



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

(Hansard)

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



Vol. XLIV No. 3B - 8 p.m., Monday, December 5, 1994

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

<u>Name</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Party</u>
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	P.C.
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	P.C.
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Lib.
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	P.C.
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	P.C.
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	P.C.
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Lib.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	P.C.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
McCORMICK, Norma	Osborne	Lib.
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	P.C.
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	P.C.
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	P.C.
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupert Island	NDP
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	P.C.
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
SHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	P.C.
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP
<i>Vacant</i>	River Heights	
<i>Vacant</i>	Flin Flon	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 5, 1994

The House met at 8 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(continued)

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(Second Day of Debate)

Mr. Speaker: Resuming debate, the honourable member for Wellington who has 37 minutes remaining.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, when I ended earlier, I was talking about the context within which we are discussing the Speech from the Throne. I made some comments about the lack of economic growth that the province has undergone, and I would like to just make a couple of more comments in that regard.

In 1994, this year that we are almost concluding, the province of Manitoba is predicted to have the lowest rate of private investment of any province in the country, the lowest rate of private investment of any province in the country. This is with a government that says that the best way to ensure that there are jobs in this province is through the private investment route, yet they have done nothing to ensure that there is any major private investment in this province. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think something that frames much of what we should be talking about in this shortened session of the Legislature and that is the whole issue of child poverty.

I will not go through all of the statistics or the ramifications and implications of the child poverty rates in the province of Manitoba because others will do that and others have done that. Suffice it to say that we have one of the worst child poverty rates in the country and a child poverty rate with all of the attendant problems that follow from that, that is unconscionable in a province that is as wealthy as this one is in a country that is as wealthy as this one is.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these child poverty rates, the lousy limited lack of any kind of economic

initiatives go to the heart of what is wrong with the government in the province of Manitoba. It is a tired government. It is a government that is bereft of ideas and it is a government whose time has come to go off into the sunset and make way for another government, a government that has ideas, that has plans, that is going to ensure that the province of Manitoba in the next year is not No. 9 or No. 10, but No. 1 or No. 2.

Mr. Speaker, in my few moments here, I would like to do a comparison of the three plans that have been presented in this last week for the people of Manitoba. I think after we discuss that, we will know which party in the province of Manitoba has the ideas and the vision and the energy and the depth and breadth to be able to put forward and to bring, to the province of Manitoba, government for all of the people.

I would like to basically compare three or four main areas. One is, of course, jobs. The next one is health care. The third one is education and then I have a couple of comments on two other areas, immigration and maintenance enforcement, and I will just basically compare.

In the jobs, the Progressive Conservative government in its Speech from the Throne has balanced budget legislation. My Leader has talked about this, the hypocrisy of this government bringing in balanced budget legislation after seven budgets, six of which did not balance in any way, shape or form. The government talks in its Speech from the Throne constantly using the word "continue." They are going to continue programs that have not worked in the past, and they are going to continue to study in areas where they have no programs. There is very little, virtually nothing, in this Speech from the Throne that is specific, that is detailed, that outlines a progressive, forward-thinking, new way of looking at how to deal with the job situation in the province of Manitoba.

The Liberals in their—I am not sure if I can even

find it; it is so slim—strategy paper, there is nothing in it, not a word in it about jobs. [interjection]

The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has just mentioned that this paper the Liberals have produced was because this session is so short. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this was their opportunity to put before the people of Manitoba—not the entire platform that they are going to run on, because we have not put our entire platform out. Until we put our entire platform out, the Liberals do not have their platform completed.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been a good idea for the Liberals to follow the path of the Progressive Conservatives and the New Democrats in their Speech from the Throne and the alternative Speech from the Throne and outline for the people of Manitoba the areas that they are concerned about and some concrete suggestions for dealing with the problems facing the province of Manitoba. No, the Liberals—here, I have found it, two pages. It focuses on children, not a bad idea. I have no problems with virtually any of the items in their—

An Honourable Member: Something old, something new, something borrowed, something blue.

Ms. Barrett: Exactly, with a heavy emphasis on borrowed.

I have very little to complain about in the Liberal plan or the Liberal kind of resolution and discussion. I will talk about one area that I do think is fairly weak. I am surprised actually by it. There is nothing in here about jobs.

The New Democrats, in our alternate Speech from the Throne, have three pages, three full pages dealing with jobs. We have a number of private members' resolutions that deal with jobs and the economy, eight of them. We have seven bills that we have proposed that will be on the Order Paper for this session, dealing with jobs and the economy. All throughout our alternative throne speech there is an emphasis on jobs.

In health care the Conservatives talk about community health care and programs for kids, but the reality of their actions over the last six and a half years speak otherwise. There is less money again being spent in the Department of Health than they are budgeted for. There are layoffs with no plans other than to cut spending. They talk about community-based health care. We have not seen it. There are over a hundred committees in the health care department, most of which have not reported, spending an enormous amount of time and energy and perhaps money with nothing to show for it.

The Liberals have a school nutrition program. That is the extent of their plan in health care.

The New Democrats in health care have again three pages of items dealing specifically with health care, three pages in the alternate Speech from the Throne. We have three private members' bills to be put before the House this session. They are not just small bills either, Mr. Speaker. They deal with accountability. They deal with the patient's right to know. They deal with major health care initiatives, two private members' resolutions, in addition to all the private members' resolutions that we have put forward in the last six years. So again we have a number of specific detailed outlined plans and proposals that we can discuss with the people of Manitoba and they know that we have a plan.

The third is in the education and training. Basically I would suggest the Conservatives are working towards a two-tiered education system in the province of Manitoba with what I will call their voucher plan, with their focus on putting public money into a private corporation such as Workforce 2000 and their support for a higher rate of support for the private school system than the public school system. They pick away at the symptoms rather than identifying and dealing with the underlying problems.

The public education system has had a decrease in funding over the time that the Conservatives have been in power with a vast increase of expectations on the part of parents, teachers,

children and the rest of the system—such as the justice system, the family services system and the health care system—on those increased expectations on the public education system with reduced expenditures.

The Liberals have a province-wide code of behaviour for students to follow. There is no problem with students and everyone; they need boundaries so that they know what is acceptable and what is not. Even we here in the Legislature have those. But to say that a province-wide code of behaviour will be established given the range of schools and the range of communities in this province does not—it begs the question. It is not reasonable to expect that the same code of behaviour, with certain basic exceptions—[interjection] I would suggest, in answer to the member for Inkster, when he asked me in what school would it be appropriate for children to hit the teacher, that of course there would be no school in which that would be an appropriate behaviour. Other than those very minimal codes of behaviour, if you want to get any more detailed, then it does not make any sense. Besides which, Mr. Speaker, that is the only thing in their two-page communique that I can see that deals with education.

* (2010)

Again, we have two full pages in our alternative speech from the throne dealing with educating and training—actually more, three or four pages when we talk about education and training. We have six private members' resolutions that deal specifically with education, and some on jobs and the economy, private members' bills, the seven, deal as well with education and training.

Mr. Speaker, in two other areas I would like to briefly comment on the difference between the Conservatives, the Liberals and the New Democrats.

The first is immigration. I have read the Speech from the Throne. I listened to the Speech from the Throne and nowhere do I find anything in the Speech from the Throne, unless I missed it, that

talks about the issue of immigration and what this government is prepared to do about it.

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

They are entering into very serious negotiations with the federal government about this vital issue and they do not even consider it important enough to warrant even one line in the Speech from the Throne.

Again, Madam Deputy Speaker, one specific thing that this government has done that leads me to believe they do not really classify immigration as an important issue, when they take away Canadian history from the core curriculum as a required course in the public school system, the impact that this has on children who come to this country from other nations is incalculable. People talk about how immigrants and new Canadians need to participate in the society that they are now living in. I would like to ask you how they are able to do that if one of the basic educational tools, Canadian history, is not available to them.

The Liberals say nothing about immigration. Not surprisingly, it is their government that is bringing down these draconian changes to an institution that the Liberals in the federal level have stated for decades as being their purview. They are the government. They are the party supporting immigrants.

I would suggest, Madam Deputy Speaker, the reason the Liberals, in their two-page communique, do not say anything about immigration is that they are embarrassed by their federal government on this issue. If they are not embarrassed, they should be.

Again, in our alternative throne speech we have two private member's resolutions and two private member's bills dealing specifically with this issue.

Finally, there is a very interesting element in the Speech from the Throne. It is a small item. It appears in all three, which I find interesting, because much of what is in the NDP speech from

the throne and the Tory Speech from the Throne does not appear in the Liberals', which is not surprising, seeing as how it is only two pages. The whole issue of maintenance enforcement appears in all three.

To be honest, what the government Speech from the Throne says on maintenance enforcement is quite positive. Again, as I stated earlier, words are words and actions do speak louder than words. The maintenance enforcement section in the government's Speech from the Throne says they will strengthen enforcement measures, they will expand the scope of attachable resources to be dealt with if a spouse refuses to pay the maintenance. Third, they will implement payment incentives and stronger penalties.

