

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 25 March, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Twelfth Annual Report of the Ombudsman for the period January 1st, 1981 to December 31st, 1981. It's presented to the Legislature pursuant to Section 42 of The Ombudsman Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. AL MACKLING (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a copy of the Spring Run-off Outlook for Manitoba; it's a report by the Water Resources Branch of the department. Generally speaking, the report is favourable.

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

**HON. A.R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose):** Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make. In view of the recent media reports, I wish to assure the people of Manitoba that the government supports and has confidence in the credit union system. There has been ongoing discussion with the system with a view of enhancing the Manitoba locally owned and controlled credit unions and Caisses Populaires. We recognize that the system provides a valuable contribution to social and economic well-being of Manitobans and it is to our interest to significantly enhance the strength of the system. Adequate funds will be provided to support and strengthen the system and the government plans to announce the details of this support on April 1st, 1982.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for that announcement. I would just like to say that I'm pleased to see that the government is proceeding along the lines of the, I understand, recommendations of the report that was commissioned I believe some six months ago. I would like to say that this side of the House is also concerned about the credit union and Caisse Populaire system. It has served Manitoba well over the last many years and I know that with proper co-operation between governments, between members and between directors of the credit union

system, we will be able to solve the, I might add, few smaller problems that exist within the system right now. There's a lot of real healthy credit unions and I believe it's a time right now where some of the cleaning up has to be done and it's in that vein that we welcome the announcement here this morning.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a Ministerial Statement. I have copies.

As the Minister responsible for Environmental Management, I wish to inform the Legislature that I requested the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission to investigate and conduct public hearings into mosquito control programs in use in the province. I'm requesting such hearings as a result of concerns expressed last summer particularly over the use of the chemical Baygon. As a result of those concerns, it is essential that a detailed investigation be carried out to determine the extent of the problem and develop appropriate control strategies as needed. Therefore, I've asked the Clean Environment Commission to investigate the matter and to hold public hearings pursuant to Section 13 (1) of The Clean Environment Act and to provide a report and recommendations before the next control season.

The Commission's terms of reference include:

(1) An assessment of existing and potential environmental problems associated with current control procedures and of alternative methods; (2) A review of the efficiency of existing control methods and of alternative methods;

(3) A review of existing legislation and procedures with recommendations as to what changes in provincial legislation may be required.

I anticipate that this investigation in public form will give all interested individuals an opportunity to both provide their expertise and to express any concerns they may have. I especially want to encourage all those with such concerns to take this opportunity to make their views known.

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

**MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the Opposition, I welcome the announcement by the Minister with respect to an investigation into the subject at hand. As the Minister knows and members of the House know, we have a very keen interest and I personally have a very keen and experiential interest in this subject. I believe that the central issue must remain as much with the Minister of Health as with his colleague, the Minister of the Environment. What is necessary is a successful search for a solution to a problem such as was posed last summer and constituted a major public health threat which so far has really defied solution except for the use of chemical insecticides.

There was a few days ago, as you know, Sir, a two-day symposium at the Health Sciences Centre

which was sponsored in part by the Department of Health, a concept initiated by our government and pursued and maintained by the present government which sought to get at some of the very problems cited in the study that is proposed by the Minister. With that kind of intensive evaluation by all parties, I would hope that we can answer this question, but I would repeat that the Minister of Health and his officials must be very fundamentally involved in this whole question because there must be a better answer than the one that was used at the time. The one that was used at the time was the only answer and it's very important that a search be funded and properly maintained to prevent damage from a public health challenge of the kind that we faced last year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere)** introduced Bill No. 18, An Act to amend the Pari-Mutuel Tax Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor).

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Gallery where we have 45 students of Grade 5 standing of the Ralph Maybank School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Mullan and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

There are 26 students of Grade 6 standing of the Margaret Park School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Jenkins, which school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

On behalf of all of the Honourable Members of the Assembly I would welcome you here today.

Does the Honourable Member for Lakeside have a point of order?

**MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** No, Oral Questions.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as promised I would now like to table with the House certain documents that were forwarded to me by the officials from the State of North Dakota having to do with the Garrison project.

My question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources would simply be, are these the documents or the proposals that had been discussed in the last little while here in Manitoba, and particularly the ones that he referred to in a press conference as having been announced by his Deputy Minister, Mr. Carter, at the annual meeting of the Action Committee Against Garrison, March 6th?

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Minister not necessarily to answer in haste and perhaps take these questions as notice. I don't particularly want him to hold another

press conference and leave us all wondering what it's about. But the question is, are these the new American proposals that were discussed in this Chamber last week?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. MACKLING:** Not seeing the documentation that the honourable member is talking about, I wouldn't know. I'll look at it.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps as a further supplementary for the Minister to take as notice, the Minister will recall that my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, on several occasions asked whether or not the American position, particularly the Secretary of the Interior, had in any way endorsed these new American proposals for Garrison. Our External Affairs Minister, the Honourable Mark MacGuigan, was asked the same question in the House of Commons yesterday. He indicated that while these had not received formal endorsement by American authorities as such, Canadians as such should not be taking them too seriously at that point.

I simply add that to the Minister's information and ask him, upon studying these documents, whether or not these are indeed those recent proposals that have been alluded to?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has furnished the House with the two documents. One appears to be entitled Garrison Extension Special Report Preliminary Draft and it's the Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Regional Office, January 1982, I have never seen that document before, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very happy to have a copy of it and look at it. I know that revisions to the Garrison project including what I would call changes in phasing rather than revisions have been talked about for some time over the course of some years.

Also, the other document appears to be in the form of a news release outlining changes in funding of different aspects of the development, none of which amounts to any formal submission in writing as was asked in the original question by the honourable member. None of this indicates any formal documentation having been submitted to my department or to this government, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. ENNS:** A final supplementary question. The second document refers to a construction schedule proposed for the year 1983 of some \$7 million with a possible extension to \$10 million of works to be undertaken of the Garrison project.

The original question, Mr. Speaker and I'd ask the Honourable Minister to refer back to Hansard is whether or not there have been any new recent American proposals. I'm assured by American officials that these documents, these proposals are all public; that they were made available to Canadian and Manitoba officials, particularly at a February 25th meeting of this year.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I think the record will show that the honourable member indicated that for-

mal submissions were made to this government through my office. I indicated that I wasn't aware of any formal submissions made at all. The documents themselves indicate preliminary draft and there have been preliminary studies, there have been indications for some years that the proponents of Garrison are prepared to be flexible in respect to the phasing but they don't want to change the entire project in its entirety.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** I direct the question to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Telephone System and would ask him, in light of his statements yesterday that the government did instruct Manitoba Telephone System to install a satellite dish in Thompson, will this service be available to other communities?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, the approach that we have taken in the provision, or assisting in the provision of television signals throughout the Province of Manitoba that there be some general equivalency of bringing a service to the north and to the south and what's happening in the north is a move in that direction.

My understanding from communities and I have spoken to different people; my understanding is that the cable operators in the south, including the Winnipeg cable operators are very pleased with what they have now, namely the so-called three plus one. There is no move on the part of the Winnipeg operators to move in this direction. As a matter of fact, I understand in the Town of Dauphin, they prefer to have three plus one, which they are not getting at the present time.

**MR. BANMAN:** A supplementary question to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether he will be supporting an application by Falcon Lake and Gimli to obtain the same type of television service that Thompson has.

**MR. EVANS:** I'll have to look into that matter, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the other day I think it was the Honourable Member for Tuxedo asked me a couple of questions. One was, how many applicants had there been for mortgage rate relief, and to date the number is 1,200. Forms have been received from the printer and are being mailed out, Mr. Speaker.

Another question he asked was, what is allocated in the Budget for advertising of the Critical Home Repair Program and it was \$53,000.00.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder

if the Minister means applicants or inquiries since, to my knowledge, the applications weren't available; in fact, I think by virtue of a telephone call this morning, they were just about to be sent out. So does he mean inquiries rather than applicants for assistance, firstly?

Secondly, I just wonder when he rises to respond, would he also give me the answer to the second part of that question on the advertising, as to who was the advertising agency who had been appointed to do this program for MHRC.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I used the word "applicants," they were probably applicants then; they are not applicants I suppose until an application is completed, but they are people who believe that they qualify. I suppose after the department has asked them a few questions, they think that they will probably be applicants; anyway, there were 1,200 people that fall into that category. They are requesting forms and they are being sent out.

In respect to the advertising again, Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that the advertising agency is the Credo group.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate if that is the same group who participated in the New Democratic Party's advertising campaign during the past provincial election?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the contractual arrangements in respect to the election advertising, but if that is the same group, I'd be highly pleased, because they did a very good job for the New Democratic Party.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate if this group was commissioned or appointed based on a proposal call basis or if other agencies were invited to put forward proposals for this particular campaign?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that Foster Advertising probably were not approached. There was a very short time frame in which this had to be carried out because we were committed to moving quickly and therefore this item was approved without going to Foster or any of the other former agencies that the previous administration employed.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wish that the Minister had moved as quickly with respect to getting the applications prepared as he did with respect to appointing his friends to do the advertising campaign.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Could the Minister confirm that Westman Media Co-op, their licence to deliver cable television is now being

reviewed for renewal?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is to be a hearing shortly.

**MR. ORCHARD:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister be intervening in support of Westman Media Co-op's licence renewal application to assure that residents in Dauphin and other areas of rural Manitoba will not have their present service interrupted?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, although we have some questions to ask of the service provided by the Westman Media Co-op we will be supporting in a general way, by means of formal intervention, before the CRTC.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Just a clarification, I missed the last part. Did I understand the Minister to say that the department — the Minister will be intervening formally in support of that application?

**MR. EVANS:** Yes.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services and I would ask him whether in view of the serious charges made against the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society by a director just resigned, in view of the recommendations made by Dr. Charles Ferguson at the Children's Hospital a few weeks ago, and in view of the recent discussions in the Estimates of his own department, Sir, whether he now will undertake to launch a review of the child welfare system in the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, a great part of the problem, as the honourable member is aware, is now being addressed; that is the question of adoptions, the placement of children for adoptions in whatever jurisdiction. So that area is being reviewed.

With regard to the one specific matter raised by Dr. Ferguson, as I indicated to the member I think a week or two ago, I believe the inquest report, the decision of the inquest hearing has not yet been handed down, at which time we would like to review the recommendation of the inquest body and see where we go from there.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, when I refer to the charges made against the society, I'm not necessarily referring to the charges having to do with "misuse of funds." That's another subject entirely. I'm referring to the charges having to do with tokenism in terms of community input with respect to the formulation of CAS policies in the child welfare field. It's that area, Sir, that I'm concerned about and I

would ask whether he is considering broadening the examination that is under way with respect to Native adoptions to encompass that whole area of policy in the child welfare system?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, that is something that perhaps should be looked into at some point. I would like to remind the honourable member that the directorship of the CAS Winnipeg is more or less the same directorship that existed for many years when he was Minister responsible for this area. So there's really no change to my knowledge in the composition of the Board of Directors of the CAS. It's made up of well-meaning very dedicated people; people who are dedicated to the care and development of children in the Province of Manitoba.

So, I would think if the honourable member has some specific concerns that he wishes to raise that we'd be glad to hear them. Certainly the allegations made today and some of the suggestions as reported in today's newspaper will be looked into.

**MR. SHERMAN:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Where does the task force under Judge Kimelman stand? Is it at work?

**MR. EVANS:** Material is being prepared for that particular committee and we are in the process of contacting formally now, we have informally contacted various organizations, and today there should be a formal request go out to the specific organizations with regard to the make-up of the committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Can the Minister inform the House what the Manitoba Telephone System operating surplus was last year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that type of information is made available in the Annual Report of the MTS.

**MRS. HAMMOND:** To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister confirm that the surplus is approximately \$14 million?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that or deny it. I'll have to go back and look at the report.

**MRS. HAMMOND:** To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister inform this House why this government is allowing the MTS to request a 16 percent rate increase?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that with the given rate structure that is now in existence and given the fact that inflation is still with us, and given the fact that the operating costs of the system are rising rapidly, that unless it did receive

some type of rate increase there would be a serious deficit in the next year. So, this information, of course, will be brought out and fully discussed before the Public Utilities Board, of course at which time members of the public will have ample opportunity to make representation as well.

I might also remind the honourable member who is new to this House that she will have opportunity at the Public Utilities Committee of the Legislature to question officials, particularly the Chairman of the MTS.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture through you, Sir. Does the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, support his colleague, the Minister of Energy, in his intentions to remove the Hydro rate freeze?

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

**HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, whether I support or not support, the decision has not been made first of all and it's a policy decision. An announcement of a review is not a decision, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, it appears more and more every day that the Minister of Agriculture has very little input into the policies of the government across the way. Could the Minister do an impact study or have his department do a calculation of the benefits of a Hydro rate freeze that has been in place over the last few years and make sure, Mr. Speaker, that the removal of the Hydro rate freeze would not have a severe impact on the farm community?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that any factors that will be used in determining what the future course of action may be will be taken into account.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister going to do a study or an assessment of the removal of the Hydro rate freeze for the farm community in the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, there's been no decision and on the second part, no.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. M. (Doug) GOURLAY (Swan River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Premier of the province. In view of the Premier's election promises of a new tomorrow for the North, I'm wondering what he or his government is doing about the 400 people that were laid off their jobs some three months ago in Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake.

