



Second Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**VOL. XL No. 8B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1991**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARR, James	Crescentwood	Liberal
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 18, 1991

The House met at 8 p.m.

### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable Minister of Education, with eight minutes remaining.

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned, I was just about to talk about the university education and the need for perhaps looking at our universities to ensure that their role is enhanced in terms of the economic and social and cultural development of this province.

That is not something that we on this side of the House just dreamed up. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the universities have been asking for sometime that there be a look at the relationship between the universities and government. Indeed, the universities would like to have somewhat of a closer link with government, so they can dialogue with us rather than simply being able to dialogue through the Universities Grants Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I think that down the road—it does not necessarily have to be this year—but indeed down the road there will be need to dialogue more closely with universities and look at the need to enhance their role in this province in terms of the way that our province develops both in a social and economic sense.

The last area that I would like to touch on is the whole area of ACCESS education and Native education in this province. We know that by the year 2000 the majority of people entering the labour force, or a large number of people entering the labour force, will be of Native origins, and we have to make sure that the Native people of Manitoba have an opportunity to get as best an education as they possibly can.

Over the last number of years we have had some programs which were jointly funded by the federal government and the provincial government. Traditionally, the share has been a 60-40 basis. However, in the last year or so, we have seen that the federal government did not wish to renew the Northern Development Agreement, and indeed we

have found ourselves in a situation where the Province of Manitoba is contributing a larger portion of monies to ACCESS education.

Mr. Speaker, we have made it very clear that in order to be able to continue the ACCESS programs we are going to have to have the direct involvement of our federal counterparts so that indeed they live up to their historical share of funding in these programs.

I am hopeful that before the end of this month or very soon we will be able to hear some word about the federal government's contribution and participation in the ACCESS programs of this province. I think we made it very clear that as a province we could not handle all these programs alone and that we do need the participation of the federal government.

I was happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to sign an agreement, along with my colleague, the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), who was then the person who was lobbying very hard for the Bachelor of Nursing program, through the Swampy Cree Tribal Council. As a matter of fact, he had been lobbying for that program since 1985, and after a year in government we were able to successfully sign an agreement which allowed for the Bachelor of Nursing program to take place at The Pas.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of that program, because I think it does address the needs of northern Manitoba and indeed -(interjection)- well, the member for The Pas said it took us a year and a half. I could tell him that he lobbied his own government, the NDP government of this province, since 1985, and every time he went to them they turned him down. They turned thumbs down on his program. It took a Conservative government to enter into an agreement and to successfully negotiate that.

Today we have a program in The Pas, the Bachelor of Nursing program, for our Native and aboriginal people of the north, so they can take their rightful place in delivering the services that are required in northern Manitoba.

I must say that it is no thanks to the NDP. As a matter of fact, when the member for The Pas (Mr.

Lathlin) was not a member of this House, he criticized the NDP loudly for the fact that they did not wish to enter into an agreement and to complete that agreement.

I have to give the member for The Pas due credit for being persistent and for phoning my office on many occasions, and in the end we finally did arrive at an agreement.

\* (2005)

Mr. Speaker, the Native people of our province indeed do deserve a proper education and a proper opportunity to receive the best possible education. I can say that when we came into government I think there were only three Native people working in Keewatin Community College in any kind of management or director position. I think there are a total of 11, and five of them are in management positions. So we have given recognition to the Native people of this province to ensure that they have opportunities to become managers and to become directors of programs which are delivered in northern Manitoba.

This province is facing some difficult times in the next year or two. Indeed, although we are facing difficult times, our priorities are going to maintain being health, education and family services. We are going to ensure that we find creative ways to deliver the programs that our youth in this province need, both in our foundations education from kindergarten to Grade 12, our post-secondary education and indeed the training opportunities and retraining opportunities that are so desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of a government that has put its emphasis on health and education and family services, because with a strong educational base in this province this province will prosper economically and socially. I believe that very deeply.

I appreciate having had the opportunity to make these few comments on the Throne Speech Debate. Thank you.

### Committee Change

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to make some changes? (Leave)

I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) that the composition of the Standing

Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) for the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh).

\* \* \*

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. Before I do make my comments, I would like to, as other members have, welcome you back as Speaker for this session, and I look forward to the same guidance and support that you showed me and other members during the first session. I look forward to also participating with you, as well as the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) and the honourable member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) for participating on the Manitoba legislative curling team during the upcoming World Curling Championship being held here in Manitoba.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome our new Sergeant-at-Arms. Welcome, sir, and I may add that his family, his daughters and their families are constituents of mine in the Fisher Branch area and very well represented by their member.

I offer my congratulations to the honourable member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson) and the honourable member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) on their appointments to cabinet and wish them well in their new responsibilities.

I would like to remind the honourable member for Kirkfield that, being from the Interlake, I am sure, he is well aware of the importance of tourism to the Interlake, and I look forward to working with him to promote tourism not only in Manitoba, but throughout the Interlake and throughout the province.

I would also like to say to the honourable member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) that, as the Liquor Commission critic and in my years in the hospitality industry, I offer my co-operation to work with her to improve on an industry so vital to our province.

\* (2010)

Mr. Speaker, as a new member, I have tried in my short time in this House to be as open and constructive as one can be with a neoconservative government. I have at times tried to be positive on occasion when I saw even a bit of what they call progressive, but it has been too hard to find. The message that His Honour delivered must have been

difficult for him to do so. On one hand, this Conservative government pats itself on the back about protecting the people who deliver these services, and then on the very next page they take away the assurances they tried to give to public service employees so that we can preserve the greatest number of jobs and services possible.

This government, Mr. Speaker, mentions economic growth and jobs for our future. This government gives us examples of jobs coming to our province, MacLeod Stedman for one; 100-plus jobs, they tell us, full-time jobs moving into Manitoba. My colleagues and I are always pleased with positive results in bringing jobs to Manitoba and we applaud a positive announcement, but I ask this government: Where does that leave the 10,000-plus people who have already lost their jobs in this province under the federal and provincial Tory agendas, jobs lost with plant closures and bankruptcies attributed mostly to free trade, jobs that are being lost right now in rural Manitoba because of centralizing housing authorities, not the greatest paying jobs, Mr. Speaker, but jobs that were held by people to help supplement their families' incomes in order to survive in the rural Manitoba economy? In my constituency alone, including managers and maintenance people, 15 to 20 jobs could be lost with decentralization of the housing authorities.

