



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 9 - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 19, 1991

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 4—The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 4, The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health, I believe, would like to table the message of His Honour.

Mr. Orchard: On Bill 4, I would like to table the message from His Honour.

Bill 5—The Mental Health Amendment Act

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 5, The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

* (1335)

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon from the Killarney School, thirty Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of David Lym. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose).

Also this afternoon, from the Forest Park School, we have twenty-five Grades 4 and 5 students. They are under the direction of Louise Kneller. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board Buyer Removal

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, last November 26 I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) whether he was pressuring the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board to remove their buyer from the auction that is held each day for the sale of hogs in this province. The minister responded by saying, at that time in the House, and I quote: we are not taking any sides on this issue. He also said, we are trying to act as an intermediary, trying to find a resolution that both sides can agree to, whatever it might be. He also went on to say that governments in western provinces got heavy-handed and tried to manipulate the process, and we are not going to do that.

I ask the Premier of this province why he has contradicted his Minister of Agriculture, because in fact the Premier has taken sides, and he has directed the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board to remove their buyer contrary to the best interests of producers of this province?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, that is nonsense.

Mr. Plohman: This is the kind of cavalier answer we get, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Hog Marketing Board in Manitoba have advised me that, not only has the Minister of Agriculture, but also, shamefully, the Premier, in the presence of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) and the Minister of Agriculture, directed the Hog Board to remove their buyer, which essentially protects the producers by establishing a reserve bid on hogs to be sold in this province.

I ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, why has he interfered in the operations of a marketing board that has been in place for nearly 20 years? This is unprecedented in the 20 years that the Hog Marketing Board has been in place. Why has he interfered by demanding that they remove their buyer from the auction?

Mr. Filmon: At no time, and there were many, many witnesses, did I ever make such a demand whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, and the member is persisting in putting on the record false information. He ought to be ashamed of himself. This is no way for anybody who is elected as a public representative to conduct the affairs of their responsibilities. It is absolutely untrue.

Mr. Plohman: Well, we will see, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that this Premier—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the member for Dauphin has been in this House for 10 years. He knows fully well that he is not allowed to editorialize on a comment or an answer given by a member of the Treasury bench, or to post-amble on his supplementary questions, and I would ask you to bring him to attention, bring him to order and ask him to state his question now.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the honourable government House leader.

* (1335)

Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board Buyer Removal

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Natural Products Marketing Council has audited the actions and the work of the Hog Marketing Board and determined that, at their request, in fact they are operating in a fair and equitable manner, and it recommended that they should retain their buyer on the board, I ask this minister, why has the Premier of this province taken sides against the producers by demanding that they remove their buyer contrary to the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The member for Dauphin is deliberately ignoring the response to the previous question in which I said unequivocally, I had not made any such demand to the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board, none whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. He deliberately insists on repeating that falsehood.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable the First Minister did not have a point of order, a dispute over the facts. The question has been put.

* * *

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): It is rather reprehensible that the member for Dauphin continues to put misinformation on the record. Indeed he just did it again. He is right in one context that we had a review done by the Natural Products Marketing Council, but they did not "recommend," as the word he used, that the buyer remain on the board.

We have been in consultation with the board for many months. We have an ongoing process at working out a relationship that keeps the buyers satisfied and the sellers satisfied, and that process of discussion is ongoing, and I am pleased to report it has gained some degree of progress over time with regard to an agreement between the two sides around the buyer on the boards, but I remind all members of this House that the Natural Products Market Council did not recommend, as the member said, that the buyer stay on.

City Council Reduction Impact Inner-City

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Last night I attended part of the hearings of the ward boundaries review commission in city centre Fort Rouge. Mr. Speaker, the most important message which came through last night is that the people of this part of the inner city, organizations and individuals do not want to lose their councillor or their political voice.

I would like to ask the Minister of Urban Affairs: Has he considered the consequences for the inner city of his instructions to the Eldon Ross committee, and has he conducted any research to examine the impact of the reduction of City Council on the poorest people in our community?

* (1340)

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, firstly let me say that the Ross commission, the commission dealing with ward reviews in the city of Winnipeg is under no instructions from myself. They are free and capable of reaching a conclusion based on the information that is provided to them through the public hearing process.

Secondly, it is the first campaign promise made by the Premier that we would reduce the size of council. If that is the question that I think my honourable friend put, that answer is, the size of City Council will be reduced when a bill is introduced in this Legislature and passed. The introduction of the bill will occur at some point after the commission has had an opportunity to conduct all of its public hearings and to make a report to myself.

Ms. Friesen: I would like to table some current research which looks at the distribution of low income families in Winnipeg. It is a series of maps which shows very clearly that the reduction in City Council which the Eldon Ross committee is considering, severely affects the representation of inner city people, no matter whether they are drawn in pie-shaped wards or based on community committee boundaries.

My question to the minister is: Will he now admit that this government policy is a deliberate attempt to reduce the costs of the inner city by destroying its political voice?

Mr. Ernst: I think that statement just made in the form of a question by the member for Wolseley shows her naivete in terms of what happens at City Hall.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the representation is the subject of a public hearing process at the moment. Once that public hearing process is concluded there will be a report made to myself, and we will be subsequently introducing a bill into the Legislature dealing with that particular issue. At that time there will be an opportunity for all of us—myself included—to debate the issue.

Ward Boundary Commission Mandate

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my final question is: Will the minister commit himself to examine the research that I have presented, to listen to the voice of the inner city and to redirect the mandate of the wards boundary review commission?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to accept any information that the honourable member wishes to table and provide to me in this process. I will consider it along with all other information that is available, and then we will make a decision and bring forward a bill.

Environmental Protection Public Confidence

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment.

The minister's response to my questions yesterday about the reason MTS was not prosecuted for failing to comply with environment act improvement orders for some eight years was troubling indeed. The minister in essence said, why would we prosecute a Crown corporation, because to do so would be—and in his quote—a bit of pulling the navel lint. Well, Mr. Speaker, that answer misses the point entirely. Anyone who knows the issues knows that full well.

* (1345)

How does this government and this minister propose to convince the Manitoba public to have any confidence in his government's willingness and ability to protect the environment when they are unwilling to hold a Crown corporation to the same standard that they asked the private sector to be held to, precisely at a time when this government is proposing to send another Crown corporation, Manitoba Hydro, into the north to do a multibillion-dollar project with potentially enormous environmental hazards?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, first of all we have seen that this MTS situation was not dealt with for some six or seven years by the previous administration. When my predecessor came to office he recognized that this needed to be cleaned up. Compliance orders were issued to have MTS clean up this site plus about 10 others that needed to be brought into compliance with the regulation.

Unfortunately, as the member, being of legal training, probably would acknowledge, the regulation was not written in such a way that justice could advise that they could proceed with compliance.

I want to make it perfectly clear that it is the position of myself and this government that any

Crown corporation must lead in the protection of the environment, and we will see that happens.

Manitoba Telephone System Fuel Oil Spill - Prosecution

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): I appreciate those words, but actions speak louder than words.

The minister has now had a chance to review the opinion of Mr. Conklin, who is the government's lawyer, on this matter. I would ask the minister why he did not prosecute when he had the chance, given that those memos do not recommend against prosecution. In fact, all they do is ask for further details and suggest that prosecution is available to the government.

Why did they not do it when they had the chance?

Hon. Glen Cummlings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the advice still appears to be that going to court would not have resulted in a successful charge.

I think what the public needs to be concerned about—what I must be concerned about is to make sure that we have the hazard to the environment cleaned up, that the proper expenditures are put in place, that actions are taken and that precautionary procedures and equipment are put in place. That was what we undertook to do. That was accomplished. I believe we now have a recognition on the part of MTS that they must live up to that standard.

Manitoba Telephone System Fuel Oil Spill - Prosecution

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Finally for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System, this minister's response to the questions yesterday was also troubling. He threw up his hands and he said, I knew nothing—I know nothing. I remember Al Mackling saying that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, has this minister got a handle on MTS or not, and if he thinks he does, how does he explain not knowing about their flagrant breach of 11 improvement orders for over eight years?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for the administration of The Manitoba Telephone Act): Mr. Speaker, the episode that the member relates to happened in 1982. For six years the former administration was in charge. They did nothing; they sat on the issue. The previous administration

ignored the order. In 1988 the Manitoba Telephone System acted on the order, and the 11 sites are now meeting all the environmental standards.

Universities Tuition Fee Waivers

Mr. Gerry McAlpine (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I had some very shocking news for me today, and I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Education.

My question is: Can the minister confirm if it is correct that children of full-time employees are exempt from paying all tuition and student fees at all universities in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, it is true that over a number of years a situation has emerged at the universities, as a result of negotiations, whereby tuition fees for faculty member spouses and dependents are either waived or refunds are allowed for faculty members and for support staff. Although the situation is not the same in all of the universities, in some cases 100 percent of tuition fees are waived and in other circumstances there is a refund especially in the case of support workers where tuition fees are reimbursed after completion of courses. So in a nutshell, yes, that is the fact.

Mr. McAlpine: My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell us how many students we are talking about who are getting this special consideration and what impact that has on the budget of the Department of Education?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I would have to indicate that is a decision that is made at the university level and is not something that is mandated by the Department of Education in any way, shape or form. I would have to say that I do not have the figures at hand as to the numbers of students who are involved in this situation, and I do not have the impact but I can certainly get that information.

* (1350)

ESL Program Funding

Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my questions are education related. The first is for the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship.

As of one o'clock this afternoon I have been advised that no word had been received from

Winnipeg School Division No. 1 with respect to the continuation of the funding of the ESL program. Can the minister confirm when that notification will be made and how much that money will entail?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, that information will first be delivered to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 before that information is given to the opposition or to the media.

Universities Funding

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Education. Another campaign promise of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) was, in 1988 the province was committed to funding universities at the rate of inflation or better. Based on that, can the minister confirm that the universities will receive a grant this year at the rate of inflation of 6.8 percent or better?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, during that election campaign commitment I have to say that following that campaign commitment, indeed when we were in office during that mandate, we not only lived up to that commitment but surpassed it. So indeed we not only lived up to our commitment, but we enhanced funding to universities beyond the level that we had committed.

During the last campaign we indicated that we would make as much support available to universities as was possible given the circumstances of the economy of this province. That still is true, and we will endeavour to afford to give the universities as much as possible given the kind of economic restraints this province is suffering under.

Tuition Fee Increases

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is to the same minister.

If the province does to universities what it has done to school divisions, will that not mean that the GFT will impact on tuition fees to entail increases of 15, 20 and perhaps 25 percent?

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I clearly heard the member

put the question in a hypothetical fashion. He would surely know that question is out of order and I would ask you to have him redraw it.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the honourable government House leader. The honourable member's question -(interjection)- order, please. I would ask the honourable member to kindly rephrase his question, please.

* * *

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, will the minister acknowledge that no increase to universities will result in tuition fee increases of 15, 20 and 25 percent.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, once again the member opposite who is the critic for Education is fearmongering because he does not understand the process that is taking place right now. Universities are in fact trying to strike their budgets and are going through their budgets to see where it is they can trim and set priorities in the best way that they possibly can.

The funding to universities has not been announced. It would be premature for the member opposite to suppose what that funding level might be. Indeed I ask him to be patient and wait until that announcement is made. At that point in time the universities will be in a better position to set their tuition fees.

Small Business Government Initiatives

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, one of the first acts of the government in 1988 when this government took over was to eliminate the business development department which looked after the interests of small business. This government has continued to provide corporate tax breaks and corporate support to the large corporate elite in the province.

My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, who is now appearing in television ads promoting Canada Safeway. My question is: Is this relationship preventing the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism from protecting the interests of small business that are being run out of business by predatory pricing being practised by Canada Safeway?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, that is quite the question for my first opportunity to rise in responding to a question in the House.

In case the honourable member has not noticed, in terms of the promotion of the World Curling Championships that are taking place in Winnipeg starting this Friday, which will bring some \$25 million economic benefit—

* (1355)

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stefanson: If he has paid close attention, I am sure he has seen other ads with the Premier of our province, the mayor of our city and people throughout this province promoting that event, both on the basis of the major economic benefit and what it will mean to this city and province in terms of international recognition.

In terms of support for business, we have support programs. We have a business development support program for the starting up of small businesses. I certainly take pride in what we are trying to accomplish in the department that I represent. We work with all business throughout this province, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Speaker, a good corporate citizen does not break the law and price goods unreasonably low, in effect subsidizing substantially less than competition in the marketplace. I spoke today with the owner of Foodland—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Put your question, please.

Mr. Storle:—who is facing bankruptcy and loss of business because of the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Trade Practices Act Canada Safeway Investigation

Mr. Jerry Storle (Filn Flon): My question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism: Will he act now to establish an inquiry under The Trade Practices Inquiry Act to investigate the allegation that Canada Safeway is attempting to bankrupt a small independent grocer? Will he do that?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): If the honourable member has some very specific information relative to a specific charge, which I am not aware of at this particular

point in time, I would be pleased to look into it if he will provide me with the details.

In terms of the issues of bankruptcies, I certainly want to put on the record with this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that we are all concerned with job losses, bankruptcies in this province, and our department is working with industry and business throughout this province in terms of making sure we minimize that impact here in this province. I want to remind the honourable member, when he starts talking about bankruptcies, well, none of us is pleased with what we see occurring in this province relative to bankruptcies.

In terms of how we compare to the rest of Canada, that is the only good news; we are faring much better than the rest of Canada. While bankruptcies in Manitoba are running at some 16 percent, this is the third lowest among provinces throughout Canada compared to the national increase to 43 percent. So, while that is still not good news, if you look at the fact that there is a recession, that some honourable members in this Chamber do not seem to be aware of, they realize that relatively Manitoba is doing reasonably well.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Dyck, the owner of Foodland in Fort Richmond, believes the predatory pricing is being practised against him and that will drive him out of business.

My question therefore is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism: Will he now undertake to instruct officials in government to begin the investigation of the third consecutive week of predatory pricing being practised by Safeway in the city of Winnipeg?

Mr. Stefanson: I have indicated that Mr. Dyck has not been in correspondence with me or our department. I am not sure if he has been in correspondence with any other department of our government. If I get the specific information from Mr. Dyck or the honourable member provides it to me, I will certainly look into it, Mr. Speaker.

Racist Literature Investigation

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I have a question for the Attorney General today.

Unfortunately, racism is alive and well in our community. In the last few days multicultural organizations have been receiving hate literature

which in some instances has been targeted at individuals. This hate literature has included pictures of burning crosses and individuals who appear to be wearing the hood of the Ku Klux Klan. Under normal circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would table the document, but because of its, what I view as such poor taste, I will refrain from tabling the document, but I will send a copy of it over to the Attorney General's right after asking the question.

My question is for the minister: Has his department received any of these copies of the hate literature from any of the affected groups, and what action has his department taken on this matter?

* (1400)

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I have not viewed personally the material the honourable member refers to, although I have had it brought to my attention by my department. I should like to encourage anyone who is in receipt of that kind of material to bring that particular incident to the attention of police authorities in whatever jurisdiction they reside, whether it be the city of Winnipeg or in RCMP jurisdictions, for investigation.

There has been an investigation going on for some time with regard to racist activities in Manitoba. That matter has not been finalized to this point.

Manitoba Intercultural Council Anti-Racism Recommendations

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): My supplementary question is to the Minister of Culture and Heritage.

In October of last year, the Manitoba Intercultural Council submitted to the Minister a report on combatting racism in Manitoba. The report offered both short- and long-term solutions. Some of the recommendations could have been acted on immediately, such as Clause 1(b) which states: the government of Manitoba provide—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster, kindly put your question now, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, my question is: Can the Minister tell us today what recommendations, if any, her and her administration have acted upon?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): I thank my honourable

friend for that question. As a matter of fact, I have just responded to the Manitoba Intercultural Council with a letter with the short-term initiatives that are ongoing throughout government and a process to put in place some of the longer term strategies.

Mr. Speaker, if I can just read some excerpts from that letter. We have had the interdepartmental committee on multicultural affairs review all of the short-term recommendations with reference to implementation. The results of that review have been presented to the Multicultural Affairs Committee of cabinet to put into the implementation process.

Our government does indeed recognize the significance of cross-cultural education in an effort to minimize racial discrimination. Many departments throughout government at the direction, of course, of this government and ministers of this government have made cross-cultural training programs available to their staff, either as a departmental function or through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Speaker, in providing cross-cultural orientation and training to staff, under the Minister of Health's direction, we have established a Multicultural Health Advisory Committee and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has also named a cross-cultural mental health specialist to its staff.

Mr. Speaker, I have several other initiatives and maybe I could continue on with the next question.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister will table it after citing from the letter, and would be happy to table the letter.

Manitoba Human Rights Commission Staffing Levels

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): My supplementary question is for the Attorney General.