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

**HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, it's very, very interesting. I have checked some of the quotes by the honourable members across the way

and it's interesting to note how some of the quotes have been taken quite out of context, but that be as it is.

In response to the Honourable Member for Swan River, this government has never for a moment suggested it could turn back the waves insofar as world metal prices. What has happened in connection with northern communities in Manitoba is the same that's been happening in northern communities in other parts of Canada, indeed the entire world, Mr. Speaker, in which there has been a substantial decrease insofar as employment in the mining sector. At least, Mr. Speaker, insofar as this government is concerned, the Minister of Northern Affairs and others have journeyed to those communities and spoken to those that have been affected to ascertain indeed what the situation is and that indeed was done some time ago, in case the Honourable Member for Swan River did not observe.

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

**MR. G. W. J. (Gerry) MERCIER (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. I gave him notice on Monday of this week. I wonder if he could indicate, Mr. Speaker, what action if any his department is taking with respect to the use of three-wheel mobility aids by physically handicapped persons.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac Du Bonnet):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did take the question as notice the other day from the honourable member and I have not yet received the information, but as soon as I have it I will convey it to the House.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board. In view of the Ombudsman's Report which we have just received, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the comments of the Ombudsman on Page 5 in which the Ombudsman indicates that, in his opinion, it was a mistake for this government to cancel the public inquiry to be held by Mr. Justice Nitikman. In view of the fact that it would have been in public and the public would have been made aware of the truth, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister explain why he cancelled the public inquiry by Mr. Justice Nitikman and instead embarked upon a series of private meetings?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. COWAN:** As was explained at the time of that decision, Mr. Speaker, the government decided that it was necessary to resolve this matter as quickly as possible. It was our feeling at the time that as long as a major inquiry was ongoing that we could not bring forward significant changes to The Workers Compensation Act in isolation and that we would have to wait for that inquiry to have completed a very long

process in order to bring forth those changes.

We also had in our possession the Lampe Report which made some specific recommendations, some of which the previous government had acted upon, some of which it did not have time to act upon, and we wanted to continue that process. We felt that the course of action which we chose would allow us to bring forth those changes as quickly as possible and we hope to do so in the near future.

I can assure the member who is requesting the information and through him, the Ombudsman, that we will be providing a statement in respect to the report which we have received as soon as that statement has been put together and we've had an opportunity to review what are several hundred pages of observations and summaries on the part of the person who undertook the review for us.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Ombudsman is of the opinion, as a result of his twelve years of experience in investigating claims with the Workers Compensation Board, he rejects the suggestion that Board employees are taught to look for ways to reject claims rather than improve them, and in view of the fact that there was a public inquiry undertaken by our government, we now have a private inquiry, would the Minister undertake to file the report which he has received with the members of the Legislature immediately?

**MR. COWAN:** The review which was undertaken by a person who was associated with the inquiry previous to our assuming office was done so under assurances from that individual and myself that information given to him would be confidential. We have received that review. What we would like to do at this time is to discuss it some more with the individual who conducted the review and put it in a form which can flow through us, which will in fact protect the confidentiality which it was felt was necessary for those individuals giving very specific information to the person undertaking the review, and at the same time provide the member opposite and the general public with an overview of the observations and summaries which are included in that report.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister confirm that in view of the fact that senior board members have been publicly maligned by virtue of the accusations that have been made and they would have been exonerated during a public hearing, can he confirm that he will be exonerating them from the charges that have been made?

**MR. COWAN:** I can confirm to the member that I will be providing him with an accurate report based on the observations and the summaries of the person who had undergone that review on behalf of the government and at that time I would be more than happy to discuss with him the specific details. Previous to that, I believe it would be inappropriate, however, I do want the member opposite to know that we will be providing him with what we believe and what I am certain the author of the original report believes will be an accurate reflection of his work.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he could inform the House how many applications have been received in his office for assistance under the Main Street Manitoba Program that was announced so often by him and his Leader during the election campaign.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member of Municipal Affairs.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, there have been many enquiries to the Manitoba Main Street Program. There have not been any applications as yet, because the program is in its formulative stages and as soon as the program is in place and ready to be applied to the different communities, an announcement will be made and the local governments will be advised how to proceed to apply under that program. I can't give him the exact figure of how many enquiries have been made, but I understand there have been a number of them made.

**MR. BLAKE:** To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he could give us some idea when the applications will be ready, and if he could give us some idea of the guidelines that may be used in those that may want to put in a formal application?

**MR. ADAM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all we have to go through the Estimates before we can get the authority to be able to implement the program, and my Estimates will be coming up some time during this Session, hopefully anyway, sooner or later, but whenever my Estimates are approved, then the program will be ready to go.

**MR. BLAKE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, if he's receiving enquiries, and I know he is receiving some, the program was announced with great flourish and great promise and \$1.5 million was earmarked some many, many months ago for this particular program. If they are going to continue to go around raising the expectations of people in rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, I think they deserve a little more than some information that the forms will be ready some time in the future, we'll discuss it in our Estimates. They would like to know now. Spring is coming they want to start doing the work and they want to know what they're going to be able to do.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, the program, I expect, is a very exciting one, it has been well received by members of the community out there, small businessmen and local governments, small towns, big towns. They're very excited about this program and, Mr. Speaker, we're going to proceed with this program in the first year in office, not like the previous administration that were going to do it perhaps in the fourth or fifth year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland):** Thank you. My question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister say whether the government has changed its decision to charge the towns along the Red River, namely Morris, Ste. Jean, Letellier and Emerson for flood control?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this matter, as the Honourable Member for Rhineland knows, rests within the responsibility of the Minister responsible for Natural Resources, and our Minister of Natural Resources has already met with municipal people and has received their submissions. I understand, Mr. Speaker, he is presently considering the submissions that have been made.

**MR. BROWN:** My question is to the same Minister. Does the First Minister think that the decision was a fair decision when the City of Winnipeg received all the costs of flooding paid for by the province, flooding from the Red and the Assiniboine River?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, it really does not matter at this point whether the decision that was made by the former Premier Duff Roblin during his term in government was a fair or unfair decision or whether it was wise or unwise. If the honourable member wants to debate that the Premier Roblin made a ill-founded decision back in the mid-60's, then I'm quite interested in hearing his arguments, Mr. Speaker, but what the Minister of Natural Resources is doing at this point, is weighing the submissions in the responsible way that indeed a responsible government should do, and I assume, Mr. Speaker, will be also entering into discussions with the Federal Government, which are also responsible for some reduction insofar as their payment towards the communities that are affected.

**MR. BROWN:** My question is, has this been discussed at Cabinet as of the last couple of months?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson):** Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't take a chance in asking the First Minister a question. I'll direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Is it true that the Minister of Finance is not supporting the Beef Assistance Program proposed by the Minister of Agriculture?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I could assure the Member for Emerson that I will support any program that gets through our Cabinet as soon as it gets through.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Agriculture then. In view of the First Minister's promise of putting top priority on the Beef Income Assurance Program, could the Minister indicate why he is not announcing the much needed and much delayed program to assist the beef operators who are

in dire financial straits.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, as soon as the program will be announced, I'm sure the members opposite will know. At least, Mr. Speaker, the program that we're working on will not be like the Hog Assistance Program that was developed by their former administration where they didn't even foresee that they were going to be short of money before the Legislative Session ended, and Mr. Speaker, we ended up having to provide supplementary funds which we are voting in now for errors and omissions that were made by the Minister of Agriculture and his Minister of Finance.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, according to the radio announcements, the Minister indicated that he would be consulting with various producer groups prior to making an announcement some time in the future. As we have been waiting for months already, could the Minister indicate which producer groups he's going to be meeting with before he makes a decision on this program?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, with as many groups as I possibly can.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The other day, the Member for Kirkfield Park asked me a question respecting the status of the appeal against the discharge of treated effluent from the Warren Sewage Lagoon to Sturgeon Creek. I'd promised her a reply at that time when I had further information. It is my understanding that the Clean Environment Commission held a public hearing in Warren, on February 16, 1981, on this issue. On April 10, 1981, they issued Order No. 914, which did allow for the discharge of effluent to the Sturgeon Creek drain. That order was appealed by an individual and by the City of Winnipeg. The previous Minister of Environment dealt with that appeal at that time and asked that a meeting be convened with the Environmental Management Division, Agro Water Services of the Department of Agriculture, and representatives of the Rural Municipality of Woodlands in order to determine whether there were appropriate mechanisms which could be used to prevent that discharge, and to come up with some studies. Those studies are ongoing. At that time the appeal was deferred. The appeal is still deferred until those studies are present. I can assure the member that it is my understanding that the lagoon has been constructed and is receiving some liquid waste. However, I'm informed that the lagoon will not require discharging for at least three years. So there will be no discharge into the Sturgeon Creek, and we expect a study within a year's time, at which time we will deal with the appeal.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Community Services. In view of the fact that the Minister received a letter from the Mayor of Portage la Prairie, dated November 17th, can the Minister advise the House and the — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon, correction, Mr. Speaker, March 17th, I beg your pardon. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise this House and the citizens of Portage la Prairie if the government supports a construction of a multi-purpose recreational centre at Portage la Prairie?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, again, this question or a similar one has been asked of me in the past and I've given answers. We've discussed it also during the Estimates. Some of those people who are saying answer it, were not present during the Estimates. I might add, Mr. Speaker, the Mayor has had one delegation in to see me since I've become Minister of this department and indeed I had the pleasure of talking to him informally when he was visiting this building during the official opening of this Legislature. I said to him at that time and I say to the honourable member now, as I said before, the entire matter is under review.

**MR. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further question to the same Minister. Is the Minister and the Premier of the province planning further meetings with Mayor Greenslade and council, to provide full details of the recreational centre for the citizens of Portage la Prairie.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I hope to have an opportunity to be at Portage la Prairie on a number of occasions. I'm always willing to meet with the various councils and mayors of our good municipalities in Manitoba. I think my first answer really provides the answer for his second question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Natural Resources, the former Member for Inkster, is taking one of my municipalities to the Supreme Court challenging the certain planning actions that the municipality has been taking to prevent the building in flood-prone plains. For a long time now the reeve and the council has been attempting to arrange a meeting with the Minister of Municipal Affairs. They have been unsuccessful in doing so. May I petition the Minister to allow Reeve Fleury of the Rural Municipality of St. Francois Xavier to meet with the Minister and indicate whether or not this government is prepared to stand behind provincial planning legislation that is germane in this instance. I have some respect for the talents of the former Member for Inkster in pleading cases before the Supreme Court.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I'd advise the Honourable

Member for Lakeside that I have met with the council and I have announced, immediately after assuming office, that I would have an open-door policy and I would meet every council, as many as I possibly could, and whenever they wanted to meet with me my door is still open. I've met with the council, we have had a nice discussion with them and we are keeping on top of the situation that they are involved in. We have to be very careful, Mr. Speaker, if the case is before the courts, it's subjudice and we will be keeping right on top of that situation, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the House has now been meeting for a month, I wonder if the Government House Leader could indicate to the House when some of the Standing Committees might be expected to meet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope to be making an announcement on that tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Question has expired.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 14, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1982?

### BILL NO. 14 — THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1982

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not speaking on this bill at this time, I'm deferring to the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to take advantage of the debate on Interim Supply to express my consternation, my dismay and my growing concern about the announcement that was made yesterday as a result of questioning in this Chamber by the Minister of Energy and Mines about the possibility of the lifting of the Hydro freeze.

Mr. Speaker, my concern really centres on these following facts. First of all, I have a very real appreciation of the dilemma that the government is facing, and



more worrisome to me, and should be to all Manitobans is that we have experienced what an NDP administration does when faced with that kind of a question. We have seen it reflected on our Hydro rates during the mid-term years of the 1970s. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, as I said, the dilemma that the government has in this instance. You see, Mr. Speaker, it's another one of their promises. It's another one of their promises that they made about immediate resumption of the construction of Limestone, the Limestone generating plant. Mr. Speaker, they have made many promises but we certainly recognize, on this side of the House, that that is a particular promise of major significance to Manitoba. We are all the more concerned therefore, Mr. Speaker, that promise be entered into with some caution.

Mr. Speaker, nobody has to tell anybody on this side of the House about the importance of Hydro development, Hydro construction to the Manitoba economy as a whole. The fact that even in 1970 dollars, put some \$250 to \$300 million per annum into the Manitoba economy escapes no one and its spin-off effects to the entire economy of Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, what worries me is that this government appears to be at least at this stage fumbling the ball on some of the major requisites to get Limestone going whether it is pursuing the Alcan arrangement to a satisfactory conclusion, the Western Grid, the Western Inter-Tie or even resuming discussions with Southern neighbours about the Mandan Inter-Tie, carrying on heavier, stronger negotiations with neighbouring provinces, Ontario, the point being that we need long-term firm sales, firm commitments for power before you can insert that word "orderly" into the development of Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen just too much disorderly development of Hydro, building for building sake, as attractive as that is in terms of immediate easing of the pressures on the Manitoba economy. But, Mr. Speaker, every householder, every ratepayer has for those that save their receipts, those annual rises in that basic utility, Hydro, in their records — 14, 18, 22 percent, 20 percent — in total, some 150-160 percent increase in Hydro rates with a very short span of years. Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend to know all my figures, but I'm told that Hydro rates for decades during the '30s, the '40s and '50s, the '60s remained relatively constant. In fact, with the demand and expansion of certain Hydro facilities in the mid-'60s, I seem to recollect there was even a downward revision at one particular period of time, but in any event, Manitobans did not face — that was one area of the cost of doing the business, the cost of living, the cost of shelter that remained fairly constant in Manitoba. That was prior to the advent of an NDP administration taking office in this province.

