. You have to be prepared to look for a use for the product to make sure that you simply do not provide a system for bringing it in and taking it out of the waste stream and then, when nobody is looking, truck it back out to the waste disposal sites because there is not a readily available market for it.

Those are the types of dilemmas that we will be moving to deal with in the very near future because the promotion of recycling and reusing of our products, while it is politically popular, it is environmentally sound and it is certainly an area that no one would criticize. It is also an area, as Ontario has found, for example, that can cause some financial problems. In cities in Ontario, and certainly the City of Edmonton, have found that some of their recycling programs have developed some huge costs. As we develop comprehensive recycling programs for Manitoba, we have to be

prepared to deal with those issues and make sure that we have a system that will not let us down after the first few years.

We have referred that we will be extending the environmental Act, and The Dangerous Goods and Handling Act will be fully proclaimed. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the environment, what that means is that we will have the ability to track hazardous products from cradle to grave and that by keeping control of some of the very hazardous products that we are dealing with we will be able to make sure that there are not large amounts of them that are intentionally, or unintentionally, deposited in an unsafe way into the environment. We will be able to track these products from production to use and back into storage or disposal and be able to trace the exact volumes.

As we talk about environmental issues, there is no doubt that many people go right back to the very basic roots of where any population must go when it comes time to revitalize their approach to the environment and sustainable development, and that is back to agriculture. I think there is little doubt that when you look at what the Minister of Natural Resources did last winter in taking forward our soil policy strategy, additionally the soil strategies going forward, that this is the basis of groundworks for development of policy which will be implemented in the near future, policies that will be a foundation upon which we can build sustainable development, infrastructure throughout this province. If you do not have the support of the people who are at the grassroots of problems such as this, then you certainly will never be able to build something from the top down. It has to be cooperative, there has to be leadership. There certainly has to be a willingness to invest time and effort on the part of the people who are most closely involved.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have a comment that I would like to read into the record. It comes from a gentleman connected with Agriculture Canada who talks about sustainable development definition in terms of agriculture, trying to state in his own mind how he sees the efforts. He refers to it as the utilization of resources and environment to optimize economic and other societal benefits today while not damaging prospects for their use by future generations.

Mr. Speaker, sustainable development frankly is, as I said a minute ago, an orientation and not a destination. We have to change the way in which we think about our environment and think about the manner in which we deal with it. I think the time has come for us all to harness the willingness of today's agricultural people to deal with what are some very real difficulties in the way in which we treat the environment.

Sustainable agriculture should produce a net surplus of usable energy, not a deficit. I think that is pretty obvious to almost anyone who wants to stop and think about it for a moment. The loss and destruction of our soils that we have seen in the last few years quite simply has driven home to many of us the fact that we are dealing with a very fragile issue in terms of dealing with our soils.

The pollution of our surface and ground waters as well, Mr. Speaker, is becoming increasingly a growing

concern with the people who are working on the lands of this province, I would say increasingly important to every agriculturalist across this country. Certainly from the point of view of the province, the provincial Government, it is our intention to provide leadership and direction in how we bring forward policies and direction for the people who are leading the department and the people who are working with the agricultural land itself because, simply, there are many of us out there, and there are some of us on the front benches and on the benches on this side who have spent all our lives working in agriculture. Many times we recognize the problems, but we do not appreciate the solution or we do not feel that we can economically afford the solution.

The other item of course that faces agriculture and faces all of us is the need to acquire some extremely safe agricultural chemicals and decrease the increasing dependency that agriculture has on chemicals in order to increase our productive ability.

There is one other item that I want to touch on briefly as well, Mr. Speaker, and that is the Repap sale. I want to indicate to the Members of this House and to the public that this will be an absolutely sound environmental process that this corporation will be put through. Frankly, there will be no end runs in terms of dealing with the environment and the applications that will be made to the Clean Environment Commission by Repap.

We simply are not going to stand idly by and watch the issues regarding the environment float by us. I can tell you that in the last two weeks we have asked for environmental hearings on Namew Lake, on the Westlake project and, as I said a moment ago, the Repap sale will go through some very fine-tooth examination by the Clean Environment Commission.

The Member for Fort Garry (Laurie Evans) was referring to our agricultural policies, and actually I think he gave our Government a very good backhanded compliment, because he simply did not attack the Manitoba Government or our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). He was busy flailing away at Ottawa and the things that they have not done, but he made a comment in his remarks that caught my attention.

\* (1600)

He said we have all this right-wing material in there and then he said we threw in all this socialist crap. I would like to know if he cleared with his Leader women's health care issues, breast screening. Is that socialist crap in his mind? Did he talk to her about child care? Did he talk to the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) about child abuse, spousal abuse, elder abuse, all issues that we need to deal with, issues that everybody in this House would want to deal with? If that is socialist crap, then I will take my share of it, Mr. Speaker.

In some people's minds, I suppose he might say everything I have been saying in the last little while about the environment is socialist crap, if he wants to put it in those terms, but Manitobans elected us to be a responsive and responsible Government and I have a little note here that indicates in a way, I think, is very

real. I will link this to another change that our Government made. Sometimes it is the little changes that make the importance and make the difference for the people out there who are receiving services from Government.

I want to compliment the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) because now young people who want to have an opportunity to go out and earn some money while their parents are on welfare can keep that money without seeing their parental welfare reduced or endangered, something that has been begging to be dealt with for years.

The great bastion of socialist protectors that sit on the opposite side of the House here had an opportunity to deal with this and did not, and frankly the amount of money that was involved was peanuts, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell you the ability for some self-motivated earning ability and the amount of pride that can give a young person, who is being raised in a home where unemployment and welfare might very well have been part of his life, I think is extremely important and beneficial.

I also want to compliment the Minister. I have a letter here from an association that provides residence for mentally handicapped. I do not think it would be fair to name them and put their name automatically in the political realm, but I will show this letter to anybody who might care to see it afterwards.

I want to read the last paragraph from their letter. They said this: "The recently announced rates for residential programs are more in line with what residential operators require to operate facilities rather than the previous rate for all residences. This decision of the Government has shown us that the Minister is listening to the service-providing agencies and responding to the practical as well as the philosophical issues." I think that letter speaks oceans about the ability of this Government to respond in areas where the simple understanding of the problem and dealing with it is all that is required and it has gone waiting and wanting for far too long in this province.

In terms of rural development, I think one of the important things that the people of rural Manitoba want to know is whether or not their Government will be closer to them, and whether or not they will have the opportunity to be served in their own communities by the people who should be serving them.

I think it is important we recognize what is happening in terms of reorganizing of Government and putting together for the people of Manitoba who live outside of the larger metropolis to have an opportunity to see a potential to be involved, and have a real chance to have their Government service provided closer to them.

While I think quite highly of the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles)—and she has always treated me fairly—I would have to say that at a symposium held in rural Manitoba this summer she made a couple of comments about decentralization of Government that I would think need to be clarified in light of what we are doing as a Government. The Member for Selkirk said it, "what we need is a Department of Rural Lifestyle, whether it

is a board, a committee or some style, that somewhere there is a voice that you can vet Government decisions through a rural agency."

That sounds interesting but the response of the rural people who were at that meeting was this. You said that we should look at setting up a Board of Rural Lifestyles. Let the people decide. You said that the politicians are not the solution, that the people of rural Manitoba are.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

There are other quotes in here I would give you but the implication is there is not a Government that is willing to take the risk and take the initiative and say they will decentralize Government services into rural Manitoba. We have taken that risk, we have said we are prepared to take that initiative. This is not taking from Peter to pay Paul. This is simply putting the services closer to where the people are so that they do not have to consider themselves going 50 miles or 100 miles down the road to get a service that they could rightfully be entitled to closer to their home jurisdiction and their home residence.

\* (1610)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to tell you that because we have made that commitment and because we are prepared to take that issue and meet it head on, I believe that the people of this province are only too pleased to see the kind of information that we put forward adjacent to that in the Speech from the Throne. We are prepared to put our money where our mouth is, put our actions where we believe we will have the best results for the people of Manitoba. I would urge everyone in this Chamber to support this Speech from the Throne.

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is indeed an honour to be recognized by you, Sir, as my first speech in this Session and yours introducing me as a new Member sitting in the Chair. I appreciate that and congratulate you on your appointment. I also hope you will pass on to the Speaker himself my continuing gratitude and support for his role he plays as Speaker. I would also add to the Pages and the staff, Hansard and the clerking staff in the House how we do appreciate the work that they do on our behalf to make everything run smoothly in this House.

I particularly would like to congratulate a Page selected from my community, Crystal Mikoluff, who was one of two in my community who applied for the program of being a Page. She was the one selected, but I think it is an attitude of the quality of the Pages who were selected in that I know that the other member from our Youth Parliament who applied to become a Page is of such high quality that it must have been a difficult choice in making the selection that was taken.