How can this government have the audacity to then tell all these people, we are working, we are bringing you jobs to Manitoba, but sorry, no more jobs for you? Every day jobs are being lost while this government's position is that they will continue to implement their economic plan to create jobs. What we need is a government sensitive to the people, by providing for retraining, further education and working together with workers in businesses to overcome this trauma, Tory trauma.

Does this speech acknowledge the worth of workers, who are people, Mr. Speaker, to society? This government says it is committed to taking an active role working with Manitoba businesses to bring about a recovery as quickly as possible, but where is the co-operation that is needed from all partners in our economy if we are to get ourselves out from this Tory nightmare?

Do they treat the worth of working people as they do capital? This government talks of individual efforts, community involvement, and the will of our

people to bring back opportunities to get our province back on track in the right direction. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have seen these individual efforts, community involvement, will of our people throughout the whole of the Interlake, hard working community-minded people, struggling to improve life for themselves and their families.

The people of Manitoba are doing their share, but are getting no support whatsoever from this Tory government. Every day jobs are being lost because of this government's strong position that they will continue to implement their economic plan to create jobs. I ask this government, check the unemployment benefit claims, food kitchens, future announcements of layoffs, and let us just see where this plan has got this province so far.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the recession is now something that is being addressed by all of us here in this Assembly, a Conservative-created recession at that. I remember when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and his colleagues assured us there would be no major recession in Manitoba, because they would see to it with fine management.

I give you an example of their fine management. Conservatives have public perception that they are great business managers. Well, they got rid of the general insurance arm of MPIC for 7.5 percent of the following year's premiums. Insurance agents themselves earn commissions on the average of 20 percent on policies they write. Would you make a deal to sell something at approximately one-third of what agents receive?

\* (2015)

I saw a memo that was given to one of my constituents by their agent in which he wrote, this sale—giveaway, as I should more likely call it—is not only extremely disappointing, but makes my job more difficult in that I have to review practically all my businesses again with regard to rewrites. I concur with this agent's sentiments; this can only be described as a giveaway motivated by their neoconservative ideology that the people through their elected representatives have no right to provide services for themselves when it had been demonstrated that private enterprise was, in industry terms, creaming the market. So much for their business sense, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad to see that the Tories are not trying to hide the fact that this recession was induced by their federal cousins in Ottawa. They even blame in their

throne speech this terrible tragedy of recession on the policies of the federal Tory government and high interest rates, but did this government listen to the people of Manitoba urging them to fight against the policies and high interest rates of their federal cousins before things got out of control? No, they did nothing, not a whimper against Mulroney and Wilson.

Now what do we hear? Now what do we hear? It is not our fault. It is their fault. It is your fault. It is the previous government's fault. It is the fault of the person on the street. It is not this government's fault.

Mr. Speaker, they are showing me that a good dose of Conservative economic policy in our citizens will bring them to realize that Tory times are tough times. Did we need these high interest rates to fight inflation, as well as spending hundreds of millions in defending the dollar? We are an exporting nation. We need our goods to go into export as much as possible.

I was shown a quote lately, Mr. Speaker, from Tommy Douglas regarding recessions. Creating a recession to stop inflation is like cutting off your head to get rid of dandruff. That is what the Conservatives are doing to millions of Canadians and Manitobans now, but it is this Premier and his government who said to us some months ago that we would weather the recession better than any other province. Where are we today in economic growth? Ten out of 10, last.

As a rural MLA, I have a great deal of concern as to rural development for our province and the concern that this Premier has, in the opinion of people that I have spoken to while we were out in rural Manitoba just last month—that this Premier does not consider rural development important enough, by giving this important portfolio to a minister who feels that because certain rural and northern constituencies do not know how to vote, should not expect to be treated as fairly as others. This comes from constituents.

Already we find that this government's promises of 700 jobs moving to rural Manitoba are being put on hold. Up till now, only 150 or so jobs have been moved to rural Manitoba, jobs that were promised to smaller communities that were needed to bolster the economic problems in farm communities. Now we have back-peddalling by this new minister. Now we will have to wait to see who will get these jobs and when.

We had no problem with the previous minister, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever. Well, I can assure you that the people in the Interlake and the people of rural Manitoba are concerned with the appointment of this minister to that portfolio. -(interjection)- No, there is nothing wrong with the other minister, a fine minister.

\* (2020)

Mr. Speaker, this government did not hesitate to decentralize, as we say, 52 jobs to Alberta. No, and now they are centralizing and cutting more rural jobs and more rural services. The former Rural minister himself, and I quote from the paper, says he does not know why the Tories choose now to say they cannot afford to move the positions on time. Money has not changed whatsoever from the time the announcements were made till now—their own previous minister making statements on rural development.

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, we have lost hundreds of jobs, of farm families in the last decades. We are now into the worst income crunch the grain industry has experienced in years. During my first throne speech I paid tribute to my predecessor on how he had proposed the need for a national income support program for Canadian farmers that was not commodity specific, hence not countervailable, which would not have turned non-farm taxpayers against the farmers as the money available would have been targeted to those in the greatest need. Is this not a principle that Conservatives subscribe to?

I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) may quietly agree with me and my colleague for Dauphin, our Agricultural critic, that perhaps the GRIP program has the potential, especially for the large operator, to become a financial boom. What would nonfarmers say when they read, Portage farmer receives \$375,000 in payouts, Mr. Speaker? Am I exaggerating? I doubt it. If coverage is \$150 an acre and you have 2,500 acres, it is possible in a dry year that this farmer would receive the payout that I have mentioned. Hypothetical? I understand that premiums have been paid, but my problem with this is that all farmers would be labelled, and I find this unfair.

Now this government is backed into a corner about the costs and the possibility of it running away on them, we see panic. What about the farmer who commits himself or herself for the five-year contract? What are their obligations and responsibilities? Do

they have the same avenues open to them as this minister wants? All of this because they got themselves in a box over sugar beets when they made their commitment that they were prepared to cost share with the federal government. By their conservative actions, Manitoba taxpayers are paying a bigger portion of their taxes toward farm programs in Ontario, Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia.