Another short-term recommendation that was mentioned from the MIC's report was that the government of Manitoba provide additional staffing and other resources to the Manitoba Human Rights Commission in order to deal with the unacceptable backlog of complaints dealing with racism.

My question to the Attorney General is: Does this government agree with Clause 2(a), and if it does, when will we see additional resources allocated out to the Manitoba Human Rights Commission?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I agree, Mr. Speaker, that governments right across this country should be taking whatever steps are possible to prevent the kind of disgusting material the honourable member sent across to me from being distributed across this province or across this country, and even most hurtfully and hatefully to individuals in our society. There is no place for that in our province. We have made that known repeatedly.

We have investigated vigorously complaints that have been made. We have found though in some cases that it is a very difficult thing to link some of this hateful material with a perpetrator, because these perpetrators are criminals, and criminals have a habit of attempting to avoid detection.

That is one of the problems that we have, but I can tell the honourable member the question he raises with respect to the Human Rights Commission and the funding of the services provided by the Human Rights Commission are issues that are before the government now as we prepare for the coming fiscal year.

Lake Winnipegosis Cormorant Population Control

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

The minister is well aware of the depleting fish stocks in Lake Winnipegosis. One of the problems that has been identified is the cormorant, which was protected when its numbers were very low.

However, the Fisheries department now indicates that there are over 200,000 birds of that species on the lake, and those birds consume from a pound to two pounds of fish per day. This has a tremendous impact on the fish stock in the lake.

Can the minister tell this House what he is prepared to do with the large number of birds on this lake at this time?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): The member is correct. There has been a very dramatic growth in the populations of cormorants in the area that she speaks of on Lake Winnipegosis. Fish biologists now have confirmed that they believe that they are in fact impacting on the fisheries in Winnipegosis.

I am pleased to indicate to her that my department is co-operating with the Canadian Wildlife Service, the Department of Environment—my colleague's responsibility—as well as my own department in devising a control program that hopefully will exercise some control on that burgeoning population of cormorants.

We have a difficulty in that there are some other species involved that are on the endangered species list or threatened list, like the pelican and some other shore birds that exist with the same cormorant population. So indiscriminate killing or slaughtering of the birds is an approach that the department is not prepared to take.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) would find this a laughing matter when his department put out a news release saying that the cormorant was a diseased bird and could spread disease to domestic birds. It can also spread disease to pelicans, gulls and all other wild species.

Will the Minister of Natural Resources take this information into consideration when he is looking at putting some control on the cormorant since it can have an impact on agriculture as well as the fishing industry?

Mr. Enns: I was just agreeing with the speech that she just made, but I did not detect a question in it.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, if I can repeat my question, I asked the minister if he would take into consideration this information that the birds are diseased. Also will he meet with the fishermen of Duck Bay and Winnipegosis and listen to their stories about these birds dying on the street? Your memos tell us—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, we welcome all information, and certainly that information will be passed on through to the department.

I can only assure her that not only my department but the Canadian Wildlife Service is assisting us in trying to come up with some solution to the problems that she identifies.

Fishermen Consultations

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question to the same minister is: How quickly can we set up a meeting with the fishermen

on Lake Winnipegosis to deal with this problem and other problems that fishermen are facing on the lake?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): I understand that senior departmental staff are meeting with the fishermen in question in the very next little while. Certainly, if further to those staff meetings there is a desire or request to meet with the ministry, I would be more than pleased to have my office arrange such a meeting.

* (1410)

Health Care System Nursing Layoffs

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, over the past week and as recently as yesterday, the Minister of Health has dismissed concerns brought to this House, that nurses were facing imminent layoffs, that nursing positions were being lost to support staff, that beds were about to be closed to accommodate the inadequate funding policy of this government.

Today the Minister of Health has received a letter from the Manitoba Nurses' Union which represents caregivers on the front line, expressing the very same concern about the effect of this government's initiatives on patient care.

So I want to ask the Minister of Health if, on the basis of that letter, he can assure nurses, Manitobans and members of this House that layoffs will not be going ahead and that service changes in this area will be planned and will be co-ordinated?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct my honourable friend on one small error in her question. I received the letter yesterday. The letter deals with many rumours about, and I can indicate to you that some of those rumours about in this Chamber and are abounded by the present questioner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that I can indicate to my honourable friend, the official opposition Health critic, is that there will be substantial co-operation, substantial planning, and substantial co-ordination amongst the Winnipeg hospitals as they face this budget year. We can no longer afford, in the health care system, a circumstance as existed previously where individual institutions would make decisions on their own for their own institution without regard to the system of health care and its

ability to deliver quality health care to the citizens of Manitoba and the residents of the city of Winnipeg.

In that regard, meetings are being held on a regular basis and will continue to be held on a regular basis with the commission and the senior executive of those hospitals as they make budget decisions.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Well, I can forgive the Minister of Health for attacking me on a personal basis and accusing me of fearmongering, but I cannot accept his—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for St. Johns, kindly put your question now, please.

Budget Plans

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Yes, I want to ask the Minister of Health, since his attitude and his comment only set back the possibility of good relations between this government and the nurses of this province, I want to ask him if he will take seriously the request in this letter that the minister says he received yesterday from the Manitoba Nurses' Union, to receive directly from him on an immediate basis his plan of action related to budget reductions and any planned changes in the delivery of health care services?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, you know, I just want to, again, with all due respect, correct my honourable friend. This government, this ministry, this Treasury Board, did not attack the nurses of Manitoba. The only time that the nurses of Manitoba have been attacked and bragged about is when the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), brags about a 3 percent solution settlement with the nurses of Manitoba.

This government worked with the nurses, unfortunately through a strike, and gave them 14 percent, better than 14 percent in a two-year agreement, substantially greater, double the amount that the honourable friend, the Leader of the official Opposition, brags about in his conciliatory attitude toward nurses in Manitoba, 14 percent when revenues grow at zero, a scant 6 percent and even zero from the NDP when revenues were going at 14 percent per year.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: The Premier (Mr. Filmon) yells from his seat that the hospitals make these

decisions. He should know that his Minister of Health—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for St. Johns, kindly put your question now, please.

Ms. Wasylcia-Lels: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very serious matter from the perspective of nurses. I want to ask the Minister of Health if he will give assurances to Manitobans, to nurses and to members of this House that he will not be introducing, moving on the Alberta solution that he threatened during the 31-day nurses strike, a threat that included reduced levels of patient care, layoffs and bed closures?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why we undertook very sincere and serious negotiations, beginning in December and running the course of the month of January, with the nurses of Manitoba, wherein we settled with the most generous settlement in a two-year contract than has been achieved for the previous six consecutive years, all of those agreements being negotiated by the former administration.

In this two-year agreement, there is more than double the money available to the nurses of Manitoba. That recognizes, Mr. Speaker, the case that nurses of Manitoba made, that their services have become relatively undervalued. We recognized that and tried to address that to the best of the financial ability of the province of Manitoba, and it was but one of a number of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Manitoba Horse Racing Commission Jim Moore Appointment

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, over the last number of days we have learned that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) has given an untendered contract worth \$20,000 to a Mr. Jim Moore. The Minister of Environment tells us that Mr. Moore is an expert in recycling, so I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism: Can he tell the House when Mr. Jim Moore was appointed as a commissioner to the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jim Moore was appointed on September 21, 1988.

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the session, the honourable Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity to put a few words on the record with regard to the agriculture industry and maybe comment a little bit on some of the comments that I have heard from other members across the way talking about the industry of agriculture, and the opportunity in agriculture, with regard to accessing world markets.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with pride about the industry of agriculture, what we have done in 100 years of developing this part of the world and converting it from wasteland, grassland, tree-infested land to very highly productive land. This industry has developed because of the leadership of people who have come from all parts of the world, who have come to Canada for an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, people have come from all walks of life all over the world to create an opportunity for themselves and their families in the country of Canada, particularly western Canada. These people have converted prairie lands into productive agricultural lands and put us into a position today where the farmers of Manitoba each feed 250 people. The industry of agriculture creates one job in seven in western Canada.

We are recognized world wide for the quality of food we produce. It does not matter what commodity you want to talk about, we have a recognition of very high quality, if not the highest in the world. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) commented the other day on canola, the recognition it has received and the major new market for us in the United States.

We have developed, through research, the ability to produce a very high quality product because there were some concerns in the commercial industry and by consumers with regard to erucic acids and glucosinolates. The research community

has bred those out of canola, produced a very highly health food oriented kind of vegetable oil that the American market has found fit to sell and develop the market for, but if we sold all our canola to the United States it would make about 3 percent of their total vegetable oil consumption presently in the United States.

Over the last 20 years we have developed a market for canola in Japan. It is our major export market. A second market has developed in Mexico, and certainly a third market is very rapidly developing in the United States.

* (1420)

Another important fact, I think, all consumers in the province of Manitoba and the country of Canada need to keep in mind, is that they are now only spending 11.5 percent to 12.5 percent of their disposable income on food—the lowest in the world. Countries like Sweden, Switzerland, Norway, Finland, countries like that, are spending anywhere from 25 percent to 28 percent of their disposable income on food, where Canadians are spending 11.5 percent to 12.5 percent. It puts us in a very enviable position in terms of having a lot of extra revenue left on which to live without having to just look after the basic necessity for food.

A little statistic that might be important for members to remember when you hear about farmers having some difficulties meeting their needs and being able to cover their costs, not 10 years ago, in 1980, a consumer—for a family of four a basket of food cost around \$68. Ten years later that same basket of food cost \$128, but what is the farmer getting out of that basket of food? Technically and substantially less, in a percentage sense. He now gets six cents out of a loaf of bread, and a loaf of bread costs \$1.40. He gets six cents for the basic ingredient that went into that loaf of bread. He gets one cent out of the beer that goes into a bottle of beer. One cent goes to the producer, so that a lot of people in between the producer and the consumer are extracting a living, and I might say a very good living, out of the industry of agriculture. That is why we have 14 percent of the jobs in Canada created by agriculture.

Agriculture itself is only 2.5 percent of the total population. For every seven jobs created in agriculture, one is really at the farm level, six are somewhere between the farmer and the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, the industry of agriculture contributes a lot of revenue to the Province of Manitoba. Right now the total income at the farm gate is some \$2 billion. It is approximately 50 percent from grains, oilseeds and special crops, and 50 percent from livestock.

In the livestock sector we have reasonable health in most of the commodities. In the supply management sector, they get cost of production plus. There is a limited number of producers able to get into dairy and poultry and turkey production and egg production, but those who are in that club who have the right to produce, have the quota, are making a reasonable return from their labours.

The other sector in livestock, the hog industry and cattle industry are receiving reasonable incomes from the marketplace now. The cattle industry used to be in the doldrums in the early '80s, but in the last five or six years pretty fair incomes are coming to the livestock sector.

In the pork industry, it is an industry that does go up and down, but we have seen tremendous growth in the pork industry in this province in the last 10 years. Ten years ago, we produced about 1 million hogs a year and now we are producing 2 million hogs a year. We are exporting 70 percent of those hogs and bringing back foreign currency into this province by doing that.

We are one of the most aggressive provinces in the country of Canada in terms of expanding hog production, and we have in this province the processing of those hogs. All those hogs, or 98 percent of those hogs are processed in the province of Manitoba, generating hundreds and hundreds of jobs in the processing sector. We are exporting that product into the United States, into the Pacific Rim and several other countries of the world.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

The hog industry has grown because of the leadership that has occurred in that industry not only at the production level but at the processing level. The breeding that has gone into the hogs has created a leaner product, a lower cholesterol product which the consumer wants. We have responded in a very positive way.

The same in the beef industry, leaner animals; grading standards are requiring less finish, less fat on the animal, in other words, lower cholesterol for

the consumer and a very nutritious and high quality product.

As I said at the beginning of my discussion, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have been able to generate a reputation of quality, not only in Manitoba, not only in Canada, but in every country in the world that we are exporting to. There is no doubt in my mind about that, and I think the farm community can be very proud of that.

I have talked briefly about the cattle industry, and now I want to switch over and talk somewhat about the grain industry. I have heard many members mention something in their comments along the way in the last few days about a grain trade war and the trade difficulties we are having in the grain sector, and clearly it is an absolute reality—an absolute reality—and not a reality that is going to go away very quickly.

If we look back through the early 1980s, say 10 years ago, 11 years ago right now, farmers were receiving \$5.50 to \$6 a bushel for wheat, and at that they were living very well. They stimulated the economy because they spent a lot of money, but that has all changed quite drastically.

By 1985, the European Community's actions with regard to putting in place export subsidies started to impact fairly seriously on the marketplace of wheat in the international situation. The European Community did that because they wanted to stimulate food production inside their countries. Once they got food production beyond their consumption, they had to get rid of it somehow, and they decided they would basically dump it on the world market and use export subsidies to do it.

In 1985, the United States decided to retaliate. They were not going to allow the Europeans to steal their market. They decided they would do something about it, so they put an export enhancement program in place. That program was designed to compete with the European community in terms of accessing markets through using export subsidies.

Madam Deputy Speaker, those were the same markets that we are selling into as Canadian exporters, the same markets Australia is selling into, the same markets that Argentina is selling into. They started to depress the price of wheat and export grains to a very significant extent. That has caused not only our prices to collapse over the past few

years, it has caused us to lose some of our market access.

Twenty years ago, Canadian wheat was going into western Europe in very large volumes. Europe became self sufficient, and we lost a lot of that market. Then we started to go into places like China and Russia. We were the first country into China selling wheat; then the United States got in there. Now the European community is in there, and Canadian wheat is now exported to some 60 countries around the world.

We still remain relatively competitive in that market but at a price return to the farm gate right now, Madam Deputy Speaker, of something less than \$3 a bushel. The farm community knows that the cost of production is probably closer to \$4 to \$4.50 a bushel. What do we do in this period of time? How do we resolve the issue? Certainly, the GATT round of discussions has been ongoing since 1986. That round of discussions has elevated agriculture right to the top of the agenda saying that if we do not deal with any trade issue, we must deal with agriculture. Agriculture must be dealt with first and all the other issue areas—some 14 of them—will be dealt with after agriculture is effectively resolved.

Madam Deputy Speaker, those discussions were to have concluded December of 1990; the talks were effectively suspended in December because no resolution could occur amongst over 100 countries at the GATT table. They could not resolve it because the European community refused to come to the table and bargain in good faith.

Those discussions have now gotten back on track a little bit. There have been a number of bilateral and multilateral discussions between countries understanding, starting to realize, that we cannot go on without a rejuvenated GATT agreement and that cannot happen unless agriculture is dealt with. So I am hopeful that in the next few months sometime over the course of 1991, we can start to see some evolution of a more positive desire to resolve the trade disputes that exist between the United States and Europe that impact very directly on many other small exporting countries.

If we do not have that resolution, I think that trade wars will escalate in the future, not only in export grains but in many other agricultural products and possibly additional products that are now exported in the manufacturing sense. Madam Deputy

Speaker, we remain hopeful in Canada that resolution will eventually occur to our betterment, but if the resolution does start in 1991, it probably will be several years before we have enough recovery in grain prices to allow our farmers to get a fair income for the marketplace.

In order to overcome that, we have set up a year ago a task force to deal with safety nets, how they can do a better job of protecting the income at the farm level. The safety net approach was devised by a task force of some 33 people, 19 of whom were farmers. They put forth the GRIP program, and they also talked about a NISA program. The Province of Manitoba is enrolled in the GRIP program designed to protect the price of grain at the farm gate for farmers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, B.C., Ontario and Quebec. Remember, those are the provinces that are presently enrolled in the GRIP program.

I could talk at length about the essence of that agreement, but it has been a long and difficult process of evolution to get that program on the table, and it has involved farmers working with government officials. It has been a very co-operative, consultative approach. Everybody tore their hair out on how we could do an effective job of putting forth a program farmers could enroll in to cushion this period in time until we get a positive resolution in the GATT process. Let us say that I have some confidence that will happen.

* (1430)

Along the way, clearly Europe is still using their export subsidies, clearly restricting market access to their part of the world; the United States has still got a U.S. farm bill in place that has significant export subsidies in place. So we have treasuries of different governments competing with each other in order to sell grain to feed people around the world.

As I look at the issues that agriculture faces right now, we have no problem with ability to produce. We can produce. We can be competitive if we have a level playing field, and we will have to be able to access markets all over the world in the coming years.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I was rather disappointed to hear comments from across the way from a number of people who are anti free trade. They are saying free trade will kill us. Well, I want to put it clearly on the record that agriculture is in favour

of free trade, very strongly in favour because we live and die with it.

With the United States, if you want to use that as an example, we have had free trade in pork, cattle, in grains and machinery for a lot of years, and we have accessed their market at a growing and growing basis. We are selling more high protein red spring wheat; we are selling more durum; we are selling more oats; and we are clearly selling a lot more canola and flax into the United States market. That is our market of the future.