This at least is a plan, something that the people of Manitoba can look towards to see if it has been implemented. The New Democrats propose on maintenance enforcement the automatic deduction of maintenance payments from noncustodial parents' pay cheque. This is one item, but it is a very, very extensive item, the automatic deduction, automatic deduction from pay cheque, not when you have missed a payment, but immediately upon the determination of how much money the noncustodial parent is to pay to the custodial parent. That money will be deducted from the pay cheque automatically from the very beginning.

I am surprised at the Liberal item on this maintenance enforcement, because the only thing that the Liberal communique says is that the parents who default will be listed with the Credit Bureau. There is no direct connection there between a defaulting parent and an ability for the state or the custodial parent to take action. I find this very weak in the Liberal document and am surprised, particularly because one of their members has spent a lot of time on this. I just think this is an indication of the weakness and the flimsiness of the Liberal document.

I know the Liberals have said that it is because this is a short session. I do believe, Madam Deputy Speaker, because it is potentially the last session before a provincial election, there is no

guarantee that when we come back to deal with the budget next spring that we will do more than have one day in the House. This was an opportunity that we knew we were going to have of two weeks at least to put before the people of Manitoba our plans for the future.

I would suggest, Madam Deputy Speaker, in closing, that when the people of Manitoba look at the plans that have been put forward by the three parties in this Legislature, they will very easily see which party has the plan that deals specifically with the range of issues that we are facing as a province and has specific answers and ideas about working together so that we can rebuild the province of Manitoba, bring it back to the state to which all Manitobans deserve to have their province and their lives so that they can live a high quality of life.

With those few remarks, Madam Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for the last time as a member of the official opposition in the Legislature and on the Speech from the Throne and look forward to hearing the opposition's response to our first Speech from the Throne next spring. Thank you.

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): Madam Deputy Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in the House today and address the honourable members and the people of Manitoba concerning the throne speech.

I must say that the honourable member for Wellington is always a tough act to follow. Even though I do not always agree with her policy, she does carry her thoughts very well and deliver a very equal and balanced speech.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the Speaker on his continued service to the Chamber and to the electorate of Manitoba as Speaker of this House. You have always demonstrated a strong commitment to maintaining a high standard of decorum and conduct and commitment which has earned you the respect of all honourable members in this House. I believe I speak for all honourable members in the House, Mr. Speaker,

when I say that you indeed set the standard in this country in managing the affairs of this Chamber in such an orderly and professional manner and we look forward to working with you in the role of Speaker in this House for many years to come. I know that all members in this House consider you a friend.

I believe that I speak for all honourable members when I say that this House regrets that a number of members left us and gave their resignations. That was Mrs. Carstairs and Mr. Storie who have decided to take advantage of other opportunities and will not be joining us in this session. Both these individuals were skilled legislators and served the people of Manitoba well. Their presence will be missed in this House immensely.

I remember reading from a book that I was given last Christmas that Mrs. Carstairs was interested in getting away from the politics to become an educator. It surprised me very much to learn that Mrs. Carstairs will be pursuing her interests in education from the Senate of Canada. Hopefully, she can do a little bit of educating there. I am sure that they will all listen.

Two other members of the House from our side with 50 years of service to the public will be leaving us, the honourable Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme) and the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose). Between the two of them, as I have just stated, they have served their communities for almost a half a century from school trustee to City Council and I know that they will be missed by all members here in the Chamber.

* (2020)

From the other side of the House, I understand that we have the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) who will not be running in the next session. I have to say that I have always enjoyed the honourable member's gentle probing of my speeches. I think they were gentle.

An Honourable Member: John did not say he

was not running yet, you know.

Mr. Laurendeau: Well, I announced it for him then.

I would like to thank the people of St. Norbert constituency for their continued support and advice and guidance they have shown me throughout my term as an elected representative to this Legislature.

My first priority as their elected representative has always been, and shall continue to be, consult my constituents throughout the riding of St. Norbert and to listen attentively to their views and to be their voice in this House. I respectively thank the people of St. Norbert constituency for giving me this distinguished responsibility, and I shall continue to preserve on their behalf as their MLA.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Manitoba continues to grow stronger due to no small part to the consistent and effective leadership of our esteemed Premier (Mr. Filmon). The Premier continues to stand strong for Manitoba, working diligently with all levels of government to ensure that the interests of all Manitobans are protected today and into the future. During his term as Premier of Manitoba, he has demonstrated a sincere willingness to work with the federal government to protect Manitoba's interest, but has not hesitated to stand up for Manitoba when our interests have been threatened by federal government initiatives.

I would like to take a moment to welcome those six young people who have been selected to serve as our Pages during this session of the Legislature. I look forward to your assistance in the upcoming session. I am certain that you will find your visit with us tremendously rewarding, however so short this time.

Let me begin by saying that the throne speech is for the people of Manitoba. It truly reflects this government's being progressive in the direction of health and education and other social programs and being conservative in the area of fiscal spending and economic issues.

We believe that working together with the people of Manitoba of all political stripes will ensure that the government succeeds in bringing about changes that benefits all Manitobans.

Since we were first elected, our government has insisted on putting people first, and I believe that this throne speech continues in that tradition. This throne speech takes in a number of initiatives I have heard the Leader of the Opposition the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) and the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) bring forward on a number of occasions. Even though we are of different philosophies, we are here to serve the people of Manitoba and to prove to Manitobans and Canadians that we have the best system in the world. We must learn to work together if we are to succeed in the future. This is essential because the people of Manitoba deserve representation that is willing to listen to their views and end the double speak of the past. It is no longer acceptable, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I have listened with great interest recently to the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) giving such an impassioned defence of the federal Liberal government's proposed changes to the social safety net. He claims the changes that are being made to the social programs are necessary due to fiscal pressures the federal government faces, yet the same honourable member has consistently opposed changes this government has proposed to social programming.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it would appear to me that the honourable member for St. James is content to ride on the coattails of the Honourable Mr. Axworthy and his federal counterparts. The honourable member for St. James cannot stand behind federal changes that will hurt Manitoba and stand up for Manitobans at the same time. Where is the honourable member's allegiance? Is it to the federal Liberal government or to Manitobans?

I would like to address the concerns raised by the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) that since we have not been in session this government has not been working. I would remind the Leader of the second opposition party

that many of us have been working in our constituencies since the last session of the Legislature, working on behalf of the constituents who elected us. To me that is more important than sitting in this Chamber listening to that honourable member criticize everything this government has done—make Manitoba small, "small potatoes," as he says. "Small potatoes" when he talks about programs such as REDI and Grow Bonds. This member does not understand what "small potatoes" are.

He demands that we come back to this session to debate the important issues of the province. What was the second question that member asked in Question Period?

An Honourable Member: What was it?

Mr. Laurendeau: About Winnie-the-Pooh, a \$20,000-expenditure. Madam Deputy Speaker, if this is the end of where they are coming from, I really have a problem. I am sure they are going to be using this in their presentation in the future.

As representatives of the people, we must learn to respect the positions that we have been entrusted to by the people of this province. In jurisdictions throughout Canada and around the world, populations have sent the message to their political leaders that they will accept nothing less than 100 percent effort on the part of their political leaders. It is a message we should all keep in mind as we enter this session of the Legislature.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Manitobans have demanded that our government make jobs and the economy a top priority, and since our government took office, we have worked hard to ensure that Manitoba's economy prospers and creates jobs for Manitobans. We have done this by positioning Manitoba to take full advantage of the international economic recovery by putting in place an economic climate conducive to growth. Although economic growth is not an end in itself, we realize that it is an essential component of creating jobs, sustaining our health care, education, social services, and maintaining the high quality of life we in Manitoba are used to.

Small business continues to form the backbone of our economy in Manitoba. Eighty percent of the new jobs in the economy are now created by the more than 30,000 small businesses in our province. Our government has worked strenuously during our term of office to create the conditions necessary for small business to thrive by lowering taxes for small businesses and by responding to the need for smarter regulations and reduced regulatory red tape. These measures, combined with the willingness on the part of our government to co-operate with business, has created a renewed spirit of entrepreneurship in Manitoba where Manitobans are taking the initiative to invest in their dreams and create jobs in our economy.

Increased trade within Canada and abroad has been the leading factor in Manitoba's economic growth recently. By aggressively tapping these markets where our products and services are in high demand, exports to foreign markets have grown by approximately 30 percent this year, and more specifically our exports to Mexico have nearly tripled between 1991 and 1993.

We must continue to seek the new opportunities in the global economy in order to provide jobs and greater economic security for future generations of Manitobans. As a part of our strategy to continue to integrate Manitoba into the global economy, word of what our province has to offer has been spread worldwide, and the world is coming to Manitoba in even greater numbers to see what we are all about. Growth in both overseas visitors and visitors from the United States to Manitoba is the highest among all provinces thus far in 1994, and now contributes \$1 billion to the economy annually. Our government continues to work with Manitoba's tourism industry with the goal of doubling tourism revenues by the end of the century.

As a Manitoban and a Winnipegger, I was filled with pride when I heard that Winnipeg had been selected to host the 1999 Pan-American Games. This provides all of us in Manitoba to show our province and the city of Winnipeg off to the world. I am fully supportive of our government's Pan American trade and tourism 1999 initiative to take

advantage of the new trade and tourism opportunities created by hosting the Pan American Games.