The throne speech emphasizes agricultural stability and includes continued diversification. The Interlake region has long attempted to follow this principle as it relates to crop production. Our producers have moved, to a large extent, into forage seed production. One of the possibilities that does exist is that a forage processing facility could be located in the interlake. There has been extensive examination in western Canada and discussions by the Interlake Development Corporation on the feasibility of this processing plant.

With more of the GRIP program, Mr. Speaker, if our priority is diversification, and I concur that it should be, why have forage crops not been included in this program? I can see farmers shifting to the highest guarantee with the possibilities of lands that should not be in cereal crops being put into production because of higher guarantees. What happens if the road forages are included before the initial contract expires? What of soil conservation? Will this program push farmers into producing for the highest protection, given the financial position of many farmers? What about the question of inputs by cash-strapped farmers? All fair questions, Mr. Speaker, that need to be addressed by this government if their pronouncements are to have any credibility.

Is this the beginning of the government's meshing of agriculture policy with that of their federal counterparts? Is this government telling farmers that you are on your own, that you are free to manage your own operation in response to market signals, a program that may turn out to be a nightmare for farmers and reverse all the work gone into soil conservation extension?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn my attention to what I consider a very important issue which is being totally ignored by these Conservatives. The issue I am referring to is that of the plight of our Native brothers and sisters and their rightful place in the fabric and Constitution of this country. This

government is applauding its leadership as it relates to constitutional matters and processes. It need not be so smug while at the same time totally ignoring the role of our first citizens and placing their priorities and aspirations on the backburner, so to speak, or to put it more accurately, taken their matters right off the stove.

\* (2025)

Our Premier (Mr. Filmon) should not forget that his hero image over Meech Lake was only there because of my colleague, the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper). He played by the rules we set in this Chamber, backed totally by his people. They sent a message to all of Canada, especially to our Prime Minister, and yet they have the gall to talk about a constitutional amendment without even mentioning how they are prepared to work with and support our Native people. I find those actions almost as petty as those of our Prime Minister on Native issues after Meech.

I presume that it will take an NDP government to bring our first citizens into this building as full partners and not outsiders when it comes to constitutional matters. Why has our Premier not shown leadership on this matter? Why has he not corrected his colleagues, the Prime Minister and the Premier of Quebec, when they spoke about the failure of Meech as rejection of Quebec? Nothing could be further from the issue. Native people were left out of the process and their issues took the back seat again, and that was more than they could handle. Not only are they being ignored, the reasons for the failure of Meech are being subverted. Treaties, land claims, self-government, economic development which include education, housing and many other issues, need to be addressed in a coherent and agreed-to process.

Let us make Canada work. It can work but only if we are prepared to remove this major sin from our past. This can only be done by recognizing and dealing with aboriginal people in an equal and an agreed-to fashion.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech mentions that they will ensure our education system is capable of providing opportunities, that they will aim at increased levels of literacy, basic skills, increased completion rates, and on and on. What are they doing instead? Cut funding, then tell the school divisions that they will have to be the ones to trim here and trim there. By doing this the quality of

education to our children in rural Manitoba and throughout this province is what is going to suffer.

Well, then to maintain standards and quality let us offload onto taxpayers. The people of Manitoba, the people of rural Manitoba where the tax base has shrunk, cannot continue to bear the burden of increased taxes that this government so much wants us to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, what is the next move? Well, jobs, loss of jobs—teaching positions, maintenance people, administrators, teaching assistants, special needs and on and on. Well, they say, then let us increase class size. Let us put two grades in one room as some are doing. No matter what is done, the children are the ones who will suffer.

In my constituency, Mr. Speaker, one of the school divisions has done what it can to help this problem. They have kept their increase to its lowest in five years so as to not to burden the ratepayers, but because of this 10 to 15 jobs will be lost in the Evergreen School Division. What they fear even more is next year when again they are going to be told by this government that they are only getting a .1 percent increase or less. Then not only are more jobs lost, but, more importantly, programs are lost. More importantly, the quality of education is lost.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba needs a government that will not continue to erode and offload its responsibilities in the same manner that their party in Ottawa has done to them. We do not need a government that by this throne speech is waving the surrender flag and saying, we cannot do anything but cut and slash. Rather than action, Manitobans are getting task forces and more studies. This throne speech says that education, health care and family services are a priority of this government, but what we get is cuts at all levels of education, forced underspending and more cuts to come in family service areas, I am sure.

\* (2030)

What is going to happen to those programs that are not considered a priority, Mr. Speaker? Who will we have to enlist to protect us from this government?

Just as my Leader predicted the day before the throne speech was delivered, this would be a "feel good" speech. It may have made the Premier, his ministers and colleagues happy. It is indeed a message that provides little to those who already

have difficulties in our society. My Leader was also correct when he labelled this government as betraying the trust of Manitobans. They campaigned just six and a half months ago that Manitoba was strong and they would make it stronger. We have yet to see that, Mr. Speaker, and I doubt whether we will see it.

However, Mr. Speaker, their hidden agenda is being dribbled out bit by bit, and what Manitobans have is an insensitive, weakened government. I shudder to think what their budget will look like. This government does not have, nor deserve, the confidence of the people of Manitoba nor this Assembly. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be able to rise to speak to the throne speech. I think the throne speech demonstrates clearly that we are into an economic era that is going to be most difficult. It demonstrates clearly that the economic difficulty has been brought about by some 20 years of economic mismanagement that we are now going to have to face, whether we are on governmentside or whether we are in opposition.

I want to, however, before I address some of those issues and some other areas of concern that I have, Mr. Speaker, congratulate you for again being able to sit in the Chair and regulate and ensure orderly process takes place in this House. -(interjection)- That is sometimes a most difficult task, as we witness right now, when it becomes difficult to hear oneself speak at times.

However, I also want to congratulate the assistant Speaker for her appointment to her most honourable position. I want to also congratulate the Sergeant-at-Arms for his new appointment, for I know that he will serve us well. I look forward to meeting him on a daily basis and ensuring that order is in fact maintained in this House.

