

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 6 March, 1987.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.**

**MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Agriculture - crisis situation

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Premier.

Yesterday, in response to my appeal here in the House for programs to aid our farmers in Manitoba who are in a crisis situation today, the Premier refused to make any commitment. Yet media reports indicate that outside the House, his Minister of Agriculture indicated that the government plans to introduce three or four measures to provide relief for Manitoba farmers.

I wonder if the Premier can indicate whether or not this is a firm commitment to the farmers of Manitoba, or whether this is a commitment similar to the one he made to the Manitoba Teachers' Society last year in which he promised 90 percent education funding by 1990.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, a number of corrections are required: first, the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that I promised 90 percent Provincial Government funding of the costs of public education by 1990, and that is a fair comment based upon the reports this morning in the paper. The commitment that was made is one that we maintain and continue to maintain. My government remains committed to phasing in 90 percent Provincial Government funding of the costs of public education.

Then I said I hoped that goal can be obtained by 1990. I so told the Manitoba Teachers' Society that remains our goal, our hope. But, Madam Speaker, to attempt to interpret that as a commitment that will be obtained by 1990 is not consistent with the clear statement. We are attempting to do it. We are committed to 90 percent funding.

I wish the Honourable Leader who, I believe for about the nineteenth time in five short days, has either been advised improperly by his researchers or has carelessly tossed around incorrect information in this House, would, for once, ensure that he obtains correct information, Madam Speaker, when he bases his questions in this Chamber, rather than leading off with incorrect information.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, then the Premier had better tell that to the Manitoba Teachers' Society since they clearly understood that when they had the meeting with the Premier and got that commitment from him.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Question?

**MR. G. FILMON:** I regret, Madam Speaker, that the Premier doesn't want to answer the question on a commitment to agriculture.

But my question is: Given that his Minister of Agriculture has gone outside the Chamber, when not prepared to make a commitment inside the Chamber, and talked about three or four measures, is this a firm commitment to the agriculture producers of this province?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, first, I must advise the Leader of the Opposition that the Manitoba Teachers' Society, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, understands what was said by myself in respect to funding. They've said that to me after discussion and after reviewing what they indeed received by me by way of letter.

The Minister responsible for Agriculture is quite anxious to again clarify an incorrect assumption that the Leader of the Opposition has left in this Chamber, because again the Leader of the Opposition is basing his question on incorrect assumptions.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I want the Premier to indicate to the farmers of Manitoba whether or not he is prepared to make a commitment to the agriculture producers of this province, to the farmers who are in desperate need. Is he prepared to bring in the three or four programs that have been talked about in news media reports, or is he not prepared? Is he prepared to leave them hung out there, waiting and waiting and waiting, while the crisis prevails around them?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, this government has stood by Manitoba farmers six years running, continuously. Madam Speaker, instead of standing up for farmers, that bunch across the way stood up for the banks when we brought in legislation to assist farmers. Madam Speaker, the grain sector is going through a major crisis in this country, and it is that bunch who continues to try and bail out their friend, Brian Mulroney and company, in terms of their support to the grain industry.

Madam Speaker, statements that I have made in this House and outside the House, and we, as a government, have made, that we are very concerned about the plight of farmers. We are very concerned about the inequities in municipal taxation and school taxation on farm land. My colleagues are conducting the review, and we have

indicated as a government that, during this period of our mandate, action will be taken. Those are the kinds of statements that I have made.

It's too bad, Madam Speaker, that some reporter wants to add on many statements to it that they are definitive commitments, because no Minister of the government can give a commitment until the Budget and other matters are brought down in this House. Those are the kinds of statements that we have made in this House. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that and honourable members know that. Well, maybe they don't know that, Madam Speaker. Maybe they don't know the protocol in the Legislative Assembly. Those kinds of measures will be brought down in the Budget, and those are the kinds of answers that have been given, Madam Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, it's interesting how the commitment to stand up for farmers is now one of standing by them and reviewing options.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** My question to the Premier is: Would he like to have leave today to have his Minister make a Ministerial Statement to clear up all of the conflicting information, to say exactly what the commitment of this government is to the farmers of Manitoba?

We are prepared to give that leave. Would he like to have that leave in order to have an announcement made as to where this government stands with respect to agriculture?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, if it is to give the leave to the Minister of Agriculture to ensure that the Leader of the Opposition is straightened out insofar as the incorrect information that he's tossed around this Chamber in the last few days, I would be delighted to see that happen.

The Minister of Agriculture has no need to receive leave in order to resolve the inconsistencies in respect to any statements he has made. This government has provided some \$160 million toward the benefit of farmers during this past year, a number of programs; and some of those programs opposed by members across the way - those members who pretend to be the friend of farmers, unfortunately, Madam Speaker, are only interested in attempting to protect their kissing cousins in Ottawa rather than deal with the concrete problems of farmers in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question is very simple. There has been a great deal of discussion, apparently, by the Minister of Agriculture with media representatives indicating that the government is prepared to introduce three or four programs.

Will the Premier indicate whether or not those programs are a firm commitment to the agriculture producers, to the farmers of this province who are in difficulty?

That's the question; let's have a straight answer.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, the discussions that I have had with the media were to try and deal with the sleaze and the misinformation that's been put

on the record by the Leader of the Opposition in the pamphlets that they sent out to the people of this province, claiming that Manitoba is way below in terms of its support for farmers as compared to other provinces.

Madam Speaker, we have always said that we would like to do as much as Alberta but, clearly, in terms of what Saskatchewan has done, in terms of its farm community, we do not take a back-seat stand to that budget at all. We have provided support, targeted support, to Manitoba farmers far in excess of what is available in terms of the loan funds, which make up the bulk of that budget, and we in Manitoba are not cutting services to schools, to hospitals and to municipal governments, as has been suggested and being done in Saskatchewan with their \$1.5 billion deficit.

Madam Speaker, members opposed, berated members on this side last Session that we are not getting our spending in control. Now they want all kinds of spending from members on this side, but yet they will berate us that our budget is all out of control. What are they going to tell their friends in Saskatchewan who put up loan funds only once for the farmers of Saskatchewan, not on an ongoing basis as we have done here?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is, very simply, is this report untrue, the report that says three or four measures to provide relief to Manitoba's cash-strapped farmers will be introduced, among which includes . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

The honourable member's question is out of order. It is a member's duty to verify the facts.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Then we'll verify the facts. Will the Premier indicate whether or not the government is prepared to introduce three or four measures, including the elimination of all or part of education tax on farm land, to help the farmers of this province?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, this government gave a very clear indication in the Throne Speech that measures would be introduced during this Session within the fiscal and jurisdictional capacity of the Province of Manitoba in order to assist farmers in Manitoba. But let it be very, very clear, although we are committed to do that, as outlined in the Throne Speech and not from some newspaper report that the honourable member pulls out, we remain committed to the commitment outlined in the Throne Speech.

Let it be clear, though, Madam Speaker, because the Tories in this House wish to deflect from the responsibility of the Federal Government, the farmers of this province know clearly that the grain crisis in Canada is a trade matter that can only be dealt with by the national government in Ottawa, just as it's being dealt with in Washington and Europe.

### Education funding - public schools

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

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Last year, we saw the Premier undercut his Minister of Education in his handling of the problem at the Brandon University. Yesterday, in reports to the media, we saw a similar example of the First Minister undercutting the importance of his Minister of Education. For clarification, Madam Speaker, I would like to know from the Minister of Education: Is it still the government's commitment to reach 90 percent funding for educational costs in the Province of Manitoba?

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, for the honourable member's information, I think the First Minister has made it abundantly clear what the intentions of the government are. Those intentions, Madam Speaker, were made clear yesterday in our meeting with the seven organizations who presented briefs. I have made those intentions clear to the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and the Manitoba Teachers' Society on many occasions, Madam Speaker. The intentions of the government were made clear in a letter from the Premier to the Manitoba Teachers' Society in 1986. Madam Speaker, the intentions of the government haven't changed. The commitment is to go to 90 percent; the goal is 1990.

**MR. C. BIRT:** My question is to the Premier.

When did he change the government's policy not to go to 90 percent of educational funding?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I haven't, Madam Speaker.

**MR. C. BIRT:** My question to the Premier, then, is: Why then during the election did he make a commitment to go to 90 percent of the educational funding, and you now are telling the public as of yesterday that it's another election promise broken? Why don't you live up to your commitments that you made during the campaign?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, again I dislike - I know the honourable Member for Fort Garry is sincere in his question in the House and I appreciate that - it's a good question - but I do wish again that the facts would be properly looked into prior to raising questions in the House.

The commitment was this, Madam Speaker: My government remains committed to phasing in 90 percent Provincial Government funding of the costs of public education. I hope that this goal can be obtained by 1990. That is our hope; that is our target outline during the campaign. It is not a commitment that we'll arrive at that by 1990 or 1991 - we are attempting to do so.

And, Madam Speaker, fortunately for us, and unfortunately for honourable members across the way, Manitobans are wise. They see through empty political rhetoric on the part of honourable members across the way. They know the wording of the commitment.

### Doctors - limit registration at U of M

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health.

Many problems plague our health care system, and the health care Minister has in the past pointed to three. He has stated that there is a surplus of doctors in Manitoba; that, at the same time, there are not enough doctors in rural Manitoba; and that, in addition, there are abuses of the testing system.

Therefore, I would ask the Minister, on the specific questions: Has the Minister met with the president of the University of Manitoba and the dean of the Medical School to discuss the possibility of limiting entrance to first-year medicine in the academic year 1987-88?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Speaker, yes, I have.

### Doctors - rural and north

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** A supplementary question: Will the government move, this year, to provide a distinct program of incentives to encourage doctors to move to rural Manitoba?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Speaker, the government will move again to keep on trying to have a fair distribution of doctors not only in rural Manitoba but north of Manitoba, and this is being discussed now and something should be announced fairly soon.

### Medical testing - abuse of

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** A final supplementary, Madam Speaker: What specific action does the Minister intend to take to prevent the overtesting of patients as they go from doctor to doctor with the same tests being repeated but the results not forwarded on to the physicians?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Speaker, this is quite complicated. I agree with the statement made. This is something that will be fully discussed during my Estimates. I think it is more of a proper place than to discuss that at this time.

### Education funding - Brandon

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the First Minister and it has to do with so much of the Throne Speech's references to caring and sharing and fair sharing.

The Premier visited my city of Brandon last Friday, and I hope he enjoyed his visit there, and I know that he spent some time with the school division there. He previously had committed himself to spend 20 minutes with them on the school funding issue, which we all think is really big of him.

After listening to the Brandon School Division, Madam Speaker, what would the First Minister be proposing to do to prove that he means it when he talks about fair sharing when it comes to school funding in Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, all I can assure the honourable member is that our practice, which has been to increase operating costs to the school divisions of the province, '82 to '87, at a rate which is higher than Consumer Price Index, will continue, unlike the practice announced by Conservative Governments in Alberta and Saskatchewan the last few weeks.

It's interesting, honourable members, when there are big announcements, Alberta and Saskatchewan like to point out those announcements, but when there's problems either in Ottawa or Alberta or Saskatchewan, they try to disassociate themselves from those same announcements. That's very, very interesting, Madam Speaker.

We are committed to continue to increase the funding to education overall, and certainly, insofar as removing disparities from school division to school division in respect to the ability to pay, that will be further examined closely by my government because it's important that all children in Manitoba have equal access.

So the wealth, the ability to pay of school divisions is under constant review, there have been improvements in the last several years vis-a-vis equalization grants to ensure that, and the representation by the Brandon School Division certainly has been received and will be examined in view of that overall principle that we're attempting to achieve.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. He might like to check with the Premier before he answers.