Before I go into speaking on issues that are of concern to my community, I would like to speak in general as to why I will not be supporting this Throne Speech. I will not be supporting this Throne Speech and perhaps,

as many of the Members in the third Opposition Party and the Government have said, it is not a popular issue. As the Minister for Environment (Mr. Cummings) just pointed out, there is trouble with trying to have statesmanlike Governments in all of the world nowadays, and it is difficult to separate popularity from becoming a politician. I believe that this is an issue that we have to stand on.

We have many students in China right now standing in defiance of what is right now their law in order to have a free vote. They must look upon us very much askance when we stand here saying we cannot be bothered with a vote. How expensive is a vote? Well, what are the alternatives? As I have said to many members of my communities, when you look at the alternatives, an election looks pretty good.

So I will not be supporting this Throne Speech and I will put on the record today the many reasons why not. I would like to read into the record again, as has been mentioned, the many layoffs that we have seen in this province over the last year. We have had plant closures in Canada Packers, 90 people; Ogilvie, 89; Wescott, 180; Marr's in Brandon, 37; Toro in Steinbach, 28; Marks and Spencer, 45; Molson's, a number we do not yet know; Wardair, we do not yet know; CN, by the hundreds. Great-West Life today has announced 35 people moving out of the province. We have the closing of CFB and Kapyong Barracks of 1,400 people. We have lost the CF-5 contract that would have replaced the loss of the CF-18 contract which, of course, we knew was a great loss to the province.

Unemployment in this province is above the national average for the first time in decades. Private investment has decreased. Housing starts have decreased while net migration from the province has increased. Manitobans this year, because of the federal Government's actions will have to pay 25 percent more in crop insurance payments. We will see actually cuts in upgrading of branch lines. We will see increases in farm fuel tax and the grain rate subsidy will be cut. These are federal Tory promises, but this Government has not taken action to stand up against them.

There also will be cuts to the Western Diversification Fund. I hear Members saying these are speeches against the federal Budget. This Government was elected on a promise they could pick up a telephone and talk to the federal Government and that would be a difference. I believe the people believed that and they voted you in as a Tory provincial Government on the belief that maybe some cooperation could be reached between two Governments of the same Party. We ask for cooperation in this House and we try to give it, but how can we expect cooperation to succeed in here when two Parties cannot get along when they are two governing bodies?

This Government speaks of being able to reduce the deficit and I think we all are well aware of the deficit reduction needs. It is interesting though that the federal Government wants to spend several million dollars or up to several million dollars advertising how much we have to get it reduced, and then do little about reducing it.

This Government has reduced the deficit but it has not been because of good management. It has

happened because of windfalls that they have received from the NDP previous Government. Federal equalization grants have come our way not because we are doing well, but because we are doing poorly. They have come our way to shore up our poor economy. Last year, this Government predicted a 2 percent economic growth rate, and yet we got less than one-half of 1 percent.

This Government has claimed we are the third-highest level of growth and capital investment in Canada, but that is only when compared to the dismal past we have had. We stand sixth overall, with only four provinces doing worse than us. Price Waterhouse has announced that our weekly earnings in Manitoba have decreased over the last year. These are the economic reasons why this Government has to stand accountable. I would like to be able to bring back to my constituents that I, as an Opposition Member elected to oppose, will do so.

I have in the last few days sat in this House, listened to various speakers of the NDP and of the Government speaking on their new-found interest of the environment. I appreciate they have found the need for the environment protection. The sustainable development is becoming a buzzword because everyone should understand what sustainable development is about.

However, as a person having lived in Selkirk for many, many years and having served on town council, having worked with environment groups, having worked for the betterment of the quality of the Red River, having been in discussion with the NDP as a Government and supposedly with the Conservatives as an Opposition just two years ago when the dispute over 350 new housing projects taking place on Shoal Lake, proposed by an Indian band—we made it a known there was a proposed gold mine going to be on Shoal Lake. I support clean water, wherever it may be.

I do wonder why the City of Winnipeg is more important than the Town of Selkirk or the Town of Dauphin or the City of Portage la Prairie or the City of Brandon. Why do we not have the right to a clean sustained water supply? Why is Shoal Lake being asked for a clean environment hearing? Why not the City of Winnipeg on the Red River? These are questions I have been asking for the last two or three years. Finally, I am having people hear them and that is appreciated by me. Now, if I have some action, I will be even happier but it may have to be in the short term from now when we, as Liberals, become Government—

**An Honourable Member:** What?

**Mrs. Charles:** —for the people will make that decision if they do not see action soon on the environment.

During the last provincial election when things were looking pretty sorry for the New Democratic Party in my riding, the Leader of the NDP stood up in a press conference and accused me of being willing to spend too much money to clean up the Red River. Now I hear him in this House standing up and saying we must clean up the Red River.

This type of action, to say the least, annoys me because we do not play, as a certain Member of the Government has put forward this week, not very appropriately, but has tried to do so, we do not play politics with certain issues, and cleaning up the Red River should be a joint membership in this House and a joint action. So I am glad to hear the Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Doer) support cleaning up the Red River. I am glad to hear the Minister for Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) wanting to clean up the Red River, so let us do it.

I also have found it interesting to hear about support for rural development. Selkirk, over the last eight years or so, has been trying to get two Governments to agree on supporting a Selkirk landing proposal. This is a fine example of rural development. It would, by studies, have a turnaround payback period of just three years. The federal Government came onside, the provincial Government came onside, but an election occurred and this Government denied Selkirk the opportunity to improve its economic opportunities and its environmental qualities and its future.

I find that most discouraging. I have asked many, many questions in this House and, unfortunately once again, the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer) did not want to listen over the last year but, as an election may be coming up, he suddenly discovered it, went out to Selkirk, said, hey, I can support this, and has introduced a resolution. Now, I will support that resolution because of the quality of the project he is naming, but not the quality of the attitude that proposed it.

We also have proposed in the Town of Selkirk a fine recreation complex which has received pieces and bits of grants over the last couple of years from the provincial Government and has been a result of many, many hours and much dedication of many volunteers. We are very pleased to see what I believe was the money set aside by the federal Government for the Selkirk landing project reissued into the recreational complex.

I was asked by the Recreation Foundation to set up meetings with Ministers of this Government in order that they could discuss what the proposal is and ask for support of the proposal. I was not intending to attend those meetings. We made the meeting with the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). We phoned two weeks before to double-check on it, it was a go. We phoned the week before and all of a sudden they did not know about the meeting until we pushed and then they knew about the meeting but it could not take place. This is an attitude which I have found over the last year to be pervasive with this Government, the idea that they have somehow their own agenda and the people should be set aside.

The biggest example of this to me has been the walkout during the Manfor discussion. It was disgraceful.

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** It was disgraceful.

**Mrs. Charles:** An echo we have in this House—as I repeat what the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus)

is saying, it was disgraceful. He was the lead critic in the committee.

We had asked for a recess of the committee, the committee to be brought back in time that we could discuss the Manfor proposal before it was signed. We were giving away one-fifth of our forest rights in the province, a land area larger than some of our provinces and the Minister did not want to discuss any aspects of it. He did not set out what he would discuss, he just said he could not discuss it. We asked if we could recess the meeting to the next day. The Minister came back, and I will quote out of Hansard, from May 1: "Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but in reviewing the timetables of Mr. Bessey and myself, there are no other options available this week, so I would suggest then that we continue through the night."

\* (1620)

The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) just previously to that had said, I do not believe that there is going to be any purpose served in having us thunder on until three or four in the morning getting very tired. I would much rather take a break, step back and look at this, research a bit and come back with some legitimate concerns. The Opposition Members in that committee were trying to be responsible. The Government asked us to sit through the night. We agreed, we were prepared to. Not very many hours later, after having asked numerous questions, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), the Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer) walked out. Never before in Canadian history has Government walked out on a committee. Shortly after that, the Chair recessed the meeting and left the room as well. The next day, we were unable to have the Chair come back and call the meeting forward, so in essence the Government locked us out of our democratic right on a duty-called meeting. I think they insulted all of the parliamentary process, the history that has gone on before us, and I find that the best example of the attitude this Government has to the people of Manitoba.

I have attended, as many Members I am sure have, many Remembrance Days honouring members of our community who have given their lives to protect democracy. When people make a laughing stock, when they disgracefully walk out, I take it as an insult to many past generations and an example set for future generations. Hopefully, we have dealt with it and will deal with it responsibly as an Opposition so that we will set a precedent that this shall never happen again.

I would like to go on with other issues that have not been dealt with concerning the Selkirk area and district. We have not had anything happening in Telephones. The calling area for Selkirk and district will not do away with the long distance calls from Selkirk to Winnipeg. The businesses in Selkirk will have to still call long distance to Winnipeg to order their supplies, to phone their doctors, to attend to their specialists, and many, many comforts that Winnipeggers can enjoy by picking up the phone and not being charged are not given to Selkirk people, nor are they given to many, many areas around urban centres.