I am especially proud of our government's fiscal record in the area of spending our tax dollars smarter. We have worked steadily as a government to eliminate overlap and duplication in the services we provide in order to ensure that every tax dollar is directed to the services that are the highest priorities for Manitobans, health care, education and social services.

* (2030)

Madam Deputy Speaker, our government has realized the importance of having a balanced budget since we were first elected in 1988. Continuing deficits and debt lead to higher interest payments to service that debt. Manitobans cannot afford to have precious tax dollars diverted from vital services to pay the cost of servicing an ever-growing debt. It just makes good sense to keep our money at home in Manitoba, providing for the needs of Manitobans. We are currently on the track for Manitoba to be one of the first provinces in Manitoba to balance its budget. This province takes pride in its record of fiscal management and responsibility by having the distinction of having a deficit growth of a mere 1.3 percent, the lowest deficit growth in all of Canada. Furthermore, this government is still bearing the brunt of the gross mismanagement of the former NDP government and is shocked by the misleading information provided the public concerning this debt.

Free Press columnist Frances Russell has stated that the Filmon government has added \$4 billion in Manitoba net direct and guaranteed debt. Let me set the record straight once and for all, Madam Deputy Speaker. Ms. Russell neglected to point out that this debt is largely due to the financial fiascos of the former NDP government. Now hear this: a full 80 percent of this \$4 billion debt is simply to pay the interest charges of the debt incurred by the NDP government. [interjection] I must have struck a nerve, Madam Deputy Speaker. If it was not for the interest charges this government pays for the former government's

economic irresponsibilities, plus the accumulated debt since that time, the government of the people of Manitoba would be enjoying a surplus of \$1.35 billion.

Every man, woman and child in Manitoba suffers because this money could have been spent on programs and services, tax reduction and a litany of initiatives which government is implementing to increase the quality of life for all. But that is not all. It is just a sweet dream nowadays. The reality is, the \$4 billion nightmare left the people of this province as a legacy by the former administrations—[interjection] Former administrations. How is that? I only came in 1990. I am a man who believes in giving credit where credit is due and blame where it belongs.

It is because of this runaway spending that this government feels it necessary to introduce balanced budget legislation. Balanced budget legislation is necessary to protect the people of Manitoba from the piracy of the public purse of their elected officials, as was the case of the former administration. Ms. Russell alleges that the fiscal record is contradictory to the throne speech commitment to balanced budget legislation. I submit, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the balanced budget legislation is because of the fiscal record of the former administration robbing the people of their day and ours.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am especially pleased that our government will be introducing balanced budget legislation with teeth to ensure that the budget is balanced soon and remains that way for years to come. We must prevent the deficit crisis of the 1980s that crippled the Manitoba economy from happening again and guarantee that Manitoba remains a stable environment in which to invest.

I am also pleased with the emphasis that our government has put on integrating Manitoba into the information highway. Clearly, more and more the business of the government and every citizen will be done by way of the information highway in the future, and it is important to continue to implement more practical applications of the

information highway such as the Drug Program Information Network, distance education projects and rural library automation.

Manitoba's position on the information highway has positioned us well to benefit from the ever expanding telecommunication industry. More and more jobs in the new economy will be in the telecommunication and information-based industries, and we have already begun to see the benefits here in Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, close to 3,000 new jobs in the telecommunications sector will be created by new operations announced over the past two years. In addition, Manitoba continues to benefit from Winnipeg's position as the transportation hub of Canada. Our prime location in the centre of the country with good access to key American markets has helped to make Winnipeg a world-class transportation and distribution centre employing over 25,000 Manitobans. I support our government's efforts to solidify Winnipeg's pivotal position in this industry by working co-operatively with the private sector and by creating conditions necessary for the growth.

Madam Deputy Speaker, all of Manitoba has benefited from Manitoba's participation in the \$205 million Canada-Manitoba Infrastructure Program. Thousands of Manitobans have been put to work in their own communities in upgrading and improving infrastructure services. Residents in my constituency of St. Norbert were pleased to see the reconstruction of Pembina Highway through St. Norbert to the city limits at a cost of approximately \$16 million. This does not only serve my constituency but all of Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg, seeing as it is the gateway to the city of Winnipeg and a primary access through to the U.S.

Madam Deputy Speaker, parents throughout Manitoba have been calling for a greater voice in the education of their children. I believe the new directions for the education initiative brought forward by the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Manness) presented a number of ideas that have been very well received by parents. Our

government is working with the other western provinces to develop a common core curricula among the provinces to ensure a high standard of education exists throughout western Canada.

This government has worked to put in place standards and testing in our schools. Despite what the honourable members opposite may say, the purpose of this testing is not to test the quality of education or of teachers but rather to establish where additional resources need to be allocated.

In order to ensure our children receive the best possible education, it is essential that resources be better allocated to meet the needs of our young people as they prepare to enter the global economy of the 21st Century. We must work together to ensure the classrooms are a safe, productive environment for teachers and students.

Madam Deputy Speaker, teachers must be given the means to make themselves feel safe in the classroom, where now it is not always the case. The sanctity of the classroom must be maintained to create the proper environment for learning to take place.

We must also link more effectively the skills that are taught in school and those skills that are on demand in the modern day workplace. In the technologically advanced society we find ourselves in during this last decade of the 20th Century, young people need a far different range of skills when they venture from school into the workplace. That was not the case when we made the transition ourselves. We must continue the emphasis on basic skills such as reading, writing and math which continue to be as important today as ever, but we must also supplement our children's education with computers and technology skills that form an ever larger component of the modern day workplace.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the people of my constituency will be better served in the years to come from the new construction of the Grandmont school facility and the expansion of Fort Richmond Collegiate and Bairdmore school. These two areas had a very large growth factor,

and we are using a large number of portable units. I know that the expansions were necessary, and I think that the constituency would like to thank the government for their assistance in coming forward with the funds.

In addition to continuing to ensure our universities provide a high level of excellence in education, the Roblin commission recommends that we re-examine the role of community colleges.

Madam Deputy Speaker, our community colleges in Manitoba provide an important resource in training many of our young people directly for the workplace. Many of the high paying jobs that are in demand in the industry relating to technology and the information highway depend on our highly skilled graduates from our community colleges. Manitoba can position itself very well to be the beneficiary of many of these new positions if we can provide the highly skilled graduates who can fill these positions.

This is the challenge that faces government in the community colleges as we enter the information age. Security of the public and of each of us as individuals continues to be a high priority for this government.

We must continue to press the federal government for changes to the Young Offenders Act to ensure that there are consequences for young people who break the law. Our government has made great strides in the way we deal with young people who have been convicted of breaking the law.

Youth detention centres at one time were places that did not seem to have very harsh consequences for young people who broke the law. I am pleased that the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) has removed the pool tables and the TVs from the detention centres and replaced the old attitudes with rules that are strict and fair. I look forward to the day when the rigorous youth confinement initiatives that we have implemented will be extended to the adult correction centres.

* (2040)

Madam Deputy Speaker, the community must be made aware of the dangerous sexual offenders living in our midst so that they can take the proper precautions to ensure their safety. I am fully supportive of the measures that our government is undertaking to permit public identification of such individuals. I also agree that we need to review levels of policing with the RCMP and municipal police forces to make sure that Manitobans can feel more secure both in their homes and in their work environment.

Our government has again reaffirmed its commitment to the protection of our health care system in Manitoba. We currently spend 34 percent of the government's budget on health care more than any other province in Canada.

Throughout our term in government, we have sought to consult as widely as possible in the community and with the health care providers to come up with new ideas and new solutions for the challenges we face in health care. Despite the comments by some members of the public that more money is always the answer, I believe we need to continue to move toward a more responsive system dedicated to preserving and restoring the health of Manitobans and not necessarily a more expensive system.

Our government is committed to maintaining the high levels of service and care that Manitobans expect. We are committed to doing it at a price Manitobans can afford.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we will eliminate unnecessary waste duplication and abusive services by building on the successful Drug Program Information Network to create a Provincial Health Information System linking all health care stakeholders. This will improve the quality and speed of health care services without increasing the cost of the services provided.

With 1994 being proclaimed International Year of the Family, all of us have benefited from the increased exposure to issues concerning the family. Often we take the family for granted, but I am pleased that our government has made such a

tremendous effort to make the importance of a family a priority for government and all Manitobans.

I am also encouraged by the initiatives that will be taken by our government to introduce province-wide curbside collection recycling under the Manitoba Products Stewardship Program. As a society, we must take responsibility for ensuring that we reduce the amount of waste that we haul to the landfills. By making recycling more accessible to Manitobans, we can take a great deal of pressure off our landfills and add years of life to our existing landfill sites.

Manitobans know that recycling is the right thing to do. All they need is the means to do it.

I believe that this initiative will enable the government to keep its pledge to reduce solid waste in Manitoba by 50 percent by the year 2000. I only hope that the Liberals will support us when we go to the federal government. I want to bring this forward again. I brought it forward last year, and I hope they will go forward with us to the federal government and ask them to pay their share through Canada Post into the recycling component. They have to stand up for Manitoba. If we are going to see recycling work in this province, they are going to have to stand up to that government and their friends in Ottawa and see that they pay their share.