Madam Speaker, I don't think that there is anything wrong with increasing grants for public schools, but that doesn't address the issue.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a question or is he making a speech?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Yes, I do, Madam Speaker. The First Minister wasn't interrupted, Madam Speaker, and I don't see why I need to be interrupted.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West with a supplementary question.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I'm not asking a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. I'm on a new question and I'm entitled to make a preamble to my question.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West with a question without an argument with the Chair, please.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. You did recognize me for a new question and that's what I'd like to ask.

Madam Speaker, the Premier has said that there will be further examinations. After last year, when the

Member for Roblin-Russell and I raised this question with the Minister of Education, he did review it last year. How many times are we going to review an unfair situation before the Minister does something about it, and what is he going to do about it now?

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I neither have to check with the Premier about the facts nor the truths.

Madam Speaker, perhaps the Member for Brandon West should lend some assistance to the Leader of the Opposition so he may be apprised of the facts on some days.

Madam Speaker, I have met with the Brandon School Board and many other school divisions and school trustees across this province to discuss funding. I have indicated that there is no simple formula that is going to work to match all of the inequities and all of the differences and uniquenesses in the school divisions in any simple way.

Brandon School Division has received increased funding this year, and I attribute that in part to their representation and the representation of other divisions on the issue of educational support. I think that it is fair to say that Brandon receives a larger share of provincial support for expenditures than many other divisions in this province - many other divisions.

Madam Speaker, of course, every division would like to see the maximum possible benefit come from the province, but there is a question of fairness for other divisions. This province has quadrupled the amount of money that is spent on equalization that is distributed to truly poorer school divisions. Fairness, Madam Speaker, is hard to achieve.

### First-contract legislation - applications

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Madam Speaker, on the same theme of fairness and equity, I'll ask a question to whomever it is answers today for the Minister of Labour.

Since the first-contract legislation was brought in by this government, how many first-contract applications have been filed by bargaining agents with the Manitoba Labour Board and how many have been filed by employers?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll take that question as notice for the Minister of Labour.

### High School Review

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education.

Friday, 6 March, 1987

During our last Session, the Minister of Education, after repeated pressure from this side of the House to finally announce the review of high school programs in this province. After some questions as to when the review would take place, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Education said that there would be a position paper ready in October and, after further questioning, he decided, no, that he would postpone that for another few months, and he also consented in having this position paper in the hands of us by the end of December. As of this date, Madam Speaker, we do not have that paper in our hands, and I am wondering whether the Minister of Education now has a new time frame; or when can we expect this position paper in our hands?

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, I acknowledge the relentless pressure from members opposite to live up to that commitment. I have to say, Madam Speaker, that it was that, and that alone, that committed us to action. What nonsense, Madam Speaker. We get this in every kind of preamble from members opposite, "we made them do it." Madam Speaker, the commitment was there; we did it. I made a commitment to have a consultation paper available to members opposite and to the public, and the good news is that it is in the process of being prepared. It has been drafted and it is going to the printers and it will be available very shortly.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Oh, it is unfortunate, Madam Speaker, that the Minister of Education thinks the High School Review process is nonsense.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Ellice on a point of order.  
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.  
Can the Minister of Education tell us whether he is still adhering to the time frame that he set out in the completion of the High School Review?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, I'm reminded by my colleagues that we are probably 99 percent to achieving that goal. I can assure the member that the time frame that I established at the committee is still achievable, despite the fact that the release of the consultation paper is somewhat delayed.

I have to acknowledge the fact that the committee that is working is a very disparate group. They come to this committee with different interests in terms of the High School Review process, and it is difficult for them to develop a consensus on all of the issues that confront the high school program, but I can assure the member that the consultation paper will be forthcoming very shortly and that the timetable that I announced, I think, still is achievable.

### High School Review - hearings

**MR. L. DERKACH:** A final supplementary to the Minister of Education.

Can the Minister indicate when and where the first hearings conducted by the High School Review will take place?

**HON. J. STORIE:** I believe I indicated at committee that the location of the hearings, whether with the whole Review Committee or its subcommittees, would be determined by the committee. I do not know that a schedule has been established, but I do know that committee hearings will be held in every region of the province and that there will be adequate notice and opportunity for individuals, for representatives of the educational system, to make input. That's the reason for the process and it will be thorough, Madam Speaker.

### Plea bargaining - Robinson case

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. I wonder if the Attorney-General would indicate to this House whether he supports and approves the plea bargaining that went on in the case of Mr. Robinson, who killed his wife, and Elizabeth Polanski in 1983.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Madam Speaker, I ask your ruling whether I . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** One moment, please. I have not recognized the Attorney-General.  
The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Madam Speaker, I am prepared to give the House the information upon which the decision was made, but whether or not I support or approve is really not the question. The facts, as known to the Crown, were that with respect to the one charge that was originally laid, the later homicide, they felt that they had a good case. Whether or not it would be first degree, or second degree, or manslaughter would of course be up to the jury to decide had it gone to trial. It was in the course of anticipating that trial that the accused volunteered the information, was prepared to volunteer the information through counsel, of his involvement in an earlier homicide. At that time it was made known to the Crown that that information would only be forthcoming if in fact a plea was accepted to manslaughter.

But it was the suggestion of the senior Crown Attorneys, who were seized of the case, that they could only do that if it was understood and accepted that the maximum of life imprisonment would be imposed. And since had the accused stood trial on the later charge alone and been convicted of manslaughter only, the sentence might have been anywhere from 3 to 5 to 7 to 10 to 15 years, we don't know. A guaranteed life term seemed to the Crown Attorney to be the best disposition of the case in the public interest.

I think those are the facts that were before the Crown Attorney who made the decision. I think many people will say that in order to ensure that a person of this kind was sentenced to life imprisonment that that was the proper course.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Attorney-General.

Given, Madam Speaker, that the end result of this case was that a man who killed two women is eligible for release on parole in seven years, given that this is a result of plea bargaining, a practice that I acknowledge has been going on for some time to expedite justice, but a practice I suggest to the Attorney-General is now bringing the justice system into disrepute amongst the public and amongst the victims and families involved, would the Attorney-General be prepared to review the practice of plea bargaining, especially in these violent crimes which have ended up in results that are completely not understood by the public in any way, shape or form, or by the people involved, in order that in these serious types of cases the Crown put in their case in full view of the public and let the results happen as they may?

**HON. R. PENNER:** I share the member's concern, I think he's right to raise it. Anything that might bring the administration of justice into disrepute has to be a matter of public concern not only outside this House, but inside this House as well. One has to ask the question, had a person of this kind in fact been convicted of manslaughter only and sentenced to a proportionate sentence, as would necessarily be the case to a person at that time known to the court only with respect to the one offence, would not the administration of justice equally be brought into disrepute? One doesn't know; those are questions that those on the front line have to weigh.

With respect to the first part of his question, I am prepared at all times to review the criteria for plea bargaining with senior Crowns and certainly undertake to continue to do so.

### Plea bargaining - review of

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, a final supplementary to the Attorney-General, and I thank him for his answer.

Would he then be prepared to indicate that he will review the present practice of plea bargaining and be in a position to report on his revised policy during the course of the review of his Estimates, which will likely come up in perhaps two or three months, which will give him sufficient time to carry out that type of review?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, I am pleased to give that undertaking.

### Farm land - school tax levy

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. C. BAKER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Could he tell us if there was an increase in the government levy on farm property for school purposes within the last number of years?

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. The Member for Brandon West has a point of order?

**MR. J. McRAE:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege dealing with the rights of all honourable members in this Chamber and, more specifically, the rights of members of the Opposition, and it arises because for the second or third time in this Session, the legislative assistant to the Minister of Agriculture has risen to ask a question of his own Minister.-(Interjection)-

Madam Speaker . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. J. McRAE:** May I go on?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Continue.

**MR. J. McRAE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Citation 370 of Beausheue says that: "Those such as Parliamentary Secretaries who are clothed with the responsibility of answering for the Government ought not to use the time of the Question Period for the privilege of asking questions of the Government."

Madam Speaker, in his book entitled, "Mr. Speaker," written by Speaker James Jerome, former Speaker of the House of Commons, on page 67 -(Interjection)-

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** On page 67, Madam Speaker, Jerome says in his book, "The essence of Question Period is accountability, and no one could ever persuade me that Ministers were really under critical scrutiny from their own government supporters."

Madam Speaker, Mr. Speaker Lamoureux in 1973, February 26, as recorded at page 1644 of Hansard, said the following: "I can understand backbenchers seeking legitimate information. If they cannot get it on the telephone, they may seek to get it in the House. But parliamentary secretaries, in my submission, are in a far different position. They are assistants to Ministers, in this case the Minister of Transport, and there is a clear line of communication available between the parliamentary secretary and the Minister of National Revenue through which the information could easily have been obtained."

Madam Speaker, I believe it was Mr. Speaker Jerome in 1974 - anyway, as recorded at page 1060 of Hansard on November 5. The Speaker of the Day said: "However, at the moment, based on the understanding of the role and privileges with which a parliamentary secretary is clothed and therefore his special opportunity of access to the ministry, in light of the position to which he has been appointed, I have expressed my own view and I am prepared at some other time to listen to further representations."

The Speakers rulings over the years, Madam Speaker, have been that parliamentary secretaries ought not to ask questions. This is supported also by Speaker Francis and Speaker Sauve.

I'll take you, Madam Speaker, now to June 11 of 1970 in this place. The former Premier of this province, Mr. Schreyer, at the time the parliamentary assistants legislation came before this House, said the following: "It makes sense, therefore, to introduce some flexibility in arrangements so that a member of the Assembly

may serve as the provincial equivalent of a parliamentary secretary, in other words, a legislative assistant."

Our former Premier, Madam Speaker, has made that comparison that our legislative assistants are clothed with the same responsibilities as those parliamentary secretaries in Ottawa.

Just as a brief aside, Madam Speaker, the Premier of the Day, Mr. Schreyer, made the point that legislative assistants should be paid on the order of \$2,000 to \$3,000, and on that basis, the total appropriation for this extra work and assistants would be less in terms of the cost to the Crown, to the public, than would be the appointment of an additional Cabinet Minister.

As I understand it, at that time there were 12 to 13 members of the Executive Council; now we have 21 and we still have four legislative assistants.

So he said there were cost-saving reasons for doing it this way, but that is an aside, Madam Speaker. The main point of my question of privilege is that legislative assistants, especially to their own Minister, should not be directing questions since they have more privileges of access than we, as members of the Opposition.

Madam Speaker, the precedents are very clear and the obiter by Speakers over the years has been that parliamentary secretaries and therefore legislative assistants ought not to be addressing questions in the House, certainly not to their own Ministers.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.- (Interjection)- Order please, order please.

May I please remind the members that a Matter of Privilege is a very serious matter. I would suggest that I am able to listen to all the advice that members would care to give on this matter, in proper decorum.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, I don't believe, at least not in my experience in this House and I think in the experience of those who have served this House, this Legislature, and the public longer than I, that we have ever seen an Opposition so adverse to the Government giving full and factual information to the public on issues of interest to the public.

**A MEMBER:** That's a crock and you know it.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Time and time again, Madam Speaker, they pose a question, then they howl when they get an answer that is full and factual and they try to cut off the Minister who is giving that answer, during the course of that action.

Time and time again, they suggest that Ministers should not provide full and factual information in answer to their questions. Time and time again, they suggest that members on this side should have the opportunity to ask questions on matters of interest to them and, more importantly, matters of interest to the general public.- (Interjection)-

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. COWAN:** The member, in his Point of Privilege, suggested that there were a number of references

regarding asking of questions by parliamentary secretaries that should apply to legislative assistants. Then he went further as to try to connect - and I believe he failed in doing so - but to try to draw a connection between the role of parliamentary secretaries and legislative assistants.