Mr. Speaker, what worries me most about the announcement that the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines made is that — you know, I've worked with them too long, I suppose, with these fellows opposite. You do get to know their method of operations. I sense, Mr. Speaker, a distinct and deliberate tactic and move on the part of the honourable members opposite. The Minister of Energy and Mines is a senior member of that administration. In my judgment, that was a studied reply. It was a deliberate first step in the

softening up of the Manitoba public to the inevitable Hydro rate increases that are unavoidable if they are to get themselves off the horns of the other dilemma in terms of doing something to generate the economy in this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, Limestone is, I recognize, one of the fastest immediate areas that the government can turn to. The plans for the resumption of construction at Limestone are there. It doesn't take a great deal of lead time to develop and to get into a 2,000, 3,000 man workforce at Limestone. After all, it was that administration that had to call a halt to the construction of Limestone in late '77 and that is well known. But, Mr. Speaker, I do caution the government. I really caution the government. We've done, I think only correctly so, we've reminded the honourable members opposite of the many promises that they made to garner votes in the last election and we will continue to do so, and we will continue to remind them of this one that they've made but, Mr. Speaker, the record will show that we have not been pressing them to move on this, their most major promise, without putting at first a few things in order in the first instance. We have not stood up in this Chamber and called for the immediate resumption of Limestone construction, even though we know what that means to this province, but what we were doing and what we knew from the day we took office in '77, the importance of that construction and ergo the diligence with which we pursued the kind of long-term power commitments, Hydro commitments that would make that possible.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite have shown anything but an appreciation of the fact in their discussions with Alcan, in their discussions with IMCE, in their discussions with the Western Inter-Tie, and you can't separate those major projects from the major project that they would now like to proceed with, namely Hydro Development. I hope they can, Mr. Speaker. They have demonstrated in the past that they're quite prepared to do so, but Mr. Speaker, I hope that Manitobans will recognize at what cost. At today's cost, Mr. Speaker, the carrying cost, the dollar cost of servicing the money required to build the Limestone Hydro generating plant, simply the carrying costs are about equal to the total amount of current Hydro revenue. —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not against it. I'm for putting the Alcan talks on the front burner. I'm for agreeing to getting the agreements necessary for the Western Inter-Tie. Any one of those two will enable a responsible and orderly and, yes, a proper technical decision to be made that will secure at firm rates with escalator clauses built into it, long-term 35, 40, 50, 60 year sales of power that would enable this government to proceed to get Limestone on track, but I don't see them doing it, Mr. Speaker.

Instead, to the utter amazement of all, they treat billion-dollar developments like Alcan very lightly in their responses in this House. They get upset about the method of advertising used. They like to play little games about talking — well, we're not just talking to Alcan — we'll talk to Kaiser, we'll talk to Reynolds. I don't know what those particular totally American-owned multinationals have that the Canadian-owned multinational of Alcan has. Furthermore, I know because the record is not that dim from the time that I

was in government, that while certainly other firms were contacted, the fact of the matter is, it was the Board of Directors of Alcan that were serious about coming to Manitoba that are right now carrying on and expending upwards to \$5 million, \$6 million in feasibility studies to come to Manitoba and it is this government that has certainly turned that on to moderate or even low heat in terms as far as priority with the things that they have on their plate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to my major point; the only trouble with that is if they do that you can't turn on Limestone. Mr. Speaker, I should retract that. Yes, they can turn on Limestone and for those that weren't in the House that read what must have been to some extent the boring debates, the long tedious debates on Hydro and Hydro development throughout the decade of the '70s, it was never a question so much of what was being done by the honourable members opposite when they were in administration, but it was the timing, the sequence of the building they were undertaking. The fact that they had to go and borrow massive amounts of money at great cost even during the '70s to finance them and then let the chickens come home to roost on our Hydro bills.

Mr. Speaker, resumption of Limestone construction without firm sales means a doubling of Hydro bills within two or three years for every Manitoban. Let that add on to all your costs that we are facing along with the municipal costs that we are now facing. That 150-percent increase that we phased during the short four or five years in the last NDP administration need not have been. Need not have been, Mr. Speaker. We are still paying for it. We are paying it by the Minister of Finance patting himself on the back about saying how he can turn over \$40-million Swiss franc loans in Switzerland to \$60 million. We haven't paid anything off yet; it's just cost us an extra \$20 million. That's how we're paying for those kind of utility increases because of the disorderly construction schedule, disorderly in terms of the sequence of how these kinds of plants have to be built.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to the government that we are, first of all, armed with the track record in this instance. Some of us, and there were lonely voices in the wilderness, one was a former Premier of this province, Mr. D.L. Campbell, then a Director of Manitoba Hydro, he felt that strongly about it. He resigned on a matter of principle because he foresaw what was going to happen in the '70s to Hydro rates. There were others, senior management people within Hydro like Mr. Kris Kristjanson, who also accurately predicted what was going to happen to that utility if that kind of disorderly construction schedule were to be pursued in the '70s and of course, my former colleague for Riel, Don Craik, myself, others, my current leader, spoke out and spoke out ad nauseum at that time about the perils we were entering.

Mr. Speaker, I admit it was a broken record. Nobody was listening. It was something that had been said all before. The only difference, Mr. Speaker, second time around is — as I say, we now have a track record. We can predict with accuracy by how much a decision to proceed with Limestone construction at this point is going to cost the average resident, the average

farmer, industrial user, municipal and school user of Hydro. We simply have to go on the record. We know the immediate end result.

So, Mr. Speaker, rather than get hung up with the kind of, I suppose, other election promises that they made to themselves that they weren't going to proceed with some of the mega projects or certainly that they didn't figure high on their priority of things, they now find themselves in that position. The one mega project that they would like to proceed with, and by the way the one that has a lot of appeal to a lot of Manitobans, we faced that constantly during the four years we were in office. Why aren't you starting up construction on Limestone? We had most serious presentations made to us by the construction industry who missed and who needed and we knew that — we acknowledged those \$300 million, \$350 million a year that was being injected into the economy. But, Mr. Speaker, we also knew having experienced the mid-'70s what that would have done to Hydro rates and a decision had to be made. We made the right decision by doing two things.

The Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy Resources talks about taking politics out of these kinds of decisions, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that politics is always front, right and centre in many of these decisions. I know this administration doesn't operate that way. The Minister of Natural Resources makes fundamental decisions affecting five or six valley communities that impact on their taxes, that break with tradition as to the funding for flood protection and has to stand up in the House and acknowledge that he wasn't really aware of it, that obviously a senior bureaucrat had made that decision for him in his department.

Mr. Speaker, let it be put right on the record there was no attempt to cover up the fact that indeed it was a political decision. It was brought into this Chamber, a bill was passed. My former colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines, we started the program; we froze Hydro rates for five years. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the members opposite they'll have to bring it back into this House to unfreeze them.

Mr. Speaker, had we done simply that, I would have been prepared, that would have been bordering on the irresponsible to simply impose a political decision on a utility with respect to rates and then just leave it at that knowing the problems the utility faced. Concurrent with that, indeed, Mr. Speaker, to the point that the Minister involved asked to be relieved of some of his departmental responsibilities that he then had in the Department of Finance to devote full-time to the finding, to the creating, to the security for us of a long-term commitments for the surplus power that we then had, that we then inherited from the overbuilding of the previous administration and that we knew we would need if we were to consider at all the resumption of construction on the Nelson. So, those two went hand in hand, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's left to the area of question I suppose right now as to what would happen, but it's fair for me to speculate that were we in office at this particular time or were we in office now, we would have concluded at least one of those major agreements, certainly the Western Inter-Tie, perhaps one of the first ones could have been concluded by now. On that basis, a responsible decision to proceed

with the much needed development work on the Nelson could have and would have been made, Mr. Speaker. At this moment, it would infuse into all manners of businesses within the length and breadth of this province, some hope, some enthusiasm for looking at 1982 with a bit more hope, with a bit more confidence than they have at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I paint that picture for you, Sir, only because I want to put it on the record that I read in the Minister of Energy and Mines' ready — what struck me was his eagerness to seize upon the opportunity to respond to a question in this House for what I read to be, and I think will prove to be, a very major, one of the first major decisions that this administration will be taking. But knowing the consequences because I will not insult his intelligence, he knows what the consequences of that decision will be.

So in typical PR fashion, they have to soften up the general public for that. They have to start talking about offering options to the people of the Manitoba — what is it that you want? Two things, do you want a heightened level of economic activity or you can you stand some increases in your Hydro rates. That's a pretty good argument to make right now, or the other argument is — that's the scare tactic that they have been using — do you want moderate increases in Hydro rates now or do you want to really get hit with massive increases when the five-year freeze comes to an end?

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me assure you there need not be any massive increases. I'm not suggesting that there will not ever be increases, moderate increases to acknowledge the inflationary trends of the day will obviously have to be passed through, but the kind of cost that we are talking about, Sir, are not predicated by inflation; they're predicated by wrong decisions. They're predicated by putting \$300 million, \$400 million, \$500 million into place when it didn't have to be put into place. That's why we're paying for Hydro at the rate we're paying today.

If they want to, for other reasons, get themselves off the dilemma, to keep a promise that Limestone would be started immediately — of course, that promise has already been broken. It isn't immediate any more. It is now five months into this government's administration but, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to press them too hard on that. As much as I and every construction worker, indeed, every citizen of Manitoba would like to see us get on with the development of the Nelson River.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we have a track record to refer to; we have our own utility bills to refer to; and the people of Manitoba know what an NDP administration can do to Hydro rates. The only trouble is, Mr. Speaker, if it comes this time around, it will impact even more severely. You have government agencies promoting with tax dollars the transfer from oil to other alternative heats. There is no question there, there's a lot of installation of electric furnaces going on in this province. Mr. Speaker, that made a little bit of sense, pretty good sense, as long as you had a Conservative administration around that had some concern about Hydro rates. That made pretty good sense.

But, Mr. Speaker, you'll find themselves walking into a situation where you have the senior govern-

ment handing out \$800 to homeowners to convert from oil to electric or other uses, while the Provincial Government is slowly softening up the public to substantial and massive Hydro rate increases because they have found no other way of stimulating the economy. Mr. Speaker, I advise them, let's stop worrying about whether or not they agree with every Alcan ad. In fact, I'd recommend them to use it every once in a while when they're putting away leftovers in their fridges. It's really quite a handy wrap, and don't be prejudiced against that firm, even if you don't like aluminum. Even if you don't like aluminum, but it will help you get started with Limestone.

If that's not your first priority, then at least get to the point that we were at where we had all three Ministerial agreement on the Western Inter-Tie, ready to go to the three provinces — (Interjection) — yes, we sure as heck had — and move on that front. Move on that front and then we can have orderly Hydro development in this province. Mr. Speaker, I even suggest to you, resume discussions with the Mandan people about selling power to the southern interest because, Mr. Speaker, what has to be done is firm commitments for power have to be in hand before resumption of construction can take place.

Mr. Speaker, with that in hand, responsible technicians — the kind of decisions that the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines wants to see being taken — they can make responsible decisions even looking at short interim deficit positions if need be for Manitoba Hydro but knowing that they've got 35, 40, 50-year firm sales for power with proper escalator clauses built into the contracts, a utility can then come back to their customers and say, we can bear out this high-cost period. We don't have to burden with unacceptable rate increases; we can make sure that Manitoba will continue to be able to count on that particular cost item in our living cost index as remaining reasonably stable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be particularly cautious about this government. I will watch with care their approach in how they move in this particular area, as will others. Mr. Speaker, the record is simply too clear and the amounts of money that we are talking about are too massive. We are talking, you know, a \$2-billion project to resume Limestone, what was a billion dollars in the '70s. At today's costs and with this government's pension for borrowing it offshore, it could place Manitobans and the utility in tremendous jeopardy. Mr. Speaker, I caution the government that they respond to that particular promise with a great deal of care.

We will press vigorously for the resumption of Limestone construction in an orderly way. Mr. Speaker, that means you have some idea of what your going to do with the end product that \$2 billion of taxpayers' money produces. You have some idea of where that's going to go and at what price and for how long and, Mr. Speaker, without that, we are obviously going back to the mid-Seventies when the easiest solution was just build, keep the concrete pouring and keep the construction workers going up north. It helps to generate the economy here in Winnipeg and the rest of the province; keep everybody working with no heed to the eventual consequences.