In closing, Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe that this government is on the right track toward making Manitoba great. Since we came to power, we have not increased any significant taxes and have managed to reduce many taxes. We have made Manitoba a safer place to invest and go into business, and businesses from around the world are discovering the Manitoba advantage.

We continue to stand up for the interests of Manitobans to ensure that there are jobs for our citizens and that the priority areas of health, education and family services are maintained at the high level Manitobans have come to expect.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there is one thing that

I have learned in my, I guess it is, almost five-year tenure now, four-and-a-half-year tenure. When I first got elected, I always wondered why it was "honourable members," and after the four years, I must say that I do not only respect, but I also understand why the other members are honourable. I know that you all speak from your heart, and you speak with emotion. You truly believe in your philosophies that you are coming forward with. At least the NDP do. The Liberals, well, we never can tell because they are always falling off the fence. It was not meant that way. I should not—if I ever wanted to do any research in history, I know I would go to the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), and I could get any of that information. She has got it at her fingertips or in her mind, but I have never met anyone who had as much ability with the historical factors of Manitoba as this member.

One of my constituents sits on that side of the House, Madam Deputy Speaker, the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), and I have always enjoyed our conversations. [interjection] Well, we are working on that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I know and respect all honourable members in this House, and whether they are back next time or not, I know that they have served the Province of Manitoba and will continue to serve it in one fashion or another.

That concludes my speech to the throne. Thank you.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to once again welcome Mr. Speaker back to the Chair. We appreciate all the guidance that we get from him and his knowledge of our rules.

I would like to congratulate the new Pages and welcome them, and as I was preparing my speech, I was thinking, I wonder what this place looks like to new Pages. In fact, just yesterday, no, on Friday, I had two guests who were in the public gallery, and after they left, one of them wrote a note to me, saying, is this any way to run a government?

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I understand what they were saying, but I explained that really they were not seeing the government in action; they were seeing the opposition holding the government accountable. That is really what the purpose of daily Question Period is.

For the purpose of trying to simplify what goes on here, I was thinking I would try to explain it to Pages, to someone who is relatively new to this process, and I think the easiest way to explain it is that what you are seeing and hearing here are competing ideas. Each political party has its own philosophy, and they are trying to convince the public through their words and through their actions and through their programs and through their critique if they are in opposition that their ideas are better or superior or more practical or more workable ideas.

So we have ideas that come from the government. Some of those could be described as buzzwords. For example, one of the current buzzwords amongst Conservatives these days is "creating wealth," and you will have members who are here who will have heard that in throne speeches and heard it from speeches on the government side. Their philosophy is that if you create wealth, this will create jobs, and if you have more people working the benefits are distributed in society and eventually everyone will benefit.

Now we have a problem with that because we believe what they are really saying is that when the wealth is created the benefits will eventually trickle down so that even the people at the bottom will benefit, which does not really happen. If you do not have a job, you do not benefit from new wealth in society. You only benefit if the wealth is transferred from one segment of society to another.

Then, in the New Democratic Party we believe in creating a more just and a more equitable society, and we would say that the way to do that is to redistribute the wealth of society and the resources of society through either programs of various kinds or, in particular, through the tax

system. We believe that everyone can benefit and that everyone can be brought up to a minimum standard of living and a decent standard of living if that is put into practice.

Then, the Liberal Party, well, I am not sure how to describe the political ideology or philosophy of the Liberal Party—

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): In between the New Democrats and the Tories.

Mr. Martindale: Well, the member for Inkster says, in between the New Democrats and the Tories. I think that sometimes I hear the Liberal Party trying to be to the right of the Conservatives on economic policy and to the left of the NDP on social policy because I can never quite figure out where they are coming from on the political spectrum.

These days the Conservatives in Canada and the right wing in Canada including The Fraser Institute and many corporations are using the example of the government of New Zealand and talking about how a government there beginning, I believe, in 1984 decided to attack the deficit, and what they are telling us, or spinning to us is what they believe happened in New Zealand.

* (2050)

However, we now have more recent evidence that I think we can use to refute what they are saying. I have a letter to the editor of the New Zealand Herald for December 1992, and it is quite interesting because this letter was written by a school principal and it was a speech that was given at a particular occasion. I would like to read the entire article from the newspaper, including the quotation, into the record.

His name is Mr. Ian Mitchell, principal of Henderson High, and he was speaking at an awards ceremony. Instead of talking about mundane matters such as which sports teams had won and which buildings had been painted and which staff were leaving, he took a very different approach.

This is what he said: "It is therefore my duty to speak out, with anger, and attack the empty economic rhetoric which we are, through exhaustion, in danger of accepting.

"The New Right ideologies have done so much damage to our economy and our already fragile social fabric that this country contains many thousands of families who have been made to feel that they are useless.

"And," said Mr. Mitchell, "those families are sending to school children who in turn feel they are useless and doomed to failure.

"This may suit very well the hidden agenda of the present government which, I am convinced, is to create a permanent social and economic underclass who are kept subdued by their poverty, poor health, no nutritional status and an ingrained sense of their own 'uselessness'.

"There is therefore today a major task facing those of us who work in and with schools. We must attack New Right thinking with every technique we know, and at the same time use our gifts and skills as professional teachers, who are committed to the betterment of humankind to uncover the skills and talents which lie within every young person," Mr. Mitchell said.

"We must ensure that every student who arrives in our classrooms paralysed by 'the inner conviction of uselessness' leaves us, knowing what his or her skills and strengths are, knowing what she/he can achieve, knowing empathetically that she/he is not useless.

"Schools . . . offer hope. . . . However tired we are, however over-stretched our meagre resources are, the fine professionals we call teachers will go into battle against a government whose policies emasculate the young, and leave them feeling powerless and useless."

Then he talked about the senior prize winners.

I think there is a parallel between the agenda of their government in New Zealand at the time and

what is happening today. The result of these policies is that—[interjection] The parallel is with Conservative governments in Canada, including this one. The parallel is that what they are doing is taking hope away from people and giving them a feeling of hopelessness and despair. When people do not have hope they have no reason for living and no reason for trying to achieve personal and societal goals.

Regrettably, I think what this government is doing and one of the things it is doing to achieve this goal is to make an unequal society. Their policies are divisive. They are dividing doctors against nurses, teachers against parents, civil servants against the public and taxpayers. I do not think that their policies are benefiting society or the majority of people in the long run.

The result of these policies is that a small part of society is better off and many other people are worse off. The people at the bottom are much worse off and it really does not have to be that way. As Tommy Douglas, former Premier of Saskatchewan, former member of Parliament said, referring to what happens to resources in society, he said and I quote: Surely if we can produce in such abundance in order to destroy our enemies we can produce an equal abundance in order to provide food, clothing and shelter for our children.

If we can keep people employed for the purpose of destroying human life, surely we can keep them employed for the purpose of enriching and enhancing human life.

An Honourable Member: How are we going to do it?

Mr. Martindale: How do we do it? Well, I have already outlined how I believe that a New Democratic government would do it, but I would like to refer to the government's throne speech and offer my critique of the throne speech.

Many of the things that I have said have really been by way of a framework, and many parts of the throne speech fit into it. For example, on the first page the government talks about an electronic

highway. Well, people are saying that the information highway, the electronic highway is a way that more knowledge can be shared with more people and that it is instantaneously available, et cetera. Well, I think that is true for those people who can afford to buy a computer and for those people who have access, but it is not true for the majority of our society, and it is certainly not true for people who do not have that kind of access, whereas public libraries do, because public libraries are accessible to the public. All you have to do is walk in the door. You can open a book. You do not have to ask anybody for assistance. If you do, it is very easy to get assistance in a library, but with the electronic highway, either you have to be at a university or a computer terminal or own your own computer and pay to be hooked up to it. So I think it is good that we have this kind of access on the Internet and other parts of the electronic highway, but what I am saying is that it is not the kind of accessibility to knowledge that a library is.

The government in their throne speech brags about wanting to work in partnership, but their idea of partnership is quite different than ours, and our Leader has said repeatedly in many throne speech debates and public speeches that our vision of a partnership is to work in co-operation with business and labour as a government in order to set out some economic objectives and to work towards achieving those. I think this government's objective is to work co-operatively with business but not to include labour in that equation.

The government brags about having frozen major tax increases, which really is not true at all. There are not any tax increases that have been frozen. Every time the federal government raised income taxes the Province of Manitoba benefited because the tax rate is a percentage of the federal rate. Property taxes have greatly increased, and they have been the most unfair and regressive increase of all because, as you know, they are not based on ability to pay. That is why they are a regressive tax increase. So they have hurt my constituents in Burrows much more than their constituents in more affluent, particularly more affluent suburban Winnipeg, ridings.

There have been increases in fuel taxes. There have been increases in cigarette taxes. There have been increases in fees. Almost every department has increased fees, and some of them have had huge increases. For example, the post-adoption registry, the fee to register is \$300, whereas in the past I do not think there was any fee. So it is just not true to say there have been no major tax increases in Manitoba.