We have a quality product in this country. We have a willing buyer down there, and to say that free trade does not work is slapping agriculture in the face. I am absolutely appalled that so many members over there cannot understand what makes agriculture tick. We want market access, free trade with every country in the world that will do that with us, because we know we could compete and we would be able to make the Manitoba and Canadian farmer stronger as a result of a greater market access and a freer trade.

When I was over in Brussels and I talked with a number of different countries, everybody in agriculture wants to achieve less trade barriers, get rid of the tariffs and allow product to move on a competitive basis on a level playing field.

The fact that the United States put in place a hog countervail against our hogs in 1985, and in 1988 against the fresh chilled and frozen pork was clearly an attempt by the producers of central western United States to keep our product out of their marketplace because they could not compete with us. We had a superior quality product, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The other point that needs to be made is that even with the amount of hogs we have exported to the United States in the last 10 years, we have never exceeded more than 3 percent of their total consumption. So we have not put a large volume of product into their marketplace. We have not disrupted their pricing, there is no question, but yet they put a countervail against us. We have fought that countervail through the Free Trade Agreement which put in place a dispute-settling panel, a mechanism where we could argue our case, and the results of that panel would be binding on both countries.

We have won that case. We have convinced that panel repeatedly that what Canada is doing in terms

of the subsidy programs through the hog industry, whether they are programs in Quebec or programs in Alberta, or whether they are national programs, are not negatively impacting on the market price in the United States. They admit that. So I am very pleased to see that recognition is there.

There will probably be a period of time before the countervail is effectively removed. They are looking at launching a response in an extraordinary sense against Canada. They may do that, but they still have no basis in their argument to say that what we are doing in Canada is negatively impacting on the hog producer in the United States, or disrupting the market for American hogs in any meaningful way.

Certainly, in terms of what has happened since the Free Trade Agreement has been in place, it is fair to say that in agriculture we have exported more cattle, more hogs, more cereal grains and more oilseeds to the United States. I am given the information that over the same period of time, some 50 new processing plants have opened up in Canada, processing primarily for the American market, and there is one that is being built in Portage right now, Can-Oat, a plant built to process oats grown in Manitoba to access the health food market for oats, primarily in the United States, and certainly will sell oats for other purposes, but the market will be in the United States, set up for that reason. About another 54 processing plants have expanded in Canada because they now see better market access in the United States market.

I think that the record of agriculture in terms of being able to competitively produce a product and compete on a level playing field is a well-documented experience that we have achieved in Canada, in Manitoba, and it is appalling that members use clichés about being against free trade because of loss of jobs. That is not true. We create jobs. We create jobs in agriculture production. We want to create more and more jobs in processing. That is why I am pushing very hard toward asking farmers in the agribusiness industry to attempt to move us into more and more diversified products, products for which there is a marketplace somewhere in the world, whether it is in Manitoba or Canada, markets that may mean food consumption, other products that can be put on the food table or other products that can be grown in agriculture from land that can be used in the industrial market.

Certainly one good example—I go back to the canola experience. We started producing a product called rapeseed. It had glucosinolates and erucic acid in it. We bred those out to produce canola for the vegetable oil market, but at the same time, breeding programs were going on to increase the erucic acid content of rapeseed. We also have an industrial market for rapeseed because of the high erucic acid content.

We started with rapeseed, and we produced one product for the vegetable oil market without erucic acid and another product with 50 percent erucic acid for the industrial market. We have two markets for that product, and both markets are growing. We have to do more and more of that kind of work, find those products, those crops, whether they are ginseng or whether it is radish or whether it is some other meat product that the consumer wants. If we can produce it economically in the province of Manitoba, process it here and sell that processed product somewhere else in the world, it is to our advantage not only as producers, as farmers, but also to our advantage as residents and citizens in the province of Manitoba.

I had the occasion two years ago to have gone on a trade mission to Japan. I went with other producers from the province of Manitoba, trying to be sure that we could access markets in that part of the world for pork, turkey, honey—whatever. I met with a large number of Japanese people, citizens at large, people who worked for various retailing companies or wholesaling companies, people who were interested in buying food from elsewhere in the world and selling it in Japan.

One of the things that they told me loud and clear was that, first, we had high quality products. They were very impressed with the quality we produced. They did not have any really bad experiences with us and, secondly, they liked our part of the world because they deemed us to have a very clean environment for food production. They said, you have low population, you have low industrial concentration; therefore you have clean air, clean water, clean soil in a comparative sense with other parts of the world. They said very clearly, we want to buy from your part of the world for those reasons. You have a clean environment.

It is appalling, day after day, how we hear from the other side of the House over the last three years of how terrible our environment is here. Clearly we are

recognized as having a clean environment, have done a good job of managing our environment so that we can maintain that reputation of clean food and food that is deemed by other countries to be the kind of product they want to buy.

We do not advertise that; we do not take credit for that. We producers in this province have not stood up and said often enough the advantages they create for society in the business of producing food, high quality, low cost for all consumers of this province and this country. We do not advocate strong enough what we do in terms of satisfying the world's needs. I guess I say that often to my agricultural producers because I do not think that they understand the significance of their role in terms of putting food on the table in Canada and outside of this country.

We always want to follow that argument up; we say we produce good quality and lots of it and clean food, we should be paid more. Well, I guess the world will always determine what the price is because the marketplace will dictate that. We will always try to extract the maximum we can over the course of time, but I have to stress that our market access is certainly out there if we want to go after it.

I have talked to many people in the agribusiness sector with regard to being more aggressive in trying to achieve market access because we can grow whatever they can find a market for in this province somewhere, because we have a lot of diversification in terms of types of soils and types of climates. We have a good livestock-producing area particularly in, I would say, north of the grain growing area, scattered throughout the grain-growing area, good pasture land. We have particularly in the south central part of the province longer day lengths, better higher quality soil that can produce a wide variety of special crops. All the rest of the province has a good capacity to produce the traditional cereal grains and oilseeds.

* (1440)

We have a lot of processing already in this province, Madam Deputy Speaker. Just some of the examples, Mohawk Oil out in Minnedosa, a good market for grains. It is a nonfood market; it is processing cereal grains into ethanol which can be mixed with gasoline at the rate of 10 percent, and it seemed to be environmentally responsible to do that.

I guess 10 years ago when that plant started there was expectation there would be great growth in that market. Unfortunately, it has not been as economically competitive with the fossil fuels as we would have liked, and therefore there is not a significant growth in ethanol production in this province. Although Minnedosa has expanded a little bit in the last two or three years and may well expand in the future, we would like to see a lot more cereal grains put through the ethanol process so we have cleaner-burning fuels in the province of Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this industry of agriculture is filled with good leaders, with people who have worked hard to make their industry what it is today, the kind of leaders who will carry it through the difficulties we are in. I often remind producers that the industry of agriculture has faced a lot of technological change over the last 10, 15, 20 years. There is no question the industry will face a lot more technological change and challenge in the next 10 or 20 years. I advocate very definitely to producers that they become educated, become knowledgeable of their industry, and for young people, that beyond high school they get some additional training so that they can equip themselves with the knowledge they need to perform in the agricultural industry of the years ahead.

Technological change is going to be in front of them, the changing in terms of what you produce. There are going to be decisions they have to make on an annual basis and certainly on a decade basis. Those producers who avail themselves of the best knowledge, the broadest level of knowledge that they can acquire, whether it is through educational institutions, whether it is visiting with other farmers or acquiring the assistance they need from government programs and government technical and advisory assistance, will be important to their ability to survive in the future.

I think that most producers are understanding of that. The economic crunch they are in right now is certainly very difficult for them to manage. The realized net income in the farm community in 1986, '87, '88 was around \$300 million and \$350 million. That was deemed to be a necessary level of income to survive in a general sense.

Last year it dropped to \$145 million. This year it is projected to be around \$90 million; a substantial drop of \$300 million to \$145 million to \$90

million—very serious. Along the way you must remember that the livestock sector makes up half of our gross income, and it is doing relatively well. It is the grain sector that is so bad that is pulling that average way, way down.

The base of our agricultural production is the grain industry—it is the export grains. I just think that in the coming years ahead the farmers have to continue to assess, regardless of government programs, whether they should be trying to always produce those export grains or whether they should be continually trying to produce more in a wider variety of diversified products, whether they are crops, special crops or whether they are other livestock products.

So the challenges are in front of the industry, Madam Deputy Speaker. We have responded with a major government program called GRIP to help them in this intervening period of time, to support their incomes while they were able to try to make some of that adjustment, so they can acquire more and more of their income from the marketplace.

We have put billions and billions of dollars, federally and provincially, into agriculture in the last five or six years. First dealing with low grain prices, then we were dealing with drought and then dealing with low grain prices again and drought again. It is just an ongoing problem; it is one or the other. Now with the crop insurance to deal with low yields and GRIP to deal with low grain prices, we have given the farm community a much greater degree of stability.

If they want to voluntarily enroll in those programs, the achievement of greater predictability and stability for the industry is there for the next few years. Hopefully over that course of time, we can get the adjustments necessary to make the industry viable in a much longer term period of time. Thank you very much.

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): First of all, I would like to say that I am pleased to take part in this Throne Speech Debate. I would like to congratulate the Speaker again for taking on the Chairman, I guess, the Speaker of the House. Also, I would like to extend the new members to the Executive Council. I am sure they will provide the leadership that we desire in this province. Also, I would like to extend my best wishes to all the members back to the House here, and hopefully we can get along well in the House.

I have a number of issues that I would like to address. I know I have a limited time because my other colleagues would like to speak on the Throne Speech Debate, but I think I would like to address the issue of aboriginal people in this province and aboriginal people in general.

We have had good relations with the aboriginal people as the New Democratic Party, and we would like to see more aboriginal members in the House. I am particularly proud that we have representation on our side of the members from the aboriginal people, my own people, who are part of the Legislative Assembly: the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) and the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), who are members of this Legislative Assembly. I always encourage aboriginal people to be involved in society as a whole across the country, because we have to advance our own interests, and who best to do that—the aboriginal people themselves.

I know that this is a nonaboriginal institution, that we as aboriginal people cannot be an island to ourselves. We have to make sure that people understand who we are. Part of the problem has been that governments have consistently denied that opportunity for aboriginal people to become involved in society as a whole. As I mentioned before, governments had deliberately passed policies of assimilation, integration and genocide, and these policies are alive and well today. They have not changed at all.

People begin to question why aboriginal people have not been involved in society and why they have not become successful in many of the fields. There are many reasons for that, why aboriginal people have not been involved. Aboriginal people, often I say, should have been the most well-off people in this country, but unfortunately we are not.

* (1450)

I know there are questions being raised as to how aboriginal people could be involved either in the Legislature or more involved in your other aspects of Canadian society, involved in academic institutions as teachers, or even as social workers, or doctors, lawyers, or as tradespeople, plumbers and electricians, but we have not had very much success. Oftentimes the kind of information that is being provided is one of stereotype image of aboriginal people and not the few successes that we

have in this country. Aboriginal people, aboriginal children do not see the kind of role models that they would like to have. There is far in between.

Over the last while, I think, aboriginal people have come together, particularly this past summer, to raise their issues and have certainly aroused the general public of aboriginal issues and aboriginal people. We, as aboriginal people, of course have to be more determined and more involved to keep the momentum alive. Oftentimes what I find is that governments, people in positions of authority, want to do things, want to make decisions for aboriginal people without even consulting with the aboriginal people.

I read in The Globe and Mail today about the Premier of New Brunswick advancing a proposal in which aboriginal people would be represented in the Legislature. In the same headline, I read that Chief Roger Augustine, President of the Union of New Brunswick Indians, has said that they were not aware of the plans at all. This is often the case that people make decisions for aboriginal people.

What should be happening is that leaders, politicians, or people in the position of authority, should be talking to the aboriginal people, even though this may be an intention, a good intention, for the Premier to address aboriginal issues.

One thing he did mention in his remarks was that the Premier, Mr. McKenna, said that the crisis at Oka, Quebec, was an example of tension that could have been alleviated through political discussions, but if people really looked at the situation there, that has been basically the problem, is that the situation at Oka is not the problem that just occurred at that time.

The problem has been the lack of political will to deal with the aboriginal people in this country. It is the relationship over the last 200 years. That is the real problem, not the crisis at Oka. If some of these issues could have been resolved a hundred years ago, we would not be in this kind of situation that we are in today.

I would just like to refer to another article. The headline says: The Oka troubles. That is the headline of this article I am referring to, and the subheadline says, Indian refused to accept seminary's proposals. This is dated from Montreal, July 28. I will just quote one sentence. It says, and I quote, the Indian difficulty appears to be as far from a settlement as ever and the prospect that was

recently foreshadowed in the Mail, which is the paper, that the Indians would refuse to accept the seminary's proposal has been justified, end of quote.

The reason why I quote this paper is that we have a headline here with Oka troubles, which is basically the same headline we had this summer with the problems in Oka at Kahnésatake. I would like to mention that this article was written in Toronto, Toronto Daily Mail, in 1887, which is well over a hundred years. So the problem did not just arrive, or it did not just come to confrontation just this summer.

Those things I mentioned before could have been resolved a long time ago if only governments and the politicians were willing to deal with aboriginal people in this country. I can refer to many other instances and the kind of mentality that exists in this country in respect to aboriginal people, our issues.

One of the things that I would like to mention is the recent court decision that was made in British Columbia dealing with Native land claims, dealing with the sovereignty of the aboriginal people in that particular territory. Of course, the judgment was in favour of the government and, of course, the judge ruled that their aboriginal rights were extinguished at the time of colonization. It is as if we as aboriginal people did not exist at that time. I think the judge used the theory of doctrine of discovery which is basically a discredited notion, a doctrine that is no longer valid and not used by academics and historians today.

What this decision has done is that it has set back some of the advancements that we have made for aboriginal people in this country. The astonishing fact of it too is that the judge did not reference at least the recent court decision dealing with another case in B.C. dealing with the Sparrow case, which was made by the Supreme Court of Canada, where an aboriginal man by the name of Mr. Sparrow challenged the court and, of course, his rights were recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada that he did have aboriginal rights.

It is not consistent with the present ruling of this particular judge, and I believe that in the best interests of all concerned, I think people would like to see the appeal process expedited as soon as possible to deal with the question of the aboriginal rights. It will have a bearing across the country, and there are many important issues that will be raised

once this has been cleared through the legal process.

As I mentioned before, there are many issues that I would like to address. The kind of relationship that we have had is one that I always mention that Canada cannot be proud of. I mean, there are documents available that you can read which are black and white in terms of the government's approach to our relations. When I say our relations, I mean the aboriginal people. Just to give you an example, I have another article, a circular which was written in Ottawa on December 15, 1921. It was a circular that was sent out, probably to all the Indian Affairs personnel. It was written by Duncan C. Scott. I will just maybe read a paragraph of what he had to say about aboriginal people and their policy. This was only 70 years ago. I quote from that letter or policy that was a circular, and it is signed by Duncan C. Scott.

It says here, and I quote: It is observed with alarm that the holding of dances by the Indians on the reserve is on the increase and that these practices tend to disorganize the efforts which the department is putting forth to make them self-supporting—end of quote. That is the kind of policy governments have. I mean, there are other disgusting comments about the policies the government had at that time, but today we have not really seen any changes at all. The policies, the government still exist today.

* (1500)

The federal government, which has the primary responsibility for aboriginal people in this country, has not taken any kind of leadership. They should be providing that kind of leadership. They should have dealt with many of the issues that were raised this summer, the Oka situation and other blockades that have happened. The government just sat back and did not do anything. I know that the Prime Minister said in the House of Commons that aboriginal issues would be dealt with, aboriginal land claims would be accelerated, but nothing has really happened. All they have done is establish a commission on unity to deal with many of the issues.

Part of that commission's mandate, of course, is to address aboriginal issues in the Spicer commission, the Citizens' Forum on unity, but this commission will be dealing with many other issues than aboriginal issues and, of course, the aboriginal issues will be just lost through the entire process

and would not become a priority. Then the commission would recommend that to the government, and it is up to the government to place priorities on the kind of recommendations that they receive from that commission. Speaking from history and experience, our experience is often that priorities for aboriginal people are not priority for many of the governments, particularly the federal government in this case, not a priority at all.

Those issues are so important. We talk about other people's concerns, and the federal government talks about the unity of this country. They talk about English Canada and French Canada, Quebec and the western provinces, but one thing they always ignore is the aboriginal people in this country, because Canada is not complete without the aboriginal people, the first peoples in this country. That should have been the first order of business in this country and should have been settled a long time ago.

We are always told that our concerns will be addressed once we accommodate other people's interests, and as I travel from province to province and I speak to other people and I read many articles, editorials, news, TV, radio or print, what we always talk about is Canada splitting up. There is no mention really about aboriginal people. I think the aboriginal people have a major role to play in this country, but we are not given the opportunity.