He has had experience -(Interjection)- Well, the Member for Pembina, in his normal manner of trying either to distract or distort what is being said, chirps from his seat once again.

The fact is - and the member who made the Point of Privilege should know full well, given his experience, there are substantive differences between the role of parliamentary secretary and a legislative assistant. He should know very well that is the case. Parliamentary secretaries, from time to time, do themselves answer questions; legislative assistants do not answer questions. Right there is a very substantive difference in respect to how Parliament treats its parliamentary secretaries and the Legislature treats its legislative assistants.

I'd like to quote, Madam Speaker, from some sources that are closer to home. In respect to the answering of questions by Ministers that are posed to them from backbenchers, and these are quotations that arise from debate and discussions in this Legislature, where the precedents are set.

Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 22, 1980, page 3899 of the Hansard, Mr. Sterling Lyon said in response to an interjection suggesting that a Mr. Len Domino, who was a member at that time, a backbench member, should not ask a question of the Attorney-General at that time, who is the Member for St. Norbert, went on to say, and I'm going to quote in full what he said. It is short but I think it capsulizes the point which may be made.

Mr. Lyon said, and I quote: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster, may I say that we thank him for that very constructive suggestion and I think he appreciates, as a former Minister of Natural Resources, something of the severity of the problem that the whole province faces at this time." We could relate those comments directly to the severity of the problems that agriculture faces and that the Member for Lac du Bonnet wants to get some answers to for the general public.

I'm going on to continue the quote from Mr. Lyon, and I think the suggestion is an extremely useful one: "The business of preparing statements, statements, by the time they are prepared are out of date. He knows that from his own experience and I'm sure that various Ministers involved in the committee will take advantage of the suggestion, with the permission of the House, to make oral statements from time to time as the situation changes because it is changing rather rapidly."

Then he goes on to address the second point, which is germane to this argument, and I wanted to put the full comment in the proper context. On the second point, Mr. Lyon says: "I would not have thought it necessary to make the point. I find it incredible to hear elected members of a Legislative Assembly in a parliamentary democracy talking about the right of any member of this Legislature to ask a question of the Treasury Bench. Mr. Speaker," he said, "we are all, 57 of us, here as elected representatives of the various constituencies in this province, and all 57 have the right

to ask questions of the Treasury Bench at any time. That is a fundamental of the parliamentary system."

He even goes on, because we've had members opposite reference other jurisdictions, and I think inappropriately so, but in this case Mr. Lyon went on to reference what happened in the mother of parliaments and he said: "If my honourable friend from the east side of Lake Winnipeg . . ." referring at that time, I believe, to Mr. Green, "would like to go over to the mother of parliament sometimes, he would see parliament in operation whereby the backbench of a government, be it Labour or Conservative, on an average Question Period, Mr. Speaker, ask at least a third of the questions of the Treasury Bench. Let my honourable friend . . ." - this is what Mr. Lyon was providing as advice in 1980, and I would provide the same advice to honourable friends on the Opposition benches today - "Let my honourable friend become better instructed in the parliament before he tries, Mr. Speaker, to instruct you in your duties." And recall, Madam Speaker, that those comments were made in respect to questions being asked by a backbencher of the Member for St. Norbert and the Opposition House Leader at this time.

That was not the end of the matter in this particular Legislative Assembly, Madam Speaker. On Friday the 3rd, April, 1981, page 2384 of Hansard, the Member for St. Norbert, who was being introduced at that time as the Honourable Government House Leader by the Speaker, made the following quote: "Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary to repeat my position on this matter but apparently it is, Mr. Speaker, that any member of this House is entitled to seek information."

Madam Speaker, the matter did not end there. Again, the Member for St. Norbert, in being addressed as the Government House Leader of the Day, on Friday the 13th . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. J. COWAN:** . . . March, 1981, stated on page 1677 of the Hansard that, "On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think we have found in the past Members of the Opposition would ask questions if the news was bad . . ." and then suggested, Madam Speaker, that backbenchers should have the opportunity to ask questions if the news, in fact, was either good or bad.

In this instance, the news is important to the people of Manitoba and we believe that the Member for Lac du Bonnet not only has the right - never mind what happens in the mother of parliaments; never mind what has happened in this Chamber for years since I have sat here and years since any member has sat here - never mind all that; he has the right, clearly. But more than that, Madam Speaker, he has the responsibility.

The other day we sat through a whole question period when not one question was asked by the members of the Opposition in respect to agriculture. Somebody in this House has to ask those questions. Somebody has to show care and concern. Somebody has to take the opportunity to put the questions forward so that the facts can be presented to the public.

Madam Speaker, there are a whole number of other references made by not only the Member for St. Norbert - I don't wish to single him out - but made not only

by the previous Leader of the Conservative Party, who was Premier at the time, but made by all members, that we do in fact have rights, responsibilities, and a need for all members of this House to ask questions when those questions are required. And if the Opposition doesn't want to ask about agriculture and get the facts on the record as they should by, then members on this side want to ask about agriculture.

So we have an Opposition that is very clearly adverse to the provision of information. Let that not stand in the way of providing full and factual information to the public of Manitoba, Madam Speaker.

Finally, I just would note that the member, and I thought given his experience he would have, did not end his statement with a motion, which I believe would be required under the circumstances. So it is obviously out of order, but I did want to make my comments, Madam Speaker, before the matter was ruled out of order.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Very briefly, Madam Speaker, members on this side appreciate very much the respect and esteem that the Government House Leader has given to statements made by former Premier Sterling Lyon and myself.

Madam Speaker, the Government House Leader failed to note that Mr. Domino was never a legislative assistant of mine in asking his questions, and I do bring that to your attention.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Member for Brandon West have something to add to the advice?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I do have a motion to move at the appropriate time.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member should have moved his motion when he raised his Matter of Privilege; he does not rise now to place a motion.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Is it the wish of the Chair to prevent me, Madam Speaker, from moving a motion?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

It is not my wish; it is a requirement under the rules of this Chamber that when a member raises a Matter of Privilege that he concludes his remarks with a substantive motion. The honourable member failed to do that at that time and therefore, after intervening proceedings of this House, does not then have the opportunity to place a motion.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** On a point of order, perhaps you can correct me, but as I understand the procedures of the Legislature, the Speaker of the House has to find that there is a prima facie case of privilege before a motion is moved.

In any event, Madam Speaker, just before your honour rules on the matter, I'd like to comment that the Government House Leader seemed to be very well prepared for this question of privilege, although he was unable to cite any precedence that would really have



any effect on the issue. It strikes me that perhaps honourable members opposite recognize the abusive nature of their questions in this House and anticipated that a question of privilege would be raised on the matter.

I do have a motion, Madam Speaker, to move, should your honour find that I have a prima facie case of privilege.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

Our practice is that the member rises to state his case of privilege, concludes his remark with a substantive motion; the Speaker then, if all conditions have been met, takes the matter under advisement.

In this particular case, the honourable member does not have a point of privilege. He has raised it at the earliest opportunity, which is the only condition that has been met in this particular case.

He has quoted Ottawa practices. We do have Manitoba practice that because a legislative assistant does not answer questions in this Chamber, the legislative assistant, by Manitoba practice over the years, has always been allowed to ask questions of any Minister, not just the Minister to which he or she is an assistant to.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. C. BAKER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am sure that the honourable gentlemen across don't remember the question so I'd like the privilege to repeat it, but firstly, I'd just like to say I can just see the headlines in our local papers at home now: "Opposition Tried to Muzzle Effective Local Representative." I thank the Opposition for that.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a question?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please! Could the honourable members please come to order?

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a question.

**MR. C. BAKER:** Madam Speaker, I detected, I'm sure everybody else did, a derogatory term by the Member for . . . and I want him to withdraw that statement.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. C. BAKER:** Madam Speaker, apparently I'm really getting under the skin of the Opposition and that's great. I would just like to say again once more, Madam Speaker, because . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

Does the honourable member have a question?

**MR. C. BAKER:** Yes, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** This is question period, not speech period.

## Farm land - school tax levy

**MR. C. BAKER:** I will ask the same question I did before, Madam Speaker, and that is: Could the Minister of Agriculture tell us when the last increase in school taxes on farm land took place? Was there any recent increase in the taxes on farm land?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. That question is not within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, with a question.

**MR. C. BAKER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Has the school taxes, the government levy on school taxes on farm land increased in the last number of years?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order. Order please!

I was not able to hear the honourable member's question. Was he asking the Minister of Municipal Affairs for information on taxation matters?

**MR. C. BAKER:** Yes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

As the Minister of Agriculture and all members of this side of the House have indicated over the years, where we are in a position to control costs, we have done our best to do so. I would like to confirm that there has been no increase in the education tax, the ESL, imposed by the province on farm lands for at least the past five years under this administration; unlike what happened under the Lyon administration.

## Winnipeg Tax Assessment - Headingley

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. J. ERNST:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

**MR. J. ERNST:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a very serious matter to raise here this morning with the Minister of Urban Affairs.

Last evening, I attended a meeting in south Headingley in my constituency where there were a number, in fact some 300 citizens attending, very very concerned, Madam Speaker, over the potential increase in their assessments, anywhere ranging from 10 to 35 times their present assessment.

Madam Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Urban Affairs if he has had an opportunity to review that very serious situation in south Headingley?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. G. DOER:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

We have discussed this issue with the Mayor. As the member opposite knows, there has been no specific position from city council or the Executive Policy Committee of City Council to us on this matter.

There are sections in The City of Winnipeg Act that would provide flexibility to the city to deal with this issue if they so choose, and we have advised the Mayor accordingly.

**MR. J. ERNST:** Madam Speaker, those residents that I met with last evening expressed great concern and they looked forward to perhaps a new classification with regard to their property, because of the very great difference between that land and the land contained inside the Perimeter Highway which is serviced.

At that time, Madam Speaker, the residents there presented me with a petition containing some 300 names, and I would like to table that for the Minister of Urban Affairs at this time. I would ask him if he's prepared to look at a new property classification for those residents?

**HON. G. DOER:** Well, Madam Speaker, during this week's debate on the whole area of assessment, the Member for St. Norbert asked us very specifically if we're going to proceed in a unilateral basis, contrary to city council's wishes. We don't have a city council resolution; we don't have an EPC position on this matter. In fact, many of the decisions we've had to make have been delayed because we didn't know where city council wanted to go in the original six classifications, let alone some of the other issues.

So, Madam Speaker, I think it's very important to point out that the City of Winnipeg has flexibility in a number of sections in the act and the Member for Charleswood knows that. Section 127 of The City of Winnipeg Act provides the ability to provide grants, if the city council so desires.

There are other sections such as 156(3), I believe, which has flexibility for that situation, but we are not going to decide to set up separate classifications based on one or two councillors' positions on this issue. I really believe we need to be flexible, but at the same time not just going on an ad hoc basis, on a weekly basis, based on every meeting in the City of Winnipeg.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Charleswood has one minute remaining.

**MR. J. ERNST:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I want to only comment briefly on the question raised with the Minister of Urban Affairs regarding the situation in Headingley. It's not a question of people wanting a grant or a handout in that situation. Madam Speaker, they want to be treated fairly and reasonably.

Madam Speaker, they feel that their assessment increase, averaging 18 times what their present assessment is, versus the seven times that is normal within the Perimeter Highway, they feel is unreasonable.

The way to address that, Madam Speaker, is to look at a property classification that will make it different from those properties inside the Perimeter because they are different. They don't have any services. They don't have sewer; they don't have water; they have very limited bus transportation; limited fire protection, Madam Speaker. All of those things that are present in great abundance within the Perimeter Highway are not there in suburban Headingley.