On the other hand, members of West St. Paul area, if they want an ambulance will have to phone long distance, if they want police will have to phone long distance—an insult upon injury, as they say. They will be taxed not only by the federal Government but in addition by the provincial Government. If any of the Members in this House have the unfortunate situation, and my hope is that they never will have, to have a serious injury occur at an early hour of the morning just north of the Perimeter Highway, I call on them to figure out how they will get ambulance or police to come to them. They will not know that although they are in a Winnipeg phoning district they have the Manitoba long distance directory to look up the long distance phone calls. They will not know that they will have to phone long distance to get the police and ambulance. I think when seconds count in our hospitalization needs, this is an unsatisfactory situation.

It also splits the community when neighbours have to phone long distance to talk to neighbours, when one business will have the opportunity to call upon a centre as large as the City of Winnipeg without cost and the next business will have to call with cost. Indeed, lines have to be drawn but the calling districts set in place are not satisfactory and improvements can be made, and I hope will be made.

I would also like to speak on what I believe is the future of Selkirk and the district, and that is tourism. We are not seeing a tourism package developed for Manitoba. There is nothing new in the minds of Government of how to attract tourists. We have the idea that if we should go out of province to make our films to support industry, if we do use in-house workers, we will not pay them going rates even though on the other hand we are subsidizing them through Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

I do support the move of the Deputy Minister for Tourism. I think he will be a good ambassador for Tourism, but he has to have a focus and he has to have support. Tourism for Selkirk, and I believe that would have been supported by this Government had they supported either one, but hopefully both of either the Selkirk landing and the recreation complex, then we would have seen a self-supporting industry in the Selkirk, Lockport and district.

The Lockport merchants are very concerned because plans go ahead to circumvent their community with yet another bridge over the Red River. They have concerns about fishing, not just by this Government but particularly now by the federal Government in their plans and procedures that they have been using in dredging the Red River. We are hoping that we are coming to a satisfactory conclusion for that. I would also like to say that some of the support for Selkirk landing project would have helped improve our infrastructure in Selkirk.

I appreciate that the federal Conservative Government did not see fit to pick up the federal Liberal policy of supporting infrastructure costs across Manitoba. It is a policy that has been stated by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities that would be self-supporting in cost, that would indeed create jobs. I think each of us probably sitting here in this House knows the need for infrastructure repairs.

I appreciate this Government has a charge ahead of them in order to figure out how they can do infrastructure repairs when bills are so costly, when in Winnipeg it is millions of dollars, when in the City of Portage la Prairie it is \$40 million. The City of Brandon needs infrastructure, the Town of Selkirk, and many other need infrastructure repairs. What I would suggest to this Government is that while we are waiting for funds to become available, and I think if enough pressure is put on by all of Canadians, we will see funding have to become available and the need for sustainable development, then let us at least get forward a priority list so that if the funds come forward tomorrow, we will be able to take action the next day. Let us not sit back and do nothing while things get worse.

I would, as well, point out immediate actions that can be taken for the Red River. There needs to be pressure put on all three levels of Government: the City of Winnipeg, the province and the federal Government to put forward a comprehensive river policy. Presently, any large craft on the Red River is allowed to dump its septic tanks straight into the Red River. The sad fact of that is, with the quantity of sludge that is already being dumped into the Red River by the North End sewage treatment plant, it does not make much difference. But the truth is every little bit will help. That would be an action by coordinating efforts of who owns the river, who controls the river, that we could begin to clean the mess up.

\* (1630)

I question this Government's support of sustainable development. First of all, they speak of rural development and say then major development projects will be only in the City of Winnipeg. They spoke of sustainable development only in the City of Winnipeg. They speak of the Mental Health Centre of Excellence for the City of Winnipeg. I have to question why the City of Brandon, why the Town of Selkirk, could not be considered? And this indeed I was speaking of at the Neepawa Rural Agenda Conference, is that the Governments will continue to make ad hoc decisions unless rural areas are given an opportunity to be lobby groups and to judge by themselves the qualities that they can give to the Province of Manitoba.

And, indeed, Members opposite are saying how about Manfor? Well, sustainable development for Manfor is still questionable because we are still looking at what will the hearings of the environment committee be.

We have the best example in Rafferty-Alameda, in that we had to convince the Government that maybe the quality and quantity of water would not be the best. They did not err on the side of caution, they decided to take the political stance and say, oh no, we know best, do not let us have to question it. Do not let us have to hold environment hearings, just let us go ahead. Environment hearings and impact studies are there for the purpose of sustainable development and, unless we understand why they are there, we will not go forward with it.

I heard the previous speaker, the Minister for Rural Development (Mr. Penner) speaking of recycling and



of course I have supported recycling for many, many years. I was saddened to see last year, I guess it was a decision by the previous Government to put forward a styrofoam egg carton plant in the City of Winnipeg, and these are exactly the type of decisions that can be made by Government by disallowing those that will pollute and encouraging those that can be recycled.

The past Minister for the Environment (Mr. Connery) is trying to make comments from the other side, and that is unfortunate that he still thinks he has an attitude about the environment because of course some of his actions were not the best.

We do not have a spills Bill, even though PCBs from the Quebec fire and tragedy will be coming through our province within a month.

We are not looking towards water transfers being discussed in this House, because this Government does not want to talk about water transfers and what may happen under the Free Trade Agreement, but they are quite prepared to change or to transmit water from one aquifer to the other. I am speaking particularly of the Assiniboine delta aquifer which is, as by the Government books, reaching the record low and yet they still have plans for transferring water from one area to the other.

Past practices in Natural Resources, I am sure, were taken in good measure but indeed they have proven to be very poor management practices. We will have to look at strong measures brought in to encourage wetland retention, and I have mentioned those in the past Session.

I was somewhat surprised and we discussed it in the economic development meeting about the fact that if we run out of seedling plants for the Manfor situations, they will not be held accountable for replanting trees. I am worried about that, and this year where the forest fires have devastated so much of Manitoba I would encourage this Government to take action in developing seedling plants and construction companies that may be of benefit of the northern communities, so that we can grow more plants to replant our forest areas.

I have to, while I am speaking of forests, speak of the trip I had to the Duck Mountains when I had the opportunity to see how the cuttings of the forests were taking place before Manfor comes onto line. I have mentioned to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) that there is an area up there, which I hope by now he has taken action on, that there are plans to burn because they do not like the way of the past planting procedures have taken place, because they would like to have the elk coming closer to the roads so people can see them, which is indeed not the encouragement we should be putting forward.

I have also seen that the producers of the forestry industry have many concerns up there and I would hope that the new Minister for Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) will look into how policy is developed and who develops the policy, how quotas are given out and who will manage the quotas because there are indeed problems in that area.

I had the opportunity and privilege of being given two new critic's positions at the end of January, those

being the critic of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, as well, as I have mentioned, the critic for Natural Resources. I have not been too surprised this week by the actions of the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). I was hoping to be surprised because I think the community deserves better than the actions that have taken place this week.

The Minister has stated that she was told by the Manitoba Intercultural Council they approved of her taking away their granting capabilities. That seems to be a departure from the truth in that they claim, not just one person but the board itself claims that is not their intention. There is a need to have the ethnic cultural community represented by its peers because they understand from whence the community is coming.

New people, new Canadians in this province will not want to join together in having to come to a Government board when many of them will have left their countries in fear of Government. There are many reasons, but I think the attitude of this Government, that they want to keep communities in submission to their power, is perhaps the most degrading that I have seen.

I had put forward before this Session came into place the need for a policy on multiculturalism, the need for an Act, and I was very pleased to see that within the Throne Speech, but I cannot believe that it will come into being when I see the actions of this Minister. I have also asked that immediate funding be made available to ethnic communities to develop background on their beliefs, customs and traditions in order that this information can be circulated to police, social workers, educators and all those dealing with this community.

I believe grants could be developed to provide school books without stereotyping of characters and without the stereotyping of illustrations, both for the ethnic community, for the handicapped and for women. There is a pilot project available through the federal Government on race relations for educators and schools. It would be most proactive for this Minister to pick up that pilot project and initiate it within our school system. We definitely would ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) to promote in-service programs on multiculturalism and stereotyping of our cultures.

I think again that the attitude of this Government has been well shown by what has been known as the Gladstone incident, not that it happened, because I understand the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), that he is a kind gentleman and would indeed put his hand out to shake people's hands. But when the problem is pointed out and people have to beg for an apology and it will not be given, then I think again the attitude of the Government comes through, an attitude of complete indifference, an attitude of no respect, an attitude of indifference to the people's needs and backgrounds, when people have run away in fear of issues that they live by day and night, the fear of their lives, the fear of their freedoms, and then there will be no apologies given when these fears are insulted, I think, is indicative of a Government without respect -(Interjection)- They are saying that I did not read the paper. Well, if an apology came, it came too late, because it should have been the first thing on the minds

of the Minister and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) rather than having to be begged for.