I think people generally underestimate the kind of influence we could have. I know that the Province of Quebec and the Premier have said that they are going to deal with the federal government, dealing with their concerns in that province. Part of the problem is that the Province of Quebec, the government of Quebec has to address the aboriginal issues, the aboriginal land claims in that province, and the federal government who has the constitutional, legal obligations have not dealt with that issue.

They have not provided the leadership, have not indicated to the aboriginal people as to what they are prepared to do for the people in that province, with the James Bay Cree and the Mohawk people in the province of Quebec. I mean they should have been providing the leadership, but they have not to this day.

When the time comes as to where aboriginal people stand in terms of unity in this country, I know they would not want to separate, and I cannot see

Quebec alienating Indian lands. They cannot, because in the province of Quebec a whole territory, I think 85 percent, is unceded territory. By that I mean that aboriginal people in that province have never signed treaties at all in that province, and if they are to come to an agreement of some sort to settle land claims they have to sit down with the aboriginal people and also with the federal government as to how they would deal with that particular issue.

So even the Province of Quebec who wants to develop the hydro project in a territory that is occupied by the Cree would have a major problem, and I know that aboriginal people will come rallying behind Quebec Cree across the country because their issues are our issues and the issues are common across Canada.

We need to make the people understand where we are coming from as aboriginal people. We want to be part of this country. We want to have the same opportunities as anyone else in this country. Unfortunately, we have not. We are not demanding anything more or anything less, but we have been at the totem pole for such a long time, and we need all the resources and all the assistance we can get to get where we are. I know they have many other issues I can relate to, and today here in terms of the throne speech we talk about the constitutional task force.

I know that the government's intention was to raise mainly issues of the Senate, but what is coming loud and clear is that many of the general public want the aboriginal issues addressed. It is not only coming from the aboriginal people themselves, but the people of Manitoba want to see governments resolve the aboriginal issues, many issues affecting them: self-government, land claims, and providing greater opportunities for aboriginal people in this province. The governments could be providing that leadership.

I know many of the concerns that were raised, and I notice our educational opportunities, I know the Minister of Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) had raised that they are looking at Conawapa providing jobs for the northerners, and providing electrification to the area that I represent in Rupertsland, and the area that I live in. This request has been made for a number of years; after all, most of the development resources like hydro development come from the

north, and we as aboriginal people, the people who live in the north, do not benefit from those resources.

* (1510)

I know when we were in government we had made the initiatives to put into place this electrification of the six communities in 1986, and I hope that it will be done very shortly. It will be a welcome, very sorely needed service that is long overdue. It will provide a better quality of life and opportunities for the communities and the areas that I just mentioned.

I know that I do not have much time because I would like to give my other colleagues some opportunity to speak and I think I will get more opportunity to speak on many other issues later on. I have gone through this, I guess, for many years now. I guess this is my 10th year as a member of the Legislative Assembly.

I would just like to express to my constituents in Rupertsland who have supported me all this time my thank you and I would like to show appreciation. I would like to thank them for electing me to be their representative in the Manitoba Legislature. It has been an honour to serve them, and I would like to say that it has been a privilege—not that I am going to not represent them in the next while—but it has been an honour and a privilege to represent my constituents and have that confidence. It is a great, great opportunity, I am sure, that every other member has that same privilege to represent their constituents. So I would just like to wish my constituents well in the constituency of Rupertsland, and I would like to wish everybody well in this Chamber.

Thank you very much.

Committee Changes

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Madam Deputy Speaker, do I have leave to make some committee changes?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the member have leave to make committee changes?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Helwer: I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development, just for Wednesday, March 19 at the 8 p.m. sitting, be amended as follows: The member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) for the member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson).

I move, seconded by the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources for Thursday, March 21 be amended as follows: The member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings) for the member for Springfield (Mr. Findlay); the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) for the member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer); the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) for the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson).

I move, seconded by the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for April 2, 10 a.m. session be amended as follows: The member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey) for the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld); the member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) for the member for Portage (Mr. Connery); the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) for the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey). Thank you.

* * *

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): It is my pleasure to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. I would like to begin by passing on congratulations through you to the Speaker and to yourself, Madam Deputy Speaker, and wish you a peaceful session. I know that is not always in your hands but in the hands of others. We will do our best to make it not more contentious than it ought to be.

I would like to welcome back the pages for another session with us. I am sure that they will learn a great deal and that they will take some of what they hear with a grain of salt and other things that they hear as maybe containing some wisdom. I would also like to welcome the new Sergeant-at-Arms to the Chamber. I have had an opportunity to have some conversations with him, and I know that he will add a presence to the proceedings of the House.

I have made a point, Madam Deputy Speaker, of sitting in on most of the debate. I have heard probably four out of every five speeches that were given in the House over the last eight days, and I must say that I was impressed with the quality of speeches that I heard. As I look around the Chamber, I see that we have represented in this House every corner of Manitoba, and collectively, we represent all different kinds of people from every region of the province. As I look around the House now, I see that we have members from the aboriginal

community, one who just spoke and the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin).

More and more women are being elected to the Legislature of Manitoba. That is a good thing. We have a man of the cloth who has been elected. We have those who represent the Sikh faith, the Jewish faith, Protestants and Catholics, those who earn their living as professionals, those who can no longer earn their living as professionals, those who represent rural ridings, city ridings. We are truly a cross section of the mosaic which is Manitoba. We in our own caucus have, I think, the first person of Sikh heritage to be elected to any Legislature in North America, and for that we are very proud.

As I listened to the speeches, there are contained within them good ideas almost throughout, that it makes you wonder why we cannot have a system so that the best of all of us somehow could not be wound up in a ball so that the people of Manitoba could be represented by what is best in our province. Often what we see, particularly in this Chamber, is what is worst about human nature and about ourselves as individuals. We often, or at least sometimes, posture for the sake of grabbing a headline, oppose for the sake of opposing. If the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) says one thing, some of us feel obliged to say another, and we do not always have to do that. Every once in a while I do have a sense that we ought to be trying a little harder to bring out the best in each of us, but I suppose the adversarial nature of the system is such that that is a difficult thing to do.

There are many issues that should be discussed in context of the throne speech. The Throne Speech Debate is an opportunity for all members of the House to take stock of ourselves, to take stock of our community and to try to put the political, social and cultural reality of our own province into some kind of perspective. That means looking beyond our borders, indeed even beyond the nation to events which are surrounding us globally.

Today is a day when the people of the Soviet Union are trying to sort through a very important referendum on the future of their federation. It looks as if the public opinion in the Soviet Union is split, whether or not that country ought to remain united. We see that the federation in Yugoslavia is breaking up as we sit here and speak, that there is turmoil throughout eastern Europe. There is still too much famine, starvation and disease in the Third World.

Finally, we have put an end to that awful war in the Middle East, a war that had to be fought and a war that was won, Madam Deputy Speaker.

As we try to put the problems of our own province into the perspective of what is happening internationally, we can take some comfort in the knowledge that we, as a civilized society, do better than most, that we are a society that is relatively free of much of the disease and poverty, but until all of it has been eradicated, our work as legislators in this Chamber is not done.

If we look around at Manitoba we see an awful lot of strength. As we go through some of the industrial sectors we see that we have a strong mining sector in the north of our province, but even that is not under our control which reminds us again of the interdependence of provinces and nations, one to the other. The health of our mining industry depends on the international price of minerals and nickel over which we have very little control. If the international economy is booming, that is good for Manitoba. If we are in a recession, that affects the treasury of our province.

The same is true of our vibrant agricultural sector. The agricultural sector has traditionally been the lifeblood of the economy of our province, yet we are caught in a squeeze of an international subsidy war fought mostly by the Americans and the Europeans that we cannot afford to stay out of. If we want to protect the integrity of our agricultural industries and the rural lifestyle which is really the backbone of our province, then we have to participate in events which we would probably choose not to if we had any choice in the matter.

Even our hydro-electric energy which requires really nothing more than water falling can be threatened by damming of rivers that flow into our water basins in Manitoba from the west, can be affected by years of drought—again, things over which we have very little control. Then we have to also look for a moment at the need to compete and the requirement to achieve. I have just said we live in a global environment, a global economy, and we have to compete, but not at any cost do we enter the fray.

There are only a couple of examples that I want to use to illustrate my point. Members of the Chamber may have turned on their televisions the other night and seen in the southern United States men and women of a middle age sleeping in church pews

because there is no social safety net in the United States to cushion their fall. When they fall, Madam Deputy Speaker, they fall right onto the hardness and the brittleness of an unused church pew. That is one of the consequences of allowing the free market economy to have full rein, unchecked by the role and the responsibilities of the state. We in Canada have rejected that as a model.

* (1520)

I look over and I see the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), and I am reminded of the speech he made in the House not long ago about Ramsey MacDonald, who was a socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain. The Minister of Health, in some of his more lucid moments, is able to discuss what happens when ideology gets in the way of decision making. I would hope that the Minister of Health would take his own advice every now and again when he sees the blinkers of ideology in front of him to ensure that he does not put on the ideological blinkers himself to fall into the same trap that he said Ramsey MacDonald, the socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain fell into back in the 1920s, I believe.

I also saw that TWA, one of the largest airlines in the world, now has a policy—and this is in its Detroit office—where all of its employees who take reservations over the phone, primarily women, are sitting at computers. If they want to take a break from their jobsitting in front of the video display terminals, they have to punch in a key that tells management that they are going on a break. If they take a break longer than one minute, there is an alarm bell that goes off, management is alerted, and they run after the employee to find out what the problem is.

The women who work for TWA were so upset they decided that they would en masse stand up, which is against the rules, so management through the glass panel could see that employees were taking some action to assert their independence, that they were not robots, that they were not automatons, that they were not all slavish to the bottom line and to the profit motive. That is not the kind of society that we have built for ourselves here, north of the 49th parallel, and that is not the kind of society that we in the Liberal caucus would like to see us build in Manitoba.

Then we look at the relationship between our province and the Government of Canada. You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, who will forget the words of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) when he came to

office and took that chair for the first time? He said, this is the dawn of a new age of federal-provincial relations. If this is the dawning of a new age, I never want to see darkness. Let me just give you a couple of reasons why.

What has the success of the provincial government been in renegotiating hundreds of millions of dollars of Economic Regional Development Agreements with the Government of Canada? Pitiful.

We are now looking at ways in which we can reclaim a little of what we have lost, to try to establish a new tourism agreement with the Government of Canada. We are debating in this Legislature this week English as a Second Language programming, and the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) and the Premier (Mr. Filmon), almost dropping tears as they speak, it is out of our control, there is nothing we can do, it is the Government of Canada that will not fund its share.

They have said the same thing time and time again. What is their response to the crisis in federal-provincial relations? A committee, a committee chaired by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson). I am for a moment wanting to call it the ERIC committee, Madam Deputy Speaker, which was I think an NDP economic development committee. A committee of ministers of the government of Manitoba is not going to solve the crisis in federal-provincial relations.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is always asking members of the opposition, be positive. Give us some good, sound, solid, progressive suggestions as to how you would do things differently if you were in government. That is precisely what I intend to do throughout my speech today, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The first issue is that there has to be some line of communication between the two governments. Now I can remember very well when the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism—he is now the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), but when he was Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism he threatened to punch Jake Epp in the nose. That was how low federal-provincial relations had stooped in our province—

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): You should have given him a Mike Tyson.

Mr. Carr: The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) said, you should have given him a Mike Tyson. To the Minister of Health I say, does he believe that is the way to get the attention of the federal government? Does he think that is the way to improve federal-provincial relations? Let me tell the Minister of Health, that is not our way of doing it. If that is his way of doing it I would be hard pressed to know who to hope for, Madam Deputy Speaker, but we will not get into that.

We can see that when it comes time to sit down at the table and negotiate these federal-provincial agreements we are doing badly. How about the Core Area Initiative? Very successful 10 years in providing what many consider to be the finest inner city renewal program anywhere in North America. They come to Winnipeg in order to study the way we have done it, because we do it, according to the experts, better than anybody else.

What is the answer of the federal and provincial Tories? We do not think that we are going to extend it.

Eighteen months ago we warned the Minister of Urban Affairs that the Government of Canada would use an excuse not to renew the Core Area Initiative unless his government, on its own, evaluated the successes and failures of that program so it could have an intelligent plan to take to the table. What did they do? They forgot to evaluate the successes and the failures of the Core. Therefore, they gave to the Government of Canada exactly the excuse that they were looking for. What is the result? No Core Area Agreement.

I say to members on the government side, that is no way to foster harmony between the federal and provincial governments.

Now they love to stand up and criticize the federal Tories. They do it every day. It was their campaign platform. If Brian says so, we say it ain't so. That could have been the Tory slogan in the 1990 election.

You have to ask the rhetorical question, Madam Deputy Speaker, for whom did they vote in the last federal election? From whom did Mr. Mulroney get his mandate? The Minister of Health is putting up his hand. It is a secret ballot, but he wants the whole world to know that he voted for Brian Mulroney. Therefore, the excuses he makes and the reasons that he trots out for bad co-operation are, in part, of his own doing. We can also ask the rhetorical

question, looking to the future, for whom will they vote in the next federal election?

Should the Liberal Party expect votes from the Minister of Government Services, from the Minister of Urban Affairs, from the Minister of Health, from the Minister of Natural Resources? Maybe the Minister of Labour will go back to his roots and vote Liberal next time, but I doubt it.

They voted for Mr. Mulroney last time, and they will vote for Mr. Mulroney next time. At the same time they blame Mr. Mulroney for everything that is wrong with Canada. You cannot have it both ways. You have to ask yourself, whose side are you on? They are on Mr. Mulroney's side, and it does not matter how many times they stand up in this House and say something else.

I would like to focus in just for a few minutes on some of the areas within my critic responsibility, Madam Deputy Speaker. I would like to start with Urban Affairs.

I have in front of me the Winnipeg Wards Review Committee brochure. Let me start by saying that this brochure has on its cover an artist's drawing of the Investors Group building with the Investors Group logo firmly planted on top of the artist's drawing to be distributed to all members of the community who wish to pick it up from the minister's office.

I open up the pamphlet and I see that there is the Richardson Building. Mind you there is no logo on top of the Richardson Building—and the Trizec building, no logo there. They may be promoting some kind of incorporate war here or playing favourites, I am not sure which. At any rate, we have a little bit of corporate logo advertising that presumably the minister's department paid for. Then when you turn inside and start reading the mandate of the boundaries committee, it says, the government of Manitoba appointed an independent Winnipeg Wards Review Committee to examine and so it goes.

* (1530)

Madam Deputy Speaker, independent of whom? Independent of the minister who appointed them? Independent of the mandate given to them by the minister, or as an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press said on discussing the question of independence: Urban Affairs Minister, Jim Ernst, has already fallen at the first hurdle on that track. The mayor should not tolerate the gerrymandering job

which Mr. Ernst is inflicting on the city. The minister has appointed a tame panel of cronies and told them what report to write. The committee—and I am just skipping along a little bit—has all the independence of a ventriloquist's dummy, unquote.

Madam Deputy Speaker, these are not my words. These are the words of presumably independent observers who write editorials for the Winnipeg Free Press. The reason that they wrote that editorial was because there is already—through Section 5 of The City of Winnipeg Act—a truly independent Boundaries Review Commission with a mandate to redraw the electoral map from time to time. That consists of the President of the University of Winnipeg, the Chief Electoral Officer from the City of Winnipeg, and the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, all of whom are divorced from the political process, who have no axe to grind vis-a-vis the political process and who have already done the job successfully for governments in Manitoba.

Now to extend the minister's logic here, we ought to gut those provisions of The Manitoba Elections Act which gives the job of redrawing Manitoba boundaries from the independent commission that is there in the act to a group of loyal supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party. He is not going to do that because he knows it is wrong. Madam Deputy Speaker, every member of the Treasury bench knows that the appointment of this committee is wrong.

It is wrong because -(interjection)- well, the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) says, you are wrong. He has not yet said why. In answers to questions he says that I do not understand The City of Winnipeg Act, I do not understand urban government. I can read. I can read—671 of the act gives the minister the power to appoint a commission to look into anything it wants subverting the authority of the independent city Boundaries Commission.

The minister is going to pay for his mistake and I will tell you why. We are about to undergo a process that hopefully will lead to important municipal reform for the City of Winnipeg, but by his actions the minister has deflected the issues of substance. He has deflected the wisdom of reducing the size of council, and we agree with the government's policy that a smaller council is in the interests of the citizens of Winnipeg. He has subverted the entire debate

over municipal reform by making the process the issue.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) wants to know what positive suggestions we have. I will tell him. The positive suggestion is to withdraw those elements in the mandate of the Winnipeg Wards Review Committee that ought not to be there in the first place, to restore some integrity to the process. If the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) does not do that, then he has become his own worst enemy of effective urban and municipal reform.