It is that situation that needs to be addressed and it can be addressed fairly and reasonably by a new classification of property for those large-lot residential properties, Madam Speaker, both in Headingley, in South St. Vital, in South Transcona, in Old Kildonan, in East Kildonan, in certain cases where there are large-lot residential properties. There they need, Madam Speaker, to be addressed on a fair and reasonable basis.

Thank you very much.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

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

First of all, I'd like to thank the people of the constituency of Burrows for reposing their confidence, their trust and their good will on their representative by electing this representative again to this Legislative Assembly.

I also wish to thank the members of the executive of Burrows Constituency Association for the dedication, service and commitment they have shown in taking care of the organizational affairs of the constituency.

Madam Speaker, I wish to introduce the topic by a brief anecdote about an American northerner who visited a southern state. As he was walking along one of the rural roads, he met a southern farmer with a drove of hogs and they had a conversation. Then he asked, "Where are you taking those hogs?"

"I'm driving them to the woods so that they can feed on the acorns."

"Well, we don't do such a thing in the north. We pen them up, then we feed them corn. In that way, they get fatter faster and it saves time."

"Oh," said the southern farmer, "what is time to a hog? Time is meaningless to him."

(Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, M. Dolin, in the Chair.)

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, not too many people have perceived the importance of time. Time is perhaps the most important thing next to our life. In fact, time is the one that gives meaning to our life. It is the context with which we live our life and we do everything that we need to do.

The businessmen will say that time is money. That is true. Santos will say time is more important than

money. Why? Because if you run out of money today, maybe you can recoup that money some other day. You may incur some losses in your enterprise at the present time. The next time around you can recover much of it and still make a profit; so you can recoup and recover whatever you lost today if you lost some money.

Now tell me if you lost some time. Can you ever recover it? You cannot, because time, once lost, is time lost forever.

Every moment of our life is a span in the context of time. Whether as individuals or as groups or as government, we make our choice and we make decisions within the context of time. In fact, timing is the most important element in making any kind of decision, public or private.

If decision-makers are aware about the importance of time, they will make important decisions whether it is done in their private lives or in their public roles in life. Every moment of our life that has passed us by belongs to a segment of eternity called the past. They call it history. It may seem unimportant to some, but it is important for us of the present generation that we maintain our link not only with the past but also with the future.

Without that link, there can be no continuity in human existence. Whatever we have today in our civilization, in our culture, whatever comforts and conveniences we are now enjoying as a result of past technological development and scientific advancement, we owe all those things to the efforts and labour of those who have gone before us, the members of the past generation, whose visions, whose sacrifices have built this country and this province and to whom we all owe an eternal debt of gratitude, but can we ever repay them? We cannot; they have gone. Time has passed them by, so we cannot repay those whom we owe.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

That put us, as members of the present generation, under an obligation, beholden to the future generation, to hold as trustee for them whatever development, advancement, culture and civilization our society has so far achieved. We owe the future because we owe the past.

We are, as members of the present generations, the bearers of culture. We are the transmitter of the heritage of the past to bring, preserve all these achievements in the past to the benefit of our children and our grandchildren in the future. We are the trustees of the interests of the total society, not only of our own particular group, or constituency, we are the trustees of the entire province, of the entire nation, even the entire world. We transmit the rights and liberties that are gained in the past, the advantages and benefits that we have achieved, the comfort and convenience that we are now enjoying. We have an obligation to preserve all that we have achieved for the benefit of all future generations.

However, in making our decisions, we cannot always achieve the level of perfection because since the fall of mankind in the Garden of Eden -(Interjection)- the Member for Lakeside liked that part - every person has fallen short of the ideal of perfection. We are all fallible; we all make mistakes; we're all prone to error,

so it has been said by one writer: "To err is human, to forgive, divine."

At one time or another, all of us, wittingly or unwittingly have committed some mistakes. Sometimes the mistake is trivial and inconsequential; sometimes the mistake is grievous and serious, affecting the lives and destinies, livelihoods and fortunes of other people, especially so if such decisions that are being made are public decisions.

It is therefore true and it cannot be denied that all human beings have made some mistakes in the past, but given that we have made mistakes, what are we going to do about those mistakes? We should not always look back on those mistakes and fret too much about them. Rather, the mistakes of the past that we have made in our personal lives, in our public lives, should teach us some lessons. They should give us some wisdom that will equip us to meet the challenge of the present, as well as of the future.

To some people, the present is too much to handle because of too many uncertainties. Much more, the future is too difficult to deal with, because our knowledge of the future is so . . .

**MR. H. ENNS:** Limited.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Limited - the Member for Lakeside supplied the right word - and sometimes it is lacking. We can only make prognoses and projections, guesses and speculations. If that is the case, people who are insecure find some refuge in the past, because the past is already secure. The past is certain. Nothing can be done more about it. Those people who are insecure find some comfort and solace going back to the past, and try to live the past.

There is certainty in the past for those who seek refuge in certainty. Some of us, most of us indeed, try to inject some vitality into the past in the form of anniversaries, mementos. We want to relive the past again, but that is no longer possible. The past is gone. The dreams of the past may still not be achieved, so we continue to treasure these dreams and longings, transform them to the present, hoping that someday they may become part of the reality of the future.

We cannot live our life in the past. The past is gone; the past cannot be changed. Sometimes some of us have some bitter experiences in life. Those whom we trust have violated the bonds of fidelity, and sometimes we have been deceived in our business relationships, in our political relationships, in our family relationships. The bitter thing about these experiences is that the closer they are to us and the more we repose our trust to them and they violated that trust, the more it hurts. No matter how often we may have been deceived in the past, I say let not such deception destroy our faith in human nature. Let not any past deception that we suffered in silence destroy our confidence in human goodness, in human generosity, in human good will that truly exists in the world.

All the more, we should prepare ourselves not by remembering or trying to relive the past, but to live in the present. The present is the only segment of time that gives us actual opportunities to do something. Let us therefore make use of the opportunities of the present in order to do some good to others, particularly

to those people who are in need of help, people who are in distress. There are many segments of our people who need help.

As the Government of the Day, it is our obligation and duty not to delay in taking appropriate governmental action to deal with some pressing social problems, including the problem of preserving family farms, the problem of creating jobs for Manitobans, the problem of improving our health care facilities and services, the problem of promoting educational opportunities and training for our citizens, the problem of protecting the environment from hazardous materials and deprivation, for the sake of the future to which we owe an obligation.

Similarly, because time is of the essence and no government can last forever - of course we expect and hope that we will stay to be the government for many years - but no government lasts forever. They say in the case of an individual: "I expect to pass through this world but once. Any good thing therefore that I can do or any kindness that I can show, let me do it now, for I shall not pass this way again." Similarly, we can say of the Government of the Day, we expect to be the government for many years, many decades if possible, but we cannot last forever. Therefore, any good laws that we can pass, any good programs that we can propose, any good system that we can install, let us do it now. Let us do whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are virtuous, whatsoever things are honourable, especially to the poor, to the afflicted and to the needy, who often in our society suffer too much from the avariciousness of the greedy in our overly materialistic society.

Now is the time for us to become aware of our social responsibilities, to be awake to the call of civic duty. The dull night of societal indifference is gone for the plight of those people who are in distress. Let us do justice to everyone. Let us act and deliver help to all people who need help.

Now let us talk about the future. Most people spend their lives today postponing enjoyment to the future. They work hard day by day, accumulate all they can, sacrifice, tighten their belts, because they want to save for the future. In fact, it becomes so much a matter of habit for some particular individuals that they forget themselves. They spend all their lives working hard, saving, postponing enjoyment to the future in anticipation that in the future they will feel secure, comfortable, affluent and forget that time is passing by.

There are so many businessmen who build economic empires, but, in the presence of doing so, they destroy their health. They have ulcers and high blood pressure. They cannot eat the good food they can obviously buy, but they can only eat bananas and milk maybe because of ulcers. That is a wrong appreciation of the importance of time in every man's life. Who benefits for all the things that they have built up?

At one time, when I was travelling to Ottawa, I sat in a plane beside two widows from B.C., and the whole trip all I heard them talk about was I'm going to Hawaii, I'm going to Europe, I'm spending this, I'm going to Mexico. I said, "How come you've got so much money to spend?" "Oh, our husbands have just died and they gave us lots of money to spend. Before we run out of

time, we are trying to spend it." That is not a wise decision, because they failed to appreciate the importance of time.

But, on the other hand, some of us worry too much about the future. We never always get satisfied with what we have today. We always have anxiety about what is to come. We, many times in our lives, spend too much time fretting, worrying about tomorrow. I say: let us not worry too much about tomorrow; we have enough worries today. Tomorrow will have enough worries of its own. There is no need for us to add to the worries of today by importing the worries of tomorrow and taking it upon us today. The present is more than enough for us to properly handle. Let us face it with courage and handle the problem today and solve it today if we can.

One of the good things about the future is that it comes only one day at a time. It would be unfortunate for us if the future would come all at once upon us. Even if the future comes only one day at a time, we still have some difficulty facing the future because it usually comes at a time when we are not prepared for it. We usually are not ready for the future because we never are ready or are completed in our planning for the future. We are always in the process of planning, planning, planning. Then the future suddenly arrives and it overtakes us and we are not ready for it.

It was Edmund Burke who said - and this is the father of the Conservative philosophy - "You cannot plan the future in the future." You cannot do that. If you have to plan the future, you have to plan it today. If you've got to be ready for the future when it comes, your plan must be completed before the future comes.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, if today is the present, how can you plan the future today, like which is the present? Then it should maybe be the past and not the future at all.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** In planning for today, in answer to the Member for Lakeside, we take our knowledge and experience of the past. We learn from the past, extract all the knowledge we can get from the past. Then we add this knowledge of the past with our analysis of the present, with our inferences from what's going on around us in the present. These two forms of knowledge, knowledge from the past and knowledge of the present, we use to formulate the plans for the future. If we are able to do that, then we can be ready to face the uncertainties of the future. Some people are so behind in their planning for the future that when the future arrives, it's unfortunate they have so many nice plans that they're already behind themselves -(interjection)- that is right.

How can we influence the events of the future? We can, in a sense, make some part of the future and shape the future by what we do today. If we do something different today than what we have been doing - maybe it's the wrong thing or the right thing, I don't know - then we can have a different future tomorrow, because we are doing something different today. But if we don't do anything different today, then we cannot expect a different future to come tomorrow. Those of us who are doing the correct things will not be dissatisfied, because we are expecting the correct event

in the future to come. But those of us who are not doing the right thing would be wishing that we had done otherwise when the future suddenly comes upon us.

The future belongs to those people who are so absorbed in living that they have no time to feel the need for thinking about what they are living for. These people are so absorbed in the processes of life. They live today as it should be lived and enjoy it, not worrying too much about the future, not worrying too much about the past. They live their life as it should be lived, fully, abundantly, as it should be. They eat without asking whether it is worthwhile to eat. They procreate and beget children like the barbarians, without asking why they are procreating them. They are expanding their domain, conquering the vast wilderness without asking for what purpose they are conquering.

Those of us who always look behind know where we came from, but we do not know where we are going. On the other hand, those of us who are always looking ahead know where we are going, and we usually do not care where we came from. We can take our pick. Do we always want to look back in the past and not know where we are going?

There are only two kinds of people again in the world: the pessimists and the optimists. Now what is the difference between a pessimist and an optimist?

**MR. H. ENNS:** I know Ronald Reagan's favourite story about that when he had his . . .

**MR. C. SANTOS:** The Member for Lakeside says he knows a story about Ronald Reagan.

Let's take a doughnut. If you look at the doughnut, who is the pessimist? The pessimist is one who looks at the hole in the doughnut. The optimist is the one who looks at the doughnut.- (Interjection)- That is one who enjoys life, the one who eats it.