\* (1640)

I am going to read into the Hansard some comments made by the Sports Federation, because the Government is pointing out they think I am off-track on where the Government is going. But there is fear in where the Government is going, not only in the ethnic cultural community, not only in the arts community but in the sports community as well.

Tom Sanders has been reported in our local Selkirk Journal of May 23 as saying, in response to the way this new Allocation Committee of Cabinet will take place, and I quote: "Not only will this result in instability of funding from year to year and so making ongoing planning difficult, but what could well happen is umbrella groups becoming less able to pursue their own priorities, and more concerned with satisfying the agendas of Government of the Day. We will see the politicization of a volunteer movement."

This Government's attitude is held in question, not only by the Members of this Party but by the members of the community because you have taken away support of volunteers through the sports community, the arts community, the multiculturalism community. It has been said by many Members in the House before that our volunteers are the character of our province. We should support them and not lose respect of what their demands are, what their needs are and what their future can be.

Before I finish this speech, I would like to comment on my first year in serving the people of Selkirk and district. It has been an extreme pleasure. I often say, although I do not agree with the policies of this Government in many cases, we have tried to cooperate as well as we can. Many Members of the Government I respect as people, I find them very kind, hard-working and well-thought people, but I must point out I believe the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) and the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) are the worst hecklers in this House, and that they do an injustice because of their position and the attitude they take in this House. I think, if the Leaders of the Party are supposed to set the tone of how the attitude of the Government is, then this Government has failed. I believe the people will respond to their failure and we would like to give them that opportunity to make the choice.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I look forward to this Session, and I hope the people will have a choice to decide the future of this province.

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education):** I would, first of all, like to begin my remarks to the Throne Speech by congratulating the Speaker who is not in the Chair at the present time, but nevertheless I would like to offer my congratulations to him on the kind of Session he presided over in the last Session, and wish him well during this Session. Certainly I know that the job he will do will be certainly creditable.

I would also like to congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker on your appointment and your acceptance as

Deputy Speaker of this Chamber. Having known you for a little bit more than a year now, I would have to say I am sure you will do a very creditable job to the position. I wish you well during this Session and I am sure that the experience will be very worthwhile, to say the least.

A month or so ago, we saw within our Cabinet the addition of two new Cabinet Ministers. Today I would like to express my congratulations to both the new Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) and also the new Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). Knowing the two individuals very well for some time, I would have to say that all Manitobans would probably join me in congratulating the calibre of the kind of people we have coming into our Cabinet, in the name of the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) and the Member for Kirkfield Park (Mrs. Hammond).

I know that the Member for Lakeside has been a Cabinet Minister in Governments before, has served under not only one Premier but four. Certainly all of the province looks forward to the kind of contribution that he will continue to make to this province, because certainly he is held in high esteem and high respect throughout the province for what he has contributed to the involvement and the development of our province.

Mr. Speaker, in assuming responsibility for education a year ago, I was joined by a staff that I did not know at the time and have come to know very well. I would just like to say today, congratulations, and thank the staff officially in my office for the support they have given me throughout the year. I look forward to working with them throughout this coming Session and throughout the coming year.

I would also like to congratulate my new Deputy Minister, Mr. John Carlyle, for having accepted the position as Deputy Minister of Education and Training. Certainly Mr. Carlyle not only has the respect of myself and my department but has the respect of both sides of the House because he has certainly been involved in the education community for a long time and has contributed very positively and effectively to the involvement of education in our province. I look forward to some very good initiatives and programs that will be developed by our department as a result of Mr. Carlyle.

Also, about a month ago, my department was expanded somewhat and we took over the training component which blends very nicely with the Department of Education. I would like to welcome those staff who have come over to join me in this new department which is now called the Department of Education and Training. We look forward to developing some very important and innovative initiatives in terms of providing Manitobans with the kind of education programming and training that is going to provide opportunities for those people who go through those programs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to turn my attention now to an expression of support for the Throne Speech. I have to say, not only was the Throne Speech that we heard on the 18th an innovative and active agenda, but it restores the confidence of Manitobans in this

province and in the Government that is presently leading it.

The thrust of this speech was to build a strong Manitoba for all of us, for all the residents of our province. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are proud of our province. If you talk to people around the province, you feel the pride in talking about the opportunities that exist in our province, the vast resources that have potential for development in our province. It is a place, a province where one can build a future and raise a family. The quality of life we have in this province is reflective of the values we place in our families and in our community.

None of this has come about by accident. I refer back to my constituency, which is a mixture of varieties of people, of groups, of cultural groups. I have to say that the pride these people have in this province, in their communities, comes from the fact that their fathers and forefathers who came to this land laid a foundation of resourcefulness, of pride, a positive work attitude and a love and respect for the fellow man and the fellow Manitoban.

That has been something that has been given to us as residents of this province to carry on and I feel a deep pride in the kind of province we have. It is a province of opportunity. It is not, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has many times referred to it, a have-not province. We on this side of the House, the Government of the Day, reject that premise. All Manitobans are rendered an injustice by comments such as this inexcusable comment that has been made by the Leader of the Opposition, not on one occasion but on many.

I think it adds insult to the kinds of opportunities that exist in this province which can be developed and created. I have not heard that comment made by any other Members of the Opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I have heard it made by the Leader of the Opposition and it gives me some deep concern.

\* (1650)

This Throne Speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe sets out an agenda which will take this province into the 1990s with a confidence that will provide for all of us in Manitoba a bright and positive future. I think Manitobans have displayed their confidence in this Government, in this province simply by the last issue of HydroBonds, if you like, and the confidence that they have shown by going out and purchasing the volume of HydroBonds that they have in three business days. That shows you that Manitobans are proud of our province. They want to invest in our province. They are proud of our Government and the leadership that it is providing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hear a comment made by the Member opposite that says they are brainwashed. Well, I do not think Manitobans are brainwashed. Manitobans are critical thinking people who have an ability to make judgment and good judgment and they are doing it and showing it.

The last Throne Speech set out an agenda which was visionary in approach and which had at its focus

the concept of putting Manitoba back on track, putting it on a course of action which would instill hope and confidence in the future, in the Government and in the province. Those goals and objectives were accomplished and were even surpassed.

I use by example the lowering of the deficit, the lowest deficit since 1981. What does this all mean? What does it mean to the average Manitoban? Let me tell you. The money that this province does not have to spend on interest can then go into the services that Manitobans require. It can go into health care; it can go into our social programs; it can go to foster parents; it can go to education, and it can go to agriculture and rural development where that money is so badly needed. That is what a deficit as low as the one that has just come out is going to do for the citizens of this province and for the average Manitoban.

It is very obvious that the tangible results that have been shown by this Government show that this Government is in control of its agenda. I refer again to the divestiture of the corporations whose futures and viability were in question. Today we find that there are corporations who can take over these Crown corporations that were not going anywhere, and can turn them into profitable job opportunities for Manitobans, for Manitobans can then also create some wealth. There has been a greater accountability of our Crown corporations, something that we needed desperately. There was chaos in our Crown corporations during the last administration. That has come under control.

The support to agriculture has been significant and we have gone through some very hard times in rural Manitoba. I am a rural Manitoban and I know the kind of stress that is in rural Manitoba because of the drought, because of low grain prices, because of inability for that part of the province to grow because of economic climates, not only in this province but in this country. We have supported the agricultural community, the rural community to a fairly extensive extent.

The education support is something that is very dear and near to me, of course. I think that as a Government, we have certainly gone a long way to support our educational institutions, the public school system, the independent school system, our community colleges and our universities, and more can be done. During the past year, some very difficult decisions had to be made by Government and especially our Premier.

I have to tell you that I am very proud, as Manitobans are right across the land, when you talk to them that here we have a Premier (Mr. Filmon) who is standing up for Manitobans. He is voicing the concerns of Manitobans and he is not afraid to do it, whether it is to the people in Ottawa or whoever may challenge him. There will be many challenges ahead.

The latest Budget by the federal Government has not been pleasant to Manitobans and especially to the community of Portage. A rural community, a nice little city which was doing very well, but this blow certainly is going to be devastating to that community. Our Government, the Premier, have expressed their

concerns and we as a Government are going to do everything we can to ensure that Portage takes its rightful place in the development of this province, both economically, socially, and in all other areas.

As we evolve as a society in a province, certain issues became apparently important. To enhance the quality of life becomes very predominant and very important. When we talk about enhancing the quality of life, we talk about protecting people from various human effects. Economic growth is important in order to survive and prosper as a province in a global sense. Because technology is changing, we have to change as well. Our Government has said that growth will take place through sustainable development and this is one way in which we, as Manitobans, can ensure that our children and future generations will have the opportunity to enjoy a quality of life that is at least equal to that we enjoy today.