I want to congratulate two of my colleagues for having been elected in their respective ridings—I should say all of my colleagues for having been elected in their respective ridings—and being able to serve Manitobans and serve them well, and I know they will.

I also want to congratulate the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) as the new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, for I know she will serve that portfolio well. Few people probably know that the Department of Corporate and Consumer



Affairs has played, I believe, in many parts of this province a major role and can continue to play a major role in the development of industries and businesses in many parts of our province as they have done in the past.

I think the challenge is going to be to the new minister to ensure that direction is given, that in fact encouragement is given to her department to in fact bring about some of that corporate development, for we are basically into an era very similar to the era when co-operatives in this province saw a major growth and played a major role in developing such industries as our grain industry for our pool elevators. And, yes, even our United Grain Growers were basically structured initially as co-operative, farmer-owned, locally run co-operatives and served the rural communities well. Many of the towns and hamlets depended on local initiatives working together to build either stores or, in many cases during the '30s, fuel distribution centres, such as Rhineland Consumer Co-ops, to serve their local people and create a competitive atmosphere and they did that well.

CSP Food, I think, is a by-product of the co-operative movement that still stands today as an example of what can be done by people working together for themselves; credit unions, caisse-populaires and many other industries or financial institutions one could identify that have the co-operative and local flavour as their background and have served many of the communities in this province very well. I challenge you, as the minister of that department, to put forward that kind of direction to ensure that can again happen, because I believe you do head up a very, very important portfolio.

I also want to congratulate, at this time, the member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson), for he has taken on, again, also a very important role.

I want to say to the previous minister that served in I, T and T thank you for a job well done because I think you served our province well in your portfolio and I wish you well in your new endeavours as Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst).

I, T and T is a department that I believe has one of the most important and major roles to play in the development of many of our communities in this province. -(interjection)- I see the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) up to the same semantics and antics that he was up to during his speech, and

he is many times. I have some appreciation for his jovial attitude at many times, but I think we all come here to this place, when we first come here, with a very serious attitude. I believe we come here seriously wanting to serve our people.

I would suggest to the member for Elmwood that, when we conduct business in this Chamber, we do so in that manner, and that we reflect the seriousness of our ambitions when we first come here, although we all know that is hard to achieve sometimes, especially when the debates emanate into areas that are somewhat difficult to bring about.

I want to also say that the importance of the Department of I, T and T to rural Manitoba needs to be re-emphasized and that more attention needs to be paid to the development of industry.

We have talked many times about decentralization. Decentralization, to me, is not simply picking up five or six or 700 people or positions out of Winnipeg and distributing them all over Manitoba. Decentralization must be true and must be economic.

I believe that the Department of I, T and T can be a major catalyst in encouraging that decentralized economic activity that we must have in order to be able to create a proper economic balance in this province.

Tourism is also one of portfolios that the new member for Kirkfield (Mr. Stefanson) is going to be looking after, and many of the areas of our province have tremendous potential for tourism. I look at the southeast corner of our province which has seen a severe economic decline over the past number of years. The closing of a forestry products manufacturing plant has—we have lost some 30-odd jobs in that area. I believe, if we paid some attention to and encouraged tourism in that area, that could be a tremendous asset to that part of our province.

I attended, just a few weeks ago, the opening, for the first time, of the Canadian-American snowmobile trail which connects a network of snowmobile trails in Minnesota and North Dakota, some of the largest areas, right into Manitoba, which will allow Americans now to travel via snowmobile right into Rennie, into the Falcon Lake area.

\* (2040)

I believe those are the kinds of initiatives that we should encourage, because those people have the

ability to spend time and money in our province. Certainly, nobody would argue that even in winter the southeastern part of our province, as some of our western part of our province, is some of the most beautiful in all of North America.

I was able to, as Minister of Rural Development, attend a conference in Australia attended by some 72 countries. What struck me most during that development conference was the country of Norway putting on a 15-minute presentation. What did they sell? They sold ice and snow. Ice and snow—come to Norway to enjoy our snow, our skiing, our ice skating. What do we do? We tell people to go south, do we not?

You know roughly about 80 percent of the people of this world have never experienced ice and snow. I think our tourism industry and we as Canadians and we as Manitobans have a challenge before us to ensure that we have a positive attitude about ourselves and our industry and about our general geographic location, a positive attitude, and encourage people to come to Manitoba even during the winter months. Ice fishing, skiing, be it cross-country or downhill, or viewing polar bears in Churchill or many of the other things—caribou on the tundra and the deer in our backyards—are something that most people in this world simply cannot experience. I think our Department of Tourism has the ability and should be challenged to sell Manitoba on that basis. I put that challenge to the new Minister of Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), for it is, I believe, important that all of us take the initiative to encourage people to come to Manitoba.

I want to, before I go on, say how sorry I am that my colleague, Mr. Ed Connery, or the member for Portage, former Minister of Co-op Development, former Minister of Environment, is no longer in cabinet, for I believe when he was moved from cabinet there was a hole created there, a position that will be hard to fill, for many times it is necessary to discuss such things as agriculture. I know many will say we have that agricultural expertise in our cabinet, and we do. However, I do not think there is anybody in that cabinet that has the experience in the vegetable industry, in the special crops area, that Ed Connery had and brought to cabinet. He did it well. It behooves all of us, as members, to be as serious about our constituency as Ed Connery was. I know that the people in the Portage area sadly miss Ed not being in cabinet, and I think this province is

going to feel some day Ed's lack of ability to be able to input into the decision making in cabinet.

I wish all the cabinet members well in their new endeavours. Yes, I do miss being in cabinet, and I will miss being in cabinet. I want to however say that I want to thank the Premier at this time for giving me the opportunity to serve almost three years in cabinet, because there are few people in this province or in this country that are able to serve in that capacity. I feel honoured, as my family does, for having been given that opportunity to serve in that capacity. I will always be grateful.

I want to thank all the staff that I have had the opportunity to work with. First of all, the Department of Natural Resources and all the staff people in the Department of Natural Resources, it was a pleasure, and I must say that they are truly a professional group of people. I also want to thank all the staff people in the Department of Rural Development. I enjoyed greatly our working relationship that we had through many of the difficult times that we went through.