Madam Speaker, in making the programs of government and making decisions of government, the point in what I am talking about is that we must have a sense of timing. Timing should always be of the essence in whatever kinds of decisions we make. Personal decisions, family decisions, government decisions, time must always be a consideration. If we can think about the past without regrets, if we can confront the present without pretence, if we can contemplate the future without fear, then we can seek and we can find the wells of human contentment, the source of human satisfaction, the fountain of human happiness.

Let me conclude, Madam Speaker, by saying that time is the context which makes our life meaningful individually, in groups and in society. In the words of Ecclesiastes:

"For everything there is a season, and a time for every purpose under heaven.

A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck what we have planted;

A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down and a time to build up;

A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance;

A time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing;

A time to seek, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away;

A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;

A time to love, and a time to hate; a time for war, and a time for peace."

I thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I can see it is going to be very difficult for me today to improve on the incisive analysis of the past and the present and the future we have heard today from the Honourable Member for Burrows.

But, like other honourable members, Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate our new Lieutenant-Governor and Mrs. Johnson. I believe the people of Manitoba and Her Majesty will be well-served indeed by these fine people. The background of our new Lieutenant-Governor and his distinguished career will serve him well as he seeks to serve us and Her Majesty.

I'd like to thank the previous Lieutenant-Governor and Mr. McGonigal for the duties they performed and for the dignity and competence with which they performed those duties.

While I'm thanking people, I'd like to thank honourable members of this House, Madam Speaker, including yourself, and some of the honourable members of the side opposite for their help and their support and their friendly assistance when I needed it over the last year or so. I hope that kind of cooperation will continue. We don't always see it in the Chamber, but it certainly does exist and I think we should say so once in awhile.

Thanks also to my constituents in Brandon West, constituents from all political persuasions who have either offered words of support in the last year or friendly and constructive criticism over the last year. I'm nearing my first anniversary as a Member of this Assembly. It has been the proudest year of my life and I have been doing the best I can to serve my constituents well and I'll take the opportunity today to recommit myself to that service.

On another note, Madam Speaker, I have to comment on the appointment of the Honourable Member for Burrows and the Honourable Member for Kildonan to a couple of Cabinet committees. Here again, in their positions as Deputy Speaker and Assistant Deputy Speaker, I hope it doesn't happen, but it may arise that the questions will be raised about that, about their access to Cabinet deliberations and how they can discharge their duties just as impartially as they are expected to, and as I'm sure they want to, in their positions.

Madam Speaker, after listening to the Speech from the Throne, reading it over a couple of times, I think I can now say that I know the creed of this government and of honourable members opposite. And that creed is that the key to political success is sincerity. And once you can learn to fake that, Madam Speaker, you've got it made.

Madam Speaker, my leader and the Honourable Member for Morris singled out a number of words used in the Speech from the Throne to demonstrate the transparency of the Speech. They listed some of the

colourful verbs and words used by the drafters of the Speech in an effort to paint a pretty picture when the reality is otherwise.

Let me single out just a few adjectival phrases that can be found in the Speech, phrases that are used to do the job of obfuscation, to cover up the real truth that we have, that we see in our province today.

The Speech, Madam Speaker, is a patchwork quilt of deception and cynicism and it shows that by the use of such words as "caring, fair and compassionate, stable, civilized society and fair share." You sure hear a lot about "fair," and it just makes me think of a beggar who has his tin cup out. Be fair! Be fair! He is talking, of course, about the government of this province always referring to the Federal Government when it talks about being fair. But there are plenty of examples right here in this province of how this government is hypocritical in taking that position, certainly when it comes to funding for schools in our province and certainly the way they have handled hospital cutbacks in this province.

Well, then they have the gall, Madam Speaker, in view of the labour record and the tax regime, they have the gall in the Speech from the Throne to refer to a favourable business climate in this province. What sophistry, Madam Speaker.

We've heard another expression the other day from the Honourable Member for Thompson. The new expression among the New Democrats to describe their failed political philosophy, the new term, Madam Speaker, for hospital cuts, is "health care reform." Let's all remember that word - health care reform. Every time we see beds cut back in the City of Brandon or elsewhere, we can just think, well, this is the New Democrats' idea of health care reform.

Well, we don't want any more health care reform in Brandon if this is the kind we are going to get. It makes me wonder just what they mean by reform in every other aspect of their jurisdiction.

The Federal Government, according to honourable members opposite, has caused all the problems we have, so the Throne Speech uses expressions like "inadequate equalization," "discordant voices." Well, we know about the discordant voices. We hear them right on the benches opposite. Let's refer to the Minister of Labour and the Honourable Member for Inkster when we're talking about discordant voices.

We hear expressions like "strong central government." Isn't that something? That was a main theme of the administration of the Right Honourable Pierre Trudeau when he was Prime Minister of this country. You know the provinces that are crying out for a strong central government? It's those provinces that are incredibly weak and incompetent that are calling for a strong central government to carry the can for them because they can't do it themselves.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

We also hear about "cooperative federalism" and "fair federal support" and "greater fairness." The New Democrats don't like to admit it, but the time is here to pay the piper. It may be that Manitobans didn't notice it, but the most significant adjective in the Speech from the Throne is a hyphenated one, and it's found on page 3 in the Speech from the Throne. That expression is

"revenue-raising initiatives." Here's another word we have.

**A MEMBER:** Buzzword for tax increases.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** That's exactly what it is, taxes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, taxes, "revenue-raising initiatives." Being the highest-taxed Canadians, Manitobans already are very aware of what revenue-raising initiatives are. They call them taxes. What we're going to get is people are going to be saying things like, in Manitoba, the only sure things in life are death and revenue-raising initiatives. Somebody's going to come home from work someday and say, honey, if we don't spend so much of our budget on revenue-raising initiatives, we're not going to have any money for our fridge that we need.

Well, some of those initiatives are found in the Autopac rates, which are up somewhere between 9 percent and 30 percent. Hydro's up 5 percent; Telephone's up 11 percent; licence fees are up. Pretty well everyone, you can imagine, certainly everyone in provincial jurisdictions - (Interjection) - yeah, we haven't even got a Budget yet. Are we going to get a land transfer tax? Is that going to come next? Well we can only speculate.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm here to bring glad tidings to honourable members in this Chamber and glad tidings to Manitobans, because I really feel good about this. I have to speak about it because we are hearing so much gloom and doom these days. Well I want to bring glad tidings. That is that on March 16 there will be no increase in the sales tax and there will be no increase in the jobs tax.

Now, as sure as I'm standing here, I can say that perfectly confidently because I believe we have an Honourable First Minister. We, in this province, have to look to our First Minister for honour. He's our example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the First Minister is an honourable man, and it would certainly be unparliamentary of me to say anything different. So I can stand here with confidence and say those taxes will not be increased because this First Minister keeps his commitments. Just ask him; he'll tell you.

During the election campaign, my Leader appeared before the Chamber of Commerce in Winnipeg to a standing ovation. The First Minister, although he didn't get a standing ovation and although not very many people came, did make a commitment to the Chamber of Commerce in Winnipeg, and that commitment was there would be no increases to the sales tax or to the payroll tax for at least two years. That's a commitment. I cannot say that our First Minister is not an honourable man, so I can tell you that when the Budget comes down on March 16, there's some good news that I can tell you about right now.

Later in the campaign, the First Minister came to Brandon. He was on a hot-line show. One citizen of the City of Brandon telephoned the First Minister on the hot-line. She kind of got the commitment made by the First Minister turned around, and she said, "What's this I hear that you're going to raise sales taxes and payroll taxes in two years?" He said, "Oh, where did you hear that? Who told you that? That's not what I said."

We know what he said, because you can check with the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. They'll tell you

what he said about sales tax and the payroll tax. So I feel kind of good about that, because I agree with the First Minister and other honourable members opposite that the sales tax is a regressive tax. I certainly agree with colleagues on this side of the House that the jobs tax is certainly a disincentive to investment and employment in this province. So this makes me feel pretty good.

But the other messages in the Throne Speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, demonstrate to me that honourable members opposite have run out of gas in terms of providing Manitobans with the kind of leadership and government we need at this crucial point in our history. I suppose if it weren't for so many revenue-raising initiatives in a gallon of gas, they wouldn't have run out of gas. But there they are; they've run out.

It appears that their response to anyone who wants to know what can be done to improve our province is to look to the Federal Government for handouts. Did Alberta rely solely on the Federal Government for agriculture? No, it didn't. Its budget for agriculture is 500-and-some million dollars. Saskatchewan? I don't think so. Their budget is \$1.6 billion.

Now, in Manitoba, the figures have been thrown around a little in the last few days, but I think there's about \$70 million in the Agriculture budget going to Manitoba's farmers through programs. That's if you include administration costs, but I think the number is more accurate when we say that \$36 million goes to Manitoba's farmers through programs.

This should be shocking, Sir, when we consider that agriculture is the No. 1 industry in this province. Just the \$27 million squandered through MTX would be quite a boost to farmers or \$80 million from the Jobs Fund. Did the government consider how much job creation for men and women there would be in the farm sector if farmers were able to operate to the extent they're capable of operating? Well I guess there's not enough farmers in socialist ridings, and that's the reason we have the problem we have.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaks about muzzling. I've never seen a government that was muzzled in my life, but I sure see an Opposition being muzzled daily in the question period in this Legislature. I also have to wonder about any government member who would make that assertion, when this government doesn't like us to be here in the first place. They don't want to hear our voices. They don't want to hear us asking them to account for the way they've been handling the economy of this province. Then the Member for Lac du Bonnet has the gall to say that we, on this side of the House, would muzzle members of the government. It's unbelievable, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

On the other hand, because of smart spending and better management at the federal level, the Federal Government was able to come up on an emergency basis with \$1 billion in aid through a Special Emergency Program. Now in addition to that, the Federal Government has provided \$5.5 billion to agriculture since September of 1984, and that's a 60 percent increase in spending over the spending done by the previous Liberal Government. The Federal Government said they would remove the sales tax on farm fuels, and they did. One hundred gallons of diesel fuel in 1974 would have cost a farmer \$115.00. Now it costs \$40.00.

That's a saving of \$5,000 to a farmer who farms 1,200 acres.

The Federal Government said they would establish Farm Debt Review Boards, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they did, and they did it before this government opposite brought in theirs. The Federal Government has the courage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to face reality, unlike honourable members opposite. We all know that not every farmer in this country can be saved. Not every farm operation can be saved, and the Federal Government was able to understand that and do something about it by providing \$46.5 million for a Rural Transition Program.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

But I think the major incentive or the major boon to farmers in this country is the fact that the Federal Government has been able to control interest rates. Now that means an awful lot to a farmer who relies so heavily on credit. A farmer with a debt load of \$100,000 will have his operating costs reduced by about \$5,000 annually strictly because of the efficient management of the economy at the federal level. So that total federal support for agriculture turns out to be \$21,500 for every commercial farmer. That was in 1986, and that's not counting the \$1 billion aid package.

The Federal Government has moved significantly in the energy field to create, I can't tell you how many, but the dollars tell me, the amount of dollars in new investment, \$10.5 billion in the oil patch. The Federal Government removed that ugly and sinister retroactive, confiscatory back-in provision, which was a 25 percent back-in. That's been removed, and I think that will also help in the oil patch.

The other thing that the Federal Government has done - and the New Democrats may like to oppose this, Madam Speaker - but they made changes at FIRA. As a result, foreign investment has flourished in Canada, reaching \$4.76 billion for the first six months of 1986 versus \$5.46 billion for all of 1985, and only \$2.6 billion in 1984. You can see which direction we're going in.