We in Manitoba and we, on this side of the House in Government, believe that we must protect those in our society who are vulnerable and perhaps less fortunate than we are. We must protect our elderly, we must protect our children. As the Minister of Education in the last year, I have only seen too often the negative effects that child abuse has had because of the fact that I am involved in the school system, and this must be stopped.

Later on in this Session, we will be introducing a Bill to enhance the penalties, if you like, to enhance the way in which we handle child abuse in not only the school system but in our society. It is my hope that we will have the support of Members opposite, both in the Official Opposition and in the third Party, because this is not a political Bill any more. It has become a public issue, a public one, which has to be dealt with and must be addressed for the good of all of us in this province, especially for our children of the province who are so vulnerable and must be protected.

Rural Manitoba has undergone some very challenging days in the years that have gone by and last year, I guess, was the climax in where we saw a drought situation that we have never seen for a long, long time. It has crippled the rural economy to a certain extent and it will take some time for that rural economy to rejuvenate itself.

As a Government, we recognize the importance of the rural communities for the development of this province as a whole and we must and will address the issues that are out there. We need to diversify, we need to decentralize wherever we can and wherever possible. Small industry must be encouraged to develop in our rural communities. Whether it is in Winkler, whether it is in Roblin, or whether it is in Selkirk, we have to ensure that those small communities are allowed to grow and are allowed to thrive. We need to also ensure that development takes place through tourism, and the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) raised the issue of tourism in the rural part of this province.

I have to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when I look at my constituency itself, a constituency that is rich in tourism potential, and I take a look at how much has been developed there, certainly we know that issue

has to be addressed. We have been working towards that and it is not something that can happen overnight, we understand that. We know we cannot do it as a Government ourself. We have to involve the private sector, we have to involve Manitobans in the development of this province but we have to provide the climate whereby this kind of an industry can develop.

Our support to agriculture, I have mentioned, and I do not think there is anybody in this House who can criticize this Government on the support that it has given to agriculture. We have seen the critic for Agriculture of the Official Opposition (Mr. Laurie Evans) stand in his place and commend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), who has indeed done a tremendous job of supporting the agricultural community. More can be done, we recognize that, but you cannot do it all in one year. I have not even heard the critic for Agriculture from the third Party (Mr. Uruski) criticize our Government or the way in which our Minister has handled affairs of farmers or agriculture in general.

Education opportunities must also be enhanced in the rural part of the province. I have been through schools both in the city, in the smaller communities, in the mid-size communities, and I can tell you there are issues out there in rural Manitoba that have to be addressed from an educational standpoint.

The smaller communities are shrinking in size. The school sizes are shrinking. We have to make sure those students, who are maybe only 20 or 30 in a small school, will get an opportunity to have an education that is equal or comparable to that which is offered in an urban setting.

\* (1700)

We must keep rural people in the rural communities. They want to stay there. They do not want to move to the urban settings in this province necessarily but they are forced on many occasions to do that. We have to ensure the climate is such that they will be motivated to stay in those areas.

Much has been said about protecting the environment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I am one who believes very much that we must protect our environment. Whether we live in the city or whether we live in the rural areas, the environment is an important issue. Lip-service has been paid by the former Government with regard to the environment but our Government has done something about it. We have raised the profile of the importance of environment. The Centre for Sustainable Development, development of economic issues through sustainable development is certainly a way to go.

In all of this, education is still the key and it must begin at a very early age. Attitudes must be developed in our youth. The youth must become involved in order to make sure that future generations will have the kind of respect for the environment and the protection of that is really required and needed.

The future of our province lies in our youth. Investment of dollars in education and training is the key to the

economic prosperity and the social development of our province.

Access to education is important. There are barriers in certain segments of our society which prevent some Manitobans from an opportunity and an access to an education that they need and deserve. We have to ensure that access is going to be available to them, to those students who are disadvantaged, who are less fortunate, to the new Canadians and to the Native population or the aboriginal population or the Metis population of our province.

We cannot do it with the traditional approaches that have been used in the past. Innovative approaches must be embarked on and we have started, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Distance Education Model is one vehicle in order to be able to provide remote and rural communities with the kinds of educational opportunities that are required. Not only is this important in the high school area, but it is important at the college and the university level.

Today our Government announced, I announced the intention of a pilot program in Distance Education for first-year university students, in which 10 university courses will be piloted in rural and northern communities via the Distance Education Model. This would not only assist those students in rural and northern parts of the province to get an education but will keep them in their communities where they belong.

Throughout the months ahead, the province and the universities will be getting together to work out the details of this approach. Certainly we look forward to that kind of an approach being successful for many not only graduating students, but older students who may enter into the university programs and get access to them. Education must involve not only the educators, the Department of Education, but must also involve many other sectors of the community, the parents, businesses, labour and other organizations.

I was listening to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) the other day when she was speaking to the Throne Speech, and I could not believe my ears because she was attacking this Government and its education policies. She said we were not proactive enough. We were not ramming things through. We were simply consulting and studying.

I have news for her, because education is not a process where you dictate to the rest of the province what is good for them. You must involve the players; you must involve parents; you must involve the businesses who are going to be the recipients of the graduates; you must involve labour who are going to be the deliverers of many of the job programs that are out there. You must involve organizations in the development of an education process and policy that is going to address the needs of this province.

In the past, the view of involving the entire community in making education decisions has not always been the view and, because of this, policies and statutes were developed that perhaps did not really meet the needs of Manitobans. For that reason, my department will be issuing a White Paper on Education legislation which

will be circulated in the fall. The purpose of that of course is to consult with Manitobans and to have the emergence of changes to The Education Act that will reflect the views of Manitobans and the direction that education should take in this province.

The High School Review has been one that has been talked about considerably over the last year or year and a-half. I am happy about the responses that have been received when I sent out the recommendations to the variety of school divisions and organizations. About 230 responses have been received to date, and we were receiving phone calls in the middle of March asking us to extend the deadline because there were organizations and individuals who wanted to respond but had not yet put their recommendations or responses together, so we extended the deadline to accept all of the views of those people who wanted to respond.

I have to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the High School Review will emerge as a process in three phases. The first phase we have gone through. That was the development of the consultation paper, the putting together of the committee and a consultation with Manitobans at large. The second phase was the tabling of the responses in the House, of the recommendations in the House, and then going out and getting the responses to those recommendations. That process has already been completed. The third phase that we are embarking on now will be the phase of synthesizing, which we have already done, of all the responses and then putting a cost factor to them.

Then comes the process of the implementation of short-term, intermediate-term and long-term goals and programs. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will perhaps form what we might refer to as the future direction of high school education in this province.

I am pleased to also indicate that the Education Finance Review is going along very well. Consultation has produced some very informative kinds of concepts, and some positive results have come about because of consultation that has taken place between the school divisions, the organizations that are involved in education. We asked for written responses to some of the consultation. We have received those now. Those have been, again, put together, compiled and now we are ready to go back in the next month or so to the organizations again to get their input and to propose funding measures which should be shared, I should say now, in the fall.

In all of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the issues that has been placed on the back burner by the former Government but needs to be addressed is the whole issue of special education. An advisory committee was established and they reported to me last October. Since then staff have prepared and developed a policy paper which talks about some of the responses to the recommendations made by the advisory committee.

Later this summer or early in the fall, a policy statement will be issued on special education in this province and the direction that we are going to go with in terms of special education in the future of this province. Not only will that be done for the intermediate and elementary grades, but also for the high schools as part of the High School Review process.

One of the most serious issues that has been discussed in this House, and it touches on health directly, it touches on education and on society as a whole, is the whole serious issue of the AIDS epidemic and the concern about what may happen in the school system and also in society. We have today a program on AIDS education which is being delivered to all schools in the province. There is an opt-out provision for parents who do not wish to have their students take the program. I have to tell you that we have recognized that there is even a greater need for expanding the AIDS program in our school system. I can tell you that throughout this year staff are working to expand that program and the delivery of that. Later on this year, we will be making an announcement with regard to the expansion of the AIDS program in our school system.

\* (1710)

Guidelines have been developed for the elementary and high school system in terms of dealing with AIDS. At the present time the Advisory Committee to the Minister of Education is working on guidelines, and the MECA group—I should say, the Manitoba Education Council on Aids—is working on guidelines for university and post-secondary institutions. Attached to this is the Family Life Program which needs some revisions to it as well. We have to make sure that we offer choices of programming to school boards, but that family life education is important in this province, so the program itself will be expanded to where we will have not only one program but perhaps choices of programs that can be offered throughout our province.

So all in all, our Curriculum Development Branch is working very hard and very constantly at reviewing and revising aspects of the curriculum where they need to be revised and to keep current with current trends, and to make sure that we are offering Manitoba students the best possible education opportunity that we can.

I would like to turn my attention now to our community colleges. Our community colleges have been operating in this province for quite some time, but now it is time to take a look at the overall concept of how community colleges relate to business, to the work force, to preparing the people who go through them, the students, for the work force. In the Throne Speech, mention was made that we would be taking a look at our community college system to see whether or not it is addressing the needs that are out there effectively, whether more flexibility is required, how we can respond better to the changing demands of industry, of labour and of society.