That is a positive suggestion, and if he does it he will not get any snarky questions from us the next day in the House. He will get notes of congratulations for doing the right thing. It is not too late; it is a positive idea. Let me encourage the Minister of Urban Affairs to give the process a chance by giving it the legitimacy that it deserves.

How about an Urban Native Strategy? Well, we know that through the Core Area Initiative, no fewer than 100 aboriginal people who live in the core area of Winnipeg were trained through the Core Area Initiative and who are now holding down employment with financial institutions throughout the city. One hundred jobs to aboriginal people from the core of our city who are now working, earning a living, supporting families, because of the co-operation between the public initiative of the core and the private sector involvement through the banking association and other financial institutions.

Maybe in a way, Madam Deputy Speaker, that is a liberal approach to a problem. We do not say that you ought to create short-term employment through expenditures out of the public purse. That is not the answer to solve our problems. We have tried those before and they have failed and they are discredited. Neither do we think that the private sector alone on its own initiative can create those kinds of jobs for inner city residents.

What does work is when you have a partnership between the two, when you can check the ideology of the left and the ideology of the right, and see yourself clear to forging the best of each. The private sector can offer long-term sustainable jobs, and the public sector can offer the necessary training and incentive matched with the private sector that creates jobs for people who do not have them. There is another positive suggestion for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) of how meaningful jobs can

be sustained over the long run through co-operation between the public and the private sectors.

Well, how about energy? Energy was not even mentioned in the throne speech. If it was, it was given very short shrift. We are presenting a positive initiative through a private member's resolution to ask Manitoba Hydro to be more aggressive in establishing conservation targets for itself.

Let me say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that when the NDP was in power between the years 1981 and 1988 there were no targets—not 1 percent, not 2 percent, not 3 percent—zero. There was not even talk of establishing realistic energy conservation goals for Manitoba Hydro. So when we hear the NDP now stand up and talk about the importance of energy conservation—someone do some mathematics for me. How long ago was 1988? We are only talking two and a half, three years ago, when the New Democratic Party was in power they did nothing. So what we have done as part of a positive initiative is, we have put forward for the consideration of the House, and I hope we will have support of both the other parties, of establishing reasonable but aggressive conservation goals for Manitoba Hydro.

We are also concerned about some elements of the Conawapa deal, Madam Deputy Speaker, that we have put on the record. We are concerned about several aspects of it. First that a deal was negotiated with Ontario Hydro that came into effect on January 1 last, after which a series of penalties kick in if for any reason the project has to be scrapped. Do we never learn our lessons? How many times do we have to realize that where we put hundreds of millions of dollars at risk, there is no escape route. The hole that we have dug is too large to get out of. We saw that with the Saskatchewan court judgment in the Rafferty-Alameda case. The judge said, well, we are into it too big. We have spent too much money, so how can we tell them to stop now?

Do you know, Madam Deputy Speaker that if you total up penalties in that contract with Ontario Hydro, and if you total up the amount of money that is going to be spent, even invested if you want to use that jargon, that by the end of 1991 we will be looking at \$150 million of expenditure in penalty? This is before the environmental review process is complete.

Well what happens if the environmental review process fails? Everybody knows that there is a dog's breakfast of legislation as between the

provincial and federal governments in the whole area of environmental assessment in review. Why would we put ourselves at risk the way we have done? Why is our first interest not in protecting ourselves against this kind of vulnerability that the contract, signed by the Premier I must say, with Ontario Hydro has left us exposed to?

So we are concerned about that. We are also concerned about the whole issue of contingent liabilities, and my colleague the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) will know more about this than most. If you look at the Northern Flood Agreement, if you look at the damage of flooding that was done in Grand Rapids and in the Lake Winnipeg diversion, Lake Winnipeg regulation, you will see that Manitoba Hydro was budgeting almost nothing to Native bands.

The contingent liabilities, the exposure that the Manitoba Hydro thought that it was exposed to was considered to be in the few millions of dollars. By the time we are finished, they will be in the hundreds of millions of dollars because entire people's lifestyles, bands were affected by the actions and the flooding that Manitoba Hydro entered into in the 1960s and '70s. We want to ask the prudent question, what are we getting ourselves into here? What will the environmental impact be of Bipole III from northern Manitoba all the way south and then into Ontario? How much risk are we entering into beyond the financial risks that I talked about a few minutes before?

Also, I would like to spend just a moment or two on the issue of tourism, and I would like to congratulate the member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson) and the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) for their entry into cabinet. They both have important responsibilities, but I would like to point something out. In a time of restraint, and members from all sides of the House agree that this is a time of restraint and we have to watch our pennies very carefully, which is why we think it was a bit foolish for the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) to pay a so-called independent committee \$20,000 to do something that people were prepared to do for nothing.

* (1540)

Aside from that issue and aside from the \$20,000 of untendered money given to Mr. Moore, something that the Resource Recovery Institute would say for nothing, here is one for the Minister of

Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), and this is dated March 1. This is very recent, a requisition for goods or services. The Minister of Tourism wants to order 3,500 two-inch barbless Manitoba spoon, red and white lures at a cost of \$10,000, for the direct mail fulfillment giveaway.

We are giving away gimmicks in a time of restraint and recession at the cost to the taxpayer of \$10,000. If that was not bad enough, it says here on the requisition order that we ought to check out a tender from Dearborn, Michigan, so we are going to lure people into Manitoba with giveaways at the expense of the taxpayer and who knows, they may even be supplied to us from Dearborn, Michigan. Every once in a while, Madam Deputy Speaker, something like this crosses your desk and you just cannot let it go.

The tourism industry is vital. We have tremendous tourist potential. The Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) when he was Tourism and I had good debate on that issue. I think he realized that we have to do a much better job at promoting our cultural life and supporting activities, the wonderful attractions in rural Manitoba outside of Winnipeg, and that we have to be much more aggressive in promoting, not gimmicks, not two-inch Manitoba blue lures, but the magnificence of the province that we all share.

So rather than the photo contests that the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) referred to in his speech, rather than giveaways in a time of tight money, we are looking for some aggressive marketing that sells Manitoba, not through gimmickry, but through the right kind of marketing.

I want to turn for a few moments, Madam Deputy Speaker, to talk about the Constitution. We are at a—

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): Stay away from the Senate.

Mr. Carr: I am not going to stay away from the Senate. The member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) says, stay away from the Senate. I am going to have to disappoint him; I am not going to stay away, but I am not there quite yet.

In many ways Canada does not make sense. If you look at the geography of North America, all of the natural lines flow north and south. From the Pacific Ocean to the Rocky Mountains, to the breadbasket of the Prairies, to the Great Lakes, to the Appalachians, to the Atlantic Coast, this continent runs north and south, and we have

managed to overcome the constraints of geography through political will and a sense of nationhood.

It is a tribute to the strength and ingenuity and tolerance of the people of Canada who came here from all over the world in many cases escaping persecution and repression to build a continent against all of the natural odds. Not only was geography against it, but so was politics because we had immediately to the south the strongest nation in the world. In spite of all of that, we managed to build a nation of which most of us are very proud.

Let me remind the members of the House that between 1982 after the patriation of the Constitution—a legacy of Pierre Trudeau, much vilified by members of the House, but who, in a recent national opinion poll, was the most popular Prime Minister of recent times, and how sweet it is for me to say that, Madam Deputy Speaker—and in spite of all of that, between 1982 and 1987, before the current Prime Minister thought that he would try to get his nose in the Constitution, there was constitutional peace in this country.

Do you know that public opinion pollsters did not even put the question of sovereignty on its polls in the province of Quebec, as it was a nonissue? No one was taking to the streets. Nobody was writing their member of Parliament. Nobody was petitioning the Premier of Quebec. Sovereignty was not even on the public agenda.

Here we are three and a half years later and we have a country that, if you believe many, is on the verge of collapse. We have lost our sense of national will because the Prime Minister in his high-handed way thought that he wanted to go down in history as someone who brought Quebec back into the constitutional fold.

The Prime Minister said something very interesting when he was running for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party. Do you know that he said, 20 years from now, when I am finished with Canada, you will not recognize it? These were prescient words from the Prime Minister, but in a context nobody in this Chamber or in this country thought possible or to contemplate only a few years ago. We are at a crossroads, and it is going to take tremendous patience and a sense of national belonging to pull us out of the muck.

One of the ways that we think we can reform our political institutions is to have a look the way we are being governed nationally. That is why the Liberal

Party has always thought that institutional reform was important including the Senate.

Now I want to turn, just for a moment or two, Madam Deputy Speaker, to the New Democratic Party. This party introduced a private members' resolution in the last session trying to lead the way toward Senate reform. Do you know what the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) said at that time? I am quoting the member for Flin Flon. About Senate reform, he said: Mr. Speaker, once in every long while, a truly stupid idea comes along, and this is that idea. He went on to say: The idea of reforming the Senate has been around for many years. I cannot tell this Chamber who the original author of that particular stroke of genius was, but this particular member is here purporting to defend the idea that the Senate can be reformed. He went on to say, the member for Flin Flon: Mr. Speaker, the idea of reforming the Senate is similar to the idea of reforming the Mafia, is what he said. You do not reform the Mafia, you abolish it—and Hear, hear, and the clapping.

I wonder, after her applause, I wonder if the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) watched the national news last night. She would have seen that the New Democratic Party in its constitutional platform nationwide thinks there ought to be more provincial representation in the Senate.

The Leader of the Opposition, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) whose face appeared on national television last night said, we cannot rule out any of the options, Madam Deputy Speaker. Everything is on the table. The New Democratic Party seems to be—it is only a news report, and maybe I am wrong, maybe I will be proved wrong on this, that if the New Democratic Party's constitutional platform includes a reformed Senate, what does that say about the member for Flin Flon who talked about reforming the Senate was like reforming the Mafia? What does that say about the leadership of his own member for Concordia, who is a member of the national constitutional committee, who now wants more provincial representation in the Senate? Every once in a while you come across a really stupid comment, and this is it in Hansard right here.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I know that the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) wants some time, so I will begin to wrap up. We all know that we are facing very tough times. The solutions are not easy

as we are reminded every day by members of the Treasury bench. We do not, in the Liberal Party, pretend to have all of the answers to all the problems. One of the shortcomings of this House is that sometimes we pretend we do, that we have this ideological warfare in the sense of oneupmanship when we cannot escape the ravages of this recession, a recession that is very real in how it affects the lives of people.

We have some advice to offer the government and that is, use good judgment. Whenever you are making choices, make those choices with all of the information you have and with all of the ability that you can muster. We see too many examples where the government has exercised poor judgment when it had choices to make, and I think I have tried in my own way to indicate just a few of those bad judgments, and there is maybe just one more, with the indulgence of my friend from St. Johns, on the issue of decentralization.

* (1550)

I could not help but notice after all of the fanfare and all of the rhetoric about decentralization—and we opposed the way the government was doing it at the time; we thought it was ham-handed. I came across an editorial from the Brandon Sun that is dated March 13, 1991, entitled: Forget your roots. It says: rural Manitoba is being sent an ugly message by the provincial government. Even though rural areas are represented almost exclusively by government members, it appears that the concerns of these people are being pushed aside under the guise of fiscal responsibility.

First, Premier Gary Filmon described that he wanted to add Winnipeg members to the cabinet. He chose to throw Rural Development minister Jack Penner out the door and passed his work on to Jim Downey. The editorial goes on to say it was a slap in the face to both Mr. Penner and rural Manitoba, and that now major parts of the government's much valued plan to decentralize government services are being put on hold.

The government was reasonably aware of what sort of economic situation it was facing when the jobs were promised, and one year later rural Manitoba is being told that times are tough and a lot of jobs are not coming. As a result, the legitimate hopes and expectations of many communities may be dashed and the editorial concludes by saying that in her speech to Manitoba Liberals last

weekend, Sharon Carstairs condemned the government's plan. Now that decentralization is under review, Mrs. Carstairs' words appear to have some validity. My point, very simply, is that the government does not always get it right.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

While I have admitted during my speech that we are going to do the best we can to be positive, and that every once in a while we will pat the government on the back, please occasionally, as well the government should admit that an idea that comes from the opposition is not poor or lacking merit simply from where it comes, but maybe the ideas can stand up on their own.

We look forward to a lively session, Mr. Speaker. We intend to be aggressive, as positive as we are able to bring new ideas to the floor of the Chamber, and again, now that you are in the chair, Mr. Speaker, to wish you all the best in the coming session, and I have enjoyed this opportunity to put several remarks on the record. Thank you.

Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to conclude debate for the New Democratic Party caucus on the Speech from the Throne.

D'abord, Monsieur le président, je vous souhaite la bienvenue à l'occasion de votre réélection comme président de l'Assemblée législative du Manitoba et aussi, je voudrais dire que j'apprécie l'esprit d'égalité que vous apportez à la Chambre et vos efforts, malgré beaucoup d'obstacles, pour toujours encourager la dignité, le respect, un peu d'harmonie et un esprit de coopération. Donc, merci, Monsieur le président.

(Translation)

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome you on the occasion of your re-election as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, and also I would like to say that I appreciate the spirit of equality that you bring to the Chamber and your efforts, in spite of many obstacles, to always encourage dignity and respect, a little harmony, and a spirit of co-operation. Therefore, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(English)

This speech and this debate, Mr. Speaker, I take very seriously, as do most members in this Chamber. In fact, in the time that I have served as an elected representative of the Legislative

Assembly, I do not believe I have seen another debate on the Speech from the Throne taken as seriously as this one. Members from all sides, by and large, in this Chamber, have participated seriously and earnestly.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, that has not always been the case either in this Chamber at this time or throughout our history. In fact, I am always reminded of the words of an author of a standard textbook in Canadian political science, McGregor Dawson, who many in this House will be familiar with, who reminds us in his text, reprinted over the years and used as a basic textbook for students everywhere, that often speeches during the debate on the Speech from the Throne are really nothing more than utterly pointless meanderings and outpourings, and often we see, in this kind of debate, speeches that lack direction and force, that splash ineffectively against the rock of national indifference.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case, by and large, in this debate. The speeches have been forceful and focused, and the public is not indifferent. The public is watchful, concerned and anxious. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is because there is so much at stake. I believe there are feelings of fear and despair all around us. We are very much at a crossroads, at a critical juncture in our society, and the role that government plays can make all the difference in terms of addressing and regressing injustice, suffering and fear, and all the difference in terms of creating hope in a world of despair.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility that we have as legislators is clear, and it is demanding our attention and our action. It is a responsibility to speak out as forcefully and as truthfully as we can about the human suffering that we see around us increasingly and about the psychic numbing, as Dr. Helen Caldicott puts it, in terms of people feeling increasingly helpless and giving up in terms of trying to change their own personal situation and the lives of people around them.

I want to use, at this point, Mr. Speaker, because it fits into the thrust of my remarks on the Speech from the Throne, the words of Margaret Laurence in an article entitled, "If I Had One Hour to Live," an article that was written actually four years before Margaret Laurence died from cancer. She writes: The problems of our world will not go away if we ignore them. It is not all happening on TV. It is

happening on our Earth, and we, humankind, are the custodians of that Earth. We cannot afford passivity. We must take on responsibility for our lives and our world, and we must be prepared to make our government listen to and hear us. Our aim must be no less than human and caring, justice and peace.

That aim, Mr. Speaker, starts with us. If we are not prepared to speak out in terms of human suffering, then there is not much point in our being around here today at all. If we are not prepared to act against injustice or demand a proactive government, then we have failed, all of us, and failed miserably. That should set the context and help explain why members on this side of the House feel such grave concerns and have expressed such strong opposition to this government's Speech from the Throne.

In our view the Speech from the Throne must fulfill several important criteria. The Speech from the Throne should be a state of the nation address, and that means the state of the situation in this province for all people, not just some people. A Speech from the Throne must provide some vision on the part of the government that addresses the concerns of all people in our society, not just some people. The Speech from the Throne in our view must set out the role of government, must define this government's understanding of the role that it has undertaken to do on behalf of the people of Manitoba. Finally, a Speech from the Throne must provide an action plan, an action plan in terms of legislated and programmatic changes that will create hope and not deepen despair. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that on all four counts this Speech from the Throne fails and this government fails.

* (1600)

Let us look at the question of this Speech from the Throne being a state of the nation address. I think deficient would be too polite a term when describing this Speech from the Throne. This Speech from the Throne addresses the concerns of a small number of people in our society. It addresses the concerns of a select few. It meets the requirements and demands of the developer friends of this government, Mr. Speaker. It responds to the requests of its corporate friends for legislation.