What is the New Democrats' record in highways, Madam Speaker? -(Interjection)- It's all in Toronto; let's talk about De Havilland.

Madam Speaker, what is this government's policy on highways? Their policy is to build a bridge to nowhere. We've been hearing about that, Madam Speaker. The Federal Government saw a need and stepped in with a \$100 million upgrading program for the Yellowhead Highway. We know people use the Yellowhead Highway; we're not so sure about that bridge.

Remember how angry we were, Madam Speaker, when the federal Liberals cut Via Rail service in this country? How soon we forget some of the things that are done. Those services on Via Rail have been restored, including the Winnipeg to Edmonton, Jasper to Vancouver service on a daily basis. That was a real annoyance to Western Canadians and that's been corrected.

In Manitoba, \$115 million in extra equalization payments to Manitoba have been provided in the last two years. In 1986-87, Manitoba was the only province to receive extra federal funding. An additional \$37 million has been provided under the Canadian Jobs Strategy to create employment and training

opportunities for Manitobans. I believe the Honourable Minister of Small Business and Tourism will appreciate the \$30 million Tourism Development Agreement.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. All honourable members who wish to participate in the debate will have an opportunity.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** As a result of the sale of De Havilland, which honourable members opposite and their federal friends spoke out so much against, over 150 jobs have been created in Winnipeg. Where did the NDP stand on that? I wonder where the Minister of Labour stands on that now and where the Honourable Member for Inkster stands on that issue.

I think the most important thing the Federal Government has done, in addition to interest rates, for this government - if we don't count the interest rate situation, which has saved us millions of dollars in interest charges to our creditors - this government's chief strategy is to bash the Federal Government. The Federal Government has done them a real favour in this regard, in that in the first year of their administration, the Federal Government has held more federal-provincial meetings in that first year than the Liberals did in the previous four, giving honourable members opposite every opportunity in the world to bash the Federal Government. That's cooperation.

I spent many years in Ottawa listening to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, the Honourable Stanley Knowles, pressing the Liberal Government to extend the spouses' allowance to widowed persons aged 60 to 64. That has now been done by the Conservative Government in Ottawa, and that benefits 50,000 elderly Canadians and it costs \$200 million. They introduced a sales tax credit to assist low income families.

Madam Speaker, the point of all this is to say that in Manitoba we can't do those things because the economy in this province has been so badly mishandled by honourable members opposite. Even if they had the money available, I don't think the Minister of Agriculture could convince his colleagues that farmers are more important than \$3 million worth of apple polishers, worth more than our senior bureaucrats in this province, which has grown at a rate that is hard to imagine, some 60 percent growth in the senior public service.

Farmers aren't as important as this government's advertising policy, are not as important as keeping Crown corporations that lose millions of dollars. In spite of protestations of the Minister of Labour and the Honourable Member for Inkster, the government hangs on to these money-losing Crown corporations. It's more important to this government to throw hundreds of millions of dollars into interest charges than to farmers who desperately need assistance, Madam Speaker.

What does the government have to show for its massive \$8 billion debt? Well, we've got cutbacks at hospitals - oh, I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, that's wrong - health care reform. We're getting a lot of health care reform in this province, and the thing that bothers me is the glee with which the Minister of Health approaches his health care reform. We get bridges to nowhere. We have increases in taxes; we have a payroll tax in this

province, a despicable tax, Madam Speaker, on jobs; a motive fuel tax which goes a long way to accounting for the high natural gas prices we pay in this province.

I warned the Minister of Finance about this last Session, and what was his response? Let gas users in other jurisdictions subsidize that motive fuel tax. I say, shame on him. How naive can the Minister of Finance be?

Tourism is down in Manitoba, significantly nowhere else. You'd think it would be more important for the government to finance highway construction and to attract tourists and improve revenues. I don't think it shows very much pride in our province, Madam Speaker, and I'll say this directly to the Minister of Tourism, and to the Minister of Highways of course.

I think it would be more important to make better investments in our future through the financing of education, even if there are only so many dollars to go around, and even if no school division will receive less than 3 percent this year, it should be important to distribute that money carefully. I talked about this last May, Madam Speaker, and I pleaded with the Honourable Minister of Education to be fair in education funding. I said it would be to his credit if he addressed and solved that problem. He addressed it cursorily last spring, dismissed it. Now we talked about it again today in question period, and they're still talking about how fair they are. Madam Speaker, that's just not true, and honourable members opposite know it and yet they continue to talk about it.

If the First Minister of this province was able to grasp the unfairness of this situation when he was in Brandon for a few minutes last Friday, more power to him. He absorbs things more quickly than I do if that's true, if he steps in and puts the bermuda shorts on the Minister of Education and if he steps in and rights the wrong, that's good. I would welcome that; so would everyone in Brandon and every other low-cost school division in this province. I think it should be more important to have money available to spend to protect children in danger of abuse. Certainly, in the Brandon area, our Child and Family Services is at the breaking point in terms of funding. It seems to be forgotten when we're always talking about Winnipeg problems, but there is a Manitoba out there beyond that famous Perimeter. I remind honourable members of that.

Madam Speaker, there are too many tragic and heartbreaking reasons why this government has to do better than it's doing in this regard. As the senior government to all municipalities, I should think it would be important to try to make more money available to rebuild our crumbling infrastructures, our streets, our roads, our water and our sewer services, the same argument that I would make for highways. If we don't do it now, it's going to cost more later, but no, the government denies Manitobans the opportunity even to debate how tax dollars will be spent because so many of them have to go to pay interest charges. It does this of course by amassing that debt at a time when we don't need to be doing it any more.

I think my leader did a good job on Monday of laying to rest the myth that this government stands up for Manitoba. Madam Speaker, I have to admit that expression has bothered me a lot in the last year. It's a powerful expression; it sounds good; it's catchy, but coming from this government, I'm appalled, in view of



their dismal record of taking care of their responsibilities.

This government is incapable of standing up for the average Manitoban, and I have to comment that sometimes I don't even think its intentions are all that good, Madam Speaker. That is a pretty serious statement to make, I admit, but I think I can make it. How can you stand up for the average Manitoban when you're always yielding to the wishes of close friends of the socialists? I refer to the union bosses and other friends of the NDP. How can we hope to have labour relations on a level playing field when the government takes its orders from union bosses? Even when we were speaking about Sunday closing, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Labour put all his emphasis on the feelings of workers, but he wasn't fooling me or many, many others. He meant, union bosses, Madam Speaker, he did.

Now I'm sorry the Minister of Labour has a sore throat and he's not able to hear what I'm saying today. I hope the message will get to the Minister of what I'm about to say because, as important a part of the Sunday shopping issue as the rights of workers is, it's not the only part. There are rural Manitobans, Madam Speaker, who rely very heavily on the regulation of Sunday shopping in places like Brandon, Dauphin, Portage, Winnipeg and all the little centres around those cities. They rely heavily to keep the independent operators and their employees in business the rest of the week and working. There's that dimension to it that the Minister of Labour conveniently forgets or certainly doesn't mention.

He forgets the general population wants Sunday regulation. He forgets that Sunday is the Lord's Day. He forgets that most people in this province are Christian and observe Sunday as a holy day. I know these things are important to you, Madam Speaker, but the Minister forgets that these are still important to the people of Manitoba. He forgets that Sunday is a family day for thousands of Manitoba families.

Now maybe all these things are implicit in what the Minister says, but the way he says it does not represent a balanced view of the issue, Madam Speaker, and this is what betrays his bias. That bias shows up loudly and clearly in The Manitoba Labour Relations Act amendments brought in by the late Mary Beth Dolin. As a result of the favouritism of this government, in the eyes of investors, Manitoba has the worst labour climate in Canada, contrary to the expression that we read in the Throne Speech. Is this the reason why the first-contract legislation is singled out in the Throne Speech as being fair? One thing I have learned about this government and this Minister, and that is that when they say things are rosy and looking good, look out, because there's a whole lot more to the story.

Just to show how fair the first-contract legislation is, I asked a question today. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology answered and very quickly supplied the information I was asking for, for which I thank him. There have been 25 applications under first-contract legislation in this province. One of them has come from an employer, 24 from the unions. I wonder how balanced that really is.

Once again this year, Madam Speaker, through its bumbling and its stumbling, the government threatens to place the jobs of thousands of women in jeopardy

by imposing the comparable work principle on the private sector, the so-called pay equity principle. The expression "pay equity," Madam Speaker, has a strong emotional appeal - I recognize that - but that's all we ever get from this government, emotional appeal. We don't get any substance.

Depending on whatever the legislation will say, Madam Speaker, can the Minister give me some assurances? Can he assure me that job consultants don't charge \$300 to \$500 per employee to bring in a pay equity system? Can he assure me that the pay police, those people who will be going around checking on the workplaces, depending on the legislation, will the pay police be able to treat people like criminals, enter their business premises without a warrant, and ask them to produce any documents or materials the pay police think are relevant? Does this sound civilized to you, Madam Speaker, or fair? The pay police can question an employer or his employees. You might be able to have a lawyer present. But are we becoming so repressive that the pay police will be seen in the same light as other police officers?

Times are tough, Madam Speaker, and if an employer has frozen wages including his own, the pay police could force you to make exceptions and pay certain people more. In a small workplace, Madam Speaker, what kind of effect do you think that would have on the morale of all the other employees in the workplace?

Madam Speaker, would you let me know how much time I left, please.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has 11 minutes remaining.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Minister of Labour, Madam Speaker, tells us about the wonderful example set in Minnesota. Madam Speaker, how would you like to be a nurse in Minnesota because, in Minnesota, you make 20 percent less than an electrician makes? Madam Speaker, if you were a nurse, you'd want to go to Wisconsin where nurses get 50 percent more than electricians get. So where's the fairness? How do you think the electrician in Wisconsin feels, and how does the nurse in Minnesota feel? Do they feel that they're treated fairly? I say, no.

Madam Speaker, will the legislation provide pay equity for automated equipment? I don't think it will. Pay equity will not likely apply to automated equipment. So that automated equipment will replace workers, or maybe the Minister will make his legislation apply to automated equipment.

Can the Minister assure me that fear of pay police will not cause employers to find excuses not to hire women? Can the Minister of Labour assure me that individuals will not lose the freedom to negotiate their terms of employment. If there are no jobs available anyway, Madam Speaker, because of legislation that may be poorly drafted, there won't be anything to negotiate, will there?

Will pay-equity legislation bring about gender apartheid, Madam Speaker, where employers will hire only members of one sex so that no comparisons can be made? Can the Minister assure me that won't happen? Can the Minister assure me that pay-equity legislation will not add strength to any argument that

women are incapable of fending for themselves and have to be protected? Will this keep women in job ghettos, Madam Speaker, thinking that the only opportunities they have are those provided by pay police protection? Will there be less desire, Madam Speaker, to succeed, to get ahead and pursue excellence? Can the Minister assure me that all these things won't happen? If he can, then let's get on with pay equity, Madam Speaker.

As a feminist, Madam Speaker, I'm sure you're glad you don't have to support this government in its drive to make every single person in our society dependent on government for every want and need. Surely, Madam Speaker, you would favour an approach that allows people to achieve on their own terms without looking to an unkind and a bankrupt government for everything. Instead of serving the people, this socialist administration wants to make all citizens captives, slaves, subservient to the government. It's supposed to be the other way around.

I've seen many examples of people, both inside and outside the public service, who are afraid to speak their minds on issues because they're afraid of the government. For some political reason, they're afraid the government will punish them personally or withdraw funding from one program or another. Madam Speaker, that makes me sick. I always thought this was a free country. This government has already taken too much freedom from us, and I'm frightened that we may already have gone too far.