The traditional approaches of teaching in community colleges has not been addressing the needs of society adequately. New technologies, new industries, a changing job market, create new demands on our community college system and we must be ready to address that, and we must be ready to change as the changes are required. To this end, we will be establishing a working group which will be taking a look at the community college system and how it responds to all of these.

Vocational programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been posing a bit of a concern because there has been inadequate articulation between the vocational programs in our high schools and our community colleges. At the present time, staff are examining these aspects and will be coming back to me with some recommendations with regard to how we can better establish links between the vocational programs in our high school system and also the post-secondary training, if you like, of our province. So much needs to be done in that regard, and we are well under way in terms of making some fairly significant progress and changes where changes are needed.

Our province is blessed with four fairly important universities: the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg, the University of Brandon and the St. Boniface College. These are four of our strongest higher-learning institutions in this province and we are proud of them. As Government, we try to do our part to make sure that these institutions are world class, that they are centres of educational excellence.

In order to ensure that there is access to universities, we have begun some discussions with the Universities Grants Commission, with the universities on innovative approaches that may be required in terms of university education. Problems in accessing university in northern and rural Manitoba have become very real.

For that reason, we made the announcement today with regard to the Distance Education Program on universities. This will provide opportunities, as I said, for students in rural and remote areas, in northern areas. It will allow students to live in their own communities and will also allow older students who may wish to work part time and take university courses to access those university courses in communities outside of the city. It will also lessen the cost for some of those parents who perhaps cannot afford to send their children to buy their room and board in the city. Those students can then live in their own community or at home. As I said, we will be working with the universities over the next two months to establish, and we are looking forward to that process and in evolving into a positive kind of approach to university education in our province.

There are also other university programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the last couple of months, I have received a very interesting and innovative proposal from the Faculty of Management at the University of Manitoba with regard to an approach of improving the quality of delivery of programming at the Faculty of Management. I am looking forward to working not only with the Faculty of Management at the University of Manitoba, with the Universities Grants Commissions, the Board of Governors, and the university president to ensure that those kind of innovative approaches are not only addressed, but certainly that we approach them in a positive light and that we give opportunity to promote faculties to a world-class standard.

I think we can all be proud of our Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba. I think that we, as a province in total and I know Members opposite would agree with me, have to ensure that the enhancement of the programming at the universities is such that we become a world-class type of institution.

I have also been in touch with the university presidents, both at the U of M, the St. Boniface College, and at the University of Brandon to take a look at programs that perhaps may need to be expanded, may need to be delivered in those institutions as well. What it does is it gives us a direct link with the universities. It provides me an opportunity to know what their concerns are and certainly then those can be addressed in a more positive way.

As I mentioned earlier in my address, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Department of Education has undergone some changes in the last month or so. We have the addition of training to our department and this is in recognition that education is a lifelong process. Education does not stop. It does not cease at Grade 12 or when a student leaves school, whether it is at high school or at the end of university. From time to time, retraining is going to be required, we know that in the working life of a person. That is because technology is changing, our society is changing. We are becoming a very global-oriented kind of society which can go back and forth across the world very quickly, where decisions made on one side of the world can affect us here in Manitoba.

Therefore, we have to be prepared and we have to have educational opportunities available and training opportunities available for those people who perhaps may have to change jobs because of the changing technology, because of industries ceasing and new industries emerging. Those people have to have the opportunity to be retrained effectively and quickly so that we do not subject a portion of our society to living on social assistance or being without a means for any length of time.

So I am looking forward to working together with staff in developing and continuing the work that was done by the former Minister and the excellent progress that she made when she was in charge of the department. I intend to continue that kind of work in this new department that has been added to the Department of Education.

We have to acknowledge that if we are going to prosper as a province that education is still the key. For that reason, education affects all of us, whether we are in industry, whether we are in business. To ensure that we do come up with the right kinds of policies and programs, we are implementing a Skills Training Advisory Committee, something that the former Minister worked on. We will continue and we will be developing that Skills Training Advisory Committee which will be made up of business, of labour, and of educational people who will then give advice to myself as Minister and to Government on the kinds of programming that needs to be developed for this province.

\* (1720)

When the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) stood in her place last day, she flailed away at the Literacy Task Force. I would like to tell you today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one of our better initiatives in this province, and one that is not only isolated to this province but is prevalent throughout Canada and

throughout the world and throughout North America, for that matter, is this problem of illiteracy.

The rate of illiteracy is alarming in our province. For that reason, the Literacy Task Force was established to make sure that Manitobans had their voices heard with regard to what they thought and they wanted in literacy programming. I have to tell you that the task force went out and did a tremendous, credible job. I am very proud of the Literacy Task Force, the diligence that they served in undertaking this responsibility. I would like to formally thank the chairman of that committee, Rosemary Beaudry, and her entire task force committee for the kind of initiative that they exhibited in carrying out this very important task.

I have to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only did they carry it out, but they came in underbudget and that certainly is a tremendous thing when you can give a task to a group and they come in and not utilize their budget. So we were therefore able to take the remaining part, we took \$60,000 that was not utilized in that budget and we were able to apply that to new programming.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) said we did not come up with any innovative programming or any programs at all, and I have to tell you that not only did we come up with some new programming, we delivered some money to allow the annual Learners' Conference to be held in April, 1989. We put some money into the Selkirk area, the Lord Selkirk School Division, on literacy for unemployed youth, there was the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities. Literacy for Deaf Adults was given some money. Also, The Pas Friendship Centre in the expansion of its community-based learner centre project was given some additional funds.

So in fact, we did address the concerns of illiteracy in this province in the last year. We intend to take the task force and its recommendations and apply some of those recommendations, as many as we can, to programming in the future year.

**Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks):** How about coordination with any of the federal programs?

**Mr. Derkach:** I tell you—oh, the Member for Seven Oaks talks about coordination with the federal Government. I have to tell you that on several occasions we met with the Minister and I am happy to say now, in case he did not know, that this province received \$492,000 to complement our programs for literacy in the last year. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is as well as any province in this country has done with regard to the coordination of programming between the federal Government and a provincial Government.

I would like to also say, with regard to literacy, that I will be very happy to table the report in a very short time as it is now in the process of being translated and, as soon as that is available, I will indeed be tabling it.

I thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I know my time is out and it has been a pleasure speaking in favour of this Throne Speech, and I look for good things to come for Manitoba as a result.

**Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I certainly will be more progressive than the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), but in any case I would like to congratulate you in your new duties. I hope you learn them well. While I have both the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Chornopyski) and the Speaker (Mr. Rocan), I would like to also welcome back the Speaker in his position. We do not know how lengthy the position will be at this point but we wish you all well in any case.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

**An Honourable Member:** No, he is not one.

**Mr. Roch:** Well, he is halfway here. He is halfway there.

**An Honourable Member:** Gilles, we will all be here for a long time and you be careful.

**Mr. Roch:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach), who I think will be in a nomination battle with the Member for Virden (Mr. Findlay), one of them will not be back, that is for sure. In any case, despite all that, I would like to welcome the Government Members back this Session. It lasted longer than the Tory Government of Joe Clark in 1979.

I would like to congratulate the new Members of the Cabinet and I wish them well in their duties. I certainly hope they can perform the duties better than some of the other Ministers have.-(Interjection)- I am not saying that not all Ministers have not performed their duties well. You can count them, on one hand, the competent Ministers in that Government.

I would also like to welcome back our interim First Minister (Mr. Filmon), as well as the new Deputy Premier, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). I would like to welcome back the Members of the NDP. I was glad to hear the other day that the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), the new Minister of Natural Resources, is introducing a Bill to look after them, The Endangered Species Act, is that what it was? I believe that is what it was.

Last but certainly not least, I would like to welcome back the only Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in this House, as well my colleagues in the Liberal Caucus, the only true Opposition Members in this House, not a charade like the phony battles and the Tory-NDP coalition. The Member for Gladstone (Mrs. Oleson) says, what did I say last year? I said last year there was a great victory in this province because we elected 45 non-socialists, and that was a victory for the people of Manitoba. I guess they agree with me, they are all silent.

What has been happening now reminds one a lot of professional wrestling. You know, it is like the MWA Main Event. The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) gets up. The First Minister (Mr. Filmon) gets up. They are both yelling at each other. Then they get together in the back room and they cut a deal. Well, you know, it could not have been better put in yesterday's Free Press headlines, "NDP to support Tories on Speech." I guess I have convinced the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) because he has now taken a seat behind me.