It addresses our economic situation totally in terms of the balance sheet, but it does not spend a moment talking about the serious unemployment

situation facing this province. In fact, it dismisses unemployment as a small irritant but improving situation in our society, contrary to all statistics and all data available to us now.

It does not spend a word talking about the growing number of homeless in our society, the astronomical increase in food banks, the numbers of single parent women in poverty, the rising number of children in abusive situations. On just about every front in terms of the reality of our society and dealing with the majority of people in this society this government is silent.

That is not a state of the nation address. That is fulfilling its commitment to a select few in our society today.

Now let us test the second criteria that a Speech from the Throne must meet. Provide a vision, a vision that will ensure there is hope in a world of despair. The only vision we get, Mr. Speaker, from this Speech from the Throne is a narrow view of the world that responds to the concerns of a few in our society. There is no vision in this Speech from the Throne for the unemployed, for the homeless, for the single parent mothers, for the battered women, for the special needs children, and the list goes on and on. There is not the slightest bit of light at the end of the tunnel from this government for those people in our society today.

Let us test the third criteria. Does it put forward the role that this government has undertaken, and does it present a plan of action? On both counts we do not have a plan of action; we have a government that is charting a course of passivity. We do not have a government that has taken and committed itself to an active role in our economy and our society; we have a government that has committed itself to do as little as possible.

There is probably an area where there is some agreement in this House when it comes to the Speech from the Throne. There is no disagreement in this House, certainly not from members on this side of the House that there are many, many strengths in this province, that we have an incredibly rich heritage on which to build. There is no disagreement, from this side of the House or anywhere in this Chamber, with the goal of prosperity and the desirability of a market economy. There is no disagreement with the fact that these are challenging times, but, Mr. Speaker, there is disagreement about how we build on the strengths

of this province. There is disagreement about how we achieve economic prosperity, and there is disagreement about how we create opportunities out of adversity.

So this debate is, in essence, about how democratic power should be used, and it is clear from this government, from this Speech from the Throne that in their mind, in their view, the best role for government and the economy is no role at all. According to their ideology that we have seen unfold its agenda slowly over the last couple of years and much more quickly and openly over the last five or six months, and according to the ideology of their Tory cousins in Ottawa, decisions made in the private sector should not only dictate what prices and commodities should be, but they should also be the predominate influence in what the priorities of our society as a whole should be.

So, for Conservatives today, we end up with this most interesting scenario that governments are not seen to have a legislative, active role in society, even when they are elected by a majority of the people in this province. It is the abandonment of the role of government to the complete supremacy of the market, leaving us with nothing less than the ideology that the public good is equal to the corporate good.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of this debate we have seen that ideology unfold more clearly, and we have seen how it takes off in a number of worrisome directions.

Let me just refer to a few of those directions. Yesterday I listened to part of the Minister of Health's (Mr. Orchard) speech, and I read the rest of it today. It became clear to me just how that ideology, that new Conservative ideology, is unfolding. The most worrisome part of it is that there is absolutely no respect, no belief, no commitment to participatory democracy. Time and time again member after member on the government benches has stood up and suggested the concerns we bring to this House based on concerns we have received from the community are figments of our imagination; that members of the opposition are inciting the masses, that we have concocted these concerns and caused them to be infiltrated in the minds of community people everywhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a fundamental denial of expression of freedom, of participatory democracy, then I do not know what is. That is an

insult to every individual and every group in our society who feels a particular pressure, a concern, a worry, some suffering, some sadness, some joy. That is the denial of the right of individuals to express a different view than the dominant ideology of the government of the day.

We will have no part of that kind of thinking. We will continue to do our job and represent the concerns of the majority of Manitobans and bring those concerns into this Legislature and demand action. For if we fail to do that, we have failed as legislators and should not be here at all.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I listened to another diatribe from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). I say another diatribe since he is the master at suggesting that any concerns raised by members on this side of the House is fearmongering, is fictitious inciting of the masses, and on and on it goes -(interjection)-fearmongering, rumour mongering.

* (1610)

Yesterday, in his address on the Speech from the Throne, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) revealed a little more clearly what Tory ideology really is all about. He suggested that public servants, when they raise concerns about possible layoffs or wage freezes or wage cuts or unemployment, are asking too much, and that they should be lowering their expectations to bring themselves in line with the so-called dilemma, the so-called bad times that our private sector is facing, that the private sector is facing severe economic times, can no longer afford to pay all of the taxes required to meet social, educational and health obligations in our society today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing to have an ideology that has some basis in fact; there is another thing to have an ideology that is based on myth, that has adopted a line of propaganda from the corporate sector and has used it to justify and rationalize every step of action along the way, because one does not have to look too far to know that the burden of taxation has been heaped over the last number of years under Liberal and Conservative federal governments—I am thinking in terms of our taxation system—how that burden has shifted onto the shoulders of low- and middle-income earners.

I am sure all members across the way have read the statistics, they cannot deny them, how in fact the average Canadian family with income of around

\$35,000 is paying over \$1,000 more in taxes today than when Brian Mulroney was elected. The members opposite know at the same time, in that same period, taxation, the tax rate, for the highest income earners in Canada, dropped three percentage points. While the middle income earners have seen an incredible increase in their tax rate, high income earners have seen a reduction in their tax rate.

The corporate sector has been able to avoid paying millions of dollars in taxes owing, taxes deferred, taxes overlooked, taxes ignored by Conservative governments federally and provincially, yet the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and, I would dare say, probably every single member on that side of the House continues to suggest that the public sector worker must tighten the belt, must sacrifice a bit because the private sector, the corporate sector, the business world is suffering. I wish at least, Mr. Speaker, that there would be some basis in fact for their ideology, because then we could understand it a little better and perhaps have an open and productive debate, but when we deal in mythology and we deal in corporate propaganda, it is very difficult to get an understanding and a spirit of co-operation in this Chamber.

Another variation on the theme of this Conservative government that is so apparent in the Speech from the Throne is that social spending, spending in health care, spending for education, spending for social services is causing our debt situation; that investment in those quality programs is at the source of our national debt problem and therefore the way we get at that problem is we have to cut. We have to reduce social programs, we have to cut in health care, we have to erode universal education, quality education.

Mr. Speaker, another myth that has to be debunked and dealt with once and for all if we are going to ever preserve any sense, any decency in terms of life here in Manitoba and across this country, because the facts are clear: It is not increased social spending that has caused and contributed to our national debt problem. It is the high interest rate policy of Conservatives. It is defence spending policy of Conservatives that has primarily caused the kind of debt situation and economic crisis we are facing today.

Let us look at one simple fact to make that point, Mr. Speaker. In 1985 health care spending and defence spending were roughly the same, about \$6 billion. Today, health care spending has—and what we are talking about is six, seven years later, health care spending has perhaps gone up to \$7 billion, but defence spending is now at approximately \$13 billion. So I say to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and to all members on that side of the House, do not tell us that health care spending is at the root of the national debt problem and therefore we have to cut back in health care in order to deal with the national debt problem. That is false and it is harmful, and it should be banished from their thinking and should be dealt with as quickly as possible so that our system does not have to continue to endure the kind of cutbacks and layoffs and crises that it is now faced with.

Mr. Speaker, I think the most telling commentary on Tory ideology are the statistics. After seven years of so-called economic recovery policies of the Mulroney government, the unemployment rate is up. The gap between the lowest and the highest paid workers has widened; the gap between the wages of men and women has widened; the income of senior executives has grown 10 times as fast as hourly paid workers; food banks have increased astronomically; poverty has taken on new, grave proportions, and the list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, if those statistics do not mean anything, then let us look for a moment at the human results of these statistics. Let us look at the feelings still that prevail of regional unfairness in this country. Let us consider the apprehension of visible minorities in the midst of this so-called economic recovery that has resulted in dramatically increased incidents of racism.

Now mind you, Conservatives perhaps do not recognize that—if Dorothy Dobbie is any indication, who would have us believe that she has never run across any example of racism in her experience in the business sector. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for St. Johns.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let us not forget, if these Tories will not listen to the statistics, will not accept the economic indicators, will not deal with the data as it is available, let us consider more examples of human suffering and the devastating impact on human lives of the

so-called policy of economic recovery by Brian Mulroney and, of course, members across the way.

* (1620)

Let us not forget the homeless men and women who sleep in bus shelters, or the aboriginal people who, as my colleague, the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) has said so eloquently just before me, continue to deal with a deepening housing crisis, a deepening economic deprivation in all of their communities. Let us not forget to juxtapose how demands for Porsches and what—BMW's and what is another -(interjection)- Porsches, continue to rise while patients are turned away from hospitals because of waiting lists. Let us not overlook that luxury condominiums are still in fairly high demand while record numbers of children go to school hungry, without breakfast. What is the Conservative response to this?

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): More money for private schools.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Yes, as my colleague the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) has said, the response has been more money for private schools, more tax breaks for the corporate sector, underfunding in important areas of service to people, health care, family services, education.

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

Instead, it has focused—it has listened to its corporate friends and said, we must cut, we must cut back in order to get a handle on our economic situation and our national debt problem. I would wish that just for once, Mr. Acting Speaker, that instead of responding to their friends in the business sector, that just for once this Conservative government would say no to cutbacks and get on with providing proactive decent government.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there are very sharp differences of approaches in this House. That there is no question about. While the Conservatives believe that good government is no government and talk about managing society or managing the future, we on this side of the House in the New Democratic Party are not satisfied with simply managing the future. We do not believe that the goals of equality, justice and fairness can be achieved on their own, left in the hands of the corporate sector and the whims and wishes of the private sector. We believe that there has to be a

proactive government helping to shape the future, create a different future.

The Conservatives believe that the role for government is like being a captain of a ship. The job of government is simply to guide the ship, to ensure that the ship is kept afloat. For us, Mr. Acting Speaker, that role is quite inadequate. Sure the ship must be kept afloat, but if that is all there is to political life, it is a view that is at once bleak and unjust. For us there must be a port, there must be charts. We must listen, but we must also lead.

I want to conclude simply by suggesting to the Premier and to his cabinet and government that he has choices. This is not a simple matter of taking a hard decision because there are no other choices. He has choices; he has heard them.

I want to say to him and his government that what is required now is a proactive government, not a passive government; a government of hope, not one of despair.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I leave him with the words again of Margaret Laurence because I can put it no better than Margaret Laurence in her article entitled "If I Had One Hour to Live." Almost as if they were written for the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and to all of us, she says:

Learn from those who are older than you are, learn from your contemporaries and never cease to learn from children. Try to feel in your heart's core the reality of others. This is the most painful thing in the world probably and the most necessary. In times of personal adversity know that you are not alone; know that although in the eternal scheme of things you are small, you are also unique and irreplaceable as all our fellow human beings are everywhere in the world; know that your commitment is above all to life itself. Your own life and work and friendships and loves will come to an end, because one day you will die and whatever happens after that or if anything happens at all, it will not be on this earth, but life and work and friendship and love will go on in others, your inheritors. The struggle for peace and for social justice will go on, provided that our earth survives and that caring humans still live. It is up to you now to do all that you can, and that means a commitment at this perilous moment in our human history to ensure that life itself will go on.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I am delighted to have the opportunity to address yet another throne speech. Having sat in this House—well, this is my 12th year—I never seem to tire of the excitement of another throne speech, the opportunity to put on the record some thoughts and ideas and share with members on both sides of the House the many areas of concern and responsibility that we have to address every day in this Chamber. I want to welcome back all members. It does not seem as though we have been away very long. I think it is just a little matter of a little over three months—in fact, it is less than three months—and it has been not very much time for us to relax and enjoy life, as many people think we do when we are members of this Chamber.

In fact, I know that even in that short while we were away everybody was working very hard; there were committees sitting. I know that the War on Drugs group were out doing their public consultations, the constitutional all-party committee, many others. -(interjection)- Certainly, I know Treasury Board was grinding away the long hours sitting sometimes seven days a week in recent weeks, putting in more than 100 hours in the close evaluation of the Estimates of Expenditure of the Province, the very key to the development of our future plans, Mr. Speaker. I know that everyone has put in a lot of time and effort in making sure that we do our best on behalf of the people who elected us and the people we represent.

I want to, of course, welcome you back, Mr. Speaker, to the high office that you enjoy in this Chamber and say how pleased we are that you continue to serve the people of this Chamber in an evenhanded and impartial manner. I want to say a word of welcome and congratulations to new members of the Treasury bench, the member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson) and the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh). I wish them well in their new responsibilities and the challenges and opportunities that are presented there.

I want to, on behalf of all Manitobans and certainly personally, thank the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) and the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) for the contributions and service that they gave on the Treasury bench. Many of us know the sacrifices that are made, the many, many hours that are invested. It is not an easy undertaking, and certainly, despite the fact that there are recognitions and other side benefits, it is a lot of hard work. They

have devoted a great deal of their time, energy and talent to the service of the people of Manitoba. They certainly have my gratitude for their efforts.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear. -(applause)-

Mr. Fillmon: Mr. Speaker, the throne speech -(interjection)- The members opposite are a real classic case of—

An Honourable Member: Of no class.

Mr. Fillmon: I was thinking more of two-faced people, Mr. Speaker.

I was trying to come up with an analogy of what the members opposite do in this Chamber, particularly the New Democrats, such as the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) who comes and gives his snide remark and then, at the same time, goes out to the media, wrings his hands and says what a terrible thing it is that I have made some changes in cabinet and how sorry he feels for the two individuals whose resignation he has been calling for, for the last three years, day after day.

* (1630)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think, in terms of what that represents, and I thought -(interjection)- No, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), no, he did not say anything like that. In fact, he is one of the others I was thinking of in terms of that comment. You know, I think in terms of just a good representation, and I was thinking of the ancient gods and who represented them best. I thought of the Greek gods. I could not associate anybody on that side with a Greek god, but then I thought of the Roman gods, and I thought of Janus, the two-faced god. I thought that probably best represents the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer) and all of his colleagues for their actions and their normal responses here in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech gives us an opportunity not only to look at the immediate plans of government, but also the long-term objectives that we have for this province as well. Never before in my time in this Chamber has the fundamental challenge before government been so clear. Never before in my experience have the issues before us, as a Legislature, been so clear-cut and so unavoidable.

Mr. Speaker, this year the government of Manitoba will have no more money to spend than it did last year. For the first time in recent memory, our revenues are not expected to grow at all from one

year to the next. All of us in this Chamber must come to grips with that reality. As a government, we cannot spend what we do not have. As an opposition, members opposite should not ask us to do so.

I am going to address some of the comments that were made by the deputy leader of the opposition in her speech in which she was, of course, on her standard line of saying that we should be all things to all people and do all things for everyone in this province. I am going to address that later in my remarks because I believe that they are key to the differences between those of us in this Chamber who want to be responsible, who want to keep faith with the people of this province now and in future and those who just want the cheap political trick and be all things to all people, Mr. Speaker. Of course, the members of the official opposition know to whom I address those remarks.

Our financial situation in this province is not a matter for debate; it is a reality. No amount of 10-second clips is going to change that reality. It cannot mask. It cannot be debated. It cannot be questioned as to what the reality is that we face, Mr. Speaker. One can misrepresent what that reality means to people, but the reality cannot be avoided.

The throne speech has laid out our government's approach. We have yet to hear an alternative from the opposition. Of course, we are still in the early days of the session. By definition the throne speech is general, nonspecific. Perhaps the members opposite are waiting for the budget, waiting to see our priorities in full context before they share with us their own priorities. Hopefully Manitobans will not have to wait much longer to see where the opposition stands.

The throne speech made a clear declaration of our government's priorities in these times. We are not accountants. Well, most of us are not accountants. I guess there are a couple, but I might say that despite the fact that we have a couple of accountants in our midst, our goals are not simply fiscal. We are representatives of the people of this province, and they remain our No. 1 priority. That includes seniors; that includes working people; that includes students; that includes children. All of the decisions within this throne speech, within the forthcoming budget have to be weighed in terms of the balance of effects on all people throughout society, in every corner of this province.

The throne speech indicates our first consideration in managing our scarce resources will be the impact of the decisions that we make on the people that government serves. With a zero percent increase in our revenues, we will not be able to protect and keep in place every single program that government has offered in the past, but our goal will be to find every alternative available to protect as many services as possible and certainly to protect those vital services that people depend upon.

We are also committed to protect the people who deliver those services. The throne speech specifically acknowledges the important role the thousands of people who deliver government services every day play in securing our quality of life here in Manitoba.

Once again, the zero percent increase severely limits the options available to government; yet, even in these difficult times, we have budgeted 3 percent more for public sector wage increases this year. That is the overall envelope of increase in public sector spending on wages—3 percent. I would like to do a lot more. I am sure every member on this side of the House would like to do a lot more, but there simply is not any more money available.

As it is, we will have to find the additional money that we are putting forward at a time when our revenues are growing by zero percent and we are increasing the salaries by 3 percent on the overall envelope. We are going to have to find that extra money to provide for that 3 percent increase through savings elsewhere in government, and that is a mighty challenge indeed.