So I ask my colleagues, the honourable members opposite, please let us be free. Let's help those who need it, so they can be free too. But let's do what we can and do what we must do to ensure that freedom can live in Manitoba again.

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

**HON. G. DOER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is indeed an honour to join in with the Speech from the Throne Debate.

I too would like to join in with other members in congratulating our new Lieutenant-Governor, Dr. Johnson, in his appointment recently, a good individual in my opinion and a good Interlaker, as the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out.

I'd like to start my remarks by dealing with an issue that's been raised from the Member for Brandon West, the issue of Sunday shopping. I, too, was very proud of the fact that all members in this House joined in in giving leave and passing that bill in an unprecedented way through three readings on the first day of sitting after the Speech from the Throne last week.

I believe strongly, too, Madam Speaker, that the Minister of Labour has taken a very consistent position on the issue of Sunday closing, and it hasn't been a linear position as described by the member opposite from Brandon. It has been a very, very consistent position from the day the stores attempted to threaten and blackmail the government and the judicial system with their proposals and their posturing.

The Minister of Labour has said, the Minister of Labour has stated that there were four major criteria for the Sunday closing position - four. One is certainly

that the intent of the law and the intent of this Legislature must be maintained in our communities in Manitoba, the respect for the law must be maintained. Two is the whole issue of the family, and the whole fact as members opposite have pointed out that not only do we have two members of one family working with children and to not have that potential of that day off would cause a tremendous degree of problems for some families.

In fact, I've observed that, Madam Speaker, with the way in which we observe July 1, the way in which we observe July 1 with a federal holiday one day, a provincial holiday sometimes another day, private sectors sometimes utilizing a third day. The end result, Madam Speaker, is many families can enjoy a long weekend on the July 1st long weekend together, and to multiply that by 52 times, I think, would have done undue disadvantage to our family and our family structure in Manitoba. I know the Minister of Labour pointed that out on numerous occasions.

The third factor, Madam Speaker, is the whole area, the rural infrastructure and the rural crisis that we have. It absolutely made no sense, Madam Speaker, to beef up and increase the volume of sales in stores like SuperValu and stores that are located in the City of Winnipeg to the detriment of stores that are in a 60- to 70-mile radius around the City of Winnipeg. Madam Speaker, the Minister of Labour, too, pointed out that was a major reason.

The fourth factor, Madam Speaker, that was articulated by the Minister of Labour was the whole issue of worker rights.

So, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Labour was not dealing with the Sunday closing issue and bringing this in an unprecedented way before this House on one priority alone, but rather on four key factors and I'm proud that every member of the House supported him.

Madam Speaker, we have a section in the Speech from the Throne dealing with the whole area committed to a stronger Winnipeg. I would like to touch briefly on those sections of the Speech from the Throne.

The key part of any city right now, in this country in fact, indeed in the Western World, the key component in any city to the vitality of that city and the quality of life that a city enjoys, is the ability of a city and the economy to maintain jobs, to maintain employment opportunities and maintain employment opportunities in skilled and challenging areas. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to say that in the last 12 months, and indeed the last four or five years, Winnipeg has constantly moved down in its ranking in terms of the unemployment rate to where it has the second lowest rate of unemployment in Canada; the only city to be ahead of us right now is the City of Toronto. Madam Speaker, we all know that every analysis of federal spending right now is showing that 95 percent of the federal spending, and the federal spending priorities is going into the Province of Ontario, and particularly into the Toronto triangle.

So, Madam Speaker, in spite of the priorities of our spending in our country, Winnipeg is maintaining the second-lowest unemployment rate in the country and it's close on the heels of the City of Toronto. Madam Speaker, we can see evidence of that all around us with the economy and the growth in our structure. Madam Speaker, we have quotes from a number of financial institutions, again predicting the strong growth

Friday, 6 March, 1987

and the strong economic outlook for Manitoba, whether it was - November, the Royal Bank: "We continue to be optimistic about the economic outlook for Manitoba. Powered by strong capital spending, the Manitoba economy is expected to out-perform the national economy during the 1986-88 interval." We go on to other quotes in the Royal Bank: in terms of lead the nation, in terms of real growth during the decade to 1994, conference board predictions, Bank of Nova Scotia predictions, Bank of Commerce predictions and just recently, Madam Speaker, the Bank of Montreal's predictions, again pointing out the Manitoba outlook remains optimistic, and that many of the areas of Manitoba's economy will continue to grow and grow faster than the estimated national average.

However, Madam Speaker, all Winnipeggers, and all Manitobans share in the concerns of this House that have been raised in terms of the agricultural crisis. We cannot look at the growth and development in our economy in one sector, in Winnipeg, and not be insensitive to the situation that is going on with rural Manitoba, the situation where there's been cuts for grain farmers for the last two years in a row, with the Federal Government policies, which I think concern all of us.

I am hopeful and I am confident that the Minister of Agriculture in our government will continue to bring programs forward that we can support on this side in our total province, and in our total provincial economy.

I'd also like to speak, Madam Speaker, about some of the subjects that have been raised in the Speech from the Throne in terms of the stronger Winnipeg. We have, Madam Speaker, just renewed a second Core Area Agreement with all three levels of government. I believe that the \$100 million investment by all three levels of government is building on the successes of the past, and that the second \$100 million, building on the successes of the past will again improve our core area of our city, in the areas of social services, housing, employment and training opportunities, heritage, neighbourhood improvements and other services.

Madam Speaker, I'm hopeful that the four themes that were evidenced in the success of the first Core Area Agreement will be hopefully the themes in the second Core Agreement. Those themes, Madam Speaker, being the tri-level cooperative approach to community revitalization; Two, Madam Speaker, the theme of a balanced approach between the social and physical; the third approach being the attempt of the public sector to lever private money; and fourthly, the attempt by the Core Area Agreement to have other major projects of worthwhile value to the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba be major spinoffs.

Let me go through those briefly, Madam Speaker. The Core Area Agreement - and I credit the Member for St. Norbert in his involvement in the first core - and my people who were ahead of me in terms of this portfolio, provided a tremendous degree of cooperation with the city and the Federal Government to get the first Core Area Agreement off the ground. I believe that the fundamental concepts of the tri-level cooperation allows the core to be much more effective in terms of spending dollars, public dollars, scarce public dollars, and an integrated and cooperative way rather than all

of us going off in our own directions and missing some priorities and duplicating others.

It also gives us an opportunity, Madam Speaker, to coordinate our other complementary activities of government spending in a coordinated way, through the Core Area office, and hopefully the most effective way for that area.

At our last Policy Committee Meeting, Madam Speaker, the three levels of government, who I should point out are always subject to a considerable amount of lobbying by a number of good groups and groups that may be not as worthy as others, agreed to do a needs assessment for the second core and develop a strategy through the Core Area office, so that we as elected officials would not always be subject to the lobbying process that goes on, and not be reacting to the squeaky-wheel syndrome, but rather developing a strategy for the next five years with the core area spending that could legitimately meet the needs in the second core, and legitimately target the areas of the greatest need in that core.

Madam Speaker, the second key concept of the Core Area Agreement is that it is a balance between the physical bricks and mortar program and the social services and people priorities of the core. This is unique, Madam Speaker, in North America, and this is unique in the Western World where people and people's training in developing the bridging the people skills in the particular area, the core area, is part and parcel of developing the bridging and the physical aspects. I am pleased again that a great deal of money will be set aside in the second core to deal with the social and training aspects of the Core Area Agreement. In fact, training has gone up, training and employment programs have gone up in the second core, as opposed to being reduced as some members opposite have suggested.

The third major priority, Madam Speaker, is to have the public money lever private money in the Core Area Agreement. The first core is a year-and-a-half away from its final evaluation, and I'm pleased to say that there is some \$75 million in the first three-and-a-half years spent by the private sector in Core I. Estimates from the Core Area office indicate that number will climb as the final evaluation is completed for the first five years.

Madam Speaker, the North Portage Development, which was initiated by the present Minister of Finance and the other two levels of government, is spending some \$76 million in public money, subject of course to final appraisals of what will take place, and will lever over \$150 million of private money in revitalizing the North Portage Agreement.

I'm hopeful, Madam Speaker, that the public money, the \$100 million in the next five years from the three levels of government will again lever private money on worthwhile projects, so that we can maximize the public spending in this area for the benefit of all Winnipeggers.

The fourth theme, Madam Speaker, has been that the Core Area Agreement has provided opportunities to have spinoffs of other major projects. In the first core, Madam Speaker, there were discussions, debates and initiatives taking place in terms of revitalizing North Portage. Out of the first core developed the North Portage Development Corporation, again a corporation that will spend \$76 million.

There will be many worthwhile projects that I'm sure, Winnipeggers will be proud of when they open up in the fall of '87: commercial projects, Madam Speaker, developed by Cadillac-Fairview; public projects, hopefully, that we are still working on in the North Portage Mall; and projects such as the IMAX Theatre that will be a world-class theatre in terms of that technology, and will also have world-class film development done here in Manitoba, conducted by Manitoba artists with Manitoba footage that will be shown in our Manitoba theatre and be available to be exported right around the world, and not only be a film that is worthwhile from an entertainment perspective, Madam Speaker, but be a tremendous tourist advantage for us with the some 25 now theatres of the similar technology across the world.

I look forward, Madam Speaker, to not only seeing the film that is being developed by Manitoba artists and Manitoba filmmakers in Manitoba here in our own IMAX Theatre in the fall of '87, but also having that film shown in Tokyo, Toronto, Vancouver, wherever. I think it will be a boon for our beautiful province and is somewhat -(Interjection)- beg pardon? There are some riverbanks, Jim McCrae. Madam Speaker, the Member for Brandon West, there is a shot on the white-water rafting in the new film, I understand - some tremendous shots of our heritage rivers in that film, I can assure the member. It'll be a spectacular and proud day when that film is produced and shown in Winnipeg and around the world.

**A MEMBER:** What are we going to do about the mosquitoes?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, the member has asked the question about what we are going to do about mosquitoes. I can say, Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of the Environment, that it's a lot easier to kill mosquitoes when they're lying on the ground hatching, as we've suggested as a government, than when they're up in the air and you can't get them with the smogging. I am glad, Madam Speaker, that the city is finally realizing that you can kill the mosquitoes on the ground and in the pools of water a lot easier than when they start flying around and you try to fog them.

Madam Speaker, it's unfortunate that a few little scandals where workers were honest enough to say that they were dumping the stuff and fixing the monitoring devices and those kind of things, it's unfortunate that scandals would precipitate an intelligent review of the city to start doing larvicide and larvicide work in the City of Winnipeg rather than trying to whimsically spray these things in the air once they've already grown.

So I'm pleased, Madam Speaker, that the city is changing its priorities. I'm pleased that the Minister of Environment's suggestion of getting them on the ground before they hatch is going to be taken seriously by the City of Winnipeg this year. I believe an effective mosquito control is larvicide, and I really believe that we have to have larviciding in the city so little children will not be bitten by mosquitoes.

Madam Speaker, in speaking to the Core Area II, I would move from the North Portage and the IMAX Theatre and the many other very valuable projects that

will be developed, to the East Yards. Madam Speaker, we have supported the ownership of the East Yards from being returned from the CNR to public ownership. We have always supported that the East Yards would be returned to public ownership, and we have applauded the fact that will take place under Core II. However, Madam Speaker, we do not believe that the East Yards should compete with downtown Winnipeg or compete with North Portage or compete with the Exchange district to be another commercially developed and very highly mixed commercial development in the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker, we have put and have nominated two very very excellent members of our Board of Directors to represent the province. We have recommended and forwarded the names of Dr. Jean Friesen, a very famous individual in this province in terms of the historic and cultural aspects of our province, who will provide tremendous and valuable input to the East Yards Board of Directors in preserving the historical realities of the East Yards at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. I'm proud we've been able to place that name forward on the East Yard Board of Directors.