I want to thank especially the Minister of Urban Affairs for his co-operation and the many endeavours that we took on together co-chairing the Assessment Reform Committee and bringing to fruition the passing of legislation, probably some of the most difficult legislation that this House has seen for a number of years, assessment reform. I appreciated the co-operation that Gerry was able to extend to me.

I want to also thank my secretary, Lynda Crilly, for being a most gracious and most professional person. She was always courteous, and I want to say genuinely that I think she is probably one of the most professional people in this building. I also want to thank Janine Hykawy for working with me for a couple of years and many of the other people who have worked with me: my first assistant, Peter Konopelny; my special assistant, Jonathan Scarth; Scott Ransom; and last but not least, Lizanne Lachance and Allen Peto for working with me to achieve what we were able to in our department—good people.

I want to also thank the members of the Conservation Districts Authority for their co-operation, the Regional Development Corporations, the Water Services Board, and especially the Municipal Board. Many of the decisions that had to be made by the Municipal

Board during the last year were difficult, not because we were doing the ordinary type of work in our department, but because of the assessment reform and many of the appeals that came before the Municipal Board. Jim Donald and his board served this province well, and I want to thank personally in this Chamber Jim Donald for his services.

I also want to thank the MAUM organization for the support and the UMM, especially Homer Gill and Manson Moir for the leadership that they provided to their organization and for their support during the assessment reform legislation and the passing of the assessment reform legislation.

I want to recognize one person that is no longer with us, and that is Warren Rusk, who passed away during this last year, who served, I believe, as secretary-treasurer or manager for the UMM for many years, whom we all knew and who was the most professional person.

\* (2050)

I also wanted to thank the executive director of the MAUM organization, Rochelle Zimberg, for her co-operation. All the municipal councils had a role to play and did play a role during the difficult period of time that the Assessment Reform Committee dealt with assessment issues. I thank them all for it.

Working in this new capacity is certainly different than coming here and never having been in this place before, being asked to sit in cabinet and being involved in all the decisions that are made by cabinet. Working as a member, as an MLA only—and I say “only”—creates a significant amount of time that was not available before. The time that I speak of will now be spent lobbying my fellow colleagues, working for my constituency.

I represent a new constituency now in this province; I represent much of it for the first time. It is about 130, 140 miles long and is about 30 miles wide. It takes a considerable amount of time to serve that whole constituency, but it is probably one of the most interesting constituencies in our province. I know it is one of the most diversified constituencies in our province.

We have forestry at the eastern end. The tourism potential, as I have stated, is great. We have industries such as cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens, livestock of all varieties in my constituency, major producers of all the livestock; agricultural products, such as peas, beans, lentils, dill, vegetables,

potatoes, sugar beets. Manufacturing and processing are major components of my constituency.

I want to talk a little bit about diversification and the need to diversify this province, especially the agricultural sector. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) has on a number of occasions indicated clearly the need for diversification. Diversification is not only raising grain, feeding cattle and selling cattle, and processing meat or livestock. Diversification is, in my view, encouraging the production of new products, whether it is growing them on farms, providing the research in this province and the expertise to develop that research, whether it be at facilities such as the Morden Research Station or the Brandon Research Station or the food processing research facility at Portage, but emphasis must be placed on those kinds of initiatives.

Should the province contribute to research and research development? Yes, it should. It is in the best interest of our producers, our producers all over the province. I was in Dauphin not too long ago and people were telling me about their bean production. Who would have thought 20 years ago that you could ever raise, commercially, beans in the Dauphin area? Well, it has been proven we can. Who would have ever thought that we could raise sunflowers north of Brandon? Yes, we can. Similarly, we have tremendous opportunities in this province if we would only avail ourselves and encourage our producers to diversify. It is not only the raising of special crops, the encouragement of providing the research; governments must have the political will to lead. For 20 years we have looked down a dry well when it comes to rural Manitoba.

There was tremendous wealth in this province when the NDP first of all took office during the early '70s. What did they do? Did they manage properly? Did they direct some of that wealth to the areas of the province that could, in fact, have ensured that growth and diversification? No.

When I look at some of the supports that we have talked about, some of the dollar supports that we have talked about that supposedly go to our agricultural community, it is quite amazing. Most of you have read these numbers: \$4.4 billion to agriculture, \$4.4 billion what is traditionally spent on agriculture in Canada. What does it consist of? Direct payments through commodity programs,

commodity-based loans, farm debt reviews, advance payments, prairie cash advance. The major programs consist of feed freight assistance. How much do farmers get of that? Rehabilitation of railway lines, how much do farmers get? Payment to railways, again in 1988, payments to the Canadian Wheat Board for hopper cars. Farmers own those hopper cars, and we still calculate in government, whether it be federal or provincial, contributions of that nature to agriculture directly to farmers. Farmers get very little of that money. Very little of that money is directly spent.

I heard the honourable member for Interlake (Mr. Cliff Evans) refer to the sugar beet industry. I want to spend a few minutes of time directing my comments to that industry. The sugar beet industry in this country for some time provided almost 20 percent. We produced almost 20 percent domestically in this country of the sugar requirements. We produce less than 8 percent today. Why? Because we have not had a federal government, be they Liberal or Conservative, in Ottawa that has the gall, that has had the will, to implement a national sugar policy. We are the only country in the world that produces sugar and does not have a sugar policy. We are the only country in the world that allows sugar to be dumped by sugar-producing nations.

Until we get a national sugar policy, we will not be able to increase or expand the production of sugar beets in this province. I say to you, you could produce sugar beets in Dauphin or Brandon, all over this province. There is a tremendous potential here if we only recognize that potential.

The oilseed industry, and I hear the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) sit there and say, yea, yea, yea. Well, they had 15 years to work towards, to help encourage the production and diversification, but what did they do? They sat there and said, yea, yea, but never did anything. I believe our oilseed industry has a tremendous opportunity for expansion in this province. Sunflowers, rapeseed and other oilseeds that can be raised have a market in the United States.

