



Fourth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

41 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XLII No. 32 - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1993

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
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
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, Cliff	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
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALLOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	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, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP
<i>Vacant</i>	Rupertsland	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Sharon Hagen, Bernice Tardiff, Stanley Tardiff and others, requesting the Family Services minister (Mr. Gilleshammer) consider restoring funding for the friendship centres in Manitoba.

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Harry Huebner, Marilyn Peters Kliewer, Adolf Ens and others, requesting the Family Services minister (Mr. Gilleshammer) consider restoring funding for the friendship centres in Manitoba.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Ivan Hagen, Douglas Ladany, Debbie Hagen and others, requesting the Family Services minister (Mr. Gilleshammer) consider restoring funding for the friendship centres in Manitoba.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member (Mr. Dewar). It complies with the privileges and the practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? [agreed]

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): The petition of undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth that:

WHEREAS the United Nations has declared 1993 the International Year of the World's Indigenous People with the theme, "Indigenous People: a new partnership" and

WHEREAS the provincial government has totally discontinued funding to all friendship centres; and

WHEREAS the provincial government has stated that these cuts mirror the federal cuts; and

WHEREAS the elimination of all funding to friendship centres will result in the loss of many jobs as well as the services and programs provided, such

as: assistance to the elderly, the homeless, youth programming, the socially disadvantaged, families in crisis, education, recreation and cultural programming, housing relocation, fine options, counselling, court assistance, advocacy;

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba may be pleased to request the Family Services minister to consider restoring funding for the friendship centres in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). It complies with the privileges and the practices of the House, and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? [agreed]

Mr. Clerk: The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba, humbly sheweth that:

WHEREAS the provincial government has without notice or legal approval allowed wide open Sunday shopping; and

WHEREAS the provincial government has not consulted Manitobans before implementing wide open Sunday shopping; and

WHEREAS the provincial government has not held public hearings on wide open Sunday shopping.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba may be pleased to request the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) to consider holding public hearings on wide open Sunday shopping throughout Manitoba before March 31, 1993.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly be pleased to request the Attorney General to uphold the current law concerning Sunday shopping until public hearings are held and the Legislature approves changes to the law.

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member (Mr. Hickes). It complies with the privileges and practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

Mr. Clerk: The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth that:

WHEREAS the United Nations has declared 1993 the International Year of the World's Indigenous People with the theme, "Indigenous People: a new partnership"; and

WHEREAS the provincial government has totally discontinued funding to all friendship centres; and

WHEREAS the provincial government has stated that these cuts mirror the federal cuts; and

WHEREAS the elimination of all funding to friendship centres will result in the loss of many jobs as well as the services and programs provided, such as: assistance to the elderly, the homeless, youth programming, the socially disadvantaged, families in crisis, education, recreation and cultural programming, housing relocation, fine options, counselling, court assistance, advocacy;

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba may be pleased to request the Family Services minister to consider restoring funding for the friendship centres in Manitoba.

* (1335)

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery, where we have with us today Major General Tom Defay who is a Commander of the Land Force Western Area from Edmonton and the Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry, 2nd Battalion, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel J.F. Calvin. The battalion leaves this week to serve in Daruvar, Croatia.

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

Also with us this afternoon, seated in the Speaker's Gallery, we have the Honourable Hubert Humphrey, the Attorney General for the State of Minnesota.

On behalf of all honourable members, I would like to welcome you here this afternoon, sir.

Seated in the public gallery this afternoon, we have 24 adult visitors from the Kirkness Adult Learning Centre. They are under the direction of Lenore Wiebe and Laurel Johnson.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Student Social Allowance Program Funding Elimination Impact

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, former Premier Duff Roblin, speaking to the MAST convention over the weekend, made some very profound statements about the need for education and the need for training. He spoke of the goal of having all students in Manitoba finish their high school. He also talked of the costs of not having a skilled and trained workforce, the costs in terms of higher unemployment, in fact three times greater unemployment for people who are not trained and skilled in our society, and that cost would be borne by the individual and by our province for years and decades to come.

Yet the government is cutting back on student social assistance. It says, on the one hand, these students can stay with their parents. We find out that is not true for 900 to 1,000. They say, on the other hand, there are other alternatives, and then we find out that they are not eligible for educational opportunities under municipal social assistance.

I would like to ask the Premier: What are the long-term costs of the decisions his government has made to cut back on opportunities for student social assistance and long-term careers for these 1,000 people?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, as in many things, this province has to choose— [interjection] The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) obviously wants to answer the question for her Leader.

An Honourable Member: She would probably do a better job.

Mr. Filmon: Well, then, I will let her, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier: They have talked for a long time about long-term planning, long-term budgeting and long-term decision making. Yet we believe the government is proceeding in a mean and shortsighted way for the students on social assistance.

I would like to ask the Premier to table the savings he believes he will have, which are of course passed on to the city of Winnipeg taxpayers and other municipal taxpayers, the savings he will have which

are passed on to the one taxpayer; on the other hand, the long-term cost to these people and to our society in the province of Manitoba for the decisions he has made to cut off student social assistance when they cannot get that student social assistance on municipal welfare.

* (1340)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, as I started to say earlier, every government in this country is facing difficult choices. The article that is in today's paper about the credit rating watch that is on for every province in Canada is symptomatic of the challenges that we face of trying to live within our means today in a very rapidly changing society, a society in which for the most part our revenues in the '90s are going to be flat at best.

As a result of that, the job that is being done by every single province in Canada is to make judgments about what programs that may have been nice, that may have been beneficial to some, that were built into the costs of government in the '70s and the '80s, and are no longer sustainable today in the '90s given the revenue that we have.

So, Mr. Speaker, very difficult choices have to be made about what things can be afforded and what things cannot. When we look at something like student social allowances, we find that no other province in Canada has found that it can afford that program—difficult choices, difficult decisions that have to be made with the sense that what we really have to do is to try and preserve the ability of most Manitobans to continue to enjoy a reasonable lifestyle. If we raise their taxes, as the New Democrats did throughout the '80s and want us to do today, then we will plunge into difficulties—significant numbers of people in our society, very large numbers of people and their children and their entire next generation. We cannot do that, in all conscience and in all commitment to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

We have had to make those difficult choices. We have said, look, if this is a program that cannot be afforded by any other province in Canada, how is it that Manitoba, not one of the larger, not one of the wealthier provinces, can justify sustaining it. Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, we cannot.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, many of the innovative programs that have been established in Manitoba have been long term and cost-effective for our

community, for our province and have been picked up by other provinces.

Look at home care which was started in Manitoba. We were the only province to start that program and now many other provinces are moving into that area because it is cost-effective.

Maybe this is the very cost-effective program you should be keeping, as the only province in Canada, and let the other provinces follow our leadership to get people off social assistance and let them get working again with a long-term career.

Let us use leadership, not followship, like this Premier.

Manitoba Foster Family Association Funding

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I have a final supplementary question dealing with long-term costs.

Mr. Speaker, over last week's period of time when the decision was communicated to foster parents and foster families across Manitoba, there was going to be projected by a number of agencies to have—instead of kids going into the emotional and cost-effective care of foster homes, there is the contingency plan now by the province to send kids into receiving homes, hotels and higher-cost institutions like Macdonald hostel.

Mr. Speaker, you will not save any money. You will not provide any emotional care with these kind of programs.

Will the Premier go back and negotiate and deal in partnership with the foster parents and the foster parents' association? It does not only make good emotional sense for our children, it makes good economic sense for our future.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, tax and spend is all that the New Democrats want us to do. In response—[interjection] No, the Leader of the Opposition is not correct when he says that people want higher taxes and people are willing to have more government money spent.

The fact of the matter is, with respect to his earlier preamble, that that program of student social allowances was in place for more than a decade. No other province picked it up because they did have alternatives for those people, alternatives with families, with friends, with part-time jobs, many other alternatives that have seen people throughout our society find the way to fund their education. In those

circumstances, they found ways to ensure that they funded their education, and they do in all the other provinces.

With respect to his second question, Mr. Speaker, this government, together with the foster parents, entered into an agreement that saw, over the past five years, foster parent rates in Manitoba go up to the second-highest level in Canada. For a province in which our cost of living is eighth highest in the country—way above the cost of living, proportionately. Even with the reduction that is put through in this budget, they remain the third highest rates in Canada. We believe, given that our expenditures, our cost of living are the eighth highest, that is not an unreasonable position in which to be.

I regret the attitude that is being taken by the foster parents' association, but we will indeed find foster care because there are many, many Manitobans who love and care for children and who will continue to provide that service for the funding that is available.

* (1345)

School Divisions Clinician Funding

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has said repeatedly that education is a priority. She said that in the throne speech in December. The Premier said that education is the key that unlocks a world of opportunity and a future of economic growth and prosperity.

The Minister of Education says that special needs kids are a priority. Yet, when we asked her in this House on March 9 how then she could justify the laying off and cutting of 60 to 70 speech therapists, hearing clinicians, behavioural psychologists who provide services for special needs kids, she said: But we are enhancing the services; we are doing more; it will allow the school divisions to hire more clinicians than previously through our department.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this minister: Is she saying in this House that it is going to cost the Department of Education, her department, more for special needs kids through the hiring of clinicians as a result of this change? Is that what she is telling the House?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, the hiring of clinicians will now be the responsibility of local school

divisions. The amount of money available to hire those clinicians flows through the funding formula by virtue of a formula. When that is then put forward to school divisions, it does allow for the hiring of more clinicians than, in fact, were hired by the Department of Education. That flows through the funding formula.

Mr. Plohman: Well, Mr. Speaker, it sounds like a classic case of double talk. The information that we have is that the total savings to the department will be \$3.8 million and the cost will be \$2.835 million, based on 63 clinicians times \$45,000.

I want to ask the minister whether in fact she is now going to acknowledge that she is saving close to \$1 million on the backs of special needs kids in this province.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, again, I do not believe the member has the numbers of clinicians appropriate in the preamble that he gave. In addition, we are looking for the services of clinicians to be provided within the local school division. We also know that a number of those clinicians have already received job offers from school divisions, and so we fully expect this service to be delivered in a way that provides the local needs to be met and to be determined by school divisions on behalf of the special needs child and that child's family.

Mr. Plohman: So the minister is saying that she is indeed saving a million dollars on the backs of special needs kids.

I want to ask this minister then: Will she now be prepared, since she is spending over \$2 million on exclusionary elite schools such as St. John's-Ravenscourt, over \$2 million per year, who have not one of these special needs kids in those schools, will she now reduce the funding unilaterally or consult with the parents' groups there and ask them whether they will take a \$1-million cut so she can put it to priorities to the special—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, we do believe that we are recognizing the priority needs of special needs young people in this province. The member is not familiar enough with the funding formula to understand, in addition, that we flow special needs funding for Level I, Level II and Level III needs students through our funding formula. We raised that amount of money by 42 percent last year. In addition, this year one of the changes to our funding formula was to include at the Level II and the Level

Ill the emotionally and behaviourally disordered young people and also those young people who are hearing impaired. We have taken several concrete steps to enhance the services to special needs young people.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I think that the member might like to rethink his statement in suggesting that our independent schools do not have special needs young people because we have just recently met with those school divisions. They most certainly do.

* (1350)

Video Lottery Terminals Revenue Reinvestment

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. This government and this Premier made a promise to rural Manitoba. They introduced the video lottery terminals and said to the rural municipalities that any revenue that was generated through these machines would be in fact returned to the communities. I have had letters and the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) has had letters from throughout the province from mayors, from reeves, some 30 pieces of correspondence in the last week asking us why this government has broken its promise to rural Manitoba.

My question to the Premier, quite simply, is: Why did the Premier and this government break its promise and not give back the money that is being taken out of the rural communities?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the member for Inkster is asking questions about rural Manitoba. His Leader just said in the newspaper on the weekend that the Liberal Party is not going to win any seats in rural Manitoba until they look like they are going to win seats in Winnipeg. She says that they are like Quebec. They will vote the way they think that the government is going to go. I think perhaps he should work on his leadership campaign instead of asking those question.

No promise has been broken to rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. We committed \$5 million from this year's budget, and we are spending \$5 million from this year's budget to rural Manitoba, from VLT revenues.

Mr. Lamoureux: This government made a commitment to return the monies that were being generated through the VLTs in rural Manitoba and

all those monies would in fact be reinvested into rural Manitoba.

My question to the Premier is: Will he give assurances to the rural municipalities that 25 percent of the revenues that are being generated will be returned to those municipalities, because this way we have some sort of assurances that the VLT revenues are in fact—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put his question.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, this provincial government is making commitments to rural Manitoba every time that it spends money on hospitals, on personal care beds, on highways, on GRIP and NISA. There are hundreds of millions and billions of dollars being spent. In addition to that, special programs with respect to the areas, for instance, in Brandon, the expansion to the Keystone Centre, the partnership agreement for water development—

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): The Southern Development Initiative.

Mr. Filmon: The Southern Development Initiative—thank you very much from the member for Thompson.

All of those things are millions and millions, hundreds of millions, in fact, billions of dollars being spent in rural Manitoba each and every day that this government is in office. No previous administration has made the commitment and spent the money that this government has in rural Manitoba.

The City of Winnipeg

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, what the Premier does not realize is that the VLT revenues are taking away from the communities much like when the government is now talking about bringing in VLTs in the city of Winnipeg. There is a cost to the VLTs that is coming directly out of the communities.

My question to the government is: Will the government, at the very least, sit down with the City of Winnipeg and come up with some sort of an agreement that if they are going to be going ahead with the VLTs and taking out of the communities, there will be some sort of assurance that money is going to be going back into the community? This is another form of offloading—

* (1355)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put his question.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, now, of course, we have the difficulty of the Liberal Party trying to go out of a rural Manitoba issue and get into the city of Winnipeg and make a special deal for the city of Winnipeg. The issue in the minds of the people of this province is, there is only one set of priorities. When they say that health care, education and our social safety net are the biggest set of priorities, they do not want us to set aside 25 percent of Lotteries funds in a slush fund so that some municipal government can set their own priorities. They want their funds spent on the priority areas that they determine are most important to all the people.

Transcona-Springfield School Division Funding Formula

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, on March 10, the Minister of Education said that her funding formula and Bill 16 are fair and equitable to school divisions. Today the Transcona-Springfield School Division trustees met with the Minister of Education and told her, and I quote: The new educational formula introduced last year has fundamental flaws, and the supplementary component does not provide equality of opportunity for the pupils of the province because it fails to compensate for the gross variation in per-pupil assessment across the province.