Mr. Speaker, it's going to be different in the 1980s

and I wanted to put that on the record.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise also to debate on the Interim Supply. I'd like to relate some articles to begin with on the front page of a rural newspaper that came into my hands today and then I'd like to relate that to the larger scene of the Provincial Government in the management of the economy. This rural paper is dated March 24, 1982, and the first item deals with a car dealership in receivership, and it says, "Carman's General Motors dealership, Parkway Motors, has been put into receivership by the Toronto Dominion Bank. The dealership was shut down Monday night; the staff retained through until Friday to complete the stock-taking. The dealership has had financial problems for several months as have so many other car dealerships across the country. Carrying a staff of more than 20 employees last January, the staff has been trimmed down to 13 at the time of the closure. Negotiations for sale of the dealership had continued during the past week; however, the sale was not completed and the bank foreclosed."

One other item of bad news on the front page of this particular paper — it talks about, "Mancorn Co-op Ltd. of Carman was forced to sell its corn-handling plant to a private company this week or face bankruptcy, corn growers learned at a meeting with Manitoba directors last week in Carman. Financial Manager Shawn McCutcheon explained at the meeting last week that the bank has cut off the operating loan and won't lend Mancorn any more money. At this point we're not in a bankrupt position, but we're getting very close to it. The co-operative's major losses were made in the early stages and steps have been taken to ensure that such losses as occurred last summer don't happen again, but because enough money couldn't be raised over the last few days to save the co-operative, the plant will be sold."

Just two items on the front of a paper, and I guess when the co-ops start to feel that pressure, again we have to ask ourselves how many other co-operatives are faced with these same problems.

What about the unreported concerns, the concerns that don't hit the front page of papers here in this small town and in other places? What about the fact that the Bank of Montreal — I heard this morning — reported that net farm income in 1982 would drop by some 15 percent and that there was no hope at all for farm profits in the next two or three years?

In a nonagricultural sense, how many union workers and nonunion people, for that matter, are concerned about their future? Events of the past few days, Metro Drugs, and how many others are going to find themselves in that situation in the near future?

People tell me that high-cost transportation and those manufacturers that depend on high degrees of energy, non-Hydro and type, and with the poor economic activity that's encompassing us all over the last while and no doubt will continue, I'm sure manufacturers will feel increasing pressure to move also. The workers know this and the problem is, of course, unions and workers can force companies, owners and employers to do many many things, but no way yet

has a union found a way that they could force a company to make a profit.

Job stability and personal debt, these are all unreported concerns as companies attempt to reduce their workers, but there are other concerns and problems, too, on the front page of this paper and they are of a different concern. They are not concerned too much at all with economic activity and I'd like to quote two of the examples of that. One is headlined, "Teacher Cutbacks Opposed. This particular division board has not yet made a decision on teaching reductions for the coming term following a meeting last week at which three delegations presented objections to the proposed reductions. The delegations were objecting to a proposal for teacher cutbacks made at the board's meeting on March 1st. A vote was taken on the proposal and was tied; the motion was defeated. The vote was then taken to refer the matter back to Public Relations and Policy Committee for further study but that vote, too, was defeated."

One other article — this again is noneconomic in sense in the facial part of it, but naturally everything has economic consequence, and here are residents complaining about emissions from a plant. "Foremost Sailcraft Ltd. will change its exhaust system in the plant to exhaust fumes out of the north side of the building. Their hearing was heard and the hearing was held following complaints to the Commission by three residents who live on the south side. They said the odor from the plant was their biggest concern; that it makes it difficult to spend time outdoors during the summer."

So these are the other concerns: two strictly economic; two noneconomic on the face. Reading just from page 1 of this particular rural paper, this one rural paper, and you know how many we have in this province — we have many. I haven't bothered to go into detail into papers like the Winnipeg Free Press and attempted to catalogue all their reports of companies in business, but just reading this one page on this one paper today, I realize that just as many residents of this area in question are not understanding how the closing of two businesses in their own backyard forces them in times to readjust their thinking. Just like groups within the same community don't understand, I have the feeling that this government does not as yet fully understand the times in which we are in; at least, if they are, they are not demonstrating it.

Now, using the previous examples as an introduction, I'd like to be more specific. What my concern is that they are related to financial management of this province by the present government. As a new member, I must indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that I was overwhelmed and I am overwhelmed by the government requirement of 2.78 billion and who knows where it will end, maybe it will end up closer to 2.9 billion. Anyway, some \$3,000 a person — I guess to put it into proper perspective, my family of six, that represents an outlay on my behalf by this government of \$18,000.00. Yet, in a detailed review as we go through Estimates, I'm sure myself and my colleagues will hard pressed to find any wanton waste or redundancy.

But I also realize, and if I can refer to a prospectus supplement put out by the Province of Manitoba

dated December 23rd — I will use this extensively for the next little while — I refer to page 6 of this particular document where we have a table on the value of production. I notice that the total value of production for this province measured in 1980 dollars was some \$12 billion. \$12 billion — that represents of course \$12,000 for each individual. Further, reading down it, it breaks it out into certain areas: primary agriculture contributes some 14 percent; minerals, 7; manufacturing, 35; construction, 11; electric power, 4; retail trade, 26; and tourism, 4. Those are the contributors to our provincial wealth in a year-to-year sense.

Yet in 1982, I'm also cognizant of the fact that we have Metro Drugs who are bankrupt; we have co-ops that are feeling difficulties. I've heard mentions made today of Leaf Rapids and some of the problems there and I also know that my primary industry of which I'm most concerned, primarily agriculture, that net income will fall some 15 percent in that area too.

Yet, what do I see? I see a government that's increasing spending and I don't know what the rates are. I've heard 14.8; I've heard 16.8; I've heard 18.9; I don't know what the final numbers will end up, but what I see is no indication whatsoever of a drop in spending to meet the obvious drop in the creation of wealth. You know, we can make reference to the Federal Government transfers and the drop of such and I don't know what they are, whether they're \$63 million or \$100 million or \$160 million, but through it all you always have to ask yourself, from where is the additional revenue to come? Going to page 13, again in the prospectus issued by this province when they went forward for that additional 200 million in loans and when we realize that 40 percent of our revenue is sourced from the Federal Government by way of transfer, some 27 percent from income and corporate taxes, 13 percent sales tax and 4, 6 and 3 and 6 from gasoline, luxury taxes, natural resources respectively, you begin to really wonder how we're going to manage the \$2.9 billion of spending.

Again, the question, from where or what sources is the additional revenue to come and I think the answer is pretty straightforward. We know where it's going to come; it's going to be borrowed. It's going to obviously come from some savers in some other jurisdiction and I suppose the Budget will give us some idea on the particular deficit and what it may be. My guess, certainly not educated at all and I hope I'm wrong and if I am wrong I'll gladly apologize, but my guess is a \$600 million to \$800 million deficit. What's the debt now? Well, page 22 of this same document tells us that the provincial debt is some \$4.76 billion or \$4,600 per person.

What about the cost of servicing that debt? The Federal Government, just a month ago or three weeks ago, if all of us were listening when they made the announcement; I think it was certainly highlighted one night on TV, indicated that 23 percent of the federal spending was going to be directed towards servicing the federal debt; Manitoba's share, I'm not absolutely sure.

I'd like to use an analogy if I could to try and paint the picture the way I see this particular problem developing in Manitoba and the way it has occurred over the last 30, 40 years and where we are right now.

If you could use the analogy of a dishrag that you

pull out of a sink full of water and if you could imagine that the hands that you use to wring that dishrag are the government's and the water that drips from that dishrag is the provincial or the national wealth. I think then the chronological events over the last forty years that I'm about to give to you might give us a better picture of what's really happening through all governments.

Of course, the '50s were good years; we know that; there was a lot of pent-up post-war demand. People had served their nation and they were wanting to go back into the world — (Interjection) — we'll get into that another time, the Member for Arthur — and we knew that they wanted to raise families and the years were good and all the government had to do with that wet, dripping dishrag was just gently touch it and the water flowed and the proceeds flowed.

Then the '60s came along and they twisted a little harder and of course the water still flowed. Then the '70s came along and the water didn't flow quite as easily. As a matter of fact, we had to twist pretty hard, but we got water and we as a nation prospered and we did many things. But now we're in the '80s and we've got that dishrag; we've got it squeezed as tightly as you can and there's nothing coming from it. There's the odd drop and that's where we are right now. I'm going to come back to this so I hope you can keep it in mind.

At this point, I'd like to break into some basic philosophy if I could and the First Minister — (Interjection) — I'm afraid my colleagues may be disappointed so I hope they're knocking the table afterwards. The First Minister, from time to time, and I've heard him use this statement a number of times through the campaign and certainly since and he says, "There's a time to balance the Budget and there's a time to run a deficit." An interesting statement, "time to run a deficit" and a "time to run a balance" and then we go back to the decade of the '70s and we wonder after we've seen how we balanced no Budgets in that decade, we have to ask the question, how long will it take the western world to recover from that decade?

We've seen what's happened in the '70s; inflation, and as indicated the other day we know our school costs are three-and-a-half times what they were in 1971; productivity growth, in a real sense, positive through the decade of the '70s but not impressive; politics, what was happening in the decade of the '70s? Politicians were afraid to say no, and there was no reason to say no to every cause and every social reform and every wish and every want. Why? Because the squeeze could generate enough wealth and people, the society as a whole, what part did they have to play in taking us through the '70s and giving us this false psychology that we're all under? I know in the area of food production whereas individuals spent some 24 percent on food, they now spend 18 percent and they're still not happy, still feel it's way too much. The consumer that wants it all now and pay later and, of course, as politicians we're nothing more than a reflection of society as a whole and that caused our decisions of the '70s.

The '70s were good years, but did anybody make an attempt to balance the budget in those years? Well, I think the Manitoba P.C. Government tried. They tried, I know they tried and I remember the complaints,

restraint and the criticisms that came down on that government. I didn't say that they were successful, I said they tried and they tried hard. They tried, but through it all whatever they did, I never ever did once hear anybody, maybe I missed it, but I didn't hear once anybody say that there was waste in those years. I've never heard the NDP say that, never heard it, so they tried to do the best they could.

Then, we listen with great delight — I happen to find copies of the Saskatchewan Estimates in their Budget Speech, trying to see how they were attempting to balance the Budget. What was the rationale behind Saskatchewan attempting to balance the Budget? Were they thinking that the times were that bad that this was the time? If you've got wealth, why do you worry about deficit? If you have got wealth and it's resource wealth and it's going to keep flowing in, why worry? For some reason, Saskatchewan's worried. They must be. So you see that or is it just that's an election year. But, usually in election years, you don't worry about balancing the budget. So there we were, Saskatchewan. Then you look at the Saskatchewan Budget and you realize that their expenditures are 2.78 billion, 100 million less than our Estimates. Again the question, why the richer province with virtually the same population as ours, why again are they able to balance the Budget and expenditures per person? I guess one big reason is, of course, the cost of interest, provincial debt, that's one of many reasons no doubt.

So I ask myself, would an NDP Government in Manitoba, would it ever attempt to balance the Budget? I don't think ever, ever, ever, ever. Eight years out of twelve they've been government in this province and were they all bad years? Were they all bad years? I am lead to believe by the members opposite there were some good economic years, but did we balance the Budget in any of those eight years? Never.

The First Minister has said many, many times, that when times are good, the Budget should be balanced, so that when times are bad you can go into deficit.

Okay, times are bad now and they're becoming worse. Where are the savings to come from that we need so desperately right now? Well, there are no savings. Why? Well, I think the reason there are no savings is because that Keynesian approach, the priming the pump, the throwing the dollars at every problem, that theory has outlived its life, it's finished. The theory that brought us out of the Depression in the late '30s and the theory that motivated our economy in the late '40s, post-war, and did a good job and I commend it for it, does not have the answers today.

We need a new theory. People realize it, but does our government realize it? All I see is again attempts to throw dollars at problems, prime the pump. I've heard the criticism constantly from members opposite about Reaganomics, terrible. It's the scourge of the Western World as we know it and I would like to, if I could, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read a few quotes.

The slurs I've heard towards that attempt at least, I question if they're anything more than pure rhetoric, or if in fact this government and governments like it still believe that solution comes from government and government only.

I'd like to refer to this particular magazine and as members I know we all received it, The Institute for Research on Public Policy. It's the March/April addi-

tion. I would like to go directly to page six, The Economics of Gradual Improvement, and I'll just take some quotes from it and the article is "What Went Wrong in the '70s and What Can We do About it for the 1980's." I'm sure that members opposite have read it, I know they wouldn't pass good reading like this over and particularly when it makes such strong reference to the problems we have and as legislators I know we would all want to read this.

One of the quotes says and I quote, and it is talking about our problems, "The answer clearly lies in the psychology of a deep entrenched inflation, the only real way out is to attack the psychology." It says further that, "Orthodox theory today readily accepts that careful monetary restraint including limiting the growth and the money supply is an essential element in the control of winding down of inflation and the restraint programs being followed in the United Kingdom on the one hand, and the apparent melange of helter-skelter monetary tightness, gyrations in fiscal policy and supply side initiatives all rolled into Reaganomics in the United States on the other hand, are cited as evidence of this criticism of the monetarist approach.