I do not blame him. He was the Minister who just the other day admitted that he had no like for his Leader. He said it right there from his chair. He says, "Everyone knows I don't like Gary." Did not he say that? He said that. I have known that for years though.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to re-emphasize the fact that the Liberal Caucus is not only the real and Official Opposition, but it is also the Government-in-waiting. We on this side are ready, willing, able and capable.-(Interjection)- Well, the Member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach) says the Liberals have been waiting for a long time. That will be dependent upon your colleagues in the NDP.

The Ministers make various comments but I have to point out that we have a diversified caucus. Unlike the Members opposite who are essentially all the same kind, basically I guess except for a couple, basically all a bunch of dinosaurs, you know. That is common knowledge. This caucus has got diversity, diversity in ethnic background, diversity in capabilities, diversity in occupational background, not as much as regional diversity as we would like but that is only a matter of time. I think—no, I believe—I know this caucus is representative of the mosaic of Manitoba. All sectors of life, all walks of life, all ethnic backgrounds.

\* (1730)

**An Honourable Member:** All sectors of life, you can say that again.

**Mr. Roch:** The Members opposite agree and that is good to know.

I mentioned earlier this caucus was the Government-in-waiting and ready to govern. I would like to point out as well that our Leader—and it is nice to have a Leader you can respect for a change. I have not had that in years, and better yet, that respects you, individual Members.-(Interjection)- The Member for Gladstone (Mrs. Oleson) makes comments from her seat, but the fact is I still have as much respect today for the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) as do most of his Cabinet colleagues, so that has not changed. Their comments make me digress from my notes.

**An Honourable Member:** They agree with you.

**Mr. Roch:** It is fairly common knowledge.

To get back to the debate of the Speech from the Throne, I think it is pretty well agreed upon by at least the majority of people in this province that the Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) has demonstrated her ability as Canada's first woman Leader of the Opposition, and that very soon she will demonstrate her abilities and capabilities as Canada's first woman Premier.

**An Honourable Member:** Mind you, she is the only one.

**Mr. Roch:** There seems to be some anti-women comments coming from benches opposite but it is not the only reason that she should be Premier, because



she is capable, not because she is a woman. It is coincidental that she will become the first woman Premier. I do not think there is anything wrong with that.

Does the Member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach) think there is something wrong with that? He is laughing. Is there something wrong with a woman being Premier? Answer me, he just continues laughing.

I am proud -(Interjection)- the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery), Cooperative Affairs has become a portfolio without Minister. Have you ever seen that before?

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Roch:** In a classic quote from the Member for Portage, "Being in Cabinet is not a demotion."

**Mr. Roch:** In Opposition, he used to refer to the "bridge to nowhere" that the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) built in Selkirk. Now he opens up overpasses to nowhere because his colleague, his twin from Ottawa, is about to put up a "road closed" sign there, but we are getting away from the Speech from the Throne here.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Would you care to interpret that for me, Neil, because it might have been in French. We might have missed it. It did not make sense to me . . . .

**Mr. Roch:** It is quite easy for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to miss a lot, quite easy. In any case, I am proud and I am pleased to support the amendment to this Throne Speech motion.- (Interjection)- What is it? The Minister, the Member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) the Minister of something I am sure, he says read it and I am pleased to do as he asks.

I shall read it. THAT the motion be amended by adding to it the following words: But this House regrets that: 1) this Government has ignored the need for employment opportunities at a time when our unemployment rate is above the national average; 2) this Government has sold Manfor without adequate concern for the environment, Treaty rights or employment opportunities for aboriginal peoples and northerners; 3) this Government has for too long been apologetic for the federal Government and is therefore incapable of achieving fairness and equity for Manitoba and Manitobans; 4) this Government has failed to stimulate the economy of our province with the result that housing starts, retail expenditures are down, while unemployment, interest rates and inflation are up; 5) this Government has failed to provide new directives for our health care system; 6) this Government has ignored the needs of rural Manitobans, including the need for rural diversification; and 7) this Government has thereby lost the trust and confidence of the people of Manitoba.

I think that is an amendment well worth supporting.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Maybe you should get some more Liberals in here.

**Mr. Roch:** I have to agree with the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey). He is absolutely right, we have

to get some more Liberals in here, and I agree with that statement.

But now I mentioned that the amendment said it all. What all does it say? Let us take a look at the Speech from the Throne, what it contains and, more importantly, what it does not. I am not going to quote the whole Speech from the Throne, but selective parts.- (Interjection)- Well, I will advise the Member for Gladstone (Mrs. Oleson) who would like to hear that copies are available from the Clerk's Office, but maybe she is not aware of that, she is not aware of what she signs.

One of the statements says: "My Government has prepared an active agenda to fulfill its mandate of restoring the confidence of Manitobans in their province and its Government." Active agenda—it is merely rhetoric, rhetoric and promises of more studies, more committees, more working groups.- (Interjection)- A lot of work to do, that is for sure, as the Member for Gladstone says, and it is about time. What are some of these reports? We have had some in the past, we have had the Wiens Report, the Stevenson-Kellogg Report, the Child Care Task Force, the Foster Parent Survey, and it goes on and on and on, the Dewar Report. I cannot read them all, there are just too many and they are proposing more. We see Stevenson-Kellogg appear almost everywhere, MIC Review, new this and new that.

There were at least 10, if not more, new proposals in the Speech from the Throne. They promised consultation, they promised an Arts Policy Committee, they promised advisory boards on this, advisory boards on that. There is just no point in reading them all because obviously, in an effort not to commit any errors, which they managed to do anyhow, they are trying to do nothing, besides this, as one of my colleague says, to keep the NDP happy. The NDP says nothing while they do nothing, a nice measure of convenience. That trick is not enough. Action is required, especially after several years of inaction.

Active agenda, indeed. The only activity appears to be a kowtowing to the NDP to ensure that the Tories survive as a Government, and yes, the NDP survives as a Party. As the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) told me approximately a year ago, we need a strong NDP to survive as a Government or, as the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) told me when I was speaking during debate on the Speech from the Throne last year, you forgot who the enemy is. No, Mr. Speaker, I never forgot. I was here for the six-and-a-half years under the Pawley Government.

The Party, which has been relegated to third Party status, they were the enemy and when the Conservatives were in Opposition it was heated daily attacks on the then socialists. Now, all of a sudden, the socialists are not enemies, they have become allies. Why this sudden change of heart? Some of the founders of that Party and some of the former leaders of this governing Party must be upset. Those who are passed away must be turning in their graves. I think what is happening is a disgrace. I would like to quote another portion in the Speech from the Throne as this Government seems or attempts to think that they can do a lot for rural Manitoba.

\* (1740)

In the section entitled Rural Development, it states, "My Government's strategy for rural development will focus on the fundamental economic challenges effecting agriculture and on the other economic and social issues that are of concern to rural Manitobans. A new Department of Rural Development has been established to lead in fulfilling this commitment."

What kind of commitment to rural Manitoba? I do not believe that taking a Minister who has proven himself incompetent in Natural Resources, was incapable of running that department, being demoted to rural Manitoba, to Rural Development is an example of this Government's commitment to rural Manitoba. Has rural Manitoba become a dumping ground for the demotion of Ministers?

It appears that we in rural Manitoba have been Rafferty-Alamedas, so to speak. It is probably why that person was put in that portfolio. The Member for Portage (Mr. Connery) says—as I retract all the things I said about Sharon before—the fact is, they tried hard last Session to get me to say—well, I hesitate to use the term "nasty," but that is exactly what they wanted me to do, say nasty things about the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in the Liberal Caucus.

What we tried to do and succeeded in doing in the last election was defeating the NDP Government and all of a sudden that is not important any more. Here we have an invaluable situation in Manitoba of having two major non-socialist Parties competing for power, the best possible of all worlds. But no, they want a strong NDP in order to survive. It goes contrary to common sense; it goes contrary to their own philosophy.

One thing I noticed in the Throne Speech is that there is little emphasis on agriculture. Oh, there was some repetition of the promises of last year but for a rural-based Party the obvious lack of initiative is not only surprising, in my opinion it is very discouraging. This new Department of Rural Development, is it more lip-service like the Seniors Directorate or has it too become a portfolio without Minister? You phone different departments and sometimes they are not even sure—or different sections of this new department—how to answer the phones. Hopefully, they will learn to answer, Rural Development.

Unless there is a real true commitment and a real true emphasis in this department, if it just becomes meaningless like some of the other agencies and directorates which have been set up, it will be an insult and a slap in the face to all rural residents. I feel this is an area where if the Government is truly serious that they seriously want to reverse a trend from rural to urban, that it can be done. It can be done, but policies have to be put in effect, action has to be put in effect. No more working groups, no more committees. I agree studies need to be done in some areas but the fact is that they had a year to study. Now is the time for action.