So that brings us to the question of fairness, and I heard that word being used by the deputy leader of the opposition. What is more fair, protecting as many jobs as possible or giving a bigger wage increase to those who are left? What is more fair? Make no mistake, those are the choices, jobs versus raises. To me it was no question. There was no question involved. The fair thing is to protect as many jobs as possible, not to lay off people to pay those remaining more.

The private sector, I might say, throughout this country in the past year or so—one of the reasons why our average industrial wage index has gone up so dramatically—has taken an opposite point of view. In many cases they have passed along large increases much greater than cost of living. Then,

having removed and stripped from their agreements job protection clauses, they have wholesale cut 15 percent and 20 percent of work forces. We have seen it in many major companies in many of our biggest industries in Canada in the past year or so. It is a different approach; it is an approach that I do not think is conducive to the operations of government.

This throne speech lays out our immediate plans to proceed toward the long-term objectives we set for ourselves in the last election. Our government's goal remains to build a stronger Manitoba. I see two elements in that goal: a strong economy and a better quality of life. A strong economy is fundamental to strengthening our province. It is only through a strong economy that we can create jobs and economic opportunities that will allow our children to stay here in Manitoba. It is only through a strong economy that we will generate the taxes we need to maintain and enhance our strong social safety net: health care, education, social services. There is a growing awareness that a strong economy is not merely an end in itself, but a means toward securing a high quality of life. That is why future development must be sustainable development.

Our government is committed to fully implementing the philosophy of sustainable development. Just as it is important for us to create jobs and opportunity for our young people, so too is it important that we respect their right to enjoy the environmental diversity that we enjoy today. We have to look at the environment—as I have said many times as a former Environment minister, the environment is something that we have to treat as though we are borrowing it from our children, not inheriting it from our parents. Of course, quality of life involves much more. It encompasses a vibrant cultural community and includes a wide array of accessible recreational facilities and opportunities. It involves strong families and strong communities.

* (1640)

As I was saying to a group that I spoke with just a few days ago, Janice's favourite saying is that the wellness of society depends upon the wellness of the family. That is why our government has moved forward with a variety of initiatives, including the toughest drunk driving laws in Canada, an expanded wife abuse shelter system, a domestic court and the home video classification system, but

our quality of life still hinges on the strength of our economy.

It is an understatement to suggest that the 1990s will be the most dynamic decade in Canada's history and for that matter, that of the world. There are tremendous changes taking place out there in the world. The global economies that are now evolving will have a significant impact on Canada and certainly on Manitoba. We are ready to meet the changes and the challenges that lie ahead, and we are ready to capitalize on it.

Contributing to our confidence for our future economic growth and prosperity is the fact that Manitoba is poised to launch one of the most expansive industrial initiatives in our history. I know that at the time that we are in the depths of a recession nationwide, people often do not think ahead to the potential for expansion, to the potential for growth, to the potential for building a very strong and growing economy, but we have a number of very positive, excellent opportunities on the horizon.

One of the major initiatives, of course, in the growth of our economy will be as a result of the \$20 billion hydro-electricity sale that we announced in 1989 to the province of Ontario. I am delighted to say that the new administration in the province of Ontario continues to support that as an excellent arrangement, a benefit, a win-win situation for both Manitoba and Ontario. That sale, of course, triggers the construction of the Conawapa generating station on the Nelson River, as well as the construction of Bipole III, the 800-kilometre direct current transmission line needed to transport this tremendous store of power from north to south in our province.

Conawapa is projected to cost \$3.6 billion, Bipole III a further \$1.8 billion. The project which would be intended to be completed in the year 2001 would create 3,000 direct jobs at the peak of construction, thousands of other industrial and service spinoff jobs. Indeed, for large and small suppliers alike, Conawapa and Bipole represent tremendous opportunities for subcontract work for many, many years to come.

Manitoba has historically been able to depend upon its electricity generating capacity as a hedge against economic downturns. Conawapa will ensure that we continue to be able to do so, and, of course, we are committed to the complete and thorough environmental assessment and review

process. Of course, that is part of the necessity to ensure that in the undertaking of such a major project, such a major development, we do not in any way risk or damage our environment.

Manitoba has historically been able to depend upon its electricity generating capacity as a hedge against economic downturns. Conawapa will ensure that we continue to be able to do that in the future. Our cheap power, our inexpensive readily available service land is attractive to industrial development and investment.

I can assure all members in the Chamber that our government, and especially the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism, is enthusiastically and proudly promoting these advantages to potential investors around the world. In fact, we have been in situations over the past year in which we have had many, many potential investors visiting Manitoba. Our I, T and T people, and the Minister and myself have been to various places in the world and were viewed from a distance as having tremendous advantages, advantages that will fit in with the opportunities that we will see in this world in the future.

Things are changing very much so that you can do so many of the things that used to require location. Do you remember the old saying of McDonald's? What was important in the development of their business? Three things: location, location and location.

Well, today, of course, you know, you can be like Omaha, Nebraska, which is the 1-800-capital of North America. A little community in the midwest, a corn-growing area primarily, agriculture, and they—partly because of location, I might say it is because they are in the central time zone as we are, but because they have low costs of operation—have attracted all of the long distance 1-800 numbers there. They are providing that kind of telephone service for corporations, for advertising. They have something in the range of over 10,000 jobs doing that kind of telephone answering service, the 1-800 system. That is what they do.

They do many other things in the way of information processing, again, data centres, ability to transmit data right across the country, being in the central time zone, being able to have hours of operation coincide best with both sides of the country an advantage. Computer access to

information and relay of information, faxes, all of these things that have revolutionized the way of doing business have changed our opportunities. You add to that, of course, as I said earlier, our low cost of electricity, in fact the lowest cost electricity in North America, the low cost of space, the low cost of operations in many other respects, our utilities, our operational costs, even our industrial wage index, being very economical for many people to look at Manitoba.

All of these provide us with a multidimensional list of advantages that people have when they look at Manitoba, a wealth of new and exciting investment opportunities. Our profile in 1991 is highlighted by strong performance in aerospace, in the health industries, in information technologies and sustainable development in tourism. We have in place a solid and diversified industrial infrastructure, what we need to make real progress in the 1990s. Our administration took office pledging to bring a re-energized and positive investment climate to Manitoba, and I am pleased to say that we are on track with that despite the recession.

Manitoba is the only jurisdiction in the country that has not only held the line on tax increases in the last three years, but has actually reduced in both the personal and the corporate taxation areas. Our government has been working to dismantle interprovincial trade barriers that fragment an already small Canadian market and discourage business from obtaining the full benefits of the Canadian market. The economic base that such benefits create are essential if business is to efficiently expand into international markets. As a result we are benefiting from hundreds of millions of dollars of new investment in our province. Names such as Boeing, Hughes Aircraft, Dow-Corning, STM, Unisys, Repap, reinforcing our position that if you build an attractive, equitable, economic environment, investment will come.

We visited Toronto about three weeks ago, and we visited with many, many people who were interested in Manitoba. We had a dinner meeting that attracted a tremendous turnout of the investment and business community and a reception that attracted dozens and dozens of people who do business in Manitoba and are looking at new opportunities in Manitoba.

We had with us the Winnipeg 2000 group as part of our opportunity to promote Winnipeg and

Manitoba as a good place to do business and to invest and create jobs and grow. It is that kind of enthusiastic commitment of an organization that represents not only business, but indeed it represents labour, it represents our aboriginal community, a cross section of people from throughout the economy that has an opportunity in my judgment to really build upon the competitive advantages.

Winnipeg 2000 of course is doing excellent things. They are calling to public attention many of the advantages of doing business here in this province. We found that when we were there that in listening to some of the changes that have taken place, the keeping of our taxes down, the competitiveness of our costs of operation in this province, that we had many, many people not only give us their business cards and say tell us more about this, but people set up appointments, set up interviews with our staff and I, T and T and others and gave us indications of areas of interests that they had, for which we have a unique, competitive advantage in this province to build upon our industrial infrastructure, to build upon all of the kinds of advantages that we have.

Winnipeg 2000 did their kick off just the other day, and they have come up of course with a variety of things to promote Manitoba. This one, it says: people like me, number one reason. Well, I will use this to just read from because it has all the—I will just use this to read on, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I will not flash this around the House. It has 100 reasons that Winnipeg attracts people. -(interjection)- That is right. Well, the member opposite, he is on this list here. Number 100 is the zoo. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

* (1650)

Point of Order

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I timed it, and it took 20 minutes for the shot. I want to say that it is the first humorous shot I have ever heard from this Premier, but I think there are hundreds and hundreds of reasons for all of us to be proud about Winnipeg and Manitoba, and we should take the high road about our province and about our great city, not any other way.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member did not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, it lists all of the things that we know, because we live in Winnipeg and Manitoba. We know why we live here and how attractive a place this is to be and why many, many other people will join us. In fact, we have been the best-kept secret for a long, long time and that is changing, and this government is out there promoting actively every day the opportunities to invest and grow in Manitoba.

As a result, there are a number of initiatives that have been announced even within the past few weeks. Several weeks ago, I took part in opening ceremonies for the new McLeod Stedman head office and distribution facility, which was relocated to Winnipeg from Toronto, I might say—jobs being moved from Toronto to Winnipeg, the kind of thing that we know will happen in the future, 120 new jobs, head office distribution jobs, good jobs.

The following week, I was involved in the opening of the new Western Glove manufacturing plant in Winnipeg. This expansion relocation, because again it happens to be a production unit that was located in southern Ontario and is being moved totally to Winnipeg as a result of an investment decision that recognizes the competitive advantages of doing business here in Manitoba, creating about 150 new jobs in Manitoba, is the second Winnipeg plant now being operated by this major designer blue jeans maker.

I might say that the Leader of the Opposition after those two announcements were made, he came out and said, yes, those are Mc-jobs, Mr. Speaker. I took great exception to that, as most Manitobans did. Any time that there are new jobs that are in distribution, that are in head office, that are in manufacturing, that come to Manitoba, I am proud of that, and I will work for that any day of the week, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who tries to ridicule them and call them Mc-jobs. The people who occupy those jobs think they are good jobs, and they like the pay, and they like the opportunities that they have by these announcements.

An Honourable Member: See if you get a new Core.

Mr. Filmon: Well, now he is talking about a new Core. This Western Glove announcement was partially funded by the Core Area Agreement.

An Honourable Member: Negotiated by the former government.

Mr. Filmon: The original Core was negotiated by the Sterling Lyon administration. I will give credit to whomever. Lloyd Axworthy was on the federal side during that, Mr. Speaker. Wherever the announcements come, as long as they benefit Manitoba—and the second phase was done by Jake Epp. If we are going to take credit, let us all take credit.

I might say that the following week I was at a press conference in Toronto at which CGE announced their intention to develop a \$10 million facility to develop an advanced digital signal processing system here in Manitoba for antisubmarine detection and all those kinds of things, a world-mandated product that is going to have markets in Asia and Europe and Australia, Mr. Speaker. Right away, right up front, I told the media that this was part of the offset undertaken in the Limestone agreement by the former administration, and I said, and I will repeat it, I do not care who gets the credit for those jobs as long as they come to Manitoba. We are going to keep working to bring those jobs here. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) wants to politicize it and call them Mc-jobs or say it was only because the Howard Pawley administration did this offset agreement with CGE as part of Limestone, that is his business, Mr. Speaker. I will give him credit for it any time he wants, even when he is not entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker, last week a number of us in this Chamber were at the announcement of the expansion, the ribbon cutting of the expansion of Gemini Fashions, again in the core area of Winnipeg, again with some assistance from the Core Area Initiative Agreement. Gemini is an example of a company that has burgeoned and grown over the years. In fact, Gemini has been so successful that it is now recognized as one of the few top ones in the outerwear garment industry in Canada. As a result, they are taking over markets that heretofore were done by Ontario firms.

There was a firm called Ditrani that used to be one of the top makers of ski outerwear in Toronto; they have gone under. Gemini, who do Mobius and other lines of outerwear for ski wear, are doing very, very well. They have added to their growth. They have added to the space they occupy. They have added to the jobs that they have in Manitoba because they

are competitive and because they produce a high-quality product—another example of a sector in Manitoba that is doing very, very well, thank you very much.

Whether it be information processing or food processing or aerospace or health industries or the environment industries, there are new opportunities ahead for business investment in Manitoba, whether it be large or small.

While we recognize that real economic growth comes from a vibrant private sector, we have identified industries where government can play an important role in industrial growth. Government involvement in aerospace will be focused and concentrated on making this sector even more attractive to private investment.

It is already playing a similar role in the growth and development of our health industries. Internationally known names, Siemens, Otto Bock, Trimel, bringing world attention and a distinct profile to this increasingly important sector of our economy. With the Aging and Rehabilitation Product Development Corporation now in place, jointly established by the federal government and the Manitoba Health Industry Development Initiative, we in Manitoba can look forward to increased health industry investment here.

Our belief in the growth potential of the health industries is predicated on the knowledge that we are having an increasingly aging population, and as such, goods and services for this particular group will be of critical importance in the years ahead. It is a very competitive sector and one in which Manitoba is very well positioned to compete.

The health industry sector will benefit from the selection of Manitoba as the location for the Canadian Centre for Disease Control, the virology lab, a national institution to be located here, and it will be critically important in providing the infrastructure of medical and scientific research personnel upon which we can build and grow our health care industries in this province.

Similar potential exists for the International Institute for Sustainable Development, again a building block coming into this same area of scientific, leading edge, research and technology development in a field that is growing and burgeoning throughout the world, sustainable development.

We know, of course, that the issue of environmental protection has never been as acutely important as it is today. You just do not have to read polls to tell you that. Go into the schools and talk to our young people. Go out in our society and talk to any group of people. The environment is an issue of importance like it has never been in the past. With the International Institute for Sustainable Development located in Manitoba, we are well positioned to be a world leader in the development and promotion of opportunities for environmental business. That is why the Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment has moved their operations here to Manitoba. That is why the Environmental Industries Association has moved here to Manitoba, because they see leadership in this province in terms of environmental protection, sustainable development. They see leadership in this province, as they do not see in many areas of the country.

* (1700)

Mr. Speaker, I see a member opposite looking askance at that statement. I have to tell you that despite all of the flack we take in this Legislature on environmental issues this province stands up very, very well on a nation-wide basis—

An Honourable Member: It used to be 10 out of 10.

Mr. Filmon: Well, it used to be 10 out of 10. I am reminded of that. When the New Democratic Party was in government in this province, Manitoba was 10th out of 10 in this nation, Mr. Speaker. -(interjection)-

No, we were No. 2 in 1990—No. 2 in economic performance country-wide in 1990.

An Honourable Member: The Conference Board of Canada says 10 out of 10.

Mr. Filmon: Well, the projection is based on—see the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie)—whose walking away now because he cannot stand the heat—says that we are projected to not do well in economic growth in this province in 1991. Mr. Speaker, if he would read the report, he would see that the principal reason given there was because of an expected downturn in agriculture income.

An Honourable Member: And manufacturing and retail.

Mr. Filmon: No, Mr. Speaker. In terms of manufacturing, in terms of retail we are doing quite fine. We are not doing as well as we would like to,

but manufacturing investment is continuing to be one of the areas, as I have just referred to, in which we are attracting growth and in which we are attracting opportunities.

Getting back to what I was saying about the environment, they were 10th out of 10 under the NDP, Mr. Speaker. We had an example given in this House by the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) of the reason why they were 10 out of 10. They put out an environmental cleanup order on Manitoba Telephone System in 1982 and did not do anything about ensuring that order was carried out throughout the rest of their term of government until 1988.

Some Honourable Members: Who was the minister?

Mr. Filmon: The Manitoba Telephone System minister, of course, was now the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

All of the bleating that we get from the New Democratic Party in opposition about environmental cleanup is an absolute shame on their record. It is a blot on their record.

Now, today in opposition they scream away saying we ought to do more for the environment. They were 10th out of 10, Mr. Speaker.

An Honourable Member: How about energy conservation?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, among many things there was a report that somebody in the opposition quoted from the—

An Honourable Member: That was the member for St. James.

Mr. Filmon: Was it the member for St. James? Yes, he selectively quoted—it was from the Ottawa Citizen, October 20, 1990 in which he found one category in which we were the worst in the country and he quoted from it.

However, that report is very comprehensive and very complete. It has a number of different areas—one, two, three, four, five. It has about 10 different areas in which they compare us on a country-wide basis. Overall, we rate fourth now in the country. That is not bad. We have been in government three years. We are up to fourth best in the country from 10th out of 10 under the NDP.

I am not suggesting that it is perfect. We have much more to do and much farther to go, Mr.

Speaker, but now we rate considerably better than the NDP did when they were in government.