"Our own experiment in Canada has been similarly assailed as a failed experiment because a steady and significant deceleration over the past six years and the growth rate of the money supply narrowly defined as currency in circulation and demand deposits, appears to have had relatively limited impact in restraining inflation."

One much shorter quote, "The government must seem to be willing to bear its share of the burden and some kind of Reaganist budget slashing."

One other article in that same magazine, page 42, and it's called, The Poverty of Reaganism. If I could quote again, "It must be particularly disturbing to Keynesian policy makers, those advocates of dollars by government for solutions to all problems," like we have across the way. "It must be particularly disturbing to Keynesian policy makers that the countries where the influence was greatest are those which have suffered most. In a changing world, a particular economic model has only a limited life span because its simplifications become dangerously wrong and the evidence is overwhelming, that the precise simplifications of Keynes' models of 1936 are now obsolete. Keynesian policy is regarded as analogous to alcohol."

I'll stop there with that one, so government has helped social problems tremendously, it has over the past years. We understand that, but in the 1980's can the government continue to spend in an uncontrollable manner when that dishrag, the one that is squeezed so tightly, has run dry.

So, again I ask, will an NDP government in Manitoba ever, ever balance the Budget? I answer no, because I believe in the old outdated methods of solutions because this government believes in the old outdated solutions. And what are their solutions, what are they putting before us, or I'm sure they will in time — ManOil. That's the solution; that's a solution? Street front repair, that's the solution; that's going to help. The joint venture psychology, that'll help. Spend, spend, spend. It's just not the time and we know that.

What about the other approach? The other approach that they chastise and they cast aspersions over. The

Reaganomics approach, or call it any thousand things as I'm read to believe. But that's what I think this government calls it. Will it work? —(Interjection)— well, I don't know if it is or not. I do know that inflation last month in the United States was between four and five percent. I do know that the major unions down there led by the auto industry are taking as much as \$2 an hour cuts because they're happy to maintain their work. We know that the profits that the companies were enjoying there have been slashed to a point where they are all negative. Is it working? I don't know. But all they're trying to do is break that inflation psychology. You can't criticize them or chastise anybody for attempting to do that and I wonder at times if this government or governments that feel that inflation is no problem, I wonder at times if they really really care about inflation at all, or if they would subscribe with why it has to be beaten.

I pulled a little article out the other day of a farm paper and I quote, Frederick Schultz, former Vice-Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, puts it this way, "I don't think there's any question that the end result of inflation is loss of freedom and a change in the political system because inflation makes the government take over more and more. Inflation causes a breakdown in the free market or drives it underground. And why does it go underground? To escape taxation."

If I could again quote one other article, and it comes from the Winnipeg Sun dated March 22 and of course the main individual that's being quoted in this particular article is Milton Friedman and, of course, I'm sure the members opposite will not accept too many of his espousals. But I'd like to quote two or three, and he's talking about the US situation, he says, "the easiest way out for Congress is to raise taxes." I'm sure which is going to occur here. "The easiest way is to increase taxes, but the right way out for Congress is to cut spending." And I see no indication of that. What President Reagan has achieved has been to put Congress in the position where it's going to have to face up to that hard choice. And he predicts the great economic progress in the decade ahead if the government pursues a steady dependable policy. That includes less regulation, lower government spending and lower marginal tax rates. They are all the wide-open issues, the ones that those that espouse free enterprise stand for and are so foreign, and so obviously distasteful to the members present because they believe, they honestly, sincerely believe that the government has the solutions and that more dollars in every case will find the ultimate.

Another point, I wonder if the NDP, pardon me, the party in power indicate a tremendous concern in inflation and I think it's been said by them and by everybody that interest rates are the problem. We need a made-in-Canada interest rate policy. And, of course, anytime that our side has shown any moral support, not open verbally, but any moral support to the attempts by Ottawa to wrestle this monster to the ground, we've been severely criticized. —(Interjection)— I won't, because I'd like to quote something that you also have or we as members have in total, we have this, "Can we have made-in-Canada interest rates?" and again, this was prepared and written by the Institute for Research on public policy. But I know

all the members opposite have read it and I'm sure that every one of them has thrown it into File 13.

But I think to sum up the intent, or the major thrust, that this one person's attitude towards a made-in-Canada interest rate, is that it's suicide. That is has no place; that it can't work.

So, I'd like to conclude now, Mr. Speaker, if I could and I'd like to state that I believe this government, firstly, has no understanding of fiscal management, that they feel an increase in spending of 14, 16 or 18 percent, whatever it ultimately ends up to be is necessary. And like all the pump primers of the past they believe that is the solution. I believe this government yet does not yet understand that when I hold up the front page of this paper, I don't think they really understand that this is just one paper and that this is happening everywhere in this province — happening everywhere. And I wonder if they realize that dishrag is dry and that what it needs more than anything is a relaxation from that furious grip, just to let it relax and let it unfold and let it breathe and let it drop down to where it can build up again. If they will just allow it to regenerate, it'll come back and it will be full of sustenance and it'll be full of wealth and again, all they've got to do is gently touch it. All the social progress that'll come from that will even make them happy but they have to give it a chance.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few remarks to the motion that is now before the House in an effort to try and find out from this government where they intend to go and how they're going to get there and how they're going to live up to all these promises and pledges that they made to the people in my constituency during the past election campaign. Mr. Speaker, it's a very interesting world, what a difference a day can make. When you read through the rhetoric and the promises that this First Minister made around this province last November, and then pick up and read some of his stuff that he's saying now, like this release in Brandon the other day, it's not the same world, Mr. Speaker. It's not the same man, he's certainly not talking the same language. He's backtracking like a scared rabbit.

I would like today to raise the matter of the Manco Plants that's closed at Rosburn and at Pilot Mound. I would also like to find out what the dairy industry of these communities are going to do. Is there any future for them? I would like to find out, and try at least, Mr. Speaker, what we've got for the beef industry. Have they got nothing to offer at all for the beef industry in our province?

I'm going to raise a subject matter that was brought to my attention today, the community of Winnipegosis, very dear to my heart. Two businesses closed up in Winnipegosis. Likely about 40 people out of work. Mr. Speaker, I'm also going to try and see if I can't find some solutions to the people at Roblin where we find Roblin Forest Products are shut down almost to four or five working. Mr. Speaker, I just wonder when you read through all this rhetoric and these piles of junk

and half-truths, quarter-truths, ill-truths, and everything else that was spread out across this province during the election campaign, and for me as an elected person to go back and try and explain to these people what's going on in this place, what kind of a government they have in this province today, and who is running the province, and who's going to provide the leadership. Mr. Speaker, it's scary, I can assure you, it's scary.

First of all I'm most concerned that we don't have any farmers over in that caucus. I don't see anybody that's considered, in my opinion, to be an active farmer today that can give that government any leadership.

I, secondly, have some problems of finding somebody over there that has any business background. Anybody that has operated a successful business in this, oh yes, my apologies, I see the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I withdraw that. But anyway there are very very few.

I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, when they sit around the Cabinet Table where they get their guidance on matters such as the problems of the cheese industry and Rossburn and Pilot Mound. Who in that Treasury Bench is leading the fight for the people of Rossburn and Pilot Mound. I guess there's nobody, because I questioned the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs yesterday at some length. He gave me no answers at all. I wonder, is there a committee at all functioning to try and get the cheese industry functioning at Rossburn and Pilot Mound, Mr. Speaker? Is there a subcommittee looking at that matter? Is there anybody across there that's seriously concerned about the problems and those people that are laid off today at Rossburn and in Pilot Mound, some 25 or 30 of them don't have a job, they have no job and wonder what this government is going to do for them. Or are they, in fact, going to do anything?

Mr. Speaker, if I don't get some answers within the next week I have to go back and tell those people out there that this government does not have the answer for the problems that they face. And they don't have the solutions to the problems out there and they're not going to do anything about it. That scares me. That scares me, because when I go back and read the promises, the pledges, this is stuff that's in black and white that the First Minister and other candidates went around this province and pledged, signed, the First Minister's signature's on these documents.

When, Mr. Speaker, are they going to come back to reality again and review what they have said? I wonder, has anybody over there gone back through their old election material. I'm sure the Member for Elmwood likely has, because he didn't get into the Treasury Bench. But nevertheless, is there anybody over there that's gone back and taken a look at the editorial page of the Free Press, on November 9th. Just read that for the good of your health sometime and see what all these great things that Mr. Pawley was going to do for the province. Well it says here "NDP's Howard Pawley's thumping the province at a promise-a-day clip." A promise a day, he was. Yes, and they're all listed. It goes on here and it says — (Interjection) — all this activity by Mr. Pawley is commendable, it says, "but it would be even more commendable if the proposed programs made some

sense." That was the second big quote out of the Free Press of that day. The other one says "Many of Mr. Pawley's other proposals however are as strange as they are impractical."

That's the one that haunts me about the people at Rossburn and Pilot Mound. That those kind of promises and pledges are strange and impractical, that he made at that time, and he's not going to live up to them. He hasn't shown us any evidence to date he's going to live up to them. No, he hasn't. I just asked him what they're going to do about the people in Winnipegosis, if you read the latest issue of the Dauphin Herald. — (Interjection) — Yes, I know a lot of people in Winnipegosis. Marchenski Lumber has gone into receivership in Winnipegosis. Do I hear the Member for Dauphin doing anything about that one? Or the Member for Ste. Rose, or the First Minister of this province? Mr. Speaker, the Winnipegosis Box and Mill Work at Winnipegosis have closed their doors putting 20 to 25 people for the summer months out of business, and in the winter months they said there another dozen logging to keep the plant operating. About 35 people are out of work at Winnipegosis today as we stand here. Do I hear anything coming from the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs to help those people out?

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing coming out of this government because I suggest when they were stumping this province in the election campaign they didn't mean a word they said. It was just junk, absolute junk. They have no intentions of living up to those election promises and they don't have anybody over there with the courage to stand up and say how they're going to do it. That concerns me, Mr. Speaker. It concerns me especially because when I read now out of the editorial that came out on March 18th, at Brandon. This is the First Minister — "I'll deliver later." Now that's not what he said on November 18th. These things were going to be laid out on the first day. They were going to be there and all the people of this province would go to bed happy at night, they'd have dollars in their pockets, they'd all be working, read it. What's he saying now? "I'll deliver later."

I am asking the First Minister who is in this Chamber today, when's he going to deliver it, how later? Six months, two years, four years, or is he never going to deliver these things that he plans, is he never? I suspect it's the latter because surely with the fresh new Treasury Bench that he's got there they should be able to come up with some of the answers to the questions that I'm raising on behalf of my people. But today, Mr. Speaker, nothing, just blank stares from across there. They'll stand up and they'll wind all around the question, Mr. Speaker, look you square in the eye and say I can't promise your people anything, because we don't have the answers. And now the First Minister, the man that's leading this party says "I'll deliver later." Isn't that shocking? That is shocking, Mr. Speaker, it must shock you being a new member in this place, it must shock you. You must be shivering in your Chair there, to see that you have a First Minister leading you who made you all those promises and now he comes out and says "I'll deliver later." I'm sure you must be concerned, like the rest of the members in this House, Mr. Speaker, as to where, and when, and why, and how, he can't stand up and justify



what happened.

The only solution that I have left is to rise in my place on an occasion such as this and try and see if I can't motivate this bunch across the way to live up to some of these pledges and promises they made to the people out in my constituency. And how much longer I'm going to be able to have enough strength and courage to do it, I doubt that I can answer that at the moment, but surely, surely there should be somebody over there to tell the people at Rossburn and at Pilot Mound — are you going to help Manco open those plants or aren't you? And I want just an answer yes or no.

Maybe the Member for Springfield can answer that because he answers a lot of questions around here. What can the Member for Springfield take if he'll give me back to the dairy producers at Rossburn and Pilot Mound who are bringing their milk into the factory and the factory is closed, Mr. Speaker. I guess they're asked to take their milk to Saskatchewan. Now isn't that progressive? The government's only been in office five months and we already have farmers who are delivering their milk to Saskatchewan. That's an insult. That's an insult to the dairy producers in this province; it's an insult to agriculture in this province; it's an insult to the Minister of Agriculture in this province; it's an insult to this government. Absolutely, there's no other way you can look at it.

Why shouldn't you react? Why shouldn't you? Why can't the Member for Springfield rise in his place and give me some answers? I'm not getting them from all the others in there, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure he will, when I sit down, I'm sure he'll give us a lot of information — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, certainly when I sit down, I'll gladly accept it then but I have a couple more questions I'd like to raise for the honourable member and when he does arise in his place, he'll have more than one question.

Maybe the Member for Springfield can assist me to tell the beef producers in this province, where is all this glory and this goal and these great policies and this great thinking and philosophy of the Socialists who said, "Leave it to us, we'll look after the beef industry in this province. We'll help you solve your problems. We'll get you out of your economic dilemma," Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Springfield's got an answer for that one when his Minister doesn't have it and his First Minister doesn't have it, so I'm sure he doesn't have it.

I wonder what they can tell the people of Winnipegosis? What can they tell the people of Winnipegosis — the Mayor of Winnipegosis who is pleading here in the Dauphin Herald for help, pleading for guidance, pleading for this First Minister when the members . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** Order please. Order please. I just have a report that the recorder is having trouble recording the honourable member's speech because of the noise in the Chamber, so could I ask members to keep their comments a little quieter?