We have also placed forward the name of Dr. Alan Artibise on the Board of Directors of the East Yards, another individual who will take the long-term mixed-development approach of the East Yards rather than the short-term commercial development that some individuals in this city so desire.

Further, Madam Speaker, with those two excellent choices who have been approved by Cabinet to go on as the provincial representatives on the East Yards Task Force, we believe strongly that there must be public input and there must be public debate to deal with the issue of what are we going to do with the 50 acres of land that the three levels of government have returned to public ownership.

We do not believe that bureaucrats with the greatest of intent or politicians with the greatest of intent should be the ones deciding what goes on in the East Yards. We believe Winnipeggers must have a say and Manitobans must have a say in the vision of that new and acquired East Yards' property. That's why, Madam Speaker, we have pushed strongly and consistently throughout the debate on the East Yards to have public input, to have public consultations, to have public vision included in the East Yards, because we believe it's a long-term project which needs a mixed set of realities. It should not be hastened by short-term commercial development, but rather incorporate recreational opportunities, historical opportunities, cultural opportunities, mixed opportunities in that site, taking advantage of the ARC Park that the province and the Federal Government is working on today.

Madam Speaker, I believe the time is near, and I would, with your indulgence, like to carry on at the next sitting.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The hour being 12:30, I'm interrupting the honourable member, who will have 20 minutes remaining when this item is again before the House. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. on Monday next.

Friday, 6 March, 1987

(English translation of Mr. Lecuyer's Speech in Vol. XXXV No. 5 - 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, 4 March, 1987.)

Madam Speaker, over the last few years, Manitobans have come to understand that the traditionally held beliefs regarding the environment are no longer true. We were used to believing that our isolation from sources of pollution guaranteed that our environment was healthy. This is no longer true. The Chernobyl disaster scattered radioactive contamination over the entire northern hemisphere. Numerous lakes and forests in Ontario and Quebec have been ravaged by acid rain, the result naturally, in part, from sources of pollution located hundreds of miles away in the United States.

In the past, we believed that regions that were only moderately industrialized could escape the dangers of pollution. This is no longer true.

In Manitoba, we have already had to battle certain major chemical spills. In certain areas, high levels of mercury have been detected in our fish. We are, therefore, not protected from pollution.

Today, we are all concerned over the long-term quality of our sources of drinking water in the cities of Winnipeg and Selkirk and many other communities in the province. We were also in the habit in the past of believing that economic development and environmental protection were incompatible. This is not true. On the contrary, there must be a close link between the two, that is to say the economy and the environment, because our future prosperity depends on it.

One out of every ten jobs in Manitoba is linked to the forest industry. The tourist industry generates billions of dollars in revenue. The long-term future of our economy depends on a healthy environment. Our agriculture depends on it as well.

Recently acquired knowledge of the environment gives a clear message. That is to say that even if we are relatively free from the serious environmental problems which certain other jurisdictions face, we cannot afford to wait for the problems to appear. We must act now to prevent the problems.

A number of specific actions are included on our agenda and are among our priorities.

Madam Speaker, it is important that the members of the House be informed of the solid foundations which we have laid down over the past five years. These foundations will enable us to make important steps in the years to come.

The most important step of all will be the introduction of a new act on the environment. The existing act, which has been in effect for almost 20 years, naturally served the majority of communities and industries in the province adequately when it was introduced almost 20 years ago. At the time, the province did not even have the most rudimentary forms of pollution control.

Since that time, we have considerably improved our capacity to deal with environmental accidents. We have increased penalties and have gathered data that will serve to maintain a healthy environment. Throughout the years, certain amendments have been introduced to the act to improve it. However, the fundamental principles and procedures have remained almost unchanged since 1968.

In the interim, many things have changed, in particular our environmental knowledge and values. The pressures

on the environment have changed. These pressures are both more numerous and more complex and some of them originate outside our province.

The extent of our knowledge of the environment has grown considerably. Today, there can no longer be any doubt. The environment must no longer serve as a drain pipe for chemical waste and other toxic contaminants. We know that some of our actions can have a negative effect on the environment even if they do not cause any contamination. We know that environmental problems are complex and that consequently over the long term they are easier and less costly to prevent than to cure. As an example, we need only refer to what we now know about the dump sites at Hooker or Occidental on the Niagara River, or the incidents that have occurred on the Great Lakes to realize that it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars to deal with the problems in these areas. Once again, I must say that it is better to prevent than to cure.

In addition, the environmental expectations of our society have changed. People are no longer prepared to accept air and water pollution for a few extra dollars in their pockets. On the contrary, people want economic development to continue, but not at the expense of the environment.

Madam Speaker, during this Session we will introduce a new act to protect the environment, as I said. This bill includes a number of elements.

Firstly, this act will broaden the scope of environmental protection to include all environmental incidents which are the result of emissions of pollutants, or any other impact resulting from a development project.

It will also reinforce regulations and introduce important incentives to improve planning before a development project is launched.

It will introduce a new mechanism for providing informed advice to the Minister, and will allow for greater public participation.

It will also provide flexibility to try new environmental approaches such as mediation.

This act will obviously not please everyone - despite the fact that we consulted extensively with the public in Manitoba. The bill, which will be introduced later in this Session, will reflect many of the concerns raised during the consultation period. There will of course be individuals who believe that this act does not go far enough, that it is not restrictive enough. Others will believe that this act is too restrictive, and still others who will disagree with certain provisions of the act. One thing is certain, Madam Speaker. I can affirm without hesitation that throughout the consultation period, and in the many briefs we received, we obtained unequivocal support for the fundamental principles of this act.

The question of nuclear waste is also an important item on our agenda for the current Session. This question was already a very critical one at the time the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of the Environment, and I have the impression that it will still be a crucial question when all of us here have retired from the provincial political arena.

We are prepared to implement all possible measures to ensure the greatest protection possible for future generations, and to ensure that neither Manitoba nor a site close to its borders is chosen as a nuclear waste

disposal site. Our policy over the past five years has been consistent and will remain so.

We will continue to encourage research in nuclear waste disposal, research which is, moreover, Madam Speaker, being carried out in Manitoba. However, we would like to use all possible means to ensure that a nuclear waste disposal site is located neither in Manitoba nor a basin that drains into Manitoba.

You will no doubt recall that we mounted vigorous opposition to potential disposal sites in the Red River Valley in Minnesota in cooperation with the citizens of that state.

We believe that it is time to place before this House a clear legislated stance on Manitoba's position on nuclear waste disposal sites, to ensure that our intentions regarding this subject are never again misinterpreted. This bill will prohibit the establishment of nuclear waste disposal sites in Manitoba. We generate very little nuclear waste, do not reap the energy benefits of this type of energy production, and do not intend to become a dumping ground for nuclear waste coming from outside the province.

We do generate other types of hazardous waste for which we are prepared to take responsibility. In 1981, we initiated a three-phase program for the establishment of a hazardous waste management system.

We are continuing to follow through each of the phases in order to complete this program. The mechanisms required to implement and regulate the system are already in place.

The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act was adopted in 1984. This act is intended to protect the public and the environment from the harmful effects of a multitude of dangerous goods which are transported on our streets, highways and railways every day.

During the last Session, we established the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Crown Corporation. This year, we will adopt certain regulations under this act and will soon have the board of this corporation in place. In addition, we will this year be choosing the technology and site for the province's hazardous waste management system.

A link which recurs throughout government strategy is that between the economy and the environment. This relation is of capital importance because, as I said previously, our future and that of generations to come depend on it. Short-term monetary gains made at the expense of the environment must no longer be considered "development". The word development suggests progress. The wasting of our irreplaceable environmental capital is not progress - no one would dare refer to this type of activity as "progress".

It is my honour, Madam Speaker, to be chairing a national task force on the environment and the economy which is made up of representatives from both the Federal and Provincial Governments, the private sector and environmental groups. I am hopeful that our work will lead to a national and multilateral consensus on principles of sound environmental economic development. As a government, we have already adopted a series of environmental principles which will guide our decisions in the future.

The concept of attracting industry by relaxing pollution control is unacceptable. This notion is

increasingly unacceptable to industry and exporting pollution is equally unacceptable.

The problems caused by acid rain in Ontario and Quebec originate in large part from sources located in the United States. Even if Canada were to reduce its sulphur dioxide emissions, which I will refer to as SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, without considerable reductions of emissions on the American side, Eastern Canada would remain in a difficult situation. Will we soon be able to resolve this transboundary pollution problem between neighbours? I certainly hope so. Negotiations have not been successful so far.

Even if acid rain is not causing serious problems in Manitoba, we cannot remain indifferent. Ontario is facing problems today because it is downwind of major sources of sulphur dioxide. In the future, Manitoba may also be downwind of such sources of pollution. It is also possible that the symptoms of such problems appear only after a few years once it is too late to correct the situation. It is, therefore, better to be cautious and prevent, rather than to cure. The degeneration of the environment regardless of the area is a problem which must concern us all.

In this regard, the Government of Manitoba adopted the position that it must do everything in its power to contribute to resolving the problem of acid rain. It is for this reason that we have chosen to participate in research and monitoring and have made a commitment to reducing sulfur dioxide emissions in the province from 738 kilotonnes to 550 kilotonnes by the year 1994. We hope in this way to contribute to simplifying negotiations aimed at bringing about similar reductions in the United States. However, we have also taken this action as a precautionary measure in order to protect our own territory.

Madam Speaker, we should be able to finalize the necessary steps, in response to the Member for Emerson who was asking me this question a moment ago, which will enable us to achieve our goal for sulfur dioxide emissions. The Environment Commission will soon be holding public hearings concerning future regulations on this matter.

I know that the members opposite will be watching our actions closely and providing constructive criticism from time to time. Although the challenges that are before us are major, I personally believe that this promises to be a most interesting year and am confident that we will be equal to the task.

Madam Speaker, I would now like to consider another equally important area, that of workplace safety and health.

The Throne Speech affirmed our government's commitment to a healthy economy, quality of life and a healthy environment.

The maintenance of the health and safety of the half million men and women who make up Manitoba's labour force is crucial to realizing these goals.

When one considers the losses that work-related illness and injury cause, one realizes that they are not given the consideration and attention they deserve.

Again the Member for Emerson is referring to another subject which I would absolutely like to touch on, namely, that of the Workers Compensation Board, if I have the time at the end of my remarks. Last year, terrorism caused 2,200 deaths which the media reported on extensively every day. However, we rarely hear of

**Friday, 6 March, 1987**

---

the loss of life caused by work-related illness and injury, despite the fact that there are an estimated 180,000 deaths and 110 million accidents every year.

In Manitoba, in 1986, there were more than 50,000 workers compensation claims. This figure represents one out of every ten workers, and is completely unacceptable.

In addition to representing pain and suffering for individual workers and their families, these accidents also affect the quality of life of Manitobans, even if they do not make the newspaper headlines.

In 1977, the Schreyer Government adopted The Workplace Safety and Health Act in Manitoba. It was a first important step in concentrating efforts on the

system rather than symptoms that cause work-related illness and accidents.

Over the past ten years, the workplace safety and health sector established the foundation of a system intended to reduce and eliminate the risks linked to workplace safety and health. I believe we are on the right track.

Today there are more than 1,000 joint committees on workplace safety and health in Manitoba.

Hundreds of thousands of hours have been dedicated to educating workers in the area of workplace safety and health. I am confident that these efforts will soon be fruitful.