The government talks about sustaining our health care, education and social services. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they were only sustaining them, probably we would have nothing to criticize. The problem is that they are cutting in all of those areas, and they are cutting back in various areas in health care. They are making cuts in education, including underexpending budgets, and cutting in social service. The list is really quite long.

In health care I would like to only refer to home care, where the cuts started in 1989, and—[interjection] The minister says there is only restructuring taking place. Well, restructuring is just a euphemism for cutting. We know that.

In social services there have been numerous cuts, and they did not just stop with the 1993 budget, because we expected the '94 and '95 budgets would contain good news, because they were getting closer to an election, but the bad news did not stop with 1993. In their worst budget in terms of cutbacks, we know that in child care, for example, the parent fees were increased by 140 percent. Now, there is an example of what could be described as a major tax increase when you increase a fee by 140 percent. They decreased the number of weeks in child care while looking for work, and they have now added a change to the number of days of children being sick, which is another cut to the child care system because it removed \$300,000 from their budget.

With foster families, there have been major increases, and the regrettable thing about these increases is that they affect northern Manitobans much more so than other Manitobans and aboriginal people. For example, foster parent payments were reduced in the 1993 budget by \$2

per child. Effective June 1, 1994, foster parent payments for foster parents who care for relatives were reduced from \$20 to \$10 a day. In the aboriginal community, the priority is given to family members to care for children. It is very important, and it is a good policy, but when you cut the per diem rate from \$20 a day to \$10 a day, then children are going to suffer.

In fact, this reduction is particularly significant for its impact on reserves in Manitoba since 80 percent of aboriginal foster parent placements take place within extended families.

* (2100)

Agency discretionary allowance is used for foster parent training, and recreational needs were also cut by \$1 per day per child. And yet the cost of living—and I said that many of these policies adversely affect northern Manitobans. The cost of living in northern communities is at least 50 percent higher in most categories than in Winnipeg, but foster care rates there are only 5 percent higher.

The area of social services is not the only department where there have been changes. For example, in the Department of Housing, the provincial Conservative government and the federal Liberal government agreed to increase the rent geared to income from 25 percent to 26 percent, I believe, starting January 1, 1994, raising it to 27 percent. Eventually, I think their intention is to raise it to 30 percent, but they have also changed the categories of monies that are included as income. As a result, some people have had rent increases as much as 17 percent. Seniors, in particular, are very concerned about this, and the Minister of Housing knows that. People have been phoning her office. We had a press conference in a seniors' building, and as a result—and we appreciate this—the Minister of Housing said that she would institute an appeals mechanism. So we are waiting for that appeals mechanism to be put in place and so are seniors. We will encourage people to use that appeals mechanism, and we are not talking about the Residential Tenancies commission, because that

already existed, but the minister promised that she would put in an appeals process for nonprofit housing. We are glad to hear that the minister has already put the appeal process in place. We will make sure that our constituents know about that and use it.

We are still waiting for the Winnipeg Development Agreement and hoping that there will be good programs in there once again for housing. Particularly in inner city neighbourhoods like Logan and Dufferin and William Whyte there is a need for housing renewal and infill housing programs. We do not know whether it is the provincial government or the federal government that we are waiting for. It sounds like we are waiting for the federal government to sign on the dotted line. I do not know what the holdup is. [interjection] The Minister of Housing (Mrs. McIntosh) says they are waiting for the city and the federal government.

The throne speech refers to \$205 million of the Canada-Manitoba Infrastructure Works Program. The need for infrastructure works is great, particularly in places where there is a need for sewer improvements and street improvements and sidewalk improvements. I have some of those streets in my constituency, Redwood, Parr and Polson in particular. Some of these streets are beyond repair and on a scale of zero to a hundred are below 10, according to the City of Winnipeg.

Many of my constituents were affected by flooding a year ago. I talked to many of them who had several feet of water in their basements, and they would like to see this infrastructure money being spent on sewer renewal. Some of it was. However, some of it went to things like the Kenaston underpass and to grants to different organizations. In fact a lot of it was not spent on what used to be called infrastructure, namely water and sewer and street repairs.

The government talks about new directions in education. Some of the initiatives that they have announced have already been enacted by school divisions. For example, Winnipeg School Division No. 1 already has a policy on parent

councils giving them a much greater role in operating schools, including in the hiring process for principals and teachers. Perhaps they borrowed this good idea from Winnipeg No. 1.

The government is expected to receive a report of the schools Boundaries Review Commission. Well, we heard that this commission report was ready months ago but it is being stalled or held up. We heard that it was sent back for a rewrite. We think probably—well, it may be released before the election, it may be released after the election. Certainly, if it is released before the election and it is controversial, nothing will be acted upon until after an election, especially I think in rural Manitoba, where changing school boundaries is quite likely to be as contentious as in the city of Winnipeg or even more so.

In Winnipeg we are very concerned that the boundaries to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 might be changed in ways that may be harmful to Winnipeg No. 1, because this school division has many programs that other school divisions do not have. For example, we have a nursery program in every school or for every child in Winnipeg No. 1. As far as I know, no other divisions have that as a universal free program. We are afraid that if we get lumped in with other school divisions that that very positive program will be eliminated.

There are many, many examples like that. There is the Child Guidance Clinic. There are the nutrition programs. There is CEDA, Community Education Development Association. We are concerned that if Winnipeg School Division No. 1 disappears many of those programs, which are badly needed in the inner city for very many reasons, will no longer be there. So we are very concerned and very interested to see what the recommendations are for Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

The government talks about the Roblin commission. One of the things—I am just going by memory here—but I think one of the things that we agreed with was the emphasis or renewed emphasis on community college education because Manitoba has a rather low rate of students going

from high school to community colleges compared to many other provinces, one of the lowest in Canada actually.

Many of my constituents have phoned me, and they want to take particular training programs at community college. Either there is no course or they have to go out of province or they are on a waiting list of a year to two years, or in other cases they cannot get the course at all at the community college and they are forced to go to a private college for which they have to pay. In the case of aboriginal students, their band council will pay for a two-year program, but they will not pay for a six-month program. So unless they have the money and can afford to pay, they are not going to get that post-secondary education that they so badly need.

The government does not talk here about their cutbacks, of course, but many of my constituents, many Manitobans are concerned about the changes to ACCESS programs, particularly excellent programs like Winnipeg Education Centre where students who normally may not have gone to university at all are getting an education and graduating and getting jobs. I think that is good for government departments as well as for the individuals.

For example, I was in Thompson. I was talking to the director of the social work faculty in Thompson and asked how many graduates they had and how many were still in northern Manitoba. They have had something like 52 graduates, I believe, and the director said that all of them are still employed and 49 of them are in northern Manitoba. I talked to the director of one of the government departments in Thompson who said that this is good for his department because they no longer have to hire people from Winnipeg or southern Manitoba who go to Thompson and work in a government office and after two or three years leave and come back to Winnipeg and they have to hire new people again and train new people at great expense to the government. Instead, they are hiring northern Manitobans who stay in northern Manitoba because they are from the North, they like their jobs and they like living there. Those are excellent programs that

governments of all political parties should be supporting, but regrettably, this party is cutting ACCESS programs.

You know, we had students here in June. They filled the galleries. They signed petitions. They wrote letters. They made phone calls. Some of them came to see me and they said, Doug, why is this government cutting these ACCESS programs? We do not understand. Why would they do this? It is such a good thing. I said there is a very simple reason. It is obvious to me, but it was not to them. It is because they do not believe in affirmative action. That is the problem with this government.

The government talks about initiatives that they will undertake concerning the level of policing in the province. Certainly, the level of policing is of great concern to not just rural and urban Manitobans, but to me and to my constituents.

I think it was in the last Throne Speech Debate that I mentioned that my car was stolen. Well, I am very sorry to say that two throne speeches in a row I can say for a second time that a second car was stolen, only this time the individual broke into our house and then broke into the garage and stole the car. So, you know, I understand very well how my constituents feel when that happens to them because I just experienced it for a second time two weeks ago, and we were very lucky compared to other people because there was almost no damage to either the house or the car.

* (2110)

In fact, it was a rather interesting experience because I went looking for my car and in 15 minutes I found it. I phoned the police, and while I was waiting for the police, I knocked on the door immediately beside where the car was parked and someone had seen the car thief get out of the car. So we have got an eyewitness.

The only thing that was stolen in the house were my wife's runners, and the only thing stolen in the garage was a hockey stick. So I am looking for a tall male wearing my wife's runners playing ball

hockey on Pritchard Avenue. If anybody sees this person, I would like to have a talk with him and so would the City of Winnipeg Police.

I went home and two hours later I get a phone call. Mr. Martindale, this is the City of Winnipeg Police Department. We found your stolen car. I said, wait a minute, I found my stolen car. They said, we are sorry, it was not on the police report.

I would like to talk about community policing because one of the reasons why people do not feel safe is because they do not see police officers except when they have a break-in, and a day or two later they come to your home. For example, our break-in was on a Saturday night. We were the 18th call, so we waited till Sunday morning before somebody came to our house.