**MR. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, maybe that microphone isn't working. Should I move over this way?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member

has 25 minutes left.

**MR. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I would again — I'm appealing now on behalf of the Mayor of Winnipegosis and the people and the council in the Winnipegosis Village and the surrounding areas to see if the First Minister can't help them to solve the problems of Marchenski Lumber, and he says here that it's gone into receivership. I guess Metro Drugs is — (Interjection) — well, he could be laughing. But anyway that plant has closed at Winnipegosis. It's something similar to what happened to Metro Drugs. And the First Minister is here in the room and I'm sure he's listening.

And then of course the other one, Mr. Speaker, that comes up here is that Winnipegosis Box and Millwork and that business has been operating in Winnipegosis for many, many years. So there's no way, Mr. Speaker, that it's a management problem. They certainly knew how to manage their industry. There is some other problem there. It's the marketplace, and I'm sure the First Minister and his Treasury Bench there have some markets for that product. I don't think they care, but I wonder if they have any markets. Have they any encouragement to offer to that box factory in Winnipegosis? Well, the Minister of Natural Resources, maybe he could get a bunch of boxes constructed at Winnipegosis, but I don't have much hope for it, Mr. Speaker, as I stand here this afternoon.

The other one, of course, that I'm concerned about is the whole general slowdown in the economy in the province since this government has taken over. It's scary. Mr. Speaker, it's scary to read the newspapers all across — not the country but the city papers — to see the terrible things that happen to our people in this province with this government sitting here on their thumbs or on their hands.

Standing up, the First Minister says, "I'll deliver later" and what help is that for the people at Metro Drugs, some 350 that were walking the streets today looking for work? What help is that to the people in Winnipegosis? "I'll deliver later," he says. I'll deliver how much later? Six months? Six years? Never. I suspect it's the latter because unless I see a different attitude from this First Minister, unless I see a different attitude from this government, unless I see some different initiatives and different programs coming out of it, they don't have the answers for these business problems that we're facing today.

I suppose the First Minister maybe hasn't got the courage of the First Minister of Canada who said he was going to wrestle inflation to the ground, but nevertheless, this Minister is the one that made the promises. The First Minister of Canada when he stumped this country in those days didn't promise hardly anything. In fact, I don't think he promised anything except he smiled and wore a flower in his lapel, but this Minister — the record is here, there's all kinds of it, there's reams of stuff.

Mr. Speaker, let's read this one — he says here — this is an important message that he's sending out to the people of Manitoba, and it says here, "Bankruptcies have skyrocketed." If he feels that bankruptcies skyrocketed when we were in government, how would you describe it today? How would you describe it today? Huge bankruptcies, numerous more bankruptcies — bankruptcies like we've never seen in this

province are taking place today, and the First Minister sits over there with his back to me and reading something and not listening at all. I know. He says, "I'll not deliver now. I'll deliver later," and that's the reason why I can't get his attention, Mr. Speaker.

He went on, Mr. Speaker, in some of these documents and he said, "Plant closures have meant the loss of thousands of jobs." Now isn't that a big statement? "Plant closures have meant the loss of thousands of jobs." Yes, Sir, there's his picture. The important message — there it is — and I ask him to again today rise in his place when I sit down, tell us what he's going to do to help the people in Metro Drugs. Tell me what you're going to do with the plants at Rossburn and Pilot Mound, those 25-30 people walking around out of work. What are you going to do with the people at Winnipegosis and they're out of work. No hope, no guidance, no leadership, no programs — all they get is a notice in the Brandon Sun — "I'll deliver later."

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister of this province has a conscience. I wonder if he actually has any concern at all for these people that are walking around this province out of work today? He came out with another big election shot here — "Conservatives will give anything to be re-elected." Now isn't that a joke? But he goes on here and he says, a precious resource. Great words, great wisdom by this First Minister "when plant closures and bankruptcies were forcing thousands of people out of work and out of this province, the Conservatives did nothing." I am asking this First Minister, Mr. Speaker, and I'm looking him square in the eye, what's he going to do? What's he going to do about Metro Drugs? What's he going to do about the plant at Rossburn and Pilot Mound? What you going to do about Winnipegosis? He just laughs and grins.

He has no heart; he has no concern; he doesn't even know what I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker, because he's not going to deliver. He says, "I'll deliver it later." Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there's a lot of unhappy people in this province today trying to figure out where this government's going to take them. Where is the leadership that we see in all these new pictures he's got. He looks like I don't know who in this one here. His hair is all muffled up, new hair style, and one I never saw before, but look at that, that important message and that went right across this province, Mr. Speaker. Those people are certainly depressed today. They're sitting back wondering what the heck is going on in this province and where are the saviours of the world that they put in office here who said they were going to solve all these problems. They are going to tell the people of Rossburn today, I'll do something later. Tell the people at Pilot Mound, I'll do something later. Tell the dairy industry, one of the most economic bases that we have in my constituency, tell them that we'll do something later. When? We're not going to do anything now or I'll deliver it later.

That's not good enough, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think the people are going to accept it much longer because they certainly don't deserve the treatment they're getting from this government because they're the ones that made the promises; they're the ones that made the pledges; they're the ones that put it in black and white and told the people of this province what

they were going to do and now, the First Minister goes in an interview in Brandon with the Vancouver Sun and says, I'll deliver later.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be on my feet on many occasions in this Session because I'm not going to accept that I'll deliver later policy which we're now getting from this lame duck government across the way.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If no other member wishes to speak to Bill No. 14, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Could I have it stand in my name?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

## **SECOND READING — GOVERNMENT BILLS BILL NO. 10 — THE RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS ACT**

**MR. PENNER** presented Bill No. 10, The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 10 is a draft Act intended to repeal and replace the existing Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act and hereafter I'll refer to it as REMO. The existing legislation was enacted in 1961 as a result of the then Uniform Law Commissioners of Canada. At the same time, similar legislation was enacted by other provinces. Now, since 1961, there have been no substantial amendments to this legislation. After review of the existing legislation, the Uniform Law Conference of Canada, a conference in which Manitoba is fully represented, drafted a new uniform Act in 1979 and that was revised in 1981.

Bill No. 10 substantially adopts The Uniform Act with one major exception that I'll amplify in a moment. Alberta has passed the legislation adopting The Uniform act, but this legislation has not yet been proclaimed. The Uniform Act has been introduced in Ontario and the other provinces have been studying the legislation with a view to enacting it.

The purpose of the existing legislation is to provide a mechanism whereby an order for maintenance for a dependant made in one province will be registered and enforced in another and, as members of the House will know, this is extremely important where we have, as we do have a highly mobile society, so that you have Enforcement Orders or Maintenance Orders made in one province and one or the other of the spouses may leave that province and the question of enforcement may arise at some subsequent date. Where there is no order in existence, the legislation also provides a mechanism allowing a dependant to obtain an Order of Maintenance against the party

living in another province as long as that province is what is called a reciprocating province.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to continue to provide the same rights and remedies available under the existing legislation, but it is intended to clarify and strengthen the procedures which are used. The proposed bill substantially adopts the recommendation of the Uniform Law Conference of Canada which set out in legislative form the procedures which have in fact evolved over the last ten years; evolved that is, as a result of 20 years of experience with the existing legislation and which would make these practices and procedures uniform across Canada.

For example, Mr. Speaker, when an order made in another jurisdiction has been registered for enforcement in Manitoba, sections of the Act specify the procedures to be followed where this registration is challenged and further specify the narrow grounds for setting aside registration of the order made in the other jurisdiction. A further section of the bill establishes certain appeal procedures for any matter that comes within the ambit of the legislation.

The most substantial change in procedure contained in the proposed bill and, remember it's a re-enactment of an existing piece of legislation; the most substantial change relates to the problem of varying, that is changing an order that is already in existence, varying an Order of Maintenance. Under the present legislation where there has been a change in circumstances of either one of the spouses, an application to vary a Maintenance Order can only be made to the Court in the province where the order was originally made. If you just think of the hardship that creates for someone who has moved and particularly someone who is dependent on such an order. So that where a party has moved to another province, under existing legislation, that party is forced to return to the province where the order was originally made in order to get a variation. This procedure is slow; it's expensive; it involves considerable hardship particularly as such applications are usually made because there has been a change for the worse in the party who . . . circumstances in that party's financial situation. A section has been included in the bill to remedy this situation. This section permits a party to apply to vary the original maintenance order in a court in the jurisdiction in which that party resides, even where the original order was granted elsewhere. Before an order varying the maintenance can be made, however, so that both parties are protected, the matter must be sent to the jurisdiction where the responding party resides to give that other party the opportunity to respond. So, what then would happen is that — let's say the wife, who is the recipient of maintenance under an order, her situation has worsened; she wants to vary for an increase, she can apply. Let's suppose that she now lives in Manitoba but the order was made in British Columbia; she can apply here for the variation; it can be granted, but before it can be enforced, it is sent to B.C. so that the husband, let's say, still residing can make any answer to it that is open to that husband.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, where one of the party still resides in the jurisdiction in which the original maintenance order was made, only then the court in that jurisdiction has the power to make a final deci-

sion as to whether or not to order variation. This section, this variation, is modelled on the provisions of The 1981 Uniform Act but we have here, as other jurisdictions have, departed from the Uniform Bill to the extent we provide that although an application can be commenced in another court only the court which made the original Order of Maintenance has the power to make the final decision to vary its own order. It's our view that the omission of this provision, which is now incorporated in the proposed bill, would work an injustice on a dependent family which has remained in the province where the order was originally granted. The Province of Ontario has adopted this change in its proposed legislation and also the Federal-Provincial Committee on Enforcement of Maintenance and Custody Orders, a body consisting of representatives of all of the provinces dealing in the area of Family Law, and the Federal Government has recommended that the provinces adopt The 1981 Uniform Act with that particular change.

I'm therefore, Mr. Speaker, recommending that Bill No. 10, to repeal and replace The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act be enacted as proposed. I have a copy of these notes for the members opposite.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland that the debate on this bill be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Government House Leader.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. PENNER:** First an announcement, Mr. Speaker. I wish to announce that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts will meet on Tuesday, April 6 and if required also on Tuesday, April 13 and Tuesday, April 20 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 253, to consider the last Annual Report of the Provincial Auditor and the Public Accounts for the Province for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981.

I wished to make that announcement and then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, if we have leave, can I suggest that rather than moving into Committee for the six or seven minutes that are available, that we move into Private Members' Hour at the end and call it 4:30 for now, and then at 5:30 we can adjourn. We have the right now to go into Committee and can carry on at 8:00.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Do we have the leave of the House to move into Private Members' Hour? If that is agreed, we will then move into Private Members' Hour.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, would we then be calling it 5:30 at 5:25?

**MR. SPEAKER:** As the members wish.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** The motion before the House is the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, as amended, by the Honourable Member for River East, I believe.

### RESOLUTION NO. 1 — TASK FORCE RE DECLINING SCHOOL ENROLMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** Mr. Speaker, the Resolution has been amended and I might just in beginning refresh the minds of members by reading it:

"That the Government of Manitoba through the Department of Education, include the topic of declining school enrolments as it affects future planning for the educational programs in school divisions throughout the province and bring forth recommendations in guidelines which will be of assistance to Manitoba School Divisions in their future planning as an integral part of the government's one-year review of education finance." So, in light of that, the proposal by the Honourable Member for Tuxedo can be and will be dealt with as part of that general review.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks in relation to this Resolution, I've spoken to a number of young couples to talk to them about the broader question of not only declining enrolments which can have several factors behind it, but also the question of a declining population and a declining birth rate. What seems to be happening in our society from coast to coast is that young couples, in particular, are being hard hit by inflation and by a downturn in the economy and, as a result, are putting off having families and concentrating on saving money to purchase housing. This is something that I think is evident, that with the state of the economy and the value of the dollar, that there are very few young couples who can settle down in the first few years of marriage and start raising a family in Canada today. I think this is probably even more of a problem for people in cities like Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto where there is a horrendous increase in the price of housing and in the cost of mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking to a relative of mine a few weeks ago from Vancouver. He now has a family that is fully grown but he had to suffer the change from a 13.5 percent mortgage to a 22.5 percent mortgage and anybody looking at taking out a mortgage in that particular price range would surely not only have to

think twice but three times as well. Because I would assume that money at that rate probably doubles in about three-and-a-half years and anybody who is contemplating a first purchase as opposed to winding up the tail-end of a mortgage obviously is going to defer and delay that particular decision.

So, just what the long-term effect of all this is going to be is difficult to say but I think that politicians and decision-makers and sociologists, etc., are going to have to, at some point address the question of a declining population and decide whether or not they are going to be able to come up with some ideas about encouraging young couples to have a family, whether this is going to be a new baby bonus system or some policy of tax benefits or incentives. Something is going to have to be done, otherwise the population is going to go from zero population growth to probably where it's getting to today of a negative population growth. —(Interjection)— Well, one of my colleagues says let the men have the babies. That's something I hadn't thought of before but certainly is an interesting suggestion.