Can this Minister of Education explain to the House, the trustees and the parents in the Transcona-Springfield School Division, how her statements that this formula is fair and equitable to the school division equates and balances with what the trustees told her today?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I did have the opportunity to meet with the Transcona-Springfield School Division today. We had a very long and a very good discussion where we did review the brief. In that brief, I pointed out to the Transcona-Springfield School Division that the past formula had really not been fair. Most school divisions across this province understood that it was not fair, including Transcona-Springfield, and that through the old formula they did receive a certain amount of money through the supplementary.

What I did go over with them today is that the new funding formula does not provide as much to the

supplementary portion because it does provide greater equity in the front-end portion, where it does look at the assessment. As we apply a uniform mill rate across all school divisions, then it does take into account exactly how much that mill rate will use, and the funding formula then balances off the issue in that way.

I did explain that to Transcona-Springfield today. The member might not understand.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the formula was so fair it has taken this minister a two-year phase-in; if it is so fair I am sure she can understand that it would not take that long.

Can this minister explain, Mr. Speaker, because she committed to the trustees today to review the inequities in the funding formula and to adjust the funding to the Transcona-Springfield School Division to recognize at long last the large rural component, when can the division expect an answer from the minister specifically addressing the concerns and making this funding formula fair support for the school division of Transcona-Springfield?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, the member was not at the meeting, so let me tell him exactly what I said. I did say to him that this funding formula was a dynamic formula. It has been discussed as that since it was first introduced last year. Last year we had the Education Finance Advisory Committee working on the funding formula, what their role was, to take the concerns of school divisions and then look at those concerns and see if they could be integrated fairly into the funding formula.

In this year, we were able to do that. We took six priorities that were recommended by that committee, and we did adjust the formula. My commitment to Transcona-Springfield today was that that committee will continue its work, that the concerns they have raised, which were not accepted last year by that committee, they are free to raise them again this year. Perhaps this year, with more experience of other school divisions, will be a year to consider those concerns.

* (1400)

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, by this minister's own formula, it is going to cost the school division \$23 per home this year, something that the division can ill afford.

How can this Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), who represents an area, part of the Transcona-

Springfield School Division, stand idly by while his colleague the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) guts dollars from school programs in his own community?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, let me just remind the member that last year his school division benefited by 6 percent. They have a very large increase as a result of this new funding formula that brought benefits to Transcona-Springfield. This year, through the changes in the transportation portion of the school funding formula, Transcona-Springfield benefited again.

Manitoba Intercultural Council Retention

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, since the Filmon government was first elected in 1988, they have emasculated the Manitoba Intercultural Council, which has lost its granting authority and has lost programming and staff to the politically appointed Multiculturalism Secretariat. Now, the minister is threatening to revoke The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act.

Yesterday, the MIC executive stated that we support the retention of The MIC Act and appropriate funding to ensure the survival of the MIC and its role in the community.

Will the minister make a commitment to the people of Manitoba today that she will not introduce an act to repeal The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act in this session of the Legislature?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister responsible for Multiculturalism): Mr. Speaker, the only government that ever emasculated the Manitoba Intercultural Council was that government when they were in power. The member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), who was the then-Minister of Culture, did not accept the advice of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. Indeed, what she did was take someone that did not even belong to the Manitoba Intercultural Council and put them in as the chairperson, without the consent and without the recommendation of the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

When we took over as government, I had a very angry organization on my hands as a direct result of what that member for St. Johns did.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, yes, it is wonderful if the government cannot answer a question; it reduces itself to personal attacks on members of the House. I await the Estimates of this department with great glee, because we will prove the inaccuracy of the statements of the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism.

Will the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism and, today anyway, the Minister responsible for The Multiculturalism Act, The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act, guarantee to the people of Manitoba that she will not introduce legislation revoking The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act this session of the Legislature? Would she please answer that simple question?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, indeed, the records will show, from the annual reports of the Manitoba Intercultural Council back in 1988, that the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) did politically interfere with the appointment of the chairperson of that council, so the facts will bear it out. It is unfortunate that the now critic was not around at that time to see first-hand the devastation of that council as a result.

Mr. Speaker, we commissioned Don Blair to examine the role and the mandate of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. He held broad, extensive consultations and did a questionnaire throughout the community. His main recommendation, and the recommendation that we have accepted as government, is indeed to repeal the legislation and to turn the organization over to the community that it serves, and we will do that.

Conference Cancellation

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister responsible for The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act then cancel the biennial conference that is scheduled for the middle of next month, which has absolutely nothing to do now that she has said that she is going to go against her own Manitoba Intercultural Council executive, the majority of the people who actually spoke with Don Blair and six of the seven recommendations that Don Blair made in his report? Why even have the biennial that is put on by the totally appointed political appointees of the Manitoba Secretariat?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister responsible for Multiculturalism): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept any of the preamble of the member opposite because indeed government appoints only one

member to every two members elected by the community, so there is still a majority of people on the Manitoba Intercultural Council who are elected from the community and community representatives.

I do not know where she is coming from again because in fact the minister does not dictate to the Manitoba Intercultural Council when to have a biennial assembly. The council determines that, sets the date and holds their own assembly.

School Divisions Wage Freeze—Teaching Staff

Ms. Avlis Gray (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, on March 1 in this House, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) suggested that if every teacher in this province were to take a pay cut, all of the teachers could still be employed and the quality of services maintained. He went on to suggest that everybody else has had to have freezes and reductions and that teachers of the province should be no different.

We have the Minister of Education, on the other hand, who is telling MAST that a wage freeze is not an option with this government.

My question to the Minister of Education is: What is the government's policy on this issue?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): From the time of the funding announcement in Education, I did refer to school divisions as employers, and school divisions as employers do have the right to negotiate with their own employees if a wage freeze is what they would like to do. That is still their option as employers.

We as a government have made our position clear. At this time, we are recommending that they also may in addition like to look at, or they may rather like to look at, what we are doing with our employees, which is a workweek reduction. We have said to school divisions, as another option as employers, that they might look at a version of the workweek reduction with their employees.

Ms. Gray: Well, the position of this government is still not clear on that issue.

Education System Professional Development Days

Ms. Avlis Gray (Crescentwood): A supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Education. Can the minister tell us, what is the policy of this government in regard to professional

development days for teachers? Do they support the fact that teachers should take professional development days and take them with no pay? What is the policy?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): We did recommend to school divisions that they might look at a version of the workweek reduction with their own employees, and some of those days that they might like to look at are the in-service days. That will be up to divisions to look at that.

We as a government, Mr. Speaker, continue to support professional development through our funding formula and to make available the kind of support to schools that we know is necessary.

Ms. Gray: This minister suggested that educators and teachers should take a page from the government in terms of what they are doing with their employees.

Civil Service Deputy Minister Seminar Costs

Ms. Avlis Gray (Crescentwood): My final supplementary for the Minister of Education is—and I would like to table page 27 from the Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission, where it indicates that a new seminar program was implemented for deputy ministers. These short and topical seminars provided deputies with an opportunity, not only to learn from the experts in management, but to exchange ideas amongst themselves which could improve operating effectiveness.

My question for the Minister of Education is: Were those seminars for deputy ministers paid for through the Civil Service Commission? Did those deputy ministers receive salaries on the days they attended?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put her question.

Hon. Darren Prznik (Minister responsible for The Civil Service Act): Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to answer that question because I think, quite frankly, if members of the Liberal Party have not quite woken up and realized it, that every area of government expenditure, every way we have done things in the past has to be re-examined. Yes, in the past those were paid for by the Civil Service Commission.

There is a new budget coming and Education, Civil Service Commission, everyone has to undergo

the same review. I say to the members opposite, wait and see what happens for next year.

Transcona-Springfield School Division Funding Formula

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radlsson): Mr. Speaker, this government's latest economic policy and attack on the public school system is unfairly penalizing students and their families in Transcona-Springfield.

How does the Minister of Education explain the disparity in class size in comparing Transcona-Springfield School Division, which has more students per teacher, with other school divisions, when the Transcona-Springfield School Division is being one of the hardest hit under this education funding policy?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): I will remind the member again that the new education funding formula provided a benefit to Transcona School Division last year, and as a result of that benefit Transcona School Division did determine their own budget. They then made their decisions which would affect their special requirement.

I think it is also important for me to recognize the hard work of the Transcona-Springfield School Division. I recognize that. I spoke to them about that today, and I recognize the hard work of all the school divisions across this province.

* (1410)

School Divisions Funding Formula

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radlsson): For the same minister—will this government commit to study the impact of this new funding policy on student retention so that next year at budget time we can see that the effect of cutting in Education will increase class size which will in effect cause more students to drop out of school?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): The member is trying to tie together a number of events. In making the funding formula in the funding announcement we also said to school divisions that there were decisions to be made, and we asked that those decisions not affect students in the classroom and not affect programs.

We do, on a regular basis, monitor the effect of the funding formula across the province. We also try to take into account the concerns that divisions

bring to us as they affect the divisions by the application.

We have asked the assistance of our advisory committee, which is a representative group made up of trustees, teachers and superintendents across this province, to assist us to make that funding formula the most effective formula it can be, but, I would also say, attempt to make it fair, because the old way was not fair.

Ms. Cerlill: Does this minister understand that the policy of reducing the base funding in neighbourhoods of modest homes and less ability to generate revenue will mean loss of resources to that neighbourhood? Can she explain her definition of how that is fair and how that is in keeping with the policy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put her question.

Ms. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, again, where the assessment is low the funding formula then does provide a greater amount to that particular school division. That is what I was saying to the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) earlier as well.

In the past it was an inequitable, more ad hoc way to fund through supplementary funding. Now we attempt to fund that through the main part of the funding formula to ensure fairness to all the school divisions across this province.

Selkirk Friendship Centre Invitation to Premier

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Yesterday the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) confirmed to all those who watched Question Period that neither of them have any idea what a friendship centre is and what goes on in friendship centres here in this province.

In light of this, and following up on the request made yesterday by my colleague the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), I would like to ask the Premier and the Minister of Family Services to visit the Selkirk Friendship Centre which this year is celebrating its 25th anniversary.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there was a question there.

Funding Elimination Justification

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have a question.

Why did this Premier cut the funding to the friendship centres before the government even investigated what the friendship centres provide in this province?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The preamble to the question is not accurate.

Selkirk Friendship Centre Alternative Programs

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the friendship centre in Selkirk provides counselling services on domestic violence, suicide prevention, crisis management.

What preparation has the Minister of Family Services made to cover the loss of these counselling services in Selkirk?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, as was indicated earlier in the week, government provides these services in the communities. The friendship centres have a multiuse purpose around that and are able to enhance those services.

I am aware, from looking at the annual reports of many of the friendship centres, of the variety of things they do. Probably the one in Thompson is the most successful in that they have a very large budget and have the Northern Inn and restaurant in Thompson as part of that. There are quite a variety of services that are provided across there. [interjection]

I would point out to the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), we are responsible for 5 percent of the budget in the Thompson Friendship Centre, and I am sure they will manage quite nicely with the other 95 percent.

Sunday Shopping Legislation Withdrawal

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism.

As I just released a survey that I held in my constituency of St. Boniface, it is now obvious that Manitobans are not in favour of unrestricted Sunday shopping. Out of the total of 1,146 replies in the survey, 723 or 63.8 percent said no, they were not in favour of unrestricted Sunday shopping, while 417, 36.38 percent, said yes. [interjection] You had a chance to ask your question.

In light of the results of this survey that show clearly people's opposition to Sunday shopping, in light of the communique released on March 17, 1993, in which the Association of Christian Churches in Manitoba stated clearly their opposition to Sunday shopping, in light of the opposition to Sunday shopping by the—

Mr. Speaker: Your question, please.

Mr. Gaudry: Could the minister enlighten this House by accepting today to withdraw the proposed amendments to The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Act presently before this House?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, in response to the honourable member's question, the short answer is no. As he well knows, this is a trial period that expires on April 5. The bill has passed second reading and will be at committee hearings shortly.

Public Hearings—Rural Manitoba

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Will the minister consider holding public hearings on the issue, unlike the federal Conservatives who push so many things down the throats of Canadians and Manitobans?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, in response to a similar question some time ago from members of the opposition, we indicated that this bill, not unlike all legislation before this House, will follow the same process and procedure and will be at committee hearings held here in this building in which all Manitobans who have interest in a particular piece of legislation can either attend in person or send a submission in by writing.

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

Nonpolitical Statements

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I would seek the leave of the House to make a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. McCrae: If I could have the attention of honourable members, I have a very important message, Mr. Speaker. I do not know how many honourable members know yet, but the May issue of Chatelaine magazine will, for the second time, name the city of Brandon as one of the 10 best cities in which to live in Canada.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer)—and this is not political—may be referred to again in *Chatelaine*, but as far as I know he has only been referred to once and the city of Brandon has been referred to twice.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure this designation by the *Chatelaine* magazine has a lot to do with the community spirit that is demonstrated very often in the city of Brandon. We can point to so many achievements over the years which have called for a massive effort on the part of the volunteer community in the city. I refer, of course, to the recent Scott Tournament of Hearts curling competition, the Canada Games in 1979, World Youth Baseball.

We are going to be hosting the World Championship Curling in 1995. We hope to be hosting the Canada Games again in 1997. We have fine educational institutions in Brandon and medical institutes as well. I cannot be more eloquent than His Worship Mayor Rick Borotsik when he responded to this by saying, it is good stuff.

* (1420)

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Leader of the Opposition have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and congratulate the community and the people of Brandon again for receiving that prestigious designation from *Chatelaine* magazine. I know that *Chatelaine* has very good judgment on these decisions, and I know that they have chosen well by choosing Brandon again.

I also heard the other day that *Chatelaine* had designated Grand Beach as a tourist attraction, as well, Mr. Speaker, and I want to pay tribute to that wonderful, wonderful location in the province of Manitoba as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is terrific that Brandon has again been awarded this judgment. I guess one would find it surprising that the honourable member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) wants to be so far away from Brandon, potentially in his future for four days out of five, but we say that in jest, not in any seriousness.

I just was in Brandon recently attending the Dakota Ojibway Games, and it was a wonderful host for people from all across Canada. I did not get an opportunity to attend the Tournament of Hearts, but

I know that they broke all the attendance records and demonstrated a tremendous degree of volunteerism and community spirit that is unsurpassed in any community in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

We wish the people of Brandon well, and I hope they are able to again capitalize on this designation. I think it is terrific that they have continued to put Manitoba on the national map in a very positive way, and I think it is great for Manitoba and great for the people of Brandon. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Leader of the second opposition party have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to also join with the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) and also with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) in congratulating the city of Brandon. It really is a gem of a little city. There is no question about that at all.

I was there last Friday, as I am sure the Attorney General knows. Once again, as I came down that hill and up again over the bridge, I was struck by the attractiveness of the community and by the many amenities that that community has to offer. The people who live there obviously live there in a spirit of great community, and that is reflected in their tremendous sense of volunteerism.

I think we should also reflect on the fact that there are many other pretty little towns and pretty other communities in this province. If there were similar categories with smaller numbers and towns, per se, perhaps they also would qualify, because this is a very beautiful province, and all of us who live here recognize that.

Committee Change

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) for the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call the Supply motion on page 5 of the Order Paper.

DEBATE ON PROPOSED MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: On the motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that this House, at this sitting, will resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, standing in the name of the honourable Leader of the second opposition party.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased again to speak on the Supply motion, to move the motion that we consider Supply in this House and this motion which, of course, brings into force and effect the establishment of the Supply committee.

As I have tried to explain over the last few days, one has to examine carefully why it is that the government wishes to go into Supply at this particular point in time.

We have clearly stated to the Minister of Finance, who is also the House leader, if he wishes to use this motion only to go into Interim Supply in order to ensure that the government has the dollars it requires to make its commitments to civil servants and to other agencies, that we are quite willing and able to go into an Interim Supply, but we would require certain guarantees from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the House leader for the government, if we were to do that. We would require very clearly that this Interim Supply motion, which is what he would like to debate, would not be used as a means to facilitate the going into Estimates in this Chamber.

We are opposed to the discussion of Estimates in the province of Manitoba at this particular juncture because we are parting with a long-term tradition in this House of presenting the Main Estimates in their total form before we are presented with and before we debate the individual Estimates of specific departments.

As I have indicated in the past, the reason for our unwillingness to do that is because we do not feel that our roles as critics would be appropriately met if indeed we are dealing with an individual department in isolation of other departments, knowing that we do not have the information available to compare and to contrast the expenditures of other government departments.

Mr. Speaker, I have in the past indicated to this Chamber that the basis for our objection is steeped in the history of Parliament and its whole tradition which has come to us from the parliamentary

system. But I think it is fair to say that it is also part and parcel of any democratic process anywhere.

If one looks at the democratic system in the United States, for example, which is not a parliamentary tradition; if we look at the fact that while we have here what is called a "union of powers" and they have there what is called a "separation of powers," there is still a process by which the economic value, the economic ability of a government to operate, must still be approved by the legislative body of that particular democracy.

I think it is important for the members to recognize that, although in the United States the President presents a budget to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, he cannot enforce that budget. Just like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) cannot get his budget, including his Estimates, passed by this Chamber without a vote of this Chamber—neither can the President of the United States.

Although he presents, in terms of his budgetary presentation, usually late in January, each year to the joint sitting of the United State Congress, he then has to do a great deal of negotiation because he is dealing with a House which is not as disciplined a chamber, I would suggest to you, as is this particular parliamentary system. Although senators and members of the House of Representatives in the United States are sometimes elected in a presidential year, they are not all elected in a presidential year.

Presidents are only elected every four years; members of the House of Representatives are elected every two years; members of the Senate are elected every six years; as a result, he has to deal with individuals in the Senate and in the House of Representatives who may have no allegiance specifically to him. In other words, some of them were elected in November when Bill Clinton was elected; some of them it may be said came in on his coattails. But, if the President is very unpopular two years from now, some of those members of the Democratic Party may still get elected, but they do not have any necessary allegiance to be directed towards the Clinton administration. Therefore, they are not necessarily going to approve the budget, even as is the case presently, the House of Representatives and the United States Senate are both made up predominantly of members of the Democratic Party.

There is also, of course, within the Democratic Party, a split—what is often called the Northern Democrats and the Southern Democrats, and frequently Southern Democrats are considered to be more Republican than some of the Northern Republicans. So the President of the United States cannot always turn, I would suggest to you, for support and for an automatic approval of that budgetary process.

But that is the whole point. There is not automatic approval. There are rules and regulations which that, another democracy, has to abide by in order for the parliamentary process to function, but also for the so-called presidential process to function. That is all that we are asking from this particular government at this particular point in time, that process be respected, that our rights as MLAs be respected, that our rights to do things according to well-known and well-respected procedures of this Chamber be respected. And if we have an indication from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that those procedures will indeed be followed, as they have been followed in the past, then we will move with dispatch to giving the Minister of Finance what it is that he wishes to have on the Order Paper which is, of course, Interim Supply. If he does not want to move with dispatch into Interim Supply, then I will continue to speak on this motion until such time as the minister and the House leader for the New Democratic Party and the House leader for the Liberal Party can come up with a legitimate solution.

* (1430)

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I spent a great deal of time talking about the evolution of the parliamentary system and because, obviously, the lesson was not sufficiently well learned, I decided that today I would go back and delve a little bit further into the development of democratic traditions and responsibilities. I think if we are going to look clearly at the democracy that we value in terms of the Canadian parliamentary system, then it is appropriate that we go back to looking at the situation in Greece which of course even before the Mother of Parliament gave us the basic concepts of democracy.

Just as one can easily compare the principles of democratic system within the need for the granting of Supply, one sees that even in the foremost evolutions of our original democracy that in Athens,

Supply again became a principal concept and one which caused the democracy to be formed.

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

I want to read from a book written by Roehm, Buske, Webster and Wesley called *The Record of Mankind*. "Among the gifts Athens left to the world, none is so important as the ideal of democracy. Under the Athenian system of government every male citizen had a part in public affairs. He might hold office, serve in the courts, and help make the laws. These privileges were open to rich and poor alike. The offices, moreover, were numerous (fourteen hundred in all), and most of them were for a term of one year. Election to office was usually by lot. This did away with favoritism and allowed the poor man a chance in politics equal to that of the man of wealth or of noble birth. It should be remembered, however, that slaves and foreigners were not citizens and therefore had no voice in the government. Furthermore, the women of Athens exercised no political rights. The proportion of the population who could take part in the government was therefore small. This fact does not make the contribution of Athens less important. Never before had the world seen a government in which the people had so large a part.

"The centre of Athenian democracy was the Assembly, which consisted of all male citizens who had reached twenty years of age. It met on the slopes of a hill called the Pnyx. The meetings were frequently disorderly and very trying to the speakers."

Well, I think, Madam Deputy Speaker, that is obviously clear that tradition has not been lost in this Chamber. The meetings of this Chamber are frequently disorderly and frequently very trying to the speakers.

"Voting was by show of hands, except in cases concerning individuals, when the ballot was used." Like in this Chamber where we do not use a ballot, we tend on a recorded vote to stand at our places, and we are counted again, a direct connection between the Athenian democratic system and what goes on in this particular Chamber.

To quote again: "Many officers and magistrates assisted the Assembly. Among these, the Ten Generals held the leading place. They guided the discussions of the Assembly and carried out the orders of that body. Since the office of general was elective, it was open to men of ability and influence.

Pericles served sixteen years in succession as one of the Ten Generals.

"The courts were composed of citizens selected by lot. Any citizen might present himself as a candidate. A court was both judge and jury. It decided by majority vote, and from its decision there was no appeal. Trials of public officers and disputes between the cities of the empire, besides all ordinary legal business, came before these bodies.

"Democracy, then, developed to a high degree in ancient Athens. The citizens ruled and they ruled directly. This system worked well in a small city-state like Athens, but its benefits did not extend to the empire. The subject communities of the Delian League were not represented at Athens. They were ruled in a dictatorial fashion by the Athenians.

"Athens had many skilled workmen—mostly foreigners—who produced fine pottery, metal wares, and objects of art. In the country districts of Attica people raised olives, grapes, and figs on small farms and large estates. These articles and products formed the bulk of the exports of the city-state."

Unfortunately, the city-states were not adequately represented, but what the Athenian government did was to present to the world, a form of government which has been copied, in many ways, and in many experiments. But, in all of the copying that they have done, one principle and one principle alone has been maintained, and that is the right of duly elected representatives to participate in votes of Supply, votes that would determine whether a government would or would not be given the money that it needed in order to function.

That is the purpose of the motion before us at the present time. Without the ability to obtain Supply, a government cannot function. Governments that have not been able to get Supply have found themselves defeated in this Chamber, and as a result, have caused an election. That is critical to our understanding of the democratic process and our understanding of what is taking place in this Chamber at the present time when the government of the day would try and limit the opportunities and limit the abilities of the opposition parties to participate as fully as they can in the making of rights and laws in the province of Manitoba.

It was this Athenian democratic system that was imported into Great Britain and which I addressed before, but which I want to address again, because I am not sure that the House fully understood the

importance of what it was that I was drawing to their attention in earlier times and because I do not wish to be repetitious, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have in fact the use of other documents to build the case that I built last week.

Again, quoting from the book entitled *The Record of Mankind with respect to how Great Britain achieved political democracy*: "Great Britain is an island consisting of England, Scotland, and Wales. England is the largest, most populous, and wealthiest of these divisions. Wales, to the west of England, was conquered in the thirteenth century, and in the sixteenth century became a part of the English parliamentary system. Scotland and England were combined under one ruler in 1603, when the Scottish king inherited the throne of England and became king of both countries. This ruler was James I, the first of the Stuarts. By the Act of Union in 1707, Scotland and England came under a common parliament. In 1800 Ireland was united with Great Britain. Together they formed the United Kingdom. Since 1922 a large part of Ireland has been a self-governing country. . . . Thus, from 1800 to 1922 the term English, or British government meant the government which controlled England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland and certain nearby islands.

"In the early 1700's, Great Britain was still an undemocratic country. The glorious revolution had preserved the liberty of the upper classes, but had not given most Englishmen any share in electing the members of Parliament. The Legislative body was by no means democratic. The members of the House of Lords composed of nobles and bishops inherited their seats or were appointed by the king. The members of the House of Commons were indeed elected, but only by a fraction of the British peoples.

"In the countries or shires only certain landowners could vote. In the towns or boroughs only a handful of well-to-do people could vote. There were even some boroughs where a rich man, generally a nobleman, had the privilege of appointing a representative. For that reason, he was said to carry the borough in his pocket and his district was called a pocket borough. At the time in the British Isles as a whole only one person in a hundred had the privilege of voting for members of the House of Commons.

* (1440)

"Elections to the House of Commons were also undemocratic because of the unequal population of the election districts. These districts had been set up in the late Middle Ages. Each shire and each borough, regardless of its population, sent two representatives. Since the Middle Ages, however, many of the medieval towns had disappeared and nothing remained of them but a house or two, a green mound, a park or a ruined wall. Yet, such a town still had representatives in Parliament who were appointed by the man owning the site. Such places were called 'rotten boroughs.' On the other hand, the towns that had grown up since the Middle Ages had no representation. Outstanding examples were towns that had become busy manufacturing centres because of the industrial revolution. Among them were the flourishing cities of Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham and Sheffield.

"Restrictions on the right to vote and inequalities in representation would have been sufficient reasons for a reform movement. In addition, however, the elections were accompanied by dishonest practices. Because voting was not secret but public, individual voters were frequently bribed or intimidated. Rotten boroughs and pocket boroughs were often sold outright to the highest bidder.

"Efforts to improve these conditions began in the 18th Century, but for a long time they accomplished nothing. Sober people alarmed by the revolution in France saw in the demands for parliamentary reform only radical plots against the government. After 1815, however, the Reign of Terror and Napoleon Bonaparte were no longer bugbears. Public opinion steadily became more hostile to a system of representation which denied political power to so many educated, prosperous members of the middle class. The Whig nobles also took up the Liberal cause and made it a party question. The Tories, on their side, stood firm against anything which looked like democracy. The Duke of Wellington, who had become Prime Minister, even declared that nothing better than the existing system could be devised 'by the wit of man.' This stubborn refusal to make the slightest reform caused the downfall of the duke's ministry. In 1830, the year of the July Revolution in France, the Whigs, under Earl Grey, returned to office. They promised to introduce a bill for parliamentary reform.

"The events which followed showed how the parliamentary system works in England. The

reform bill introduced by Earl Grey, the Whig Prime Minister, failed to pass the House of Commons. Parliament was then dissolved and a general election called to test the opinion of the country. The Whigs won and the Whig ministry or cabinet twice more tried to put through a reform bill. Each time, the House of Lords turned it down. Popular excitement rose to fever pitch. England seemed on the verge of revolution. In one mass meeting after another, the lords were denounced as corrupt and selfish. The Prime Minister, Earl Grey, advised the king to create a number of new peers, or lords, who would favour reform. The new peers would, of course, be members of the House of Lords and would vote for the reform bill. The king refused to comply with this request, and the Prime Minister and his cabinet resigned from office. The Duke of Wellington tried to form a Tory ministry but did not succeed. The king then promised to create the necessary peers, and Earl Grey came back as Prime Minister. The king did not have to create new lords. The mere threat of doing so brought the House of Lords to terms, and in 1832 the long debated bill quietly became law.

"The Reform Act corrected some of the worst evils in the system of electing representatives to the House of Commons. In the first place, the act did away with the most rotten and pocket boroughs. This left a large number of seats through towns and countries which had too few representatives or none at all. In the second place, the act gave the franchise a right to vote to all men in the towns who owned or rented houses worth \$50 a year and to those who rented land of certain value in the country. These two provisions of the act were important steps in bringing political democracy to Great Britain. Nevertheless, the majority of the population consisting of working men, farm labourers and women still remained without a vote.

"The Reform Act brought about a great change in British politics. The revolution of 1688-1689 had transferred the chief power from the king to the upper class or landed aristocracy. The parliamentary revolution of 1832 shifted the power to the middle class of merchants, manufacturers and professional men, the class corresponding to the French bourgeoisie. Henceforth, for many years, the middle class ruled Great Britain. Furthermore, the events of 1832 proved that the Tory aristocracy entrenched in the House of Lords could not permanently go against the popular will.

The lords had yielded, however reluctantly, to popular opinion. Their actions meant that for the future, Great Britain would possess in her parliamentary system a means for orderly reform."

I want to stop there for just a moment, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I think that is a significant statement. Their action meant that for the future, Great Britain would possess in her parliamentary system a means for orderly reform. If indeed that is what we want here, if indeed the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) wants some reform of this Chamber, wants some reform on the basis by which we bring about changes to the parliamentary system as it is practised in this Chamber, then the process is to make sure that we have that orderly reform.

There was no orderly reform in this particular motion by the Minister of Finance, the House leader for the government of the day when he decided that he would do something which in his own words was unparliamentary and unprecedented. He knew that he was doing something which was not orderly. He knew he was doing something which had never been done before, and rather than try and obtain some means by which such activity could take place, he chose himself to move such a motion in the Chamber, thereby violating all of the concepts of the evolution of a system and means for orderly reform.

This party to which I am the Leader and will remain the Leader until the 5th of June when we will meet together and select a new Leader—that process leaves me here as the Leader of the party having to make decisions as to whether I will allow the government of the day in this province to circumvent the orderly process of rules which is so very much a part of our parliamentary tradition.

Let me continue with The Record of Mankind.

"Even after the passage of the Reform Act of 1832, only about one ninth of the grown men in Great Britain could vote. Farm laborers, day laborers in the cities, and many of the middle class were left without the franchise because they could not meet the requirements laid down by the First Reform Act. The desire for further parliamentary reform grew, particularly among the laborers. The depression in 1837 which threw many of them out of work deepened their dissatisfaction. In 1838 a group of workers issued a document known as the 'People's Charter.' It demanded annual meetings of Parliament, universal manhood suffrage, equal electoral districts, the secret ballot, and other

reforms considered radical at the time. The workingmen also made their wants known through mass meetings and petitions to Parliament. Chartism, as the movement was called, lost ground during the 1840's because some Chartists staged violent uprisings."

That is, Madam Deputy Speaker, not unlike what we experienced last week, and the horror of it on television when we watched people with, for the most part, very good motivation storming the British Columbia Legislature, and losing their cause because of their violent actions. That is the sad part about it.

Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa): Tree huggers.

Mrs. Carstairs: It is very sad that the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) would use the expression "tree huggers" with such disdain, because the concept of being a tree hugger and the concept of being a tree lover is not one which anyone should consider in a disdainful way. Because without trees our entire ecological system would be out of balance, and for those who believe in the preservation of trees, there should be no public condemnation. What there should be, for all those who are interested in pursuing any movement, is the lesson that I thought all of us had learned from Mahatma Gandhi and later from Martin Luther King, that you can be far more successful in nonviolent processes by which you achieve change than you can be through violent ones, because violence in itself breeds violence, but, more importantly, it loses you supporters.

I think that the whole environmental movement in British Columbia, who could not identify many of those people who staged that protest, started with the nub of perhaps a very good idea. The whole purpose of that assembly was to be a candlelight ceremony on the grounds of the British Columbia Legislature.

We have had candlelight ceremonies here to celebrate memorial days like the Montreal massacre. They have never had a violent connotation. They have been important and significant, very significant in terms of their ability to make the point that people want a special note of recognition that their rights or their concepts or their beliefs have somehow rather been destroyed and they want a re-enactment of those. They want some hope that those ideas will be preserved.

* (1450)

That is exactly what the vast majority of those people, who the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) treats with such disdain and calls them tree huggers, were doing. Unfortunately, it was a small minority who chose to act in a violent way and in that way hurt the entire evolution.

That is what happened to the Chartists in the period of the 1840s because they certainly had ideas which were ahead of their time, but ideas that we certainly would not today consider revolutionary in any way, shape or form. I mean which one of us in this House would consider that universal suffrage was a bad concept? All of us have it. All of us are grateful for having it.

Who in this Chamber would argue against equal electoral districts? Who in this Chamber would argue against the secret ballot? These may have been radical reforms in the 1840s, but they certainly are not radical today. They have, in fact, at least in our system of government, received wide acceptance.

But the Chartists lost ground during the 1840s, as I said earlier, because some of the Chartists staged violent uprisings. Let me quote again from *The Record of Mankind*, and it is referring to the Chartists.

"It made a temporary comeback in the revolutionary year of 1848, when a huge procession was planned to deliver a monster petition to Parliament. The government prohibited the parade, and it was found that the petition contained many forged signatures. The resulting ridicule put an end to Chartism, but almost all the Chartists' demands have since become a part of English law.

"The death of the Chartist movement did not end political unrest. The outcome of the American War between the States"—sometimes called the American Civil War—"was regarded by many Englishmen as a triumph for democracy. It encouraged their demands for popular sovereignty. It seemed absurd that the British workingmen should be denied the vote when it was about to be granted to former slaves in the United States. Moreover, two of the leading statesmen of Great Britain became supporters of further parliamentary reform. One of these was Gladstone, a leader of the Liberal party (formerly the Whig party). The other was Disraeli, a leader in the Conservative party (formerly the Tory Party).

"William Ewart Gladstone, the son of a Liverpool merchant of Scottish birth, had been educated at

aristocratic Eton and Oxford. When only twenty-four years old, he entered Parliament from a pocket borough." In other words, he was not elected.

"To many he seemed the 'rising hope of the stern, unbending Tories.' His advancement was rapid, for he had wealth, family influence and attractive personality, wide knowledge of both books and men, enormous energy, and great oratorical ability. All things considered, no Englishman of Gladstone's generation equaled him as a public speaker. He was an impressive figure, whether in the House of Commons or on the platform. In time he disappointed his political backers by joining the Liberal Party. It was as a Liberal that Gladstone four times became Prime Minister of Great Britain."

I must digress for a moment here to say that, of course, every now and then we are delighted that Tories come to their senses and join the Liberal Party as Mr. Gladstone chose to do.

Let me now look at *The Record of Mankind* once again: "Benjamin Disraeli belonged to a converted Jewish family of London. His father, a well-known author, had him educated privately. The public first knew him as a novelist. In book after book he would ridicule upon the upper classes and called attention to the sufferings of the common people. He entered Parliament as an independent radical. At first his flowery language and dashing clothes—as a young man he wore bright-colored waistcoats and decked himself with rings—provoked only amusement. Gradually, however, his intelligence, courage and intense patriotism overcame the prejudice against him. As he gained experience, he toned down his radical viewpoint and before long became a Conservative. Thereafter, he was a staunch defender of the Crown, the established church, and the aristocracy. However, he insisted that they serve the welfare of the people. His program came to be known as 'Tory democracy.' Disraeli was an expert in parliamentary rules of procedure and was always feared in debate. For thirty years he dominated the Conservative Party and twice became prime minister.

"In 1866 Gladstone, then Liberal leader of the House of Commons and the prime minister, introduced a bill providing for further extension of the right to vote. Gladstone's bill was defeated and his ministry overthrown. The Conservatives now returned to power with Disraeli as the real Leader, though he was not Prime Minister.

"Popular demonstrations throughout the country convinced Disraeli that an extension of the right to vote could no longer be delayed. With Gladstone's aid, he secured the passage of the Second Reform Act in 1867. Under this act, the voting population was more than doubled and most of the factory workmen were enfranchised. The agricultural labourers remained as the only considerable class of men without the vote.

"In the next election, after the Reform Act of 1867, the Liberal party returned to power with Gladstone as its leader. In 1872 he secured the passage of a bill providing for the secret, or Australian, ballot. The Ballot Act did away with the old opportunity to buy votes and to threaten voters. Under Gladstone's leadership democratic reform was carried still further in 1884 by the passage of the Third Reform Act, which gave the vote to farm labourers. After its passage, the United Kingdom enjoyed practically universal manhood suffrage, such as had already been established in France, Germany, and the United States"—and, I might add and digress, also in Canada. "The following year another democratic step was taken when Gladstone's government made the election districts of the country practically equal in population."

I think it is important, before I leave Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, to read from perhaps one of the foremost writers on democracy, of course none other than Winston Churchill, who was himself a Prime Minister in Great Britain, but a Prime Minister who did not have an easy ride of it, a Prime Minister who was rejected by the people until wartime, was accepted by them during that wartime because they felt they needed his strength, his power.

When it appeared in 1945 that the war was coming to an end—it had already, in essence, come to an end in Germany and they were just waiting for it to come to an end in Japan—Winston Churchill was defeated by the people of Great Britain despite the remarkable courage which they had held him in and the remarkable opinion that they had had of him during the wartime. They rejected him because they thought he would be too tough for peacetime and they wanted a new face, somebody who would not remind them of the war that they had just been through.

We talked a minute ago, and just before I begin to read from Winston Churchill I must talk about the Reform Act and the introduction of the secret ballot. I would not want the Pages in the room to think that

the secret ballot was as well protected throughout even the earlier parts of this century as the book would let you believe.

I will recount to you a story which my husband experienced in 1950. He was a young man when he went to university. He was only 16, having just turned 16 in July of 1949. He went off to university. That year there was an election in the province of New Brunswick, where he was a student at the University of New Brunswick.

His landlord—he was living in a rooming house at the time—asked him if he wanted to work on the Liberal campaign. My husband, who had never been involved in politics and did not know much about politics, said, well, yes, he would work on the Liberal campaign. It became more appealing when he was told that he would be paid \$20 for the day.

Being 16 and already somewhat of an entrepreneurial spirit, he decided that \$15 or \$20 was a good way to make some money. He had to find out what he was supposed to do. The concept was the following: The polls opened in the morning and the first Liberal person who entered the polling station took his ballot, did not mark that ballot, dropped the ballot outside and passed it on. It was my husband's job to pick up somebody, drive them to the poll, mark that ballot he now had in his hand which was blank with an X by the Liberal candidate and pass it to the person whom they had picked up. That person went in, picked up a fresh ballot, dropped the X-marked ballot in the ballot box and then brought out the clean ballot.

If they brought out the clean ballot, they got a bottle of Scotch in the case of a man, or they got a box of chocolates if they were a woman. If, of course, they did not bring out a clean ballot, they got nothing. So they brought out the clean ballot and the process continued. The next person who was picked up would be given the X Liberal-marked ballot. They would deposit that ballot in the voting box and bring out of the polling station a clean ballot. My husband would then put the X by the Liberal, give the individual a bottle of Scotch or a box of chocolates, and the process continued all day.

* (1500)

Lest members of the Chamber think that just because we passed a secret ballot act back in the last century, secret ballots were in essence not well protected in this country until we ourselves went through electoral reform. Now it is very difficult for those things to happen in Canada but they certainly

went on. I think the Atlantic provinces had more of a history of this, quite frankly, than the western provinces tended to have. Certainly, it was not a fait accompli just because Gladstone adopted the Australian ballot.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am reading now from Winston S. Churchill's book, *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, Volume IV, *The Great Democracies*. We now enter upon a long-connected and progressive period in British history, the prime ministerships of Gladstone and Disraeli. These two great parliamentarians in alternation ruled the land from 1868 and 1865. For nearly 20 years, no one effectively disputed their leadership and until Disraeli died in 1881, the political scene was dominated by a personal duel on a grand scale. Both men were at the height of their powers, and their skill in oratory and debate gripped and focused public attention on the proceedings of the House of Commons.

Every thrust and parry was discussed throughout the country. The political differences between them were no wider than is usual in a two-party system, but what gave the conflict its edge and produced a deep-rooted antagonism was their utter dissimilarity in character and temperament. Posterity will do justice to that unprincipled maniac Gladstone, wrote Disraeli in private—extraordinary mixture of envy, vindictiveness, hypocrisy and superstition and with one commanding characteristic, whether preaching, praying, speechifying or scribbling, never a gentleman.

Gladstone's judgment on his rival was no less sharp. His doctrine was false, but the man more false than his doctrine. He demoralized public opinion, bargained with diseased appetites, stimulated passions, prejudices and selfish desires that they might maintain his influence. He weakened the Crown by approving its unconstitutional leanings and the Constitution by offering any price for democratic popularity.

Thus they faced each other across the dispatch boxes of the House of Commons, Gladstone's commanding voice, his hawk-like eyes, his great power to move the emotions against Disraeli's romantic air and polished, flexible eloquence. When Gladstone became Prime Minister in 1868, he was deemed a careful and parsimonious administrator who had become a sound, Liberal reformer, but this was only one side of his genius.

What gradually made him the most controversial figure of the century was his gift of rousing moral indignation both in himself and in the electorate. In two great crusades, on the Balkans and on Ireland, his dominant theme was that conscience and the moral law must govern political decisions. Such demand strenuously voiced was open to the charge of hypocrisy when, as so often happened, Gladstone's policy obviously coincided with the well-being of the Liberal Party, but the charge was false. The spirit of the preacher breathed in Gladstone's speeches. He was willing to break his party rather than to deny his conscience. Soon after his conversion to home rule for Ireland, he said to his lieutenant, Sir William Harcourt, I am prepared to go forward without anybody. It was a spirit which was to mismanage men and split the Liberals, but it won him a place in the hearts of his followers of which Britain had never seen the like.

To face Gladstone, Disraeli needed all the courage and quickness of wit with which he had been so generously endowed. Many Tories disliked and distrusted his reforming views, but he handled his colleagues with a rare skill. He has never been surpassed in the art of party management. In all his attitudes there was a degree of cynicism. In his makeup there was not a trace of moral fervor. Large sections of the working class were held to church, Crown, empire and aristocracy by practical interests which could be turned to party advantage, or so he saw it. He never became wholly assimilated to English ways of life and preserved to his death the detachment which had led him as a young man to make his own analysis of English society. It was this which probably enabled him to diagnose and assess the deeper political currents of his age. Long handicapped by his own party, he led it in the end to an electoral triumph and achieved for a period the power he had always desired.

Nothing created more bitterness between them than Gladstone's conviction that Disraeli had captured the Queen for the Conservative Party and endangered the Constitution by an unscrupulous use of his personal charm.

When Gladstone became Prime Minister, Victoria was still in mourning and semiretirement for Prince Albert, who had died in 1861. She deeply resented his attempts to bring the monarchy back into public life, attempts which culminated in a well-intentioned scheme to make her eldest son the viceroy of

Ireland. Gladstone, though always respectful, was incapable of infusing any warmth into his relationship with her. She once said, according to report, that he addressed her like a public meeting.

Disraeli did not make the same mistake. The principles of the English Constitution, he declared, do not contemplate the absence of personal influence on the part of the sovereign and, if they did, the principles of human nature would prevent the fulfillment of such a theory. He wrote to the Queen constantly. He wooed her from the loneliness and apathy which engulfed her after Albert's death, and flattered her desires to share in the formulation of policy.

At the height of the eastern crisis in May 1877, he ended a report on the various views of the cabinet with the following words: The policy is that of your Majesty and which will be introduced and enforced to the utmost by the Prime Minister.

Victoria found this irresistible. She complained that Gladstone, when in office, never told her anything. Had he done so after 1880 it might have been transmitted to the Conservative opposition. From then on, she was not friendly to her Liberal governments. She disliked Gladstone and detested the growing radicalism of the party. But, in fact, little harm was done. Gladstone was careful to keep the person of the Queen out of political discussion, and none of their disagreements was known to the public. He grumbled that the Queen is enough to kill any man, but he served her patiently, if not with understanding.

In any case, the development of popular government based on popular election was bound to diminish the personal power of the Crown. In spite of her occasional leanings, Victoria remained a constitutional monarch.

Gladstone always said that his cabinet of 1868 to 1874 was one of the best instruments of government that was ever constructed. Driven by his boundless energy, it put into effect a long-delayed avalanche of reforms. This was the golden age when liberalism was still an aggressive, unshackling force, and the doctrine of individualism and the philosophy of laissez faire were seeking out and destroying the last relics of 18th century government.

The civil service, the army, the universities and the law were all attacked, and the grip of the old landed interest began to crumble. The power of what James Mill had called the sinister interests

shrivelled bit by bit as the public service was gradually but remorselessly thrown open to talent and industry. Freedom was the keynote; laissez faire, the method. No undue extension of government authority was needed, and the middle class at last acquired a share in the political sphere equal to their economic power.

* (1510)

Gladstone came in on the flood. A decisive electoral victory in a country ready for reform gave him his opportunity. The Liberal Party, for a rare moment in equilibrium, was united behind him. The scale and scope of this policy directed at a series of obvious abuses was such that radicals, moderate Liberals and even Whigs were brought together in agreement.

He began with Ireland. My mission, he had said, when the summons from the Queen reached him at his home in Hawarden, is to pacify Ireland. In spite of bitter opposition and in defiance of his own early principles, which had been to defend property and the Anglican faith, he carried in 1869 the disestablishment of the Protestant Church of Ireland. This was followed next year by a land act which attempted to protect tenants from unfair eviction, but Ireland was not so easy to be pacified.

In England, the government found no lack of work to do. After the electoral reform of 1867, Robert Lowe, now Chancellor of the Exchequer, had said that we must educate our masters. Voters ought to know at least how to read and write and have open to them the paths to higher knowledge; thus, the extension of the franchise and the general liberal belief and the value of education led to the launching of a national system of primary schools. This was achieved by W.E. Forster's Education Act of 1870, blurred though it was, like all education measures for some decades to come, by sectarian passion in controversy.

At the same time, patrimony was finally destroyed in the home service. Entrance to the new administrative class was henceforth possible only through a competitive examination which placed great emphasis on intellectual attainment. Ability, not wealth or family connection, was now the means to advance. In the following year, all religious tests at Oxford and Cambridge were abolished. The universities were thrown open to Roman Catholics, Jews, dissenters and young men of no belief.

The ancient intricacies of the judicial system, so long a nightmare to litigants and a feeding ground

for lawyers, were simplified and modernized by the fusion of courts of law and equity. The judicature act marked the culmination of a lengthy process of much needed reform. For centuries, litigants had often had to sue in two courts at once about the same matter. Now a single Supreme Court was set up with appropriate divisions and procedure, and methods of appeal were made uniform. Offices that had survived in the reign of Edward I were swept away in a complete remodelling. All this was accompanied by a genuinely sound administration and what was perhaps closest to Gladstone's own heart, a policy of economy and low taxation.

The sufferings and disgraces of the Crimea had made it evident that the great Duke of Wellington's practices in the hands of lesser men had broken down. The Prussian victories in France administered a shock to military and civilian opinion. Reforms were long overdue at the war office. They were carried out by Gladstone's Secretary of State, Edward Cardwell, one of the greatest army reformers. The Commander-in-Chief, the Duke of Cambridge, was opposed to any reform whatsoever, and the first step was taken when the Queen with considerable reluctance signed an Order-in-Council subordinating him to the Secretary of State.

Flogging was abolished. An enlistment act introduced short service which would create an efficient reserve. In 1871 Cardwell went further, and after a hard fight with service opinion, the purchase of commissions were prohibited. The infantry were rearmed with the Martini-Henry (phonetic) rifle and the regimental system was completely reorganized on a county basis. The War Office was overhauled, though a general staff was not yet established.

All this was achieved in the space of six brilliant, crowded years, and then, as so often happens in English history, the pendulum swung back. Great reforms offended great interests. The Anglicans were hit by several measures. The nonconformists found little to please them in the Education Act. The army and the court resented Cardwell's onslaught. The working classes were offered little to attract them apart from a Ballot Act, which allowed them to exercise a newly won franchise in secret and without intimidation. The settlement for \$15 million of the Alabama dispute with the United States, though sensible, was disagreeable to a people long fed on a Palmerstonian diet. They began to suspect that

Gladstone was half-hearted in defending British interests. An unsuccessful licensing bill prompted by the temperance wing of the Liberal Party estranged the drink interest and found an alliance between the brewer and the Conservative Party. Gladstone was soon to complain that he had been worn down from power in a torrent of gin and beer.

Disraeli, now at the height of his oratorical powers, painted this portrait of the ministry: Her Majesty's new ministers proceeded in their cares like a body of men under the influence of some deleterious drug. Not satiated with the spoil and anarchy of Ireland, they began to attack every institution and every interest, every class and calling in the country. As time advanced it was not difficult to perceive that extravagance was being substituted for energy by the government. The unnatural stimulus was subsidized. Their paroxysms ended in prostration. Some took refuge in melancholy, and their eminent chief alternated between a menace and a sigh. As I sat opposite the Treasury Bench, the ministers reminded me of one of those marine landscapes, not very unusual on the coasts of South Africa. You behold a range of exhausted volcanoes. Not a flame flickers on a single pallid crest, but the situation is still dangerous. There are occasional earthquakes, and ever and anon the dark rumbling of the sea.

Nevertheless Gladstone's first government stands high in British history, but there were few fresh Liberal ideas to expound when Parliament was dissolved in 1874. He fought the election on a proposal to abolish the income tax, which then stood at threepence in the pound, and to the end of his life he always regretted his failure to achieve this objective. But the country was now against him and he lost. He went into semiretirement believing that the great reforming work of liberalism had been completed. Most of his Whig friends agreed. The radicals thought otherwise. All of them were wrong.

The grand old man was soon to return to politics and return in a setting and amid a storm which would rend and disrupt the loyalties and traditions of English public life in a manner far more drastic than any of them had yet conceived.

While his great adversary devoted his leisure to felling trees at Hawarden and writing articles about Homer, Disraeli seized his chance. He had long waited for supreme power. For 25 years, he had been the Leader of the Conservative Party in the House of Commons and now he was over 70. His

physique had never been robust and his last years, made lonely by the death of his wife, were plagued by gout and other ailments.

Power has come to me too late. There were days when on waking I felt I could move dynasties and governments, but that has passed away.

But at no time had his problems been simple. Apart from the interlude of the Peel ministry of 1841 to 1846, an interlude which had ended in party disaster, the Tories had been more or less in opposition for close on half a century. Labeled the party of reaction, its members mocked as the heirs of Eldon Sidmouth and other hard-shelled, old Tories, it now had to face a democratic electorate.

The fact that the extension of the franchise had been sponsored by the Tory Leader made it no less a leap in the dark for them, but Disraeli had no doubts. He remained true to the spirit of the young England movement which he had founded a generation before. He never believed that the working men of England were radicals or would be destroyers of the established order.

He saw clearly that although many of the new electors were attracted by the ideas of tradition, continuity and ordered social progress, such feelings would never ripen into electoral advantage under the inert conservatism of his own backbenchers. He had only to win over the electorate, but also to convert his own party.

Disraeli's campaign began long before Gladstone fell. He concentrated on social reform and on a new conception of the empire, and both prongs of attack struck Gladstone at his weakest points. The empire had never aroused his interest and, though passionate in defence of the political rights of the working class, he cared little for their material claims.

Disraeli on the other hand proclaimed, the first consideration of a minister should be the health of the people. Liberals tried to laugh this off as a policy of sewage. In his first full session after reaching office, Disraeli proceeded to redeem his pledge. He was fortunate in his colleagues, among whom the Home Secretary, Richard Cross, was outstanding in ability.

A Trade Union Act gave the unions almost complete freedom of action. An Artisans' Dwelling Act was the first measure to tackle the housing problem. A Sale of Food and Drugs Act and a Public Health Act at last established sanitary law on a sound footing.

Disraeli succeeded in persuading much of the Conservative Party not only that the real needs of the electorate, including healthier conditions of life, better homes and freedom to organize in the world of industry, but also that the Conservative Party was perfectly well fitted to provide them.

* (1520)

Well, might Alexander Macdonald, the miners' leader, declare that the Conservative Party have done more for the working class in five years than the Liberals have in 50.

Gladstone had provided the administrative basis for these great developments, but Disraeli took the first considerable steps in promoting social welfare.

The second part of the new Conservative program, imperialism, had also been launched before Disraeli came to power. Gladstone's passion for economy and all things military, his caution in Europe and his indifference to the empire jarred on a public which was growing ever more conscious of British imperial glory. Disraeli's appeal was perfectly tuned to the new mood.

Self-government, in my opinion, he said, of the colonies when it was conceded ought to have been conceded as part of a great policy of imperial consolidation. It ought to have been accompanied by an imperial tariff, by securities for the people of England, the enjoyment of the unappropriate lands which belonged to the sovereign as their trustee, and by a military code which should have precisely defined the means and the responsibilities by which the colony should be defended and by which, if necessary, this country should call for aid from the colonies themselves. It ought further to have been accompanied by the institution of some representative council on the metropolis, which would have brought the colonies into constant and continuous relations with the home government.

All this, however, was omitted, because those who advised that policy, and I believe their convictions were sincere, looked upon the colonies of England, looked upon even our connection with India, as a burden upon this country. Viewing everything in its financial aspect and totally passing by those moral and political considerations which make nations great, and by the influence of which men alone are distinguished from the animals, well, what has been the result of this attempt during the reign of liberalism for the disintegration of the empire? It has entirely failed, but how has it failed?

To the sympathy of the colonies for the mother country, they have decided that the empire shall not be destroyed and, in my opinion, no minister in this country will do his duty who neglects an opportunity of reconstructing as much as possible our colonial empire and of responding to those distant sympathies which may become the source of incalculable strength and happiness to this land.

At first, Disraeli was brilliantly successful. The Suez Canal had been open for six years, and it transformed to the strategic position of Great Britain. No longer was the Cape of Good Hope the key to the route to India and to the Far East. The foreign office had been curiously slow to appreciate this obvious fact and had missed more than one opportunity to control the waterway.

In 1875, Disraeli, on behalf of the British government, bought for 4 million pounds, the shares of the Egyptian Khedive Ismail in the canal. This Turkish shatrah (phonetic) was bankrupt, glad to sell. His holding amounted to nearly half the total issue. The route to India was safeguarded. Possible threat to British naval supremacy was removed, and of faithful importance for the future, Britain was inexorably drawn into Egyptian politics.

In the following year, Queen Victoria, to her great pleasure, was proclaimed empress of India. Such a stroke would never have occurred to Gladstone or indeed to the next generation of imperialists, but Disraeli's oriental, almost mystical, approach to empire, his emphasis on imperial symbols, his belief in the importance of outward display gave his policy an imaginative colour never achieved by his successors. His purpose was to make those colonies which he had once condemned as millstones around our neck sparkle like diamonds. New storms in Europe distracted attention from this glittering prospect.

In 1876, the eastern question erupted anew. The Crimean War had been mismanaged by the soldiers, and at the peace, the diplomats had done no better. Most of the Balkans still remained under Turkish rule, and all attempts to improve the Ottoman administration of Christian provinces had foundered on the obstinacy of the sultan and the magnitude of the task. Slavs, Romanians and Greeks were united in their detestation of the Turk. Revolt offered little hope of permanent success, and they had long looked to the czar of Russia as their potential liberator.

Here was a fine dilemma for the British government. The possibility of creating independent Balkan states, in spite of Canning's example in the small Greek kingdom, was not yet seriously contemplated. The nice choice appeared to lie between bolstering Turkish power and allowing Russian influence to move through the Balkans and into the Mediterranean by way of Constantinople. The threat had long been present, and the insurrection which now occurred confronted Disraeli with the most difficult and dangerous situation for Great Britain since the Napoleonic Wars. Rebellion broke out in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where 40 years later, an assassin's bullet was to start the First World War.

Germany, Austria and Russia, united in the League of Three Emperors, proposed that Turkey should be coerced into making serious reforms. Disraeli and his foreign secretary, Lord Derby, resisted these plans, arguing that they must end very soon in the disintegration of Turkey, and to emphasize British support of Turkey, a fleet was dispatched to the Dardanelles, but these diplomatic manoeuvres were soon overtaken by the news of terrible Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria.

Disraeli, handicapped by faulty reports from his ambassador at Constantinople, who was an admirer of the Turks, failed to measure the deep stir in public opinion. In reply to a parliamentary question in July, he took leave to doubt "whether torture has been practised on a great scale among Oriental people, who seldom, I believe, resort to torture but generally terminate their connection with culprits in a more expeditious manner." This tone of persiflage fanned into fierce and furious activity the profound moral feeling which was always simmering just below the surface of Gladstone's mind.

In a famous pamphlet, *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*, Gladstone delivered his onslaught on the Turks and Disraeli's government: Let the Turks now carry away their abuses in the only possible manner, namely, by carrying off themselves. Their zaptiahs and their mudurs, their bimbashis (phonetic), the ubashis (phonetic), their kaymakams and their pashas, one and all, bag and baggage, shall, I hope, clear out from the provinces they have desolated and profaned. This thorough riddance, this most blessed deliverance is the only reparation we can make to the memory of those heaps on heaps of dead, to the violated purity alike of a matron, of maiden and of child.

There is not a criminal in a European gaol, there is not a cannibal in the South Sea Islands whose indignation would not arise and overboil at the recital of that which has been done, which has late been examined, but which remains unavenged, which has left behind all the foul and all the fierce passions that produced it, and which may again spring up in another more murderous harvest from the soil soaked and reeking with blood, and the air tainted with every imaginable deed of crime and shame. No government ever has so sinned; none has proved itself so incorrigible in sin, which is the same so impotent for reformation.

After this broadside, relations between the two men became so strained that Lord Beaconsfield, as Disraeli now was, publicly described Gladstone as worse than any Bulgarian horror.

At the end of the year a conference of the great powers was held at Constantinople at which Lord Salisbury as the British representative displayed for the first time his diplomatic talents. Salisbury was the direct descendant of Queen Elizabeth's great servant, William Cecil, and of James I's minister, Robert Cecil, whose namesake he was. Over a period of 20 years in both Houses of Parliament, he had been highly critical of his chief. He had joined Disraeli's government only after much heart-searching, but in office gradually the two men grew together. Salisbury's caustic, far ranging common sense supplemented Disraeli's darting vision. As Secretary of State for India and later at the foreign office, Salisbury established himself as the next predestined Tory leader.

At Constantinople a program of reform for Turkey was drawn up, but the Turks, sustained in part by a belief that Salisbury's zeal for reform did not entirely reflect the views of his Prime Minister and the British Cabinet, rejected it. The delegates returned to their capitals, and Europe waited for war to break out between Russia and Turkey. When it came in the summer of 1877, the mood of the country quickly changed. Gladstone, whose onslaught on the Turks had first carried all before it, was now castigated as a pro-Russian. Feeling rose as month after month, in spite of heroic Turkish resistance, especially at Plevna (phonetic) in Bulgaria, the mass of Russian troops removed ponderously toward the Dardanelles.

At last in January 1878 they stood before the walls of Constantinople. Public opinion reached fever point. The music hall song of the hour was: We do

not want to fight, but by jingo if we do, we have got the ships, we have got the men, we have got the money, too. We fought the bear before, and while we are Britons true, the Russians shall not have Constantinople.

In February, after considerable prevarication, a fleet of British ironclads steamed into the Golden Horn. They lay in the seas of Marmara, opposite the Russian army for six uneasy months of truce, the while, as Bismarck said, facing the elephant.

* (1530)

In March, Turkey and Russia signed the treaty of San Stefano. Andrassy, the Austrian foreign minister, in anger called it an orthodox, Slavic sermon. It gave Russia effective control of the Balkans and was obviously unacceptable to the other great powers. War again seemed likely, and Lord Derby, who objected to any kind of military preparations, resigned. He was replaced at the foreign office by Lord Salisbury who immediately set upon summoning a conference of the great powers.

They met at the Congress of Berlin in June and July. Business was dominated by Andrassy, Beaconsfield, Bismarck and the Russian minister, Gorchakov, a quartet whose combined diplomatic talents would have been difficult to match. The result was that Russia gave up much of what she had momentarily gained at San Stefano. She kept Russian Bessarabia, which extended her territories to the mouths of the Danube, but the big Bulgaria which she had planned to dominate was split into three parts, only one of which was granted practical independence. The rest was returned to the sultan.

Austria-Hungary, as we now call the Hapsburg Empire, secured in compensation the right to occupy and administer Bosnia-Herzegovina. By a separate Anglo-Turkish convention, Great Britain received Cyprus and guaranteed the territorial integrity of Turkey and Asia in return for yet another pledge by the sultan to introduce proper reforms.

Beaconsfield returned from Britain claiming that he had brought peace with honour. He had indeed averted war for the moment. Russia, blocked in the Balkans, turned her gaze away from Europe to the Far East. The arrangements at Berlin had been much criticized for laying the trail to the war of 1914. But the eastern question as it was then posed before the nations was virtually insoluble. No settlement could have been more than a temporary one and the Congress of Berlin, in fact, ensured the peace of Europe for 36 years.

The following weeks saw the zenith of Beaconsfield's career, but fortune soon ceased to smile upon him. Thrusting policies in South Africa and Afghanistan led, in 1879, to construction of a British battalion by the Zulus at Islandhlwana and the massacre of the legation staff at Kabul. These minor disasters, though promptly avenged, lent fresh point to Gladstone's vehement assault upon the government, an assault which reached its climax in the autumn of 1879 with the Midlothian campaign.

Gladstone denounced a bigger risk, that is to say narrow, restless, blustering and self-assertive foreign policy. Appealing to the self-love and pride of the community, he argued that Britain should pursue the path of morality and justice, free from the taint of self-interest. Her aims should be self-government for subject peoples, and the promotion of a true concert of Europe. His constant theme was the need for the nation's policy to conform with the moral law. Remember, he said, Adelphi, that the sanctity of life in the hill villages of Afghanistan among the winter snows is as inviolable in the eyes of almighty God as can be your own.

This appeal to morality infuriated the Conservatives, who based their case on the importance of defending and forwarding British interests and responsibilities wherever they might lie. They maintained that Beaconsfield policy had raised national power and prestige to new heights, but the force of Gladstone's oratory was too much for the exhausted ministry. Moreover, their last years in office coincided with the onset of an economic depression serious enough for industry but ruinous for agriculture.

When Beaconsfield dissolved in March 1880, the electoral result was decisive. The Queen was forced to accept as Prime Minister for a second time the man whom she described in a letter to her private secretary, Sir Henry Possenby (phonetic), as that half mad firebrand who would soon ruin everything.

While the duel between Disraeli and Gladstone held the centre of the stage, far-reaching movements were taking shape below the surface of parliamentary politics. The Reform Act of 1867, in granting the vote to virtually every adult male resident in a borough, killed the modified 18th Century regime which had persisted since 1832.

The emergence of a mass electorate called for a new kind of politics. Sheer numbers rendered the old techniques ineffective in the large cities. Two

things were required, a party policy which would persuade the electors to vote and an efficient organization to make sure that they did so.

Of the two leaders, Gladstone was slow to see the implications of the new age. The great demagogue was bored by the ordinary everyday business of party. Disraeli, on the other hand, produced both a policy and an organization. Twelve years earlier, he had appointed John Gorst as party manager under whose guidance the Conservative Party was completely overhauled.

The central office was established, and a network of local associations was set up combined in a national union. The transition was remarkably slow, and although there were to be storms in the early 1880s, the system created by Disraeli still remains largely at the present time.

In the Liberal camp, the situation was very different. Gladstone's coolness and weak hostility prevented the building of a centralized party organization. The impulse and impetus came not from the centre but through the provinces.

In 1873, Joseph Chamberlain had become mayor of Birmingham. Aided by a most able political advisor, Schnardhorst (phonetic), he built up a party machine which, although based on popular participation, his enemies quickly condemned as a caucus. A policy of municipal socialism brought great benefits to Birmingham in the shape of public utilities, some clearance and other civic amenities.

The movement spread to other towns and cities, and a national Liberal federation was born. The aim of its promoters was to make the federation the parliament of the Liberal movement which would work out a radical program and eventually replace the Whigs by a new set of leaders drawn from its own ranks. This was a novel phenomenon. Unlike chartism and the anti-corn-law league, movements for reform needed no longer to operate on the fringe of a party. Radicalism was now powerful enough to make a bid for control.

This change was greatly aided by the clustering of the parties around opposite social poles, a process well underway by 1880 and which Gladstone recognized in the course of his election campaign. I am sorry, he declared, to say we cannot reckon upon the aristocracy. We cannot reckon upon what is called the landed interest. We cannot reckon upon the clergy of the established church either in England or in Scotland. We cannot reckon upon the wealth of the country nor upon the

rank of the country. In the main, these powers are against us. We must set down among our most determined foes.

At the election, Chamberlain and his followers put forward a program of reform which was unacceptable to the Whigs and indeed to Gladstone. Their success exposed and proclaimed the wide changes which the new franchise had wrought in the structure of the party system.

Gladstone and Disraeli had done much to bridge the gap between aristocratic rule and democracy. They both believed that governments should be active and that the statute books for the years between 1868 and 1876 bulge with reforming measures. Elections gradually became a judgment of what the government of the day had accomplished, an assessment of the promises for the future made by the two parties.

By 1880, they were being fought with techniques which differ very little from those used today. Gladstone's Midlothian campaign, the first broad appeal to the people by a potential Prime Minister, underlined the change. It shocked the Queen that he should make a speech about foreign policy from a railway carriage window, but her protest echoed an age that had already passed. This was the way to become the people's William.

Beaconsfield died a year later. His great task, taken on almost single-handed, had been to lead the Conservative Party out of despair for the period of 1846, to persuade it to face the inevitability of democracy, and to endow it with the policies that would meet the new conditions. That he was successful is a remarkable indication of his skill in all matters related to party. He made the Conservatives a great force in democratic politics. The large scale two-party system with its swing of the pendulum begins with him.

Tory democracy, working men by hundreds of thousands who voted Conservative, became the dominant factor. The extension of the franchise, which had hitherto threatened to engulf the past, bore it proudly forward. Whereas the Whigs vanished from the scene, the Tories, though they were slow to realize it, sprang into renewed life and power with a fair future before them. Such was the work of Disraeli for which his name will be duly honoured.

* (1540)

And that, Madam Deputy Speaker, brings us to the period of 1880.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Alligator pie, alligator pie, if I do not get some, I think I am going to die.

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, I rather like Alligator Pie, I must suggest to the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). It was one of my favourite books that I used to select to read to my daughter Jennie but I think she took my copy when she went off to university, so I will have to deny the member for Flin Flon the pleasure of hearing Alligator Pie read by the member for River Heights.

An Honourable Member: One of the nicest readings we have ever had in the Legislature.

Mrs. Carstairs: Thank you.

The next election after the Reform Act of 1867, the Liberal Party returned to power with Gladstone as its leader—and I am now reading, Madam Deputy Speaker, for the purpose of Hansard, from The Record of Mankind.

In 1872 he secured the passage of a bill providing for the secret or Australian ballot, but the drive for political democracy in Great Britain carried over into the present century.

Now we are going to hit the 20th Century.

It now took the form of an attack upon the House of Lords. That body did not represent the people, and yet it frequently blocked legislation which public opinion favoured. In 1911, another Liberal, David Lloyd George, led both the Liberal and the Labour parties in securing passage of the famous Parliament Act. The Lords agreed to it only when threatened, as in 1832, with being swamped by a large number of newly created Liberal peers. The Parliament Act deprived the Upper Chamber of all control of money bills, that is, bills levying taxes or making appropriations. The act further provided that any bill passed by the Commons in three successive sessions should become law after two years even though not approved by the House of Lords. Thus, by 1911, the real authority in British government was in the hands of the people's representatives, the House of Commons.

About the time of the passage of the Third Reform Act, 1884, a campaign began for votes for women. This demand aroused the anger and ridicule of Liberals and Conservatives alike. Nevertheless, the supporters of women's suffrage were persistent. They formed organizations to promote their cause,

debated on the platform and in the newspapers, and introduced bills into Parliament proposing equal political rights for women.

The movement made slow progress. A few women impatient with peaceful methods became militant suffragettes. They broke up public meetings, smashed shop windows, slashed paintings in art galleries and committed other outrages to bring their cause prominently before the people.

Then came World War I. The patriotic service of British women in the hospitals, in munitions factories and on the farms strengthened the cause of women's suffrage. In 1918—I digress just a moment to foresay it was 1916 in this province—Parliament passed the Equal Franchise Act, granting the right to vote to women who were 30 years of age or older. Ten years later, in 1928, the government made the qualifications for voting the same for both sexes.

Great Britain had thus abandoned the old feudal idea that voting is a privilege attached to the ownership of property, especially land. Voting is now a right to be enjoyed by every citizen. The will of the majority of the people guides the actions of Parliament. Politically, Great Britain ranks among the most democratic of modern countries.

The British Constitution is partly written and partly unwritten. The written part consists of such documents as Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights, which represents agreements between king and people, parliamentary statutes such as the Habeas Corpus Act, the Act of Settlement and various reform acts, international treaties, including the union with Scotland and the union with Ireland, and the common law as expressed in court decisions. These various documents have never been brought together in one complete statement as in the Constitutions of the United States, France and other modern countries like Canada.

The unwritten part of the British Constitution includes a mass of customs followed by both Crown and Parliament. Some of them reach back to medieval times, but others are more recent, such as those relating to the cabinet. Traditional usages of this sort grow up in every government. For example, in the United States, custom gives the two major political parties an important part in carrying on the government, although the Constitution does not provide for political parties.

The party system has become part of the unwritten Constitution. So far as appearances go,

the sovereign of Great Britain is a monarch who rules by divine right. Whatever the government does, from the arrest of a criminal to the declaration of war, is done in the name of the king, or queen, since the accession of Elizabeth II. Coins and proclamations still say that he rules by the grace of God, *deo gratia*, or in the case of Queen Elizabeth II, *deo gratia*, but the British sovereign now acts only by and with the advice of his responsible ministers; that is, ministers responsible to the people. He reigns but he does not rule. The sovereign occupies nevertheless a useful place in the British system of government.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not think there is a quorum in this Chamber. I would like to call for a quorum.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A quorum has been requested. I would ask all members present to rise in their places and ask that the Clerk at the table call out and record the names of those present.

Point of Order

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, quorum was called prior to myself, the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey), the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) and the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) were inside the Chamber, so I would suggest, when we are counting the quorum, that members who were not inside this Chamber do the honourable thing and not participate in the quorum count.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): First of all, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think this is a rather incredible attempt to raise a point of order. The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) walked out. How would he know who was in the Chamber and who was not? Second of all, I point out that it is not appropriate for members to make reference to absence of members in the House and, third, that we are currently having a quorum count, as was requested. We should proceed with that without what was not a legitimate point of order.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Deputy Speaker, I clearly do know who was in this Chamber at the time that I requested a quorum. At the time that I requested the quorum, the members identified by the member for Inkster were indeed not in this Chamber. Now if there is to be quorum in this House, surely the quorum must reflect the number of people who were in this Chamber at the moment that quorum was requested, and the moment that quorum was

requested, a number of the people presently sitting in their seats were not here. I think it is only appropriate that those people absent themselves from this Chamber for the quorum count, and I would urge the Deputy Speaker to so direct.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Madam Deputy Speaker, you have, as we have just heard, said you were about to call and count as to whether there is a quorum here. I think you should proceed to do that.

* (1550)

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Deputy Speaker, I would suggest that we reflect back to another opportunity where there was a quorum called. The Speaker who was in the Chair asked individuals who were not inside the Chamber at the time that the quorum was being called exclude themselves from the quorum count. Now the Speaker of this Chamber had that request that time. I would suggest the same request should apply for this quorum count also, because it is a part, again, of the Rules and the tradition of this Chamber. As the current Speaker himself had asked previously on a quorum count, when the quorum has been called for, the members in the Chamber are the ones who count, not members who come in after the quorum count.

Mr. Ashton: Madam Deputy Speaker, I do believe there is a willingness to continue in terms of this debate, and in fact I do not know what the logic of the Liberal House leader was in leaving the Chamber. If he does not want to listen to his own Leader's speech, we are quite prepared and have been doing so for the last six or seven hours. I would suggest, we might even want to rethink whether we have a quorum call or not and continue to deal with the business of the province for the next two hours and 10 minutes.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If I may have the attention of all members of the House for a moment, please. I am awaiting the ruling of the Speaker from the precedent last year before making a ruling both on the point of order and continuing with the quorum count.

* (1600)

Mr. Downey: Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to speak to the point of something that I just heard the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) say that it was the Tories who broke the quorum, when in fact we were sitting in the House listening to a speech when in fact the Liberal Leader caucused with two

of her members and instructed them, we believe, to leave the Assembly—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable minister does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

Order, please. I am ruling on the point of order. May I have your attention, please.

On June 22, Speaker Rocan ruled: When a quorum count is requested, members are requested to rise in their places in order to have their names called and recorded. Therefore, any members present in the House but not in their places when a quorum count is requested should return immediately to their places.

In Beauchesne, Citation 282 reads: While the House is being counted, the doors remain open and members can come in during the whole time occupied by the counting. Sir John Bourinot, Parliamentary Procedure and Practice in the Dominion of Canada (4th edition, 1916), page 218.

Therefore, I am ruling that members can come in while the House is being counted.

The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) did not have a point of order. In fact, according to Citation 281.(2) in Beauchesne: While the count of the House is taking place, no point of order or question of privilege will be considered by the Chair. Debates, May 5, 1982, page 17067.

I should not have recognized the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), and I apologize to the House for that.

In any event, a quorum existed by the time the points of order were raised.

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Deputy Speaker, on a point of order—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have not recognized the honourable member.

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Deputy Speaker, you have made a ruling, and I would like to challenge that ruling. This is the time to challenge the ruling.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged.

All those in favour of sustaining the ruling, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yeas and Nays, Madam Deputy Speaker.

* (1700)

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

Order, please. The question before the House is: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

Yeas

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Cummings, Derkach, Dewar, Doer, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Ernst, Evans (Interlake), Findlay, Friesen, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Hickes, Laurendeau, Maloway, Manness, Martindale, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Pallister, Praznik, Reid, Reimer, Render, Rose, Santos, Stefanson, Storie, Sveinson, Vodrey.

Nays

Carstairs, Edwards, Gaudry, Lamoureux.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 38, Nays 4.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

The hour being five o'clock, it is time for private members' hour.

Committee Changes

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), Interlake (Mr. Cliff Evans) for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk).

Madam Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: No.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 200—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), Bill 200, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille, standing in the name of the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), who has seven minutes remaining.

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Also standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Child and Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer). Stand.

Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the two honourable members? [agreed]

Bill 203—The Health Care Records Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis), Bill 203, The Health Care Records Act; Loi sur les dossiers médicaux, standing in the name of the honourable member for Emerson (Mr. Penner).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 205—The Ombudsman Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), Bill 205, The Ombudsman Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'ombudsman, standing in the name of the honourable member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [agreed]

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: Are we proceeding with Bill 202? No? Okay. Are we proceeding with Bill 208? No? Okay. Proceeding with Bill 209? No? Okay. How about Bill 211? No? Okay.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 11—Environmental Initiatives

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose),

WHEREAS promoting and practising an environmentally friendly way of life is important to all Manitobans; and

WHEREAS there are many programs currently in place that help foster environmentally efficient practices such as the 3 R's: reduce, reuse and recycle; and

WHEREAS it is essential to encourage an energy efficient and environmentally conscious lifestyle through recycling and conservation of our natural resources;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba encourage all Manitobans to adopt an environmentally sustainable lifestyle by making the effort to recycle and conserve our natural resources.

Motion presented.

Mr. Laurendeau: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is one area that we, in this House, can all come to an agreement on and that is on the importance of our environment and our initiatives that we bring forward, not only as a group within the Legislature, but as individuals on whom rests the true responsibility of recycling and reducing and encouraging the proper management of our natural resources throughout the country, not only the country but the world. It is not only a global effort that is required today. We also have to bring about the awareness to the citizens of communities on how important it is to move towards this area.

Within the area of waste, Mr. Speaker, is the first area I would like to touch on. In my area, particularly, we have what is going to be the only landfill in the city of Winnipeg, at the Brady landfill. Even though it is one of the best in North America and they do have a lot of the proper initiatives put in place at the landfill, we do have to expand its use to a lot more than just the 40-years life that they are projecting for the facility.

Mr. Speaker, the day we stop calling the vehicles that come down our highways carrying the waste garbage trucks and start calling them waste reclamation units—and that is what they should be because until we start really reclaiming a lot more of

the waste that is going to our landfill, we will have a problem and a lot of concerns. Our children have been lucky that they are being instructed in the schools and have been able to instruct us as parents on the importance of recycling and reuse of products. I, myself, learned from my children on a lot of the important issues around recycling and the preserving of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, where do we go and how do we put the concepts around the issue? Governments of the day have to understand that, yes, we have to educate our children and the general population, but we also have to educate those industries that are producing the waste. In some cases, those industries do not want to learn or be responsible. I feel that by putting in place these licensing practices and initiating a system to have the waste producers pay their way and be responsible for the products that they are producing, it is not only governments, but the population of the country that ends up gaining from that resource.

Mr. Speaker, the government has been at the forefront in ensuring that sustainable development is pursued throughout Manitoba. I have seen a number of initiatives brought forward by this government. I have seen initiatives that were brought forward by past governments, and I must say that I am pleased with a lot of the initiatives that were brought forward by governments throughout our country to this time.

Mr. Speaker, we do have to move into another phase. We have to start moving not only at the education of the masses, but we have to be educating those industries that are creating it. Why is it that the newspaper business can create such a large portion of the waste going to our landfills but not have to put any expense into reclaiming those products? The packaging industries and the bottle recycling programs that are in place are good, but are they capturing enough?

* (1710)

I think it is time we move ahead and start looking at more innovative ways of capturing some of the waste, and instructing on a whole all the people of Manitoba. I think by ourselves here in the Legislature starting to practise more of the environmentally friendly ways.

I know I have seen the honourable members with their plastic cups. I do try to carry mine, but I forget. I do forget to bring it, and I end up with my other cup

here in front of me and I think about it after. I think that is because I was not educated along the way.

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): What do you mean you were not educated along the way?

Mr. Laurendeau: On that program, for the honourable member for St. Boniface. I am glad to see that you are finally listening, because I saw that when the Liberals were looking through the little window past there trying to obstruct the way this House operates, that they could wave friendly gestures, but that is all they could do. I am pleased that they were friendly gestures that the Liberals wave our way.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, I believe the member for St. Boniface might have a question.

Point of Order

Mr. Gaudry: I thought you would listen to what he is saying because he is not relevant to the resolution he has on the Order Paper today.

The member for St. Norbert is not being relevant to what he is talking about on the resolution on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for St. Boniface does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for St. Norbert, to carry on with his remarks.

Mr. Laurendeau: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought when I talked about a Liberal I was always talking about something that was reclaimed because they usually are recycled to get here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stick to the subject and, if the Liberals would care to listen, it would make it much easier, but when they try to drag you off the discussion that you are on and bring you onto the issue which is more important to them. That issue is probably something that is not relevant to me, so I am not going to attempt to listen to those members, even though they are running for leadership of their party.

I am going to attempt to stay to the facts. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very important. I know that the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) and the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) will support this resolution. They know it is very important to this province that we move and we

move in the direction of educating our children and the rest of the people throughout the communities.

Mr. Speaker, having a landfill in my area opens my eyes to a lot of the initiatives when I see thousands of waste recycling units travelling through the highway to basically put away, where the public can no longer see, a product that could possibly be recycled. We do have to lay that responsibility on the industries that are producing it and start to be a lot more proactive than we have in the past.

I know that the honourable member for St. Boniface is dying to get up and speak on this issue, but I do have a little bit more time left, and I am going to stay here and just finish putting my thoughts on the record.

The government has been supporting a broad range of community activities through the Sustainable Development Innovation Fund, including projects aimed at increasing individual citizen awareness of sustainable development.

Mr. Speaker, I could go through a whole list, but I am not about to sit here and read from my notes, as some members from the Liberal Party have done over the past two weeks. I could sit and read from a book or read from papers for three or four hours very easily myself, but as you are aware, there are rules that prevent us from doing that. I am not about to abuse the rules and sit here and read and read.

I am glad that the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) has joined me here to hear this presentation. Maybe at this range, he will be able to understand a little bit more the concept. A little bit more understanding from the Liberals is very appropriate. I have always enjoyed his company, and I have always enjoyed having him come and visit on this side of the House. I have always found him to be a lot more conservative than those members anyway.

I know that all members of this House understand the issue. All members of this House understand how important it is. I am waiting and honestly would like to hear from the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) where he stands on these issues, seeing as he is probably going to be the next Leader of the Liberal Party in this province. I am really looking forward to hearing his views on the environmental issues because as the Leader of the Liberal Party in this province, he will have a lot of weight on his shoulders, and as the Leader of the

Liberals in this province, I think he is going to have a lot of effort to go forward.

I know the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) is trying hard to get it, but the grassroots will elect the member for Inkster. It is just the way it is going to be. He has told me all about it.

Mr. Speaker, I am waiting with bated breath to hear the honourable member for Inkster.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it gives me some pleasure to stand and speak to the resolution put forward by the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau). [interjection] Well, quite a bit of pleasure because I actually read—and what is here I agree with. The problem is what is not here.

This resolution talks about promoting and practising an environmentally friendly way of life. I completely agree with that. It talks about the many programs currently in place that help foster environmentally efficient practices. There are many programs. The unfortunate truth is that the government is not supporting those programs that are doing these things and, secondly, is not coming up with the programs to achieve the ends they say they want to. That is the problem.

It goes on: WHEREAS it is essential to encourage an energy efficient and environment conscious lifestyle through recycling and conservation of our natural resources. Again, I agree

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba encourage all Manitobans to adopt an environmentally sustainable lifestyle by making the effort to recycle and conserve our natural resources.

I could not agree more with that statement, Mr. Speaker. The unfortunate reality, however, is that the government of Manitoba, as I have said many times, certainly knows how to say sustainable development, they know how to write it, they know how to make it look good on slanty writing, on nice booklets, glossy pamphlets. Anywhere you can put those words, you put them. Any speech you can fit them in, even if you cannot fit them in, you put them in. It is the new jingoism of the 1990s. The Conservatives know that better than anyone else.

They, more than anyone else, are responsible for turning that term, I would say by this point, almost into a term of mockery for the public. The public just does not believe it any more. They keep hearing people—sustainable development this, sustainable

development that. Everything has sustainable development laced through the speech, every Speech from the Throne. Every time anybody gives anything out they talk about it. It would not be bad if they knew what it meant. The problem with this government is that sustainable development has no real meaning for them. They name committees of cabinet, and all kinds of initiatives are called sustainable development. They understand completely that the polls show people are interested in this concept and interested in conservation, like the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), but the truth is actions speak louder than words.

* (1720)

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this government has consistently shown that they are not prepared to take the concept and the precepts behind sustainable development seriously. That has been borne out throughout their tenure. Let me just give you one recent example of that. Mr. Randy Smith, who is not a well-known Liberal, I would not say, not a well-known New Democrat; no, he is a well-known Conservative in Brandon and a very competent lawyer and a nice guy. He was given the job of sitting on the Clean Environment Commission overseeing the Abitibi-Price application to expand their forestry licence into Nopiming Park. That was a very, very important set of hearings, and do you know what? He took it seriously. He listened to all the people who came—[interjection] That was his first problem, as the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) says. They did not expect that he would do that. I do not think they would have appointed him had they thought he would do that.

He listened to the presentations. The company was represented, had all kinds of experts there, but the environmental groups did, too. They brought people who spoke about the park, about sustainable forestry, sustainable development, and that is a perfect encapsulated case in recent Manitoba history to show what this government's true intentions are. Because at the end of the day, Mr. Smith, having heard all of that evidence, being in the absolute best position of anyone in this province to make that informed decision, being in the best position having heard all of that evidence, he made a decision. Do you know what he said? He said the forestry policy of this government is terrible. It is archaic. It is totally out of sync with public expectation and what is known today as good environmental practice. He said the province's forestry policy is a shambles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, that does not come from a person who has a history of nonpartisanship. That comes from somebody who I think would want to sympathize with this government, but he just could not. He listened to all of that evidence and he just could not in good conscience say that. So he wrote this report.

Now you would think the government getting that report would say to itself, look, if we were going to get a favourable report, we would have gotten one from this guy. So if he is writing this report saying we are not doing a good job at all, something is really wrong. We know that he would not have done this unless he really believed it, and he did.

He wrote it in strong terms. It was not a report that skirted the issues. It laid blame on the Province of Manitoba for a forestry policy that was not working, was not progressive, was not in keeping with the principles of sustainable development and simply was out of sink with what people deserved in this province. That is what he said.

What did the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) do? Well, he waited a respectable period of time—I think three or four days—and then it was raised in this House. His response was, well, we are going to grant the licence anyway. That is what he did, completely undercutting not just any credibility on forestry, it went beyond that. This is a point on this issue of sustainable development as well. What he did was undercut the committee itself.

The Clean Environment Commission, for the first time as long as anyone could ever remember, turned someone down, cold. That is what they did in that case, and the government's response was not to take them seriously but rather was to give them the back of their hand and say, no, you have got it wrong. You were supposed to approve this thing. You have got it wrong.

They say that to the committee that listened for weeks to the evidence, looked at this fairly over a period of time, took time to write the report, crafted a carefully written report. Little did they know that they had to get the right result as far as the government was concerned, and they did not.

So the Clean Environment Commission was told, no, you are wrong, and because we have to say something about your criticisms of our policy, we are going to hold some more public hearings on forestry.

They pretended to call those new hearings. There were in fact hearings already scheduled

under the Land and Water Strategy program, Mr. Speaker. In reality, what happened was the whole thing got swept under the carpet, so the government thought—so they thought.

Mr. Speaker, that is a very current—that is by no means the only, and I do not have time to go through the litany of incidents which prove this—example, a recent example of what this government actually does in the issue of environmental protection which is a keystone of sustainable development.

The major problem with this resolution is not so much what it contains, but what it does not contain. I want to conclude my comments, therefore—and I want to leave time for other members to speak—by proposing an amendment, seconded by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

I want to add to the resolution the following additional clause. I think it is a friendly amendment. It reads as follows:

AND THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba condemn the government of Manitoba for consistently giving only lip service to the concept of sustainable development.

Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I have to bring forward that amendment, but I believe it is an amendment which is warranted, and I would not be making it unless I thought it was warranted.

Thank you.

* (1730)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed amendment of the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), I am having some difficulty with the relevance of the honourable member's amendment, so therefore I will take the honourable member's amendment under advisement at this point in time.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think probably I am better off speaking to the original resolution. I think it is a little more straightforward. I have not always agreed with members opposite, but I think the intent behind this resolution is good.

Mr. Speaker, intent is always a difficult thing to determine, and certainly over the past couple of weeks, I have had, as many members in the Chamber have had, some interesting experiences. The fact of the matter is, in making one's remarks and putting things on the record, sometimes we are misquoted, sometimes we are misunderstood and sometimes our intentions are misunderstood. I know, as anyone in this Chamber—and a recent

example is a good one, where allegations were made about my conduct, and there have been false allegations made from time to time.

More recently, it was reported quite wrongly that I had made allegations about other people's conduct, and I want to say categorically that at no time do I believe or did I ever say that any members in the Chamber had done anything wrong, Mr. Speaker. I have the utmost regard for all members.

I regret that my words, perhaps as other people's words have been twisted in the past, were twisted and used in effect against me, because I am quite disappointed that that kind of intention was applied to my words. That is why I say that this resolution at least is clearer in intention.

I am not sure that the member for St. James' (Mr. Edwards) additions do anything to clarify it. As I mentioned earlier, sometimes little additions and little twists here and there of a person's words can create a great deal of havoc. The member's additions in this case, I think, are an example of that, where he has twisted completely the intent of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I think you were quite right to take the matter under advisement to make sure that it is consistent with the rules because we all want to be consistent with the rules.

The fact of the matter is that our critic for the Environment has some comments about, I guess, the nature of this resolution, and will want to put on record some clarification, from our perspective, on the government's handling of what is an important issue. That is waste reduction in our province and the managing of environmental issues.

As I say, while I appreciate the intent of this resolution—I think the member for St. Norbert's (Mr. Laurendeau) heart is in the right place—perhaps, without being unduly partisan, he should have consulted with the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) about the government's actions when it comes to the environment, because they are not always consistent either.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) has an amendment that she is going to be introducing, and I simply wanted to add those remarks to the record.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak to this resolution. It gives me a much wanted chance to make some

comments about this government's disregard for matters pertaining to the environment.

This resolution from the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) obviously has not come from the cabinet because I think it is obvious that this cabinet has the position that they do not even think the Department of Environment is necessary. We can see that by the way that they have cut the branch that is going to undertake the waste reduction and recycling function of this government.

It is interesting, too, to note that the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) has not brought in a bill regarding car safety and MPIC during this session, and has switched to be concerned about the environment.

We are waiting to have bill that would address the cuts at MPIC. Perhaps there might be some interest from the member for St. Norbert about the environmental initiatives at MPIC, and the fact that MPIC has not been directed by this government to do all that they could have done to fulfill The Ozone Depleting Substances Act.

This branch, which is referred to in this legislation, is the very branch that would have had the relationship with MPIC. So they could have, in fact, done all that they could to ensure that ozone-depleting substances—the Freon from car air conditioners—are in fact collected in the most efficient manner.

But, no, this government does not use all the tools that it has available to it. When they have some power to deal with garages that are servicing vehicles through MPIC, they do not move to empower that agency to require the ozone-depleting substances to be contained.

We see over and over again, Mr. Speaker, that this government is all talk and no action on environmental matters and sustainability. One of the areas that I have been interested in talking about is forestry, and it was really interesting this Christmas when we saw the government's disregard and incomprehension of forestry practices when they were logging right here on the Legislative grounds. They were cutting down evergreens for Christmas trees right on the Legislative grounds, and the attitude was, it was a dead tree. Well, that tree was viewed by a number of people and the tree was green from top to bottom.

* (1740)

The attitude that was prevalent in that action to take down that 40- or 50-year-old tree is the same attitude that is practised by this government in its forestry policy, if we can call it that because this government does not have a forestry policy. It is the attitude that trees have no function other than in the marketplace. They do not appreciate that trees in an urban environment are crucial to dealing with pollution problems, that trees are the lungs of the earth and that those trees have an important function in creating oxygen for us all to breath in the city.

It is the same attitude that disregards our call for sustaining the urban elm trees in the city of Winnipeg and where they have again had to be badgered to give the proper funding so that the urban forests can be maintained.

One only has to look at the Hazardous Waste Corporation to see the way that they have neglected to move forward to build the facility that is going to deal with hazardous waste in this province. There have been no moves by this government to move toward sustainable agriculture and to stop encouraging the overconsumption and overproduction of chemicals in agriculture. We have seen nothing from this government to move toward organic agriculture.

In terms of wildlife and endangered species, we have seen moving in the opposite direction when they have changed The Wildlife Act to encourage development in wildlife management areas. They are nowhere near, Mr. Speaker, implementing any programs that are going to meet the target to have 50 percent waste reduction which the Premier (Mr. Filmon) so excitedly said that they were going to do when he was paddling the canoe in the election. We saw the Premier in the canoe talking about how they were going to protect the environment. They are nowhere near going to reach the target.

I would like to see one document from the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), as he says they are way ahead of the target. We have been looking for where the money is, Mr. Speaker. Where is the money in the Environmental Innovations Fund that was supposed to go to innovations in Manitoba? Why are they spending it on their own government departments, rather than giving it to organizations that are trying to do environmental education and have conferences and develop new technologies and to provide programs in the community? But, no, they are spending money collected from

recycled material to subsidize their own government departments, particularly the Department of Natural Resources and the sustainable development division, which everybody knows is merely this government giving more handouts to their engineering buddies and corporate friends in the auspices of environmental contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that we have tried to impress upon this government is if they are really interested in environmental protection and sustainability, that they would start putting some money into creating jobs in environmental restoration and environmental protection rather than cutting those grants to organizations, rather than cutting the areas in the government in the departments that are responsible for environmental issues. They are moving in the opposite direction of sustainability on so many fronts, particularly in dealing with poverty and ensuring that people have a way of marrying, if you will, the need for jobs and the need for environmental protection and restoration.

There are so many areas. We have the aqueduct from Shoal Lake that needs to be maintained. There is a lot of work that could be created in putting money into fixing up the sewers in Winnipeg. This government has not approached, to my knowledge, the federal government at all. There are capital cities across this country that have gotten money from the federal government to improve their sewer and water services. This government has failed in accessing the government money from the federal government that is available for those projects. They know it.

It is their buddies in Ottawa who are in right now. You would think that there would be some increased improvement in the relationship between the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of Manitoba and the Prime Minister of this country, but they seem to have a personality conflict, perhaps, that gets in the way of the progress of this government and this province in moving towards sustainability and environmental protection.

I think it is a sad case when the personality conflicts between the Prime Minister and the Premier of Manitoba are preventing Manitoba from having its fair share of green plan money and money from the federal government to improve our sewers and water system, to improve the aqueduct from Shoal Lake to Winnipeg. That is where there should be jobs created.

We do not need to have the kind of masquerading, of giving out contracts to rural consultants developing recycling projects when we know that money is going to Conservative friends, just like they have done in so many other departments.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

Point of Order

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member is making some rather serious allegations. I wonder if she would like to substantiate her charges.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable minister does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

* * *

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, I have written to the minister, and I have asked for a complete list of all the individuals and companies that have gotten grants under the Innovations Fund. I would ask the minister to table a complete list in—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Hon. Jim Ernst (Acting Government House Leader):

Mr. Speaker, the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) clearly put on the record allegations of impropriety by the minister, suggesting that the Environmental Innovations Fund provided money to personal friends of the minister and so on. That is a distinct allegation. Either she should back it up with facts or withdraw and apologize.

Ms. Cerilli: I said that they were friends of the government, not personal friends of the minister.

The point is, Mr. Speaker—and I would think that they know who their friends are—

Mr. Speaker: You are still on the point of order.

Ms. Cerilli: I think that they know who their friends are, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised, the honourable minister did not have a point of order. It was a dispute over the facts.

* * *

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have left?

Mr. Speaker: Four and a half minutes.

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to move a motion to amend the resolution. I move

THAT the resolution be amended by adding after the words "efficient practices" the words "being dismantled since they cut the branch," and in the third WHEREAS by substituting the words "it has not encouraged" instead of "essential to encourage," and finally in the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED after the words "Manitobans" to include "let this government know how miserably they are failing."

I would like to move that, seconded by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Radisson has moved an amendment to Resolution 11. Unfortunately, I may not accept the honourable member's amendment at this time because the House is already in possession of an amendment moved by the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), which I have taken under advisement. Therefore, unfortunately, I may not accept the honourable member's amendment.

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few comments to this motion. It seems to me that the opposition likes to revel in a lot of verbiage without very much substantiation of their knowledge of the environmental issues in this province.

First of all, we have the Liberal critic spending a whole lot of time talking about issues that he perceives to have taken too long to have been handled or perhaps should be handled more aggressively. On the other hand, we have the NDP critic standing on her feet suggesting the department is full of improprieties or that the department or this minister is not taking responsibility for its actions in the field of waste reduction and in protection of the environment.

* (1750)

I find it absolutely titillating to think that the NDP is now complaining about respect for the environment and how the Progressive Conservative government here in Manitoba is in their opinion neglecting care and responsibility for the environment when our neighbours to the west, the Romanow government, it seems to me that they still call themselves NDP—given their budget, I am not sure that they are still sticking to the original election promises—but what did they do about the environment? They did away with the whole

department. They blew them away. That is how they respect the environmental protection in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the member raised some very foolish, in my opinion, concerns about what is happening in terms of how this government has used the funds which are produced from, first of all, the elimination of the exemption on the diaper tax and put into a sustainable development fund in order to encourage some innovations and activity around environmental protection and enhancement. The member challenged me as to whether or not I was able to produce a record of the people who had access to funds from that fund. Every single contract or grant that was awarded under that fund has been tabled in this House, and the member continues to say that she lacks information. Well, if she has some information that I do not have she better be tabling her information, because every dollar that has been spent out of that fund is accounted for in the House in a report that was tabled here and will be tabled again this year as a result of the 1992 expenditures—every dollar.

At the same time, we have a number of regional waste disposal ground initiatives in rural Manitoba that are presently using funds out of this allocation to do research and design on waste disposal sites in rural Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, most of those contracts have been awarded to an organization called Earthbound Consultants, and if anybody can tell me who the heck owns Earthbound Consultants then they probably have more personal knowledge about it than I do.

The Department of Environment has had some very significant successes in terms of initiatives that are bearing fruit today and will bear fruit throughout the 1993-94 years in terms of waste reduction. The members opposite with great glee jumped up pointing at me saying that the policy branch of the Department of Environment, that the Waste Reduction and Prevention branch was gone, with little regard to the fact that they are reorganized back into the department to implement the very initiatives that they brought forward.

Manitoba is recognized across Canada as being the leader in The Ozone Depleting Substances Act and implementation of the regulations that go with that. Other jurisdictions, in fact, copy our regulations, copy our legislation and, frankly, it has become very noticeable that other jurisdictions call upon the expertise that is resident in the Manitoba

Department of Environment to give them advice on the experience that they have had with Ozone Depleting Substances Act and the regulations that go with that.

The initiatives that we have undertaken regarding tires, we are one of the few provinces in Canada that will have a clearly defined plan in place before the summer is over. That Manitoba—and as recently as a few hours ago I had an opportunity to discuss with representatives from United States where they are headed and where we may be headed in terms of dealing with waste tires across the province. It seems to me that the province of Manitoba is in very good shape related to other jurisdictions, and the flow of tires back to recycling will increase dramatically this summer.

Manitoba is also presently the location for what I think is one of the most innovative and technologically advanced methods of dealing with used oil, specifically to refer to the organization and a company known as Enviro-Oil. They now have a fully operating plant here in Manitoba, in Winnipeg. They will likely have a second one up and going in Virden this summer. As that capacity to recycle that oil into No. 2 diesel is enhanced, we will have an opportunity to then take the oil from a number of the communities around the province who are now establishing their own waste oil collection sites. In the very near future I can, without fear of contradiction, say that we will see most of the used oil that is generated in this province either recycled into No. 2 diesel, as this company would like to do, or put into other alternative uses that are environmentally sensitive, and have this waste permanently removed from our environment.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that tends to tantalize all of us is the return of old newspaper for recycling. Development of systems in the province have not left us with a situation where we have huge warehouses full of newsprint that cannot be moved. The fact is the market for old newsprint has grown dramatically to the point where those who are now actively shipping old newsprint are searching for additional product. That means that the time is exactly right for us to enhance our collection system so that the volumes of paper that are needed to supply that market can flow directly to the market rather than be subsidized at taxpayers' expense. It will be handled at the expense of those who put the waste into the environment.

I suggest that this is one of the problems that both opposition parties have, is that they believe that government should be moving in with large gobs of tax dollars in order to initiate and to drive recycling programs across the province. The fact is that those recycling programs can and will be driven by the value of the product. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you call the Minister of Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) in order. She is shouting things at me, and I am having a difficult time hearing the Minister of Environment make his presentation because the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is shouting things across the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised, I would remind all honourable members, if they want to carry on a private conversation, they can do so outside the Chamber.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Minister of Environment, to carry on with his remarks.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I have been known to make hour-long speeches on this topic, so I have a couple of other items that I would like to touch on very quickly, that the members opposite seem to be so shortsighted in the way they look at the advantages that we have in this province and the technological capabilities that we have.

Two items that are very, very important that I think will put this province apart from some other regions or certainly keep us close to the lead is in terms of biological weed control and bioremediation of certain wastes in the environment.

The fact is that occasionally funds are taken from the Environmental Innovations Fund into the Department of Agriculture to manage those types of initiatives, very specific initiatives. That means that in the long run, if they are successful—and in many cases they have been successful—we can eliminate the number of toxic chemicals that are used in weed control, that are used in the control of infestation of bugs of various natures that attack our fruit, vegetable crops and a number of our other cereals, where we now have serious problems with the potential chemical resistance on some weed species.

While this is very low key, and there is not a lot of pizzazz in having people go out and look at a field that has a lot of bugs in it, the fact is that in the long run, I am a committed believer that this is the type of work with the type of people whom we have working in this province that will lead to some very interesting and I believe successful long-term results.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable minister will have four minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

CONTENTS

Presenting Petitions

Restoration of Friendship Centre Funding	
Storie	1257
C. Evans	1257
Plohman	1257

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Restoration of Friendship Centre Funding	
Dewar	1257
Sunday Shopping	
Storie	1257
Restoration of Friendship Centre Funding	
Hickes	1257

Oral Questions

Student Social Allowance Program	
Doer; Filmon	1258
Manitoba Foster Family Association	
Doer; Filmon	1259
School Divisions	
Plohman; Vodrey	1260
Video Lottery Terminals	
Lamoureux; Filmon	1261
Transcona-Springfield School Division	
Reid; Vodrey	1262
Manitoba Intercultural Council	
Barrett; Mitchelson	1263
School Divisions	
Gray; Vodrey	1264
Education System	
Gray; Vodrey	1264

Civil Service

Gray; Praznik	1264
Transcona-Springfield School Division	
Cerilli; Vodrey	1265
School Divisions	
Cerilli; Vodrey	1265
Selkirk Friendship Centre	
Dewar; Filmon; Gilleshammer	1265
Sunday Shopping	
Gaudry; Stefanson	1266

Nonpolitical Statements

City of Brandon	
McCrae	1266
Doer	1267
Carstairs	1267

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Debate on Proposed Motions

Consideration of the Estimates	
Carstairs	1268

Private Members' Business

Proposed Resolutions

Res. 11, Environmental Initiatives	
Laurendeau	1286
Amendment	
Edwards	1288
Storie	1289
Cerilli	1290
Cummings	1292