If the Government is very serious about doing something about the sad situation of rural Manitoba, they can expect cooperation from this caucus. Of that, there is no doubt. As a matter of fact, I feel that rural

Manitoba should be looked upon as an area where a Member, a Minister is promoted to. That is the kind of stature, the kind of area rural Manitoba should be, and I can think of a couple of examples, the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey). He is one of those few which I count as a competent Minister but I feel that he is highly underutilizing his present portfolio. That Member has been a critic for Municipal Affairs in the past. He knows rural Manitoba inside and out. Why could he not become Minister of Rural Development? I would certainly have a lot more confidence, a lot more faith that this Government is truly committed to rural Manitoba.

The reason that he promoted some backbenchers into the Cabinet, the Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz) who has three more years experience as a Member of the Legislature than the present Minister, has been a Mayor of the town of Steinbach in the past, is from rural Manitoba. If they were going to bring in new Members, why not the Member for La Verendrye? He also knows rural Manitoba municipal affairs, but no, no, we get a Minister who bungled up one department and now we, in rural Manitoba, are stuck with him.

Again, I would like to continue on an area which I brought up the other day, the whole area of rural casinos. This is an area which some Members across take lightly but the issue here is not whether it should be a casino or not. The issue is that many organizations in rural Manitoba, because of the way the systems have been set up, became dependent upon those annual casinos for their source of revenue, in some cases, averaging \$40,000 a year from that one single solitary casino annually. They have yet to learn if they will be compensated adequately.

It is not enough to say some of them are losing money, that is very possible. Those in my area, in eastern Manitoba, none of them are losing money. They may have had some years which were better than others, but on the overall the average was quite good. Although they have received forms, they have received formulas, they are still unsure as to whether or not they will get the compensation which is due them, given the fact this other source of revenue has been taken away.

I would like to refer to another section in the Throne Speech, which comes under the section of Rural Development. It says: "The pressures of continued out-migration on the social services and infrastructure of rural Manitoba will be addressed in concert with the people who live in these areas. My Government's strategy to strengthen rural communities, include a Government-wide effort to decentralize service delivery. To this end, my Government has established a working group to continue the process of identifying Government operations that can beneficially be decentralized."

Again there is a question, why another working group at this time? They have had a year, a year so far, we have heard a lot about decentralization, but nothing is happening. I realize the former Land Titles Office in Boissevain have had the employees which the previous Government took away replaced, but again that is strictly a replacement, it is not additional jobs.

That section also says the provincial Government has already re-established, again not a new initiative,

re-established. What I want to say here too is they mention Cabinet offices in Thompson, Cabinet offices in Brandon. What about eastern Manitoba, what about us in eastern Manitoba? We are part of the province too, we pay our taxes like anyone else. We are entitled to services, we are entitled to decentralization.

\* (1750)

Mr. Speaker, there are several communities out in eastern Manitoba who are surviving simply because of their close proximity to the City of Winnipeg. I do not feel that those communities should be there solely as satellite communities of Winnipeg. If there is true and meaningful decentralization, I think something should be put into place because the day could conceivably come where just being in close proximity to Winnipeg will not be enough to ensure their survival.

Then there are communities further east, communities like Seven Sisters, Whitemouth, Elma, Rennie, where the proximity to Winnipeg is too far for them to travel to and from work, although some do it out of necessity. It just underlines the urgency that is required to decentralize because the unfortunate fact of life is that whereas at one time a farmer could make a living on a quarter section, those days are gone. New ways, new industries, new sources of employment must be found to keep people in a rural surrounding. I think previous speakers on the Government side, as well as on our side, have indicated that and there seems to be general agreement. The question now is to do it.

One of those ways would be to establish some policies within the department, policies which have been lacking for years and years, especially in the area of rural residential development. The Government cannot on one hand say that it wants to repopulate rural Manitoba, and on the other hand when applications come in, especially in areas which are sandy, stony, bush, where they want to develop housing, turn around and say, no, you cannot develop there because you do not have a development plan in place.

The buck is being passed from one department to the next, from one level of Government to the next. It has to stop and the direction has to come from the top. The Minister, the department has to take the bull by the horns and lay down the framework, the groundwork, and say this is what we are going to do. Using the excuse in some areas that they cannot subdivide because it is prime agricultural land while in another area prime agricultural land is being subdivided does not make sense. There is no rhyme or reason to the way the department is operating right now. There is total mass confusion. I would say that it is the one area of concern, apart from Workers Compensation, where I guess I get almost the greatest number of calls.

It is not a question of not allowing agriculture, it is a question of striking a balance between agriculture and rural residential development. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that if one lives in an area which is potentially, or which was at one time primarily agricultural, if one holds only 10-20 acres and is surrounded by a housing development and he cannot develop that 20 acres just because a couple of years

ago the department decided that they would not approve anything else until a municipality or municipalities put together a development plan, well, I say that is not good enough. Obviously, a small parcel like that is not viable to make a living unless one which is turned into a cattle or a hog operation, but then it would not be allowed for environmental reasons, and rightfully so.

These are areas which must be cleared up and where policies have to be enunciated and soon because the backlog is just piling up. Just appealing it to the Municipal Board every time is not sufficient because the Municipal Board in the end is forced to rule based on the vague outlines that they have and precedents that have been set, and there is just a general unfairness out there in rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in rural Manitoba, it also says that plans will be announced for the expansion and improvement of the highway system, an essential part of the infrastructure in all regions of the province. That is welcome news because, as we all know, the previous Government had slashed highway spending something fierce, but again in one year we are still waiting. I have communicated with the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) on numerous occasions, some of them at his requests, about line priorities mentioned in provincial roads, provincial trunk highways, potential usable roads which could become provincial roads, but all we get is outright refusals, or it will be considered. I realize a lot of emphasis has been put on Highway 75, and rightfully so, but it is not the only highway in Manitoba. There are a lot of other highways being used in this province, a lot of provincial roads. I realize it cannot all be done overnight but one has to start.

The Members across laugh. They chuckle. Well, they used to criticize the NDP for the very same reasons but now that they are in power it seems to be status quo. Now, I hope they prove me wrong.- (Interjection)-

Well, the Minister agrees with me that they do not know where they are going. The Member for Rhineland (Mr. Penner) has just said he does not know where he is going or where he has been. I am glad he is not the Minister of Highways because he would be all over the map.

Provincial roads, provincial trunk highways in my area where it is critical is the 405. How many times has that been requested of these two Governments? Provincial Road 306, Provincial Trunk Highway No. 11, so far no action, so far no indication of action, so far not even the confirmation that it will be considered.

Areas where there are major intersections, where all that is being asked is a traffic light to control the potential danger of accidents, even that is being outrightly refused.

Part of the problem really lies, I believe, in the fact that Canada is one of the few developed countries which does not have a national highways policy. I think it is time that the Ministers of Highways from across the country got together with the federal Minister of Highways and tried to develop some kind of a national strategy. It cannot go on this way in the hodgepodge of individual programs.

We have Alberta spending \$1 billion on highways, whereas we have other provinces spending a few million in other parts of the country. It would be far better if we got some kind of a national highways policy where highways development could be cost shared, as is the case in the United States.

An example of this is our Trans-Canada Highway system, which the Yellowhead Highway became a part of in 1986. While I am on the topic of the Yellowhead, I would like to mention that the Yellowhead Highway which presently goes right up to Winnipeg is serving only half the province of Manitoba, yet this is a cost-shared highway. There is ample opportunity, and I am sure the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) would agree with me, for the Yellowhead to continue from Winnipeg down to 44, to West Hawk Lake, to the Ontario border. It would complete the alternative route to the Trans-Canada No. 1, north of No. 1, from B.C. to Ontario, and then the Trans-Canada continues on from there in whichever areas that those provinces desire.

I hate to change topics when there is this little time left today, but the Members say, go ahead anyway.

Well, this interrelates somewhat with highways, because things like highways bring in the tourists. While I applaud the Minister responsible for Tourism (Mr. Ernst) for his recent initiatives in promoting tourism in Manitoba, I do not believe that enough is being done as a whole to promote tourism in Manitoba. It says in the Throne Speech that there is potential for increases in tourism, then it goes on to many of their sectors. It is only briefly mentioned. What this Government should

consider, Mr. Speaker, is what has happened in other jurisdictions, and that is—and I have said that in the past, I mentioned that last year during the Speech from the Throne, or the Budget Debate, one or the other, and in previous years—but I believe that, given the potential of tourism, Manitoba could use a separate Department of Tourism.

I realize the time, Mr. Speaker. Seeing as there is time left to continue, I will keep on this. As I have said awhile ago, given the fact that in several other jurisdictions across the world, including not only provinces or states or principalities, but also cities have got their own Departments of Tourism, I believe that this Government should seriously consider it.

Our caucus has seen fit to appoint a critic strictly for tourism separately from the rest of the Department of Industry and Trade, simply for the reason that we realize that although at the present time agriculture is our No. 1 industry, tourism has the potential to become eventually the second largest, if not the largest, at one point. For that reason alone, I believe that it should continue.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hour being 6 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings according to the Rules. When this motion is again before the House, the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) will have five minutes remaining.

This House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning (Friday).