One of the issues though that I think the Member for Tuxedo is going to have to address in regard to this particular resolution and some of his colleagues is the fact that it was their government which I believe had a direct negative effect on the schools and school closings in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it was under their government that 40,000 Manitobans in their term of office left the province. I don't have a breakdown of the age categories of that group, but one could assume that if 40,000 people left in an exodus from the province because of the poor state of the economy which was a direct result of the economic policies and the nonthrust of the Lyon administration then I think it would be reasonable to assume that probably half would be school age children. If there were some 20,000 students among that group that left for other provinces, you take one or 200 lots and divide it into 20,000 then I think it's probably true to say that probably 100 schools or their equivalent were lost and wound down as a result of those economic policies. —(Interjection)— Well, I don't know what the member is saying. Something about, they grew older. I have to tell the MLA that the sensitive group in Manitoba's society is always in the 25-45 age range. That's often the most dynamic group and that group is usually well educated, it's usually upward mobile, usually looking where the action is, well, the action wasn't, the action wasn't from 1977 to '81 in the Province of Manitoba, it was west of here and east of here. These people pulled up stakes, moved their families and as a result aggravated a situation in the Province of Manitoba which particularly hit and hurt the neighbourhood schools.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is something that conservative spokesman in the debate should address themselves to and should recognize that when they came forth with their great laissez-faire policies they failed. Mr. Speaker, the thing that amazes me as one who sits in this House, is to hear speaker after speaker after speaker from that side of the House demanding a return to those same policies which the public rejected only a few months ago. There seems to be a lack of recognition and a lack of understanding on the part of

the Conservative benches and I say that's okay with me, that's okay with me if they want to persist in those policies when they come up again three or four years from now with their new leader and with their old policies, they're going to get more of the same. They're going to get another rejection slip, another pink slip from the people of Manitoba. —(Interjection)— Well, my colleague says he'll stick with their present leader. I don't think that he'll stick around and when he pulls out then the present front bench which is coloured from pumpkin orange to Tory blue, they'll all jump into the fray and then it's going to be a hot contest. There is no red Tories there, but there is an orange coloured Tory.

Mr. Speaker, I, in the last four years was involved, four to five years, was involved in trying to prevent some school closures in my own riding. Some of the people here from the city might recall that George V was a fairly controversial school closing and I might also tell the honourable member that I recently saw Doug Rowland and some of the honourable members will recall him - he looks like George V as a matter of fact. He has a beard and moustache that is exactly identical to the former British monarch.

Mr. Speaker, I helped the people in my area oppose a school closing and it was a problem for two reasons. One was a declining enrolment and another was deteriorating building. The school board wanted to close George V for both reasons and came up with some engineering reports and so on and the people in the area refused to throw the towel in or the dishcloth, as the Member for Morris would put it and, Mr. Speaker, they put on a tremendous fight and demanded further engineering and architectural reports and pressured the Winnipeg School Board and in the end won their case and won a small budget for renovating the school. That was a success story.

Sir Sam Steele is also in my area and that was an unsuccessful attempt where the — well, I'm looking at the former Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Education and appealing to him in retrospect that perhaps his Minister bit the dust perhaps of the kind of policies that he put forward in the province. Mr. Speaker, in that particular instance, you had an excellent building. You had a building that is, I think, good still for another 50 years if not 100 years. It seems to be the type of building that will just go on indefinitely, but their enrolment kept going down. Their enrolment went down from the 80's in number to the 50's to projections in the 40's and eventually, regrettably, that building had to go.

Here's where you get into a chicken and egg situation. You get into a situation where if a school is not going to be operational in a community, the young couples in the area will move out or they will not move in and that's exactly what happened in this instance. People kept tabs on the school and as the fortunes of the school deteriorated, I know exactly what happened. You had young couples who were moving into Elmwood as they have in all parts of Elmwood, into the older areas, buying older houses because they couldn't afford the newer three bedroom, four bedroom, five bedroom with two or three bathrooms and double garages and so on, buying old housing stock, renovating it, living in it, raising their family. Instead of doing that, they moved out and in some cases, of

course, moved elsewhere.

Then you get a further irony, Mr. Speaker, where you get the inner core housing stock and schools deteriorating and then you get a demand for new facilities in the suburbs. So from an economic point of view, it makes very little sense. You have the housing stock that can be utilized, but you close the schools and as a result, people go to the suburbs and then demand new construction, additions and portable housing, everything else, in the suburban areas. So you're into a real vicious circle. Closing existing schools and then trying to decide whether to build new facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it's already been said and I simply add my weight to the argument that school buildings wherever possible should be used by the community on a day and night basis and that wherever an evening school can go in, wherever a day care centre can go in, wherever recreation facilities can be accessed, then of course, we should support that. The thing that concerns me is where you get schools that are, in some cases, being sold and in other cases, I suppose, being demolished because that's happened in the downtown area where a lot of downtown schools were simply boarded and in other cases sold and demolished. Once that happens, of course, people won't move into that area with young families and the young downtown families are sort of from the old days, from 20, 30, 40, 50 years ago. Very few people are going to move families into downtown Winnipeg and then send their children to a school somewhere else.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboine, I believe he and his family and his brothers and I know one of his brothers well went to school right downtown, maybe the old St. Paul's site, Isbister School. So, they know how it used to be in what is now the old days and I guess the Isbister School is now the Adult Education Centre. I, myself, taught there a few years ago. That's one of the positive examples where the building didn't go and where the school board was intelligent enough to turn it into an adult education centre and make use of that facility, but in the other cases, all the other schools that used to be around there are now ancient history.

So, one of my concerns, Mr. Speaker, is that we shouldn't act too hastily about closing buildings because in some cases once you close the school, you close it forever and you permanently alter the characteristics of the area and as they say, I guess, in the States, there goes the neighbourhood. Nobody's going to then want to live there, they're going to relegate the area to singles and people who are older or have no families, etc. etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say in conclusion in regard to the resolution, I'm glad that the Member for Tuxedo brought in this resolution and I think it can, as amended, be supported by both sides of the House because I think in so doing we can express our concern for the quality of education. I want to say that my colleague from Dauphin, I think, made a very good speech as a former trustee — I assume he's no longer a trustee — (Interjection) — a teacher and councillor. I always think of him as a school trustee, but he was a city councillor in Dauphin, but he knows a lot about education. He just came out of the educational sys-

tem and his speech on the quality of education, the concern about what might happen with declining enrolments, is one that I think all of us should pay heed to.

But the other point that I make to members across the way is this; that unless they can come up with suggestions and unless they support some of the progressive policies of the government to get the economy going, to stimulate the economic side of the question, then there'll be no solution. Whatever is gained in one area will be lost in another. We have to retain our population; we have to attract people to Manitoba and we have to make sure that we don't lose the existing population and we have to build on the existing population and build on the existing economic base.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I must say I'm prompted to make a modest contribution to this very worthwhile resolution placed before us by the Honourable Member for Tuxedo for really one reason. I'm so much surprised at the partisan tones that I hear coming from across the way on a resolution of this kind, and I say particularly surprised because it's coming at Private Members' Hour and again, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly not for me to be patronizing in any way to honourable new members, but it is worthwhile for them to appreciate that Private Members' Hour is a rather unique hour.

It's an opportunity where some of the usual day to day partisanship can be shed — not necessarily, of course, because resolutions can be of a highly political nature — but it's particularly an opportunity for government backbenchers and all other private members as we all are on this side of the House to talk about an important subject such as this one is and try to at least have a pretty good debate on the merits of the resolution; to amend that resolution in whatever way is deemed proper recognizing at all times that members in the Opposition can only recommend that the government give consideration to doing something. We are not government, we're Opposition, we know our role. We know our place, if you like. Therefore the traditional line in every resolution that is put forward by a member in the Opposition, is that we request the government give consideration or consider the advisability of undertaking certain measures.

So with that kind of approach which is the format for Private Members' Resolutions, I'm somewhat surprised at the partisanship that I hear coming on this kind of a resolution. It's a resolution that deals with what I think we all acknowledge to be a very serious problem.

So for the Member for Dauphin, and I have to disagree with my friend, the Honourable Member for Elmwood — I certainly acknowledge the Honourable Member for Dauphin had a very fine speech and all that but it was really his speech that prompted me to rise. If I'm paraphrasing him right I believe he said it was all the Conservative's fault, that we didn't do anything about it in the last four years and the NDP will solve it. Well bully for you, God bless you, I hope you have a good time in solving it. It is a problem and I

think that's what the purport of the Member for Tuxedo's Resolution is all about. There are some obviously that recognize it.

The Minister of Education, I think, recognizes to some extent the depth of that problem. I'm just suggesting that embodied in the Resolution is an opportunity for us collectively to offer some guidelines and some advice to the very serious problems that school divisions have in Manitoba facing this problem.

So I find it little surprising for a member to suggest that the whole issue was politically motivated to begin with, that is the problem. Conservatives had something to do about the fact that we have a declining enrolment. Conservatives are responsible that families have children of one or two, or indeed young families put off having children for many years before they have their first child. That was, I suppose, part of the Conservative policy of the past four years, that we're responsible for and you are going to solve it. Well, how are you going to solve that? Are you going to take the pill away? Are you going to do away with planned parenthood and roll over whatever the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing all of the member's remarks. If he would direct his remarks into the microphone in front of him we could all hear him.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, that presents a problem. I was used to the end seat where I could kind of wander around a little bit more and have more freedom of movement.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying and suggesting to honourable members opposite, that they take this opportunity at Private Members to shed some of their partisanship and in this case — and I don't know why I should be giving honourable members this advice — the question of how school boards handle the difficult problems of allocation of their resources, of how they deal and cope with the disruption that takes place when schools have to be closed for one reason or other within a community, why they wouldn't want to share that burden in a nonpartisan way with all members of the Legislature, is beyond me. But from the nature of some of the comments that I've heard that seems to be the case.

The Minister of Elmwood simplifies the problem even further. He says the whole problem is there because of Conservative economic policies, that we didn't create sufficient jobs to keep certain families living and residing in Manitoba, that that was a problem. Well, of course, there's an element of truth to that. But, Mr. Speaker, that denies the demographic figures that are available to us, of what's happening in the 1980s in terms of population growth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I should place on the record — it seems honourable members opposite have a tendency of doing this from time to time — my particular credentials to speak on a Resolution having to do with education stem from the simple fact that I started off my adult life as a teacher long before I thought of politics, long before I thought of cattle ranching, having spent 10 or 12 years in such glamorous occupations as advertising, selling of water pumps and concrete mixtures, my first full-time employment was as a

teacher.

I taught up in whose constituency, perhaps the Honourable Member for St. George up at Fisher Bay, at a small school very much like the school that was described by the Member for Morris, seven grades with 30 children at the tender age of 17, I was. That was the year when education had not been exposed to the progressive forces of a Conservative administration, that during the Sixties — laugh my friend — during the Sixties virtually revolutionized education in this province, that in my area alone in the Interlake by Order-in-Council we closed 186 one-room schools and we took a lot of political flack for that because we felt it had to be done, and I was part of an administration that I was proud of, the Roblin administration that did that.

But, Mr. Speaker, times have changed. I was then employed directly out of this building, working for the Department of Education for the grand sum of \$4.00 per day. I only got that if I sent in a registry at the end of the month of school attendance, every month and with the \$4.00 I might add, Mr. Speaker, I was my own caretaker. I had to light the fire in the school. The school needed cleaning out, I had to do all my own cleaning out. I don't want to embarrass the Honourable Member for St. Boniface because in it there could be some reason why he changed his politics — this was under the Liberal administration in those days — that was awaiting for this bright new look at education that the Sixties provided.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Resolution provides for an opportunity to do precisely what the mover of the Resolution said, and I would ask you to take the time to read his comments. The Resolution isn't being forced here to embarrass the government; it's quite frankly a situation where there will be more losers than winners for all concerned and I'm not saying that in a political sense. It's just that anything that changes, anything that is disruptive, as closing certain schools down, accommodating new curriculum is a very difficult job and what the Member for Tuxedo is attempting to do is to show some understanding and some compassion for those who are principally charged with that responsibility, namely our school division trustees. I suggest that the Minister of Education has chosen to ignore that good advice, the advice of setting up a task force which could have been a multi-party task force, which could have shouldered some of the responsibilities in this question, but the Minister of Education in her own way politely rejected that advice, has amended the constitution to strike out such references to that task force to study this and to include that all in the study that she has talked about as currently underway.

Mr. Speaker, that of course is her prerogative and that's the prerogative of the Opposition to do so, but I think the discussion that we've had on this Resolution, and I think any careful reading of this Resolution and the contradictions made by different members, the Member for Morris, the Member for River Heights the other day, all the member speakers, certainly the mover, the Member for Tuxedo, the Member for Kirkfield Park; they have been contributions in that vein. You have not heard from our side, at least those comments that I've heard from our side, an attempt to suggest that it is the present government's fault, it's

the present government's total responsibility in trying to resolve these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's difficult for socialists to accept that anybody other than they in a central role of planning can offer guidance and can offer some support to a very important subject matter such as education. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the next decade, for a number of the reasons that can only be really plumbed to their full depth by the kind of task force that my colleague suggests, are going to be some very difficult times for our education system. The appropriate share of funding, the changing curriculum requirements in themselves can be disruptive, and you can leave all such problems of language problems or relationship of a French-English question out of this. Just the question of how do you accommodate the desire on the part of parents to make sure their children have access to certain curriculum can be very disruptive.