But community policing is a very good idea, and we have had some very small scale examples of that, but what we need to do is to augment the City of Winnipeg so that they can have a full-scale community-based policing model.

Now they are moving towards it, and as I say we have had some of the experiments in the north end. For example, we had a very good constable, Bob Johnson, who is located at the North Y Community Centre. Everybody knew Constable Bob because he was always walking on his beat.

It is very interesting to be around a community, to live in the same community for 14 years as I have because you see trends, you see cycles, you see things come and go. For example, in the 1988 election, community-based policing was a very important issue in Burrows constituency because there was a citizens' committee that were campaigning to have foot patrols. Almost everywhere I went people talked about community safety and their fear of crime and their experience with break and enters. But an interesting thing happened. It was after 1988 that we got Constable Bob Johnson and a store-front office on Selkirk Avenue.

In 1990, when I went door to door in Burrows constituency, almost no one talked to me about

personal safety and crime and breaking and enter, which is really quite amazing. The reason is that people felt safer because they saw the police walking on the street. It makes a big, big difference.

Regrettably, the police zone office on Selkirk Avenue is only down to a staff complement of two, and they are two excellent people. They are doing a lot of public relations. They have an advisory committee, and I have been to their advisory committee meetings. They get 20 to 25 people at an advisory committee meeting which I think is wonderful support for the City of Winnipeg Police Department.

They are going to open a larger store-front office, and they are going to increase the complement of police officers to eight or 10. I think that is badly needed. But we do not want them out in cars patrolling and answering routine calls. We want them walking the streets and talking to citizens and making people feel safer because they are visible and on the street.

Regrettably, people do not feel that way right now. As a result, we have the Andrews Street Co-op. This is an idea that normally is put into practice in high-income neighbourhoods where people hire private security guards. Amazingly, it is happening in one of the poorest neighbourhoods in the city of Winnipeg, the William Whyte neighbourhood, where people are getting together. They are having public meetings. They have incorporated, I believe, as a co-op. What they are doing is they are charging people so much a month to pay them to patrol the streets, citizens. All they are doing is checking on houses and reporting things that they see.

I think it is a sad commentary on our society and on the level of funding for police when citizens start paying their neighbours to provide—

An Honourable Member: It is a sad commentary.

Mr. Martindale: It is a sad commentary on your government for not providing adequate policing.

Every year the Province of Manitoba cuts back on the funding to the City of Winnipeg, and so they have pressure on their budget. That is why they do not spend the money on it. I am sure they would like to spend more money on policing. I will bet the city councillors here get more phone calls about policing than almost any other civic issue. It is an issue that is part and parcel of the province and their funding formula to the City of Winnipeg as much as it is a function of the budget of the city itself.

I heard my colleague from Wellington making positive remarks about the Maintenance Enforcement Program. Certainly we know that there needs to be major changes and improvements because people have been having an impossible time trying to get through. We know that people are not paying the maintenance that they are legally supposed to be paying.

The government, in its throne speech, talks about caring for families. They refer to social services and income-support programs and then talk about the federal-provincial social safety net. I have some rather interesting observations to make about this, particularly about the role of the federal government who initiated this. These are what I would call Axworthy's axioms. You might be interested in listening to what Axworthy's axioms are.

The first is: As the need for income security goes up, the supply of social services should go down. The second Axworthy axiom is: If you need or use income support, you are an abuser, but if you paid for benefits and do not use them you are a responsible citizen. The third Axworthy axiom is a new economic theory. It says: Markets are not important; free trade has nothing to do with it; there is only the deficit in social programs, and if we eliminate both, there will be economic growth.

I think Mr. Axworthy borrowed the third one from the Minister of Finance, Mr. Martin. It is quite obvious now that the purpose of social security reform is not about modernizing and revamping social programs. It is about cutting

expenditure. Mr. Axworthy really had no choice. I am sure it was a cabinet decision, and he is carrying out his marching orders for the Minister of Finance just like all his other good cabinet colleagues are doing, and so the result is that we have already seen cuts to unemployment insurance, which is also offloading expense to the Province of Manitoba. The Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) in Manitoba has said that in the first year that would cost the government of Manitoba \$2 million because those people who used to be on unemployment insurance are now on welfare and the cost is cost-shared with the federal government. Actually it is \$4 million, but the provincial share is \$2 million.

What is coming in the future? Well, there are a number of things. One is changes to CAP and therefore to things like it could affect child care and certainly will affect social assistance. Then there is stage two, and we are already getting phone calls from seniors because they are concerned that pensions are going to be on the block. They should be concerned. All they have to do is look at round one and see where the cuts are and then look at round two. Fortunately, they are starting to get organized.

The government says they will implement reforms and strengthen incentives to work, and certainly that is something we support. It is something that can be done now. They do not have to wait for Mr. Axworthy. They can do it through changes to the work incentive program in Manitoba. The government talks about maintaining basic income supports. The problem is that they are not maintaining them, they are cutting them in many cases.

The government talks about the Taking Charge initiative. Regrettably, nothing has happened except for a press conference at the chamber of commerce club, a place that most single parents will never, ever see in their lives because we know that 60 percent of single parents live in poverty.

We are still waiting for a store-front office. We are waiting for the board to be appointed and, amazingly, there is no evaluation. In fact, I have

a detailed description about six or eight pages long of the Taking Charge initiative and the last page about the evaluation is blank. It says the evaluation will come. Well, I think they have everything backwards, because I think you should know where you want to be at the end of the day.

This government does not think that way, regrettably. In fact, they do not even know how many jobs are going to be created, and to their credit the media really pushed the government on that in the press conference. They asked Mr. Axworthy and they asked the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) how many of these single parents, after 4,000 of them go through this office, would have jobs. The Minister of Human Resources, the federal minister skated and the provincial Minister of Family Services skated and they would not answer the question. The reason is obvious and simple—because there are no job creation goals for the taking charge single-parent pilot project. There is no evaluation. The press releases explained it all. It is about assessment and referral and goal setting and an entrepreneurial program and that is all. We think this is a very inadequate way to address the problem of poverty among single parents and getting them into the workforce.

* (2120)

The government talks about the environment and a curbside collection program. Regrettably, Manitoba and particularly Winnipeg are light years behind many other provinces. I lived in Toronto from 1973 to '76. We were recycling newspapers, glass and tin cans. We were even composting. Almost nothing went in the garbage, almost everything was being recycled. Here it is 1994, I live in Winnipeg and there is no curbside recycling, and I have to go to three different recycling depots in order to get rid of all our recyclables. Some of them are struggling, like the West Kildonan one operating on volunteers and the province will not give them any money. Every year the number of tonnes of recyclable materials they pick up is greatly increasing, and they are doing a wonderful job. So a curbside recycling program is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, we have put out an alternative throne speech, as you know, and we have announced a putting-children-first action plan on child poverty. I am sure that my colleagues will describe these things in much greater detail, including our Leader, because we believe that these are good announcements, they are good proposals, they are workable proposals. I could even say they are doable under Gary Doer and an NDP government. We look forward to being able to implement these policies as government.

As I conclude, I would like to wind up with a few issues that are of concern to my constituents in Burrows. One important issue to the people on Flora Place is what is going to happen to their houses, because right now the government policy is to board up the houses as they become vacant. Not only are they boarding them up—this was a surprise to the minister; she did not know this when she came to a community meeting—they are disconnecting the hydro and disconnecting the water. That means to me that they are going to bulldoze these houses.

To her credit—and I would like to thank the minister for inviting me to a meeting in her office, and also for organizing a public meeting, and thirdly, for consulting the tenants of Flora Place public housing at every step of the way. They will be consulted.

There is a great need for publicly assisted housing, especially for low-income seniors. We do not want to lose 120 units of housing. It is a very interesting situation, and it shows how important a home is to an individual, because these houses were built in the late 1940s and they are starting to fall apart. It is good that some government is having a serious look at this. But even though the quality is not good, people love living there. They are single-family detached houses. People know their neighbourhood. I could tell you some wonderful stories about Flora Place. In fact, a year ago they had a Flora Place reunion for people who lived there who were on welfare in the 1950s and '60s. It was fascinating to listen to some of their stories and some other time I will share those stories with honourable

members.

There are some very concerned people in Burrows constituency about the social security review, particularly seniors are concerned about their pensions. We believe that the government does not need to cut expenditures on the backs of seniors because, right now, high income seniors have their pensions clawed back, so it is not necessary to save money at the expense of seniors.

We know that old-age pensions were brought in by a Liberal government, I believe in 1926, under pressure from J.S. Woodsworth and his colleagues in a minority government as the price of their support. We will continue to defend pensions for seniors vigorously against the cutback deficit reducing agenda of Paul Martin and Lloyd Axworthy. There are many people in Burrows constituency, and not just the more recent immigrant groups from Southeast Asia, but also immigrant groups who have been here for many generations, like the Ukrainian community, about the immigration changes. They are particularly concerned about the change in the family reunification class.

Someone from the Greek community made a very interesting observation to me. She said, in our culture we value seniors, we value our parents, and when they are old we expect to support them, not the other way around. It seems that in Canadian society, many parents and grandparents are supporting their children and grandchildren, but she said, in my culture, it is the other way around. I want to support my parents when they are old.