We have said much about free trade in these benches. Whether pro or con—I guess we can all identify some pros and cons—however, it is very clear that canola oil does have a tremendous opportunity, and our oilseed producers have a tremendous opportunity to expand those markets in the United States. Specialty crops such as peas and

lentils can be expanded dramatically, and many of the others, but it does need the support of government, both provincially and federally, to ensure that those kinds of things in fact happen.

I want to spend a few minutes on the new program that I see both of the opposition parties support. I am pleased to see that. It is called the GRIP program.

\* (2100)

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Should we as a province be in it? I hear the Liberals say, yes, we should be in it. I hear the NDP say, yes, we should be in it. We have agreed that we should be in it. However, let me raise a few questions. For years we have indicated clearly that it should be the federal government's responsibility to fight the trade war. For years, we have indicated clearly that the contribution that the grain sector has made to the balance of payments in this country is of national interest to every citizen of this country, is of benefit to every citizen in this country. Yet now today, and the Liberals agree and the NDP agree, we are saying that the responsibility to maintain that industry over the long term must be relegated to the three western provinces.

I say to you in this House that we will rue the day that we agreed to fund this program, because I do not believe that we will serve the farm community well by relegating the responsibility to either the provinces or the individual to fight such things as trade wars or other problems that are created by disagreement. That is really what we are doing.

Every province in western Canada will have to go to its treasury and say, pay up. Every farmer will be asked to contribute more. I ask any one of you in these Chambers, how can we justify going to tell a young farmer who is not able to meet their interest payments, not able to meet their land payments, tell them that you are going to have to spend another \$15 or \$20 an acre to stay in business? I see the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) saying yup, yup, yup, and yet what did they do when they were in government? What did he do when he was the minister for many years?

We are going to be spending some \$40 million to \$60 million on this program as a province and it should be the responsibility of the federal

government to ensure that our grain sector and our oilseed sector be maintained over the long haul.

There are many other things that I would like to talk about, Mr. Acting Speaker. He tells me that I have eight minutes left, and what can one say in eight minutes?

I want to say that the previous administration spent some considerable amount of time negotiating or trying to negotiate an infrastructure agreement with the federal government. I understand that they spent almost two years futilely trying to negotiate. I was pleased that I was the minister, that together with my colleagues was able to bring that program to fruition. It is going to be a \$90 million program which will expand the infrastructure and enhance the old infrastructure in many of our towns, including Portage la Prairie, and our member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) knows what kind of a benefit that will be to Portage la Prairie and the people of Portage la Prairie. Brandon—the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) will certainly recognize the benefits that will be created by the implementation of the SDI.

We heard about a month ago, a month and a half ago, a report that was tabled in the Red River Valley, and I read with interest some of the things that were said in the report and some of the recommendations that were made in the report. The Red River Valley Task Force recommends drawing water out of the Red River and out of the Assiniboine River to supply the Red River Valley which has been traditionally short of water from time to time, and at the same time has also been subjected to some of the most major flooding in this province. I read with interest a summary of activities and a brief history of the Lower Red River Valley Water Commission that goes back to 1950. Some of the recommendations made by the Lower Red River Valley Water Commission were virtually identical to recommendations made by the water task force established in the Red River, but it points out clearly that we spent almost 50 years—and in large part, the previous NDP administration was in power when some of these major recommendations were made, yet they did nothing.

They sat there, and they criticized. They wondered whether they should or they should not, and they are still wondering today whether they should have or they should not have. Similarly, they sit today and they criticize the government of

Saskatchewan for building the Rafferty dam. Well, had the now honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) in this province not taken the initiative and built a dam that now supplies Brandon with water, Brandon last year would have been out of water, yet when we look now at the large lake that was created in the Assiniboine Valley, we have to admit that it created a brand-new environment all to itself that none of us would want to destroy.

The sports fishery that has been created on the Lake of the Prairies and the tremendous tourist potential that we have created by building the dam to store water to supply Brandon and the rest of the towns and villages along the Assiniboine, including the city of Portage, has tremendous economic potential, yet the opposition parties are criticizing other provinces for taking that same initiative. Had we not availed ourselves of the water that North Dakota now stores down the Red River Valley, behind eight structures, the Red River this last winter would have been dry. What would we have done? It is time that we in this province started taking some of the initiative and building some of those structures ourselves to ensure that communities such as Morden, Carman and many others are going to in fact have a water supply that is going to maintain those communities and let them grow.

Many of our communities have been growth communities over the last ten years simply because they have taken the initiative to do it themselves. You can look at Winkler; you can look at Steinbach; you can look at Morden; you can look at Carman; you can look at Portage. It is because of the initiative that people in their own communities have taken that this growth has occurred. Take Altona, for instance, the large printery that is established there, employing some 400 people. Was it done with government money? Was it done by government direction or initiated? Was it encouraged by the previous government here? No, it was not. Rural community development bonds is something that we have to do in this province to encourage all the communities and individuals in the community to invest in initiatives in their own communities, because government cannot do it, and government will not do it. It has to come from within.

\* (2110)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Therefore, the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey) just a few weeks ago announced a

sustainable communities program and, hopefully, we will be able to announce fairly soon a community development bonds program.

I would like to talk about the fiscal challenge. I would like to say a few words about assessment reform, and I would like to, before I end, thank all members both opposite and on our side of the House for the co-operation they showed during a most difficult period of time in passing one of the largest pieces of legislation that we passed in this House, for I truly believe that Manitobans will be better off with the new assessment reform act than they were previously.

I want to thank my colleagues for the support that they showed during that period of time, because it was a difficult decision. I want to say that decentralization will continue. I think the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey) will continue to push for decentralization. It has to happen, but it cannot only be government positions being moved to rural Manitoba; it must be true economic decentralization that happens.

I challenge the minister and all of you in this House to encourage wherever you can the implementation of programs that will decentralize economically our province, because that is truly needed if we want to have a balanced economy, a balanced approach and, in the final analysis, have growth in this province. It will need the incentive of government and the support of all of us.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence. I want to challenge all members to work closely in this House, and I want to say to a few members opposite that the reference that has been made on a number of occasions to some radical movement on this side will not happen as long as this government proceeds on the economic path that it is on. I fully support this government. I fully support our Premier. He made a difficult decision. He had to make it, and I support that. Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence.

**Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan):** I would just like to begin this Throne Speech Debate by thanking the constituents who have talked to me and have written letters to me and have given me their advice and suggestions in the last several months. I would also like to congratulate you on the excellent job you have done as Speaker of the House. I mean that sincerely, and I would also like to congratulate the

two new members of cabinet on the other side of the House.

I wish I could be more positive, but I am afraid that this government after six months in office has shown that it is following the same type of strategy that its federal counterpart has done in Ottawa. I wish I could be more positive, Mr. Speaker, but it is very difficult. Solely based on the telephone calls I have been receiving from constituents, people are frightened. Not only are we entering a very serious economic decline, but our country in very many ways appears to be falling apart at the seams, and I think all members of this House will join me in expressing my concerns in this regard.

I want to talk about something that perhaps we do not always get an opportunity to talk about in this House, and not just statistics and numbers, but I want to talk about some real people, some real constituents of mine that I have encountered the last several months. First, it is the large number of people on UIC. It is not just young people. It is people who are middle-aged. It is people who had careers and professions and who thought they would never be in the position they are in. They are lining up at the UIC offices—offices that, at least to my perspective, have been cut back in size and staff and in benefits, and that is a tragedy. It is a tragedy when I have to sit in someone's kitchen and tears come to her eyes, and she says, I want to work, but I cannot. She can work. These are the kind of people who are being punished by federal Tory governments and I dare say by some of the practices of members of this government.

I look at a constituent who has bleeding ulcers on his feet, and he cannot get into the hospital because it is not serious enough. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) denies there has been cutbacks in the hospital care system in the hospital care system. You tell that to my constituent who cannot get into the hospital, or you can tell that to my constituent who has to pay for a cushion for her wheelchair, and they say, no, there is no user fees and, no, there are no cutbacks. You tell her when she gets a bedsore, because she cannot afford a cushion for her wheelchair. You tell her that.

Mr. Speaker, I visited a school where there is someone who is getting special needs training. This young girl, who is courageously carrying on with her life, doing a marvellous job, with marvellous work, required a special machine to talk. She could no

longer communicate verbally. There were no funds to buy that machine. A volunteer organization had to raise the funds to buy that girl a machine in order to speak. I have got nothing against volunteer organizations, and I think they are tremendous, but I also think that for every one of those girls who has volunteer organizations that could buy a machine, there might be 10 others that do not, because this government has not lived up to its funding commitments like it promised only several months ago.

My constituents have said to me, why do you not talk about the GST? I say I talk constantly in this House about the GST, but members on the opposite side of the House do not listen, or do they not care? I do not know what it is.

They said to me, talk about free trade, talk about what free trade is doing to us. I say, I have talked about free trade, and we on this side of the House have tried to talk about free trade, but I do not think it is getting through.

Centra Gas—a big issue in my constituency, the situation there. I look at the situation regarding Centra Gas, and I say that company purchased ICG. The books were open. They knew what the liabilities were. They knew what the bad debts were. They still purchased it. Now they have to go back, and now they have to get a retroactive increase from customers, from the clients, in a monopoly situation. It does not strike me as fair. It does not strike me as fair at all.

Increasingly we have talked about how there is such a distrust of government, and I am afraid there is a cynicism out there. I, unfortunately, by watching some of the antics and the actions of members on that side of the House, have been forced to admit that they are a very, very manipulative group over there.

Time and time again, we have heard in this House from members opposite how the economic crisis—the minister had a press conference, and he had an analysis, and he brought out his charts, and he brought out his graphs, Mr. Speaker. What day did he choose to do that? Why are we cynical? He chose the day before the education grant announcement. He chose the day the House was sitting when the nurses were all here. Does that not smack of a little bit of manipulation? No wonder members on this side of the House were cynical.

That announcement could have been made a month earlier, could have been made two months

earlier. In fact, it should have been made in September 1990 when they hid the true agenda from the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. That is when it should have been done. The only thing that changed was the fact that the government was manipulating and trying to get the best news out as best they can.

Mr. Speaker, there is no wonder that members on this side of the House are somewhat uncertain and unsure of what members on that side are saying. No wonder the immigrant community does not believe this government when they say they are going to fund ESL. It took press conferences. It took people having to line up before this government listened. They sent someone out to say no more funding for ESL, as I understand it.

The only way they react, all of a sudden there is something in the press, Mr. Speaker, and all of a sudden the minister is out making an announcement only when something appears in the press. No wonder people are cynical. Is there any wonder that people are cynical of this government and this government's actions? I am sorry to have to say that, but in the few months I have been in this House -(interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

\* (2120)

**Mr. Chomlak:** We know that revenues are a problem, Mr. Speaker. There is no question that revenues are a problem in the Province of Manitoba. We recognize that. How many tens of millions of dollars would have gone to the education and health system if they had not cut back and given grants to their corporate friends, on the education and health tax? How many millions would be available to the public education system if in the last budget they did not give a \$7 million tax credit to their large corporate friends? How many millions would be available for the public school system if they were not channelling \$100 million over the next eight years to the private school system? How many millions would be available? No, it is clearly a revenue problem, but it is a revenue problem brought on by the members themselves. That is the problem.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they go around and say there is no tax increase in this province. There are no tax increases. We have not increased taxes. They have not increased taxes? Winnipeg School Division, St. James School Division, Seven Oaks School Division, Transcona-Springfield School

Division, River East School Division, Seine River School Division, those are all Tory tax increases. Every tax increase is a Tory tax increase. It is the GFT, the GFT all across this province.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Attorney General state on radio that what was wrong about the federal government's cutback of the RCMP costs, what was wrong with the federal government was revenues were not increasing, and that should not be a reason to pass on the burden to the provincial government. What does his colleague in cabinet do? His colleague in cabinet does precisely the same thing, only they pass it on to the municipalities, and they pass it on to the school divisions. Ultimately, it gets passed on to the children, and it gets passed on to the local taxpayer. That is a tragedy. Mr. Speaker, that is what happens -(interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am having great difficulty in hearing the remarks of the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak).