The Honourable Minister has on her desk of this kind of school allocation in an area just east of the city here which I wish her well to try to resolve. What I suggest has come about as a result of this resolution before us is that they are saying they need no help. They are saying, as the Member for Dauphin says, it was all our fault, the Conservative's fault that education has problems today and that the NDP will solve it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of admiration in the Member for Dauphin's abilities and his aspirations. I have no doubt that he will in many ways distinguish himself in this Chamber, but I really and truly am looking at a superman if he and his colleagues believe that they can, in a partisan way, resolve the problems that have been outlined in this resolution.

I would ask the government, I would ask the honourable members opposite — I say this particularly to the newer members. We do engage in it and that's part of the adversary system of those who are in government and those who are out, but I think particularly inasmuch as this being the first Private Member's Resolution before us and I say for the second time, I'm not saying this in any patronizing way, but as one of the older members in the Chamber, I'm simply pointing out that this is a tool and a means of discussing matters of mutual concern under less partisan conditions. It is a Private Member's Resolution; it does not require a formal government response. It does not require clicking-of-the-heels attention by all backbenchers of the government to respond in one way or another to a particular subject matter that's raised.

We, of course, on this side don't have to respond to any Executive Council. It's easier for us to have a diversity of opinions, easier for us to raise a greater profusion, if you like, of resolutions. I invite honourable members to take advantage of the tradition of this Chamber that Private Members' Hour gives us as individual members, as 57 members, and to regard that opportunity as one that they can allow their own personal feelings to come to the full fore without necessarily the party whips being exercised, without necessarily the ministerial prerogatives being exercised. It is precisely as the resolution states in its final word, a suggestion that the government consider the advisability of doing something. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the Honourable Member for Elmwood and it scares the living daylights out of me because I do agree with some of the things that he said. I'm a little disappointed though because we have a rule in this Legislature about referring to members in debate in a degrading manner and the remark that was made concerning the pumpkin kind of bothered me, particularly when there's one member on the government side who's got one hidden under his jacket.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wonder whether you could check the record and determine whether I said bumpkin or pumpkin?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa may proceed.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Thank you. I rise to speak on this Resolution inasmuch as there are many interesting facets that have to be taken into consideration. First of all, I'll establish my position. I have no relatives on the St. Boniface School Board; I have no intention of buying any property in the St. Boniface school area; I do not have any friends who are going to be able to gain any financial gain through the closing of any schools. I think if there's going to be any criticism as to my position it won't be for my association with any relatives and property sales.

But I would just like to read a notice that was in the newspaper concerning houses for sale. In its title at the very top it says "French Immersion - 4 bedroom, 2 storey, 1-½ bathroom, attached garage, recreation room, one owner since new," and it goes on. It is selling that bit of property in the St. Boniface area and capitalizing on the location close to a school. It doesn't matter whether it's a French Immersion School or it's an English School or otherwise but they are capitalizing on that particular aspect. There are many others that capitalize on that type of an aspect, which proves that people buy houses close to schools so that their children will have an opportunity to go to those schools, and they make their plans years in advance. It hurts them financially when these plans are changed through no power of their own, but because of declining enrolment and shifts in the type of programs being offered in a particular area. I think that these people should be protected once they've bought their property in a particular area.

First of all before we go any further, I have no criticism, or very little criticism of the St. Boniface School Board in their decision to close some of the schools. I think when the facts are laid on the table, that they had to make a decision based on the finances that were available to them and their decision was based strictly on financial matters. As a matter of fact I have a letter from one party in the St. Boniface area and I just want to read one part of it on how the decision was made to close some of the schools.

"The decision reached by the trustees on March 10, 1982, was by their own admission, based solely on economic considerations." We've got to remember that. We all agree we must work together. I'm not here

to criticize the government — (Interjection) — not yet, I'm not here to criticize them as I've already mentioned to the Minister. I think the Minister has got an open door to her office and she's able to listen to the people who come to make presentations. I would hope that the people from my area have made their presentations to the Minister and she has listened.

But I do find it a little repulsive to find out that everything wrong with the school system is to be blamed on the previous administration. There's no reason to do it, I support you and if you want to really blame the previous administration, go ahead and do so. But remember that it's going to come back to haunt you because now is the time that we've got to do something concerning the keeping open of some of these schools and the whole of the school system in the St. Boniface area.

Now, I'm talking about the school system in the St. Boniface area because that is my constituency, part of it is my constituency and I'm protecting my interests and the interests of the people that I represent. That's correct, Southdale, there's a school closing in Southdale; there's a school closing in Windsor Park; there's another one closing — it's being converted and we've already lost some schools, the Howden School — but there are many schools closing in the whole of the area and I hope that the Honourable Member for Radisson is going to get up and support my position on this.

The Honourable Minister has been able to come up with special grants, particularly — and I'll go to the Transcona area — where they felt that they were not being considered in a proper manner because of the funding that went to the Transcona area, and the Honourable Minister came up with special grants to assist Transcona, St. Boniface, River East, I realize that. The Minister is to be commended. But it's been from pressure being brought to bare and from her own considerations also.

These special grants have to be made from the heart, not just from the financial consideration. We have to keep some of these schools open because the community revolves around these schools. Once a school is closed it's like breaking glass, you can put it back together but there's always that crack, there's always that problem, it's never the same. In the Jewish marriage vows they break a glass because there's the proof of it. You can put it back together but you can't make it exactly the same as the original and the original in my area is good. But the Minister has to help the School Board to make that decision to keep those schools open.

The schools have special programs which I'm sure will be lost forever if the schools close, even for a short time. They've got day care centres, and I'm most aware of it. They've got after school lunch programs all to the benefit of the community. They look after the special students. The special students have to be transferred from one school to the next, to the next. It's happened twice now with the closing of the Howden School in my area, I'm sorry, in the area of The Honourable Member for Radisson — but I'm just going to take the St. Boniface area — the Howden School was closed and the special students were moved to one area to another school, and to another. They're quite happy now where they are but it's a



traumatic experience moving these people. We've got to give them something stable so they know what's going to happen in the future, not just today and tomorrow, or next year, or the year after, but for at least a five-year program.

We have schools bearing beautiful names in remembrance to people that were there in the past. Two of the schools — well I'd be even happy if there was an Ed Schreyer School in my area, but there isn't. We have a William Russell School which is —(Interjection)—well I'm sure that there will be but I'm not going to go into that. There is a William Russell School which is now the School Board Office, well respected men and thank goodness even though they've closed the school it is still the School Board Office and its still referred to as the William Russell School Office.

There's the Howden, there's the VanBelleghem —(Interjection)—, is there a Bernie Wolfe School? I didn't know that. Anyway there's a VanBelleghem School which is to be closed; there's a Prendergast School which is to be closed; all respected names from way back in the history of St. Boniface. I don't want to see the area lose the value of having these schools with these names that are to be well remembered.

I think that if a special grant is given to the St. Boniface school area and I am asking the Minister, please consider it. You can't tell the St. Boniface School Board what to do. Make it available to them, let them make the decision. They are our elected representatives there. Let them make the decision but at least give them the opportunity of making the decision with the background of having that financial strength behind them. The only one who can do that is the Honourable Minister. So, I plead with the Honourable Minister, please give them that opportunity.

I've got a couple of letters here, I'm not going to read the letters because the Minister has copies of these letters. I've got copies. It all says the same thing. Save our school; do what's right; do what's best; don't turn one group of people against another by closing one school and converting to another area. We have many programs, all excellent programs in our area and I've been a strong supporter of the Immersion Program from way back. But it's never harmed the other programs and I wouldn't want to see it ever happen where the Immersion Program harms the other programs and I can see where it possibly can at this point. There is a junior high school in the Windsor Park area in the Honourable Member for Radisson's area, and it's an all-English junior high school and we must keep that English junior high school. Right now, I believe that the plans are to convert it to an immersion high school. We cannot lose the junior high school because there has to be that transition point for the kids from primary school before they reach high school. I've heard all kinds of junk about how you don't need a junior high school because you can go K-8 and then 9-12. That's baloney. There's no proof that has ever said that the junior high school is not required. They don't have one in Southdale, but it doesn't matter. The people in Windsor Park have an English junior high school and they want an English junior high school. Its got many programs, its got band and home ec and all of these different type of

programs that they wouldn't have if they went to a high school. They've got it in the junior high school. It's well organized and I would like to see that junior high school remain as an English junior high school. But it's going to require some additional funds so that we can provide the immersion group with a high school in the area.

I don't have any costs to throw at the Honourable Minister or the people in the government. I don't have any costs and I don't care about the costs. The important thing is the people in this area should have some decision as to what their school system is. They've elected a board to look after their decision-making powers and they can't do it because they don't have the financial strength to do it. Please, Madame Minister, give them that financial strength.

There is one other point and I guess I've got about what — ten mintues, five minutes? Well, I've got five minutes and you know everytime I get up to talk —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. ENNS:** I believe the Minister of Education is disconcerting the Honourable Member for Niakwa by her very rapt attention that she is providing.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Did the honourable member have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member should continue his speech.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Thank you very much. To the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, when I need any help from either my side or their side, I'll rattle the chain but at this point, and it's mostly reference to their side, not ours. You know what I recall, Mr. Speaker, the old toilets, you know with the big water closets that they had and then when they pull the chain how the toilet would flush. I'm just reminiscing a little bit but I will get back.

The Resolution, I'm going to before I —(Interjection)—that's right, I guess you've got to talk on the Resolution. I've got to go back a little ways to a remark made yesterday by the Honourable First Minister where — I guess we're all looking to pass the buck and find somebody to blame for. The First Minister sat over on that side and you can't make reference to members in debates in degrading manner, but he sat over in his chair and he pointed across and he said, "They sat on their rears, Mr. Speaker, for four years, they sat on their rears." They weren't really making reference to members but sort of, and I thought well maybe on a point of privilege I should call the Honourable First Minister for making a remark. Then I thought, well, if I do that and he was found to be ruled out of order then I can't make the same remark so I thought I better just keep quiet because I've got a remark that's going to be similar and I can't be ruled out of order because the Honourable First Minister wasn't ruled out of order.

Now, I had marked on the amendment on the pro-

posed resolution where it stated that there was no great hurry as to when all of this was going to come into effect because there was something about a year, and I can't find it because I didn't mark it on here but I know there was the term of a year and I think that's going to be too long, Madame Minister because as I'd mentioned before, it can't be a year, it can't even be a month. It has to be now, because as I've stated before once that school is closed or those schools are closed and I've already had two in that area that have closed, and I'm fighting to keep what are left open. I'm not asking to reopen the others but I'm fighting to keep the two that are planned to be closed, open. You can't let it go longer than a couple of days because once the decision is made the teachers are being transferred from one place to another, the students are being moved from one to another, 14 out of 18 schools are involved. We've got to make the change now, if there is going to be a change. The Minister might just throw up her hands in the air and say let's blame the St. Boniface School Board, let them be responsible but we can't do that. We know that this situation can be corrected with a few dollars. We know that it can be corrected and I would ask the Honourable Minister, please contact the St. Boniface School Board, let them know, not in a year's time, but right away.

Maybe the Honourable Minister when she is speaking on this, again at a later time might be able to say I've already made this decision, maybe the money is already been allocated, and I would be so happy and I would say that we've got an Honourable Minister of Education that has been at least as good as the one that we had before — at least — because we had a terrific Minister before. The people in his area decided that they were going to make a change and that's their business but I'm protecting my area. I want the Honourable Minister—(Interjection)—, oh yeah there it is. It says, "Part of the government's one-year review on education financing." To the honourable government, I will not be supporting this Resolution because we can't wait a year. The Honourable Member for Tuxedo came up with a beautiful resolution, but in the wisdom of the Honourable Members of the Government — (Interjection)— Thank you, am I getting the Moses sign again? One minute? To the Honourable Members of Government to take credit, if there was going to be any credit, to change the Resolution when it wasn't necessary; I cannot support the amendment and I will be supporting the original motion.

I ask, again, please, Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable Minister take some action now, not tomorrow but today, and see that this situation, which can be remedied, can be rectified and the people in my area will be so happy. As a matter of fact, the Honourable Minister will be protecting the interests of her own party because right now, if this situation is left the way it is, we'll find out that the whole of the St. Boniface area, that votes in this particular aspect, in the next election we will find that there'll be many changes. The Honourable Member for Radisson who will have put in his four years will not be entitled to his pension because he'll be gone and I would ask the Honourable Minister, please protect the Honourable Member for Radisson and his pension and do something for the people in our area. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Tuxedo will be closing debate.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could call it 5:30. We started early and we've been almost an hour in debate and I wonder if we could call it 5:30. I don't wish to have my remarks split if that's possible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If it is the will of the House. Is it the will of the House to call it 5:30? The Resolution will then stand open and any member wishing to speak to it next time may do so.

With the agreement that the members will reconvene in committee this evening at 8:00 p.m., the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)