With our abundant, clean hydroelectric power, our diversified industrial profile, our support network, including our academic institutions and a skilled work force, we are able to offer a very positive atmosphere conducive to the profitable establishment of environmentally friendly industries. These are difficult times, but they are still exciting times, because we have much to look forward to in a positive sense, Mr. Speaker.

We are witnessing the sorting out of a new global economic order, one that will take a few years to stabilize. Globally, we are watching social, political, economic changes on a scale never seen before. I spoke a little bit about that in the last throne speech, Mr. Speaker, but we have got huge challenges presented to us by all of these changes, a change in the way we are going to do business, a change in the way that we will operate country to country, a change in our social order. We are ready for that challenge.

I know that all of us in this Chamber share the goal of building a stronger Manitoba. We all want to leave this place a better place for our children. We all want to work to ensure that there are opportunities there that were not there for previous generations, and our ability to achieve that goal is threatened. High levels of government debt and taxation have threatened to strangle our economy and starve our social services. That is the problem with our social services funding today.

The problem that the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) raised in her remarks is as a result of the huge debt load that this province is saddled with. Manitoba truly is at a crossroads. For most of the last two decades, our province was led by governments with a spend-now, pay-later philosophy, and the costs are staggering. We have a \$10-billion debt in this province, \$10,000 for every man, woman and child. Half of that total \$10-billion debt was developed in a six-and-a-half-year period under the administration of Howard Pawley. That is Manitoba's version of the Dark Ages, that six-and-a-half-year period under Howard Pawley. -(interjection)-

Well, the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is not really totally being humorous about this. The fact is those were good years in terms of growth. Government income was rising at levels that were a

minimum of 6.5 percent in the worst year. Many of the years it went up by 18 percent. During that period of time, of course, what were they doing with the nurses? What were they doing to the nurses? They were giving them zero, 2 percent, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) sits and grins, because he knows that all the time he was boasting about how they kept the nurses down, and then he could go out and march on the picket lines with them and encourage them to strike now, because somebody else was in government. Now, we are back, of course, to the two faces of Janus that I talked about. That is what we are up against with the member for Concordia. Janus is spelled J-a-n-u-s. It is the Roman god with two faces, and it represents very much the actions of the member for Concordia.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind you that there are still a number of members who sit in the New Democratic Party benches who are part of that gang who brought a doubling of the entire debt in a six-and-a-half-year period to this province. We have the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis). We have the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). We have the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), the member—

An Honourable Member: We lowered it \$300 billion a year. We will see what you do next week.

Mr. Filmon: You lowered what? What did you lower? You lowered the standards of honesty and of doing of government in this province, Mr. Speaker. That is what they lowered.

Before we spend a single dollar on health care or education this year, we have to spend—and I am talking about the fiscal year in which we are, 1990-91—\$551 million of interest costs due to primarily six and a half years of NDP mismanagement. The reason is, it cannot be put more clearly, but the last budget of Sterling Lyon, 1981-82, \$104 million went to interest costs in that budget. By the end of the Pawley administration in 1988, it was \$530 million, five times as great. That is interest, Mr. Speaker. That is interest that cannot be spent on social services, that cannot be spent on health care, that cannot be spent on education because it goes to interest.

That is the legacy of the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis). That is what she has to

answer to her children and her grandchildren for and to the people of this province who are having a difficult time today making ends meet and not getting the services that they need. It is because of her actions as a member of the Pawley administration, because before she was a member of the Treasury bench she was in his office on the Executive Council staff doing work on behalf of that government, totally committed to the unbelievably negative policies of that administration which are dragging down our province unmercifully, Mr. Speaker.

* (1710)

If we did not have to spend that money on interest, we would have had \$400 million in surplus in last year's budget. Just imagine that. What could we have done? No more 2 percent tax on net income, no more payroll tax. We could have wiped them all out with that extra money, Mr. Speaker, and we could have of course provided for even greater and enhanced services in health care and education and social services.

Well, we cannot change the past, but we can make choices about what kind of future we want. I do not want to burden future governments and future generations with the costs of programs that we are not willing to pay for today. One taxpayer lamented to me that it is too bad that our great grandchildren and their children are not here to see the incredible things that governments are doing with their money, because it is indeed the money of future generations that we are being asked to spend every time the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) gets up in the House these days, Mr. Speaker.

We are committed to keeping the deficit under control. We are committed to keeping taxes down, and that means that we have to do a very, very difficult and challenging thing and that is, we have to control spending.

They used to say that one of the biggest financial challenges that we have to face is teaching our kids the value of a dollar. Now, unfortunately, what we have to do is teach opposition members the value of a million dollars and many, many millions of dollars, because they are spending it day after day after day.

Obviously we are facing tough times. From the beginning of our first mandate, a top priority of our administration has been the restoration of our

province's finances. As I said earlier, it means controlling the debt and keeping taxes down. Our taxes are the highest in western Canada and amongst the highest in Canada. Everywhere Manitobans look, another government has its hands out for more taxes.

I am sure that everyone in this Chamber knows the reality of what is happening out there. The GST—we all fought it. We all were opposed to it, Mr. Speaker. That is another burden that people regrettably have to have on their plates today. High taxes are not only unfair to taxpayers, they hurt our ability to create jobs and attract investment.

In this province, as a result of NDP administrations of the past, of course we tax jobs—the payroll tax. We tax jobs. Of course, as a result of a former NDP administration, we tax capital through the corporation capital tax. In fact, that corporation capital tax even taxes borrowed money, because it is capital employed that it taxes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that with this administration here we have a much better chance of someday getting rid of that tax, in response to the Leader of the Opposition, than we ever would under his administration, because they want to spend and spend and spend and raise taxes and raise taxes and raise taxes as they did when they were in government.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about what they would do if they were in our shoes, because we have heard a lot of things from them during the course of their throne speech. We have heard them talk about how they would make corporations pay more taxes if they were in government. This is what they did when they were in government, because it is all well and good to talk about what you would do.

I remember the member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) telling the story in this House about a hired hand he had once, who in the wintertime would tell people what a great baseball player he was and in the summertime would tell people what a great hockey player he was. That is what we hear from the NDP opposition. We hear about what they would do if they were in government.

An Honourable Member: We look forward to seeing you on the rink.

Mr. Filmon: Listen, I will take you on the squash court any time. I will give you a couple of points, okay?

During the time that they were in government in this province, corporate income tax revenues rose 49 percent, personal income tax revenues rose 139 percent. So the little people, the individual taxpayer who they say they have such great sympathy for, that they are going to do things for, they raised their taxes three times as much as they raised corporate taxes. That is the kind of commitment that they had when they were in government. Actions speak louder than words. It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker, to hear the two faces of the Leader of the Opposition when he is in government and when he is in opposition. That is the kind of thing that we get from them.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to do everything in our power to keep taxes down in this province, because we believe that is the way this province will grow, and over the past three years we have made steady progress in improving our province's finances. We knew that this would be a difficult year. That is why we set up the Fiscal Stabilization Fund, that is why we refused to use it to pay for campaign promises as some other opposition Leaders were doing during that election campaign. I remember that. We created the Fiscal Stabilization Fund for the reasons that we stated when we brought it into this House, to allow us to protect essential services—health care, social services and education—and that is what we are doing with it.

I want to remind members opposite who tell us in this House that we did not tell people about the difficult times, not only did we tell people about difficult times, in the 1989 budget, for the first time ever we forecast ahead one year what the projected increases in revenues and expenditures would be, what the projected deficit would be. I will tell you, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and his colleagues want to go back and take a look at it, it is awfully close to being accurate, Mr. Speaker. That is why we set up the Fiscal Stabilization Fund, because we knew there were storm clouds on the horizon, that there would be more difficult times ahead.

Mr. Speaker, as an open government, we projected in this budget, the 1990-91 budget, two years ahead to show members opposite again the difficult times that we are going to be faced with because of the national recession, that we were all going to have to deal with.

They said, spend. They said, raise taxes. They said, raise the deficit. What are deficits? Deficits are deferred taxes. You have to pay them and you have to pay them with interest. -(interjection)- The member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) raises another shadow of the Pawley years in which they did not like to refer to deficits as deficits. They called them unfunded liabilities—a little doublespeak, a little doublespeak there from those NDP people opposite.

Even with respect to funding of universities, Mr. Speaker, in the 1990 election campaign we knew we were not in a position to make commitments to them for increases in funding that we could not keep. We did not make lavish campaign promises throughout that 1990 campaign, because we knew that our financial problems were going to face us square on as we got into the recession that everybody in the country was into.

Sound provincial finances are not an end in themselves. They are a means to an end. Sound finances will let us build a strong economy and provide a stable foundation for the human services government provides. We have no more money this year. That is a reality that we all have to face.

Health care costs are continuing to rise. That is another reality that we all have to face. We are determined to give health care and the other vital services in government the money they need to maintain services. In order to do that, we have to find savings elsewhere. We are going to have to make choices, and they are going to be difficult choices.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this is the most difficult time that I have ever personally had in going through budgets in a government setting. I was on City Council for the better part of two terms, and I went through the budget process when I was chairman of Works and Operations. We had 60 percent of all the city's expenditures at that time, because we had Parks under our jurisdiction as well at that time. We made some tough choices, and we thought we went through it with a fine tooth comb.

I was on Treasury Board during the Lyon years, but we have never had the kind of thorough and comprehensive budget process that we have had to undertake this year. We have had to do it because there just is not enough money to do all the things that people would like to do.

I say to the members opposite, and I would like to really hold out the challenge to all of the members

opposite, instead of coming in day after day after day, which they have been doing in the past little while in Question Period—why are you not maintaining this service, why are you cutting back on that, why are you not doing this, \$25,000 here, \$88,000 there, \$150,000 there, a million here, \$20 million there, as the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) was saying, \$20 million more for hospitals.

* (1720)

Mr. Speaker, even to keep our expenditure levels to the level that we are, we are having to take people's budgets and go through it with them program by program, function by function, line by line, work station by work station and say, what are the choices that we can make? What are the things that we would like to do? What are the things that we must do as a government? Those are difficult, gut-wrenching choices, and each and every member of this government is committed to make those difficult choices so that we can do one thing, preserve the vital areas of services in health care, in social services and in education. We cannot do everything.

If we were to do everything that the New Democrats were to demand, Mr. Speaker, what we would end up with is the same kind of slide down into that black hole of debt that Howard Pawley and his colleagues took us into, that black hole of debt that is still costing us \$551 million of interest this year so we cannot provide the kinds of things the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) wants, the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) demands, the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) and others are demanding day after day.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing, of course, is the cute trick that they want to pull when they say to us, well, of course you could find other ways of saving the money. You could put it on the corporate sector. That is the standard line that we get. They say, take that \$7 million that was given to the corporations. Well, No. 1, not a nickel of that has flowed to a corporation. So they are wrong in that count. Number 2, that money is provided to fund training and education, retraining at a time when the private sector is under siege.

The private sector does not have any easier answers to the recession than we do. The private sector is forced to lay off people, and the thing they can do is invest in human resource capital so that

people who are underskilled can perhaps be accommodated in other jobs, that they can make an investment in people, Mr. Speaker. The New Democrats are opposed to that. They are opposed to an investment in training people. I do not know of one sector of society, one reasonable thinking sector of society that is opposed to investing in the development of our human resource capital by way of training and education.

We hear it from organized labour. We hear it from social service agencies. We hear it from business. We hear it from education: Invest in human resource capital. Only the New Democrats in this Chamber are opposed to that. That tells you their priorities, and that tells you why they were turfed out unceremoniously in 1988.

The other thing, they say, is, take the money from the private schools. Take the money from the private schools—St. Paul's, where the Leader of the Opposition attended high school, Mr. Speaker.

An Honourable Member: Holy Ghost.

Mr. Filmon: Take it from Holy Ghost. Take it from all of these schools, and then you will cure all of the problems of public school education. The total amount of increase that is going to independent schools this year is \$1.8 million on a \$770 million budget for public school education. I have a great deal more respect for the people in public school education, that I know they do not believe that \$1.8 million added onto a \$770 million budget is going to dramatically improve their ability to do the things they do in public schools.

I have great confidence in the public schools of this province. I am a product of the public schools, so are my children, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the public schools can do the job, and I do not believe that taking a fraction of 1 percent of their funding away is going to dramatically cripple their ability to provide the quality services which they do in this province. I think that it is absolutely false and really unfair—

An Honourable Member: Misleading.

Mr. Filmon: —and misleading of the New Democrats to try and make cheap politics out of that kind of policy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk for a few moments about responsibility, because I think that there has been a lack of responsibility on the part of the opposition in the course of the throne speech and

all the questioning done. Here is what a New Democrat says when he is in government. I talked about what the New Democrats of Manitoba did when they were in government, the havoc that they wreaked on the people of this province, the things they said that today they say they would not do, all the things they did to the environment, all the things they did to corporate taxes, which they said that they would do today and did not do in government.

Here is the answer. It is a headline from *The Globe and Mail* the 28th of January of this year, and it says: *Can't Afford to Throw Money at Crises, Rae Says.* Now that is Premier Bob, Mr. Speaker, and he is doing exactly what all responsible governments in this province are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the members opposite give an opportunity to Manitobans to try and work co-operatively together, because these are not easy times. There are difficult challenges ahead. It is going to take the concerted effort of all members. As I said earlier, instead of looking for the cheap trick, instead of looking for the 10-second clip, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and his colleagues in the New Democratic caucus ought to get down to some responsible decision making, look for ways in which we can cushion people, because the last thing that we need to do in this province is to leave the people of this province who are hanging on in the private sector, happy to just hang onto their jobs, happy to just hang onto their homes. Leave them with enough money so that they can make ends meet instead of doing what the New Democrats want, which is spend more and tax more.

That would be the greatest human tragedy that could be perpetrated on the people of this province in the circumstances we face. That is the human tragedy that is the legacy of the NDP administration of Howard Pawley. That is the human tragedy that New Democrats consistently want to foist upon Manitobans, and we say no to that, Mr. Speaker. We say no to that.

We will not always be popular. We will not always be popular, because it is not easy to say no to every special interest group that comes along. I know that the members of the New Democratic Party—I see the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak). He will be out there rallying the troops on the Legislature steps on Thursday. He will be out there fomenting unrest in the people of this province. He will be out there

misleading them, telling them that the New Democrats would give them everything when we know that New Democrats in government do not do what they say they will do. New Democrats in government go absolutely opposite to what they say when they are in opposition. New Democrats are dishonest with people. When they are in government, they keep their increases down to 2 percent, and when they are in opposition, they say spend it all, Mr. Speaker.

We will not break faith with the people of this province. We will keep taxes down. That is what we will do. We will build an economic climate that will allow people to accomplish their goals and their ideals here, not be taxed out of the province and driven out of the province by government policy, Mr. Speaker. We will build an economic climate that will lead to growth and prosperity and investment and opportunity.

We have a solid set of programs for the province. We have common-sense solutions to real problems that are worthy of support, and if we make it through this difficult year with our finances intact, we will be able to move forward on our broader agenda. My government's goal is to move onto that broader agenda, to build a solid foundation for economic growth.

* (1730)

I invite members opposite to put aside their partisan politics, to put aside the challenge of the 10-second clip of that cheap little bit of politics with the one-liners, Mr. Speaker, put it all aside and join hands with us and work to that better future and try and ensure that we protect and enhance the opportunities for the people of this province and support what I believe is a very good throne speech, the right throne speech for the present time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the main motion as proposed by the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render) for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the session.

All those in favour of the main motion will please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it. Order, please.

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

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, before I move the motion of adjournment, I am wondering if I could make a change to the Standing Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources dealing with Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I would ask that the committee also consider the 1990 Annual Report of MPIC, which was just tabled by the minister in the House the other day.

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

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that this House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Tuesday, March 19, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
		Small Business Storie; Stefanson	339
Introduction of Bills		Trade Practices Act Storie; Stefanson	340
Bill 4, Health Services Insurance Amendment Act Orchard	335	Racist Literature Lamoureux; McCrae	340
Bill 5, Mental Health Amendment Act Orchard	335	Manitoba Intercultural Council Lamoureux; Mitchelson	341
Oral Questions		Manitoba Human Rights Commission Lamoureux; McCrae	341
Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board Plohman; Filmon; Findlay	335	Lake Winnipegosis Wowchuk; Enns	342
City Council Reduction Friesen; Ernst	336	Health Care System Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard	343
Environmental Protection Edwards; Cummings	337	Manitoba Horse Racing Commission Carr; Stefanson	344
Manitoba Telephone System Edwards; Findlay	338		
Universities McAlpine; Derkach	338		
ESL Program Chomiak; Mitchelson	338		
Universities Chomiak; Derkach	339		

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Throne Speech Debate

Findlay	344
Harper	350
Carr	354
Wasylycia-Leis	361
Filmon	366