**Mr. Chomiak:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The members on the other side of the House do have a strategy. I am well aware of that. There is no question they are following the—I was going to say Brian Mulroney. Of course, they are following that strategy, but it is also the Ronald Reagan strategy, Mr. Speaker. What happened after Ronald Reagan's tenure in office? Does he have a balanced budget? In fact, does Brian Mulroney have the balanced budget he promised? No, \$3,000 billion in debt is the United States debt, and that is the legacy of Ronald Reagan's slashing and cutting and tinkering with the economic system. That is a tragedy, and that is what they want to do to this province.

My Liberal friends, Mr. Speaker -(interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Kildonan only has seven minutes remaining, and I am sure we would like to give him the opportunity.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could go on for the last seven minutes just discussing the problems I see with the Liberal party, but just in general, I would just like to indicate that their support for the increased funding to private schools, and their support to the corporate tax breaks of the same friends of the Tories have caused some of the same revenue problems that this government is facing—terrible, terrible.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for some of the minutes remaining to an area that I am becoming increasingly familiar with, and the people of Manitoba are increasingly distressed about, and that is the area of education. You know, I want to give the government credit for some things. I think the minister's special needs guidelines were commendable. They should be more strictly enforced, but they were commendable. I am happy to hear the Minister is finally coming out with a strategic plan, something we called for all last session. We knew that he had it, and finally he is going to release it, so I am happy to hear that.

I guess, when I get into the area of education, I am struck by the comments of the member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) when he was the opposition critic in this particular area in 1982. When the government gave a 12.9 percent increase to education, this was the comment of the member for Tuxedo. He said: The power was there for the minister to offload. The power is there, but she chose to offload a significant amount of it on the property tax rolls, and the people of this province will not be very happy. There will be a ratepayers' revolt, and they will let her know—that is the minister—and they will let this government know that all their posturing and all their rhetoric during the election campaign amounts to nothing in terms of their ultimate credibility, because it is their actions that they will be judged upon, Mr. Speaker.

That was March 24, 1982. On a separate date, April 5, 1982, the Premier, then member for River Heights and Tuxedo, said, quote, we have this year almost every jurisdiction, almost every school division looking for an increase in mill rate. Throw it onto the property taxpayer where it should not be and that it does not bear any relationship to one's income, and they have argued so strenuously in the past.

Mr. Speaker, that was the member for Tuxedo in 1982, and now he is doing precisely to the local taxpayer what he said should not be done, and that speaks legions. I do not even have to go on to explain it.

Of course, in 1988, as I indicated in the House this afternoon, we had the member for Tuxedo promising that the grants in education and grants to universities, and I quote, April 2, 1988, would at least equal the rate of inflation. That was the member for Tuxedo in 1988, and now today he comes here and says, there is nothing.



One of the most insidious things that I find about this particular government is the scapegoating, the blaming. First it was the students. Then it was the nurses. Now it is the teachers. The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) goes out and looks at the teachers—he says in 1969 he took a salary cut—and he looks out to the teachers and says, 85 percent is salaries. Then it is going to be government workers and, of course, it has been school boards. Who is next? The sick, the old? I find that deplorable.

What I find mostly about comments of members opposite is that it is empty rhetoric—no funding, unfunded, complete unfunded rhetoric, Mr. Speaker. -(interjection)- That is right. It is rhetoric that is totally unfunded. Members opposite hear it time and time again.

We have called for some time for a funding formula. The minister indicates they have been working on a funding formula for some time. I remind the minister they promised a white paper in the 1989 throne speech. The minister promised me before Christmas in this House they would have a funding paper out. We still have no funding paper. Now we are hearing the funding paper in springtime. We hear of amendments to PSA for several years and we have seen nothing and on and on.

Special needs is one area that has unfortunately suffered most acutely as a result of this government's actions, and as I indicated in the House last week during the debate, that in many cases it is the special needs area of education that is suffering the worst under these Tory cutbacks.

Members opposite often ask us on this side of the House what we would do in terms of education, what we would do in terms of funding, and we have given several examples. We have indicated to members opposite that clearly there are revenue problems because they have foregone considerable revenues to their large corporate friends. They have given money to private schools. They have hired management. They have hired a \$60,000 administrator to do something that should be done in the Department of Education.

The ministers talk increasingly about the dropout rate and their strategies for dealing with the dropout rate, but I do not believe the minister even knows or has any understanding of what the retention rate is in this province, because they do not have a proper system in place, because they do not have proper

records. They do not have proper records and a proper system, because they have had no plan in effect, they have had no direction in effect.

\* (2130)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hour being 9:30, pursuant to Subrule 35(3), I am interrupting the debate in order to put the question on the amendment as proposed by the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). Is it the wish of the House to have the amendment read?

THAT the motion be amended by adding to it the following words:

But this House regrets that:

- (a) This government has refused to take leadership to stimulate economic growth in this province when it is most needed, which will result in Manitoba being the last Canadian province to come out of the recession;
- (b) this government has failed to take any action to protect and create jobs in Manitoba;
- (c) this government has not taken any initiative to guarantee that farmers receive the real cost of production and has instead supported inadequate farm programs which continue to force producers off their land;
- (d) this government has instituted a series of initiatives to radically erode the quality of health care, education and services to families, claiming that no resources exist to finance these vital programs, while refusing to take steps through the implementation of a fair tax system that would properly finance them;
- (e) this government has failed to take any steps to place justice for northern and aboriginal people at the top of this province's agenda;
- (f) this government has no environmental strategy in place to protect the quality or quantity of downstream water in Manitoba;
- (g) this government has thereby lost the trust and confidence of the people of Manitoba.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the proposed amendment, please say yea. All those opposed will please say nay. In my opinion, the Nays have it.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the members.

The question before the House is the amendment of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer).

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the results being as follows:

### **Yeas**

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carr, Carstairs, Cerilli, Cheema, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Edwards, Evans (Brandon East), Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Gaudry, Harper, Hickes, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylycia-Leis, Wowchuk.

### **Nays**

Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau,

Manness, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Yeas 27, Nays 29.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment defeated. Order, please.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable government House leader, seconded by the honourable Minister of Justice, that this House do now adjourn. Agreed? (Agreed)

This House now stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

Monday, March 18, 1991

**CONTENTS**

**Throne Speech Debate**

Derkach	319
C. Evans	320
Penner	324
Chomiak	330