So we have been very critical of these changes that the federal government is bringing about and so too have people particularly in the Filipino and the East Indian community.

There are some very good things happening in Burrows constituency. Some people I would like to pay credit to: particularly the new family resource centre at Pritchard Place Drop In, in addition to the good work that is being done at Pritchard Place Drop In; and also Open Doors

Adult Literacy Program at King Edward School; and White Flower House on William Avenue run by Sister Clair Jobin, who is working with immigrant seniors and teaching them to read and write English. Some of them were born in Canada. It is really quite amazing. I met an elderly Ukrainian gentleman who grew up in the Roblin area. He had never learned to read and write because he grew up in the bush, and he is learning to read and write English for the first time in his life.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to rise on the occasion to make one's contribution and comments to the throne speech. I begin in the traditional way because I am a traditionalist. I make no apologies for it, and offer you, Sir, my very best compliments and congratulations and those of my constituents, that great constituency of Lakeside which certainly believes in change but change ought to be made cautiously and prudently. I say that with the knowledge that in the last 76 years, there have only been two MLAs elected from the constituency of Lakeside, and I am one of them. So we do believe in change but not in inordinate haste.

Mr. Speaker, along with my congratulations to you, Sir, of course, to all of your staff whom I am pleased to see are here again to serve us as they have on other occasions, the new crop of Pages that will provide us the services that we sometimes take for granted as members, but I assure you we are always appreciative of the attention that they provide us to make our lives a little more comfortable in this Chamber.

I want to particularly also on this occasion congratulate the mover and the seconder of the throne speech last Friday. Indeed, it is always interesting to hear the first salvos of another session, in this case coming from the government side by the mover and seconder. In a surprising way the mover has put his own stamp on this entire throne speech. It seems to revolve around potatoes.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely well aware of the fact that in the Parliamentary Rules & Forms, 6th Edition, Fraser, Dawson, Holtby, No. 503 states: "Members may be 'punished' for the use of potatoes as exhibits," as a result of May 5, 1987. I will, of course, take that admonition to full account and conduct myself accordingly.

Allow me to say something. I quite frankly congratulate the government, my government, on the timing of this session. I think there is something appropriate about calling us together at the conclusion of the year. I think it is always in order for the government of the day, the ministers of the day to be held accountable to their shareholders, to the people that they serve. In a way this is a nice way of doing it and at the same time to focus on the future by the presentation of the throne speech, which is of course the instrument of government in our parliamentary tradition that ought to and does and certainly under this government set out the focus, focus all of our own attention on where it is that we want to travel in the future.

I would like to suggest to honourable members opposite, I know that particularly those noteworthy members of—I forget now, what are they, the fifth or the sixth estate, the media, the press, who are ever present watching us as we deliver it, they have, particularly of late, made comment on the fact that our work habits are less than what they ought to be, that we do not have sort of scheduled sittings of the Legislature and that this government particularly has not called or convened the session of the Manitoba Legislature as often as it ought to.

An Honourable Member: How would they know that?

* (2130)

Mr. Enns: That is a good question. [interjection]

My honourable friend the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) reminds me of what George Bernard Shaw had to say about the Leader of the Liberal Party. Well, he did not really say it about him, but he is quoted in saying: He knows

nothing, he thinks he knows everything. That points clearly to a political career.

I am afraid at my expense and the expense of those who do know something who also choose political careers.

Mr. Speaker, I am being diverted from the serious intent of my few moments of debate with respect to the throne speech. I was saying that I quite frankly welcome the kind of format that has been introduced in 1994, as we close out the year 1994, with an opportunity, certainly, for us as government to respond to all members and members opposite and at the same time to hold out the promise in the future of what will happen and what will come, what we hope to bring about in the new year in the form of the throne speech. I commend honourable members opposite to consider that kind of a format that we could perhaps establish as a tradition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Agriculture for the province of Manitoba and one that certainly has to and is prepared to give account of what has happened in the last year since last we met and coming back to the theme that was established by my colleague the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) about small potatoes and how the Liberal Leader saw everything in that light, I want to indicate that agriculture did more than just grow small potatoes in the year 1994. This potato grown in the fine constituency of Lakeside in the community of St. Eustache is but a sample of the bountiful harvest that Manitoba farmers exhort from the fertile fields of Manitoba.

I see the Clerk is cautioning you. I can tell you the page. The rule is No. 506. I can be punished. I can be punished for this offence, so I will no longer—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, given the seniority of the member, I do not wish to raise it as a point of order in terms of prohibiting exhibits, but I am wondering if that

thing that the member was waving around might perhaps be delivered to the legislative cafeteria for tomorrow's lunch.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I would very much offer my reading appliances here to the member for Thompson to ensure that he did not actually see what he thought he saw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised, without a doubt, it is part of my duties to remind the members. The honourable minister is quite correct; it is Beausheue 503. Members may be punished for the use of potatoes as exhibits. We have on several occasions, being on two other occasions, had these potatoes as exhibits.

So I would just like to remind all honourable members that not only does Beausheue say members may be punished, I will tell honourable members, members will be punished for the use of potatoes as exhibits. This thing, this huge thing that the Minister of Agriculture has brought in, whatever you want to call it, that definitely is an exhibit. It is definitely an exhibit, and I would ask the honourable minister to keep such a great big thing in his desk.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, I do apologize to you and all honourable members for breaking the rules so early in this session. I would ask you, Sir, one particular favour and that of your staff, your very capable staff. Would they mind researching, why is it that of all the bountiful things that we grow, corn, beets, apples, bananas—well, no, we do not grow bananas. But why was the potato singled out in Beausheue for such severe punishment? Is this some residue, ongoing Irish resentment built into our rules from the potato famines, or what is it that we have got going here? But I will leave that to you, Sir, to advise me of it at some time at your leisure. Some slow day when there are no rules for you to adjudicate on, perhaps you could come down to the ruling on why the potato was being singled out in this particular way.

* * *

Mr. Enns: Allow me to say though, very seriously, to my friends and particularly to the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), I understand that today in Question Period, as a result of my not being here at the start of the Question Period or missing the Question Period, that there were some questions directed with respect to agriculture to the government benches.

Allow me to say, of course, that '94 has been an exciting year in agriculture, particularly when you compare it to the immediate past year of '93. I say that with the full knowledge that, as there always will be in agriculture, certain areas that did not fare as well as others. I am certainly mindful of the fact that, again, east of the Red River, particularly where the Minister of Highways (Mr. Findlay) is currently resident in when he is in his constituency, suffered from more rain than they needed. Certainly there were areas in the province, the south and the southwest, that were struck with some very severe weather disturbances in the form of hail and high winds which regrettably can ruin the expectations of that year's crop.

But, in the main, Mr. Speaker, the difference between '93 and '94 was really quite remarkable, and that is expressed to me throughout the different parts of the province as I travel through it on my visitations on different occasions to different areas of the province. And potatoes, speaking very seriously about them now, is just one example of them.

We are fortunate that we have a very flourishing potato industry in this province, two major processing companies in Portage la Prairie and Camation, along with other producers, notably the Old Dutch, people who operate and process here in the city of Winnipeg.

We have harvested a tremendous crop of potatoes along with other root crops. I know that the sugar beet crop, although a little more difficult to take out of the harvest in some areas, again for reasons of too much moisture—but in the end I am told and I am advised after a somewhat shaky start back in the spring, as some members recall, as we

tried to resolve labour dispute issues between management and workers and farmers. Nonetheless, a significant crop of sugar beets was planted and harvested in this last crop year.

* (2140)

I take exception to the suggestion from honourable members opposite that this government or this ministry has not taken positions and let them be known with respect to some of the major issues facing agriculture. That is simply not true. Positions taken by myself, positions taken by the Ministry of Agriculture are similar to positions espoused by the former Minister of Agriculture on the WGTA, for instance. We do hold to the payment of the benefits to the producer.

That is different than the New Democratic Party, who cling to the old, keep paying it to the railways. We have seen the trouble, Mr. Speaker. We have been doing that for all these many years, big, big chunks of public money, \$700-plus million every year. What has happened? Have they improved the system? Have they cut down the turnaround time between cars leaving our farm, our elevator points and then to Vancouver? No, they have not. They have just taken and gobbled up that money, and there have been no efficiencies brought to the transportation system. So some change has to take place, in my opinion. That is why we support that position. That is a position that is clear. That is a position that I am expressing to the federal government, to Minister Goodale, and will be expressing it to him most forcibly again on December 18 and 19, when next we meet with fellow ministers in October.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. We understand where the official opposition and the government stand on those issues. Of course, where are our friends the Liberal Party? Where do they stand? They are the party, they are the government in Ottawa that will make the determination. Where are the members of the Liberal Party who represent Manitoba farmers? What kind of message are they bringing to Mr. Goodale? That, I think, is a legitimate question that we have to ask of them,

and it is legitimate for us to expect some questions to flow from them.

I appreciate that in agriculture there are some formidable forces at work that are questioning some of the traditional ways of doing business in agriculture. Mr. Speaker, lest we think that they are housed just within a relatively small group of people within the agricultural community, that simply is not the case. Lest we think that they are housed within a political group or political party, that is not the case. I know that questions are being asked about some of the traditional means of how we have structured ourselves in the marketing of our agricultural products and our primary products.

Honourable members opposite like to climb on every political wind or wave that they see fanning or blowing in the breeze and point to that as being the clear indicator. That simply is not good enough, and it is not good enough if you examine it yourself. I find it interesting, for instance, that while honourable members opposite, particularly New Democrats, like to hold fast to the traditional and the established marketing structure, particularly the monopoly marketing structures that have been established, yet where is their member from the North when he questions the ongoing allegiance of the fishermen of the province of Manitoba to the Freshwater Fish Marketing board? They want a dual marketing system for the northern fishermen. They want to change the marketing structure for the fish marketing board. That, Mr. Speaker, is what some wheat producers are questioning, what some grain producers are questioning. That is what some hog producers are questioning.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a responsibility of this minister of this government to try to sort out, to try to listen, to consult and to act with a great deal of caution and a great deal of prudence before making some fundamental changes.

But we should understand why some of these pressures are on our system. Agriculture is changing and we know that. Agriculture is not the same as it was 20 years ago or 25 years ago, never

mind 30, 40 or 50 years ago when some of these institutions were established. That does not mean that we look upon these institutions and cast them aside as has-beens. What it means is that we look at them with honesty and integrity and we challenge them to look at the changing face of agriculture as it meets the responsibilities today.

Mr. Speaker, coincidentally to these changing times come of course the changing conditions that this nation finds itself in. I find myself particularly struck by what has happened in the last four or five years in the whole business of, not just agriculture, although understandably because agriculture is my portfolio I tend to address myself to that issue, but on the whole issue of trade we have as a nation.

I know those who do not want change, the arch-Conservatives, the reactionaries, those who do not represent change, the New Democrats, the Maude Barlows of this world will continue not to acknowledge what is happening in this world, but the rest of us, even the Liberals, after feigning differently during the election, have quickly jumped aboard the fact that this is a global economy that we are in and we are our neighbour's keeper and we trade with everybody in this world.

So we have come under in the last four or five years major international trade obligations: CUSTA, Canada-U.S. agreement; NAFTA, Canada-U.S.-Mexico agreement; GATT agreement—all of these. That has had a powerful influence on the way we do business and the way our farmers are expected to do business in the coming world and the way they will have to do business if they want to continue on the landscape. That is the issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is not because of the ideology of a particular political party. It is not because of the wilfulness or the intentions of a particular minister that will dictate how business will be carried out and how goods and services will be traded. It is the international economy and our position in it if we want a position in it. That is what we will have to try to determine with care and with caution and with prudence and with a great deal of

listening to our primary producers, who are, after all, those most directly engaged in this business.

Mr. Speaker, allow me just to conclude by saying about agriculture that I have never, not for a moment, lost sight of the fact that those of us engaged in agriculture are of course the most important people in this province, in this country and quite frankly in what we would call our organized, civilized world. Without agriculture there would be no debates about medicare. Without agriculture, without the ability of a relatively minor group of producers, being able to produce surplus food, it is only because these producers can produce surplus foods, surplus to their own needs, that we have everything else that we call as modern day, civilized living.

Universities, schools, education, health care, medicare, none of that was there of course when mankind was engaged in and occupied totally as a hunter-gatherer society, when we did not have the ability to produce surplus foods. We did not have time to philosophize. We did not have time to write poetry. We did not have time to write music. We did not have time to attend or establish universities. We did not have time to mend and heal ourselves in hospitals and medicare systems. That only occurred when man reached that level of being able to produce surplus agricultural foodstuffs.

That is sometimes something that we lose sight of. For that reason I am delighted and I am honoured and I am privileged to be able to speak for the food producers of Manitoba. I carry that with me anytime I have the occasion to represent food producers on any forum, whether it is in their own communities or whether it is abroad as their emissary representing the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, the government of Manitoba or indeed, as it has on some occasions been, as a representative of the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud and very privileged to be the Minister of Agriculture at this particular time in the history of Manitoba. I know that with the kind of support that we have within this government, the kind of hands-on experience

that comes around our caucus and cabinet table that we find ourselves continuing to enjoy, never to be taken for granted, certainly not us, but we continue to enjoy, I think that is what the honourable members opposite acknowledge, the continued support from a vast majority of the food producers, of the farmers of Manitoba.

* (2150)

That is a privilege and that is a responsibility that this government has to carry with a great deal of seriousness, because it is not and ought not to be given lightly. We have been favoured over a lengthy period of time now, indeed a period of time that spans my lifetime in this House and beyond that, where a majority of the members representing rural Manitoba, the farming areas of Manitoba, have been Conservatives. There has to be a reason for that, because we have not flown into flights of fancy that have attacked farming in an unfair way, as we see in some of the actions of honourable members opposite. I will leave for another day when I can debate those particular issues more specifically. Mr. Speaker—

An Honourable Member: What about the horses?

Mr. Enns: Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the horses? I will allow the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), Mr. House leader, to tell us about the horses sometime and about how the horses—and there are at least 3,000 or 4,000 in her constituency that are probably receiving better care under more humane and comfortable conditions than any other farm animal now under any kind of housing operation, particularly when it is a day like today and a night like tonight at 28, 29 or 30 below, to be comfortably housed in a well-ventilated barn, to have the water and the grain brought to it, I tell you, my three saddle ponies who are right now looking for a little bit of shelter out in the bush in the back of my quarter, they would prefer to be in a barn. I can tell you that.

Because it was felt to be an attackable area of agriculture—horses have a special place in the

western tradition—and following on the successful attack by the environmentalists on the white seals some decades ago, they chose not pigs, because who likes pigs, not even dairy cows because dairy cows, after all, they look contented, but they picked on horses. In doing so, they did themselves a disservice, and the official opposition did themselves a tremendous disservice by not immediately disassociating themselves from that kind of an unfounded attack and by not clearly, you know, indicating to the people of Manitoba, who at one point in time had placed their trust in that party as government but obviously will not do so for some considerable long time if their current standing in the polls is of any particular meaning.

Mr. Speaker, what we make of our friends opposite, to our immediate right, the Liberal friends—we are told that governments who like to describe themselves when they are in opposition as being governments-in-waiting—you look at that preponderance of the Liberals standing and staring us in the face, and you have to ask yourself: What are they waiting for? What are they waiting for? It is amazing how in the course of a year, and it has been a year, of simply not doing anything. I guess it proves something that, if you do not do anything, there is nothing in particular that the people or the general public can take issue with you, so how else can you explain the current status of our friends of the Liberal persuasion?

But, Mr. Speaker, that will be determined as we move steadily forward to some final decisions that regrettably even this Liberal government will have to make. They will have to make it. The honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), is it, who spoke just previous to me? [interjection] He, in the course of his remarks, made some reference to the New Zealand situation, and we are, of course, are familiar with the New Zealand situation.

There have been numerous occasions where spokespersons from that country, important people who have served in senior government ranks, have been on a lecture tour not just in this country but in other parts of the western world, I believe, essentially telling us that again was something that

has been around for a long, long time.

I am again advised by—I am getting better, Mr. Speaker, you will notice I have better research staff here and they are giving me these little—here is something that was said, and I quote:

The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, public debt should be reduced, and the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled.

Cicero said that, in '63. My friend from Portage la Prairie recognized him immediately, as a learned man from the fields of Portage. But Cicero in '63 said that, Mr. Speaker. Now, of course, we have ignored that advice. I say "we," I am not prepared to be partisan on that issue. I accept my fair share of the responsibility, although I do like to remind Manitobans from time to time that it was indeed Howard Pawley and the New Democrats that managed to borrow more money than all 18 or 19 administrations and previous Premiers before him, all in the space of five and a half short years. Not just more money, but more than twice as much money.

So, in a nonpartisan way, let me nonetheless fix responsibility in that way, but that is here nor there. The fact of the matter is, and that is coming and it is interesting to see how it is coming home to roost on the Lloyd Axworthys, on the Liberals, and on all of us that something has to be done, as it had to be done in New Zealand. When it was

done in New Zealand, it was done swiftly. It was done virtually overnight.

Mr. Speaker, the amazing result is, as was reported to me by a visitor just a few months ago. The High Commissioner from New Zealand was in my office, and I asked him specifically about this situation. I asked him specifically about agriculture. How could they reduce, virtually cut, the agriculture support programs away in a period of six or eight months, and how did that impact on the farm scene? Was there a tremendous loss of farm families? And there reports to be hardly any.

To suggest that it was easy, of course, it was not. To suggest that there were not some dreadful, personal individual problems associated with that kind of reduction in government spending, of course, one has to accept that as a given. But the simple fact of the matter is, what the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) did not go on to conclude with, is that where is New Zealand today? They are getting out of their difficulty. They are moving. They are moving ahead, Mr. Speaker, and that is what this country will face, and the issue is do we have—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) will have six minutes remaining.

The hour being 10 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 5, 1994

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Throne Speech Debate

(Second Day of Debate)

Barrett	101
Laurendeau	104
Martindale	111